

Supplementary Information for:

The EEG multiverse of schizophrenia

da Cruz, Gordillo et al.

1. Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1 - List of the abbreviation of the EEG features

ampl total power alpha	Amplitude total power in alpha band
ampl total power beta	Amplitude total power in beta band
ampl total power delta	Amplitude total power in delta band
ampl total power gamma	Amplitude total power in gamma band
ampl total power theta	Amplitude total power in theta band
approx entropy	Full-band EEG Approximate Entropy
asymmetry ampl alpha	Range EEG asymmetry in alpha band
asymmetry ampl beta	Range EEG asymmetry in beta band
asymmetry ampl delta	Range EEG asymmetry in delta band
asymmetry ampl gamma	Range EEG asymmetry in gamma band
asymmetry ampl theta	Range EEG asymmetry in theta band
betw cen e-dtf alpha	Betweenness Centrality of the directed transfer function at electrode level in alpha band
betw cen e-dtf beta	Betweenness Centrality of the directed transfer function at electrode level in beta band
betw cen e-dtf delta	Betweenness Centrality of the directed transfer function at electrode level in delta band
betw cen e-dtf gamma	Betweenness Centrality of the directed transfer function at electrode level in gamma band
betw cen e-dtf theta	Betweenness Centrality of the directed transfer function at electrode level in theta band
betw cen e-icoh alpha	Betweenness Centrality of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in alpha band
betw cen e-icoh beta	Betweenness Centrality of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in beta band
betw cen e-icoh delta	Betweenness Centrality of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in delta band
betw cen e-icoh gamma	Betweenness Centrality of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in gamma band
betw cen e-icoh theta	Betweenness Centrality of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in theta band
betw cen e-plv alpha	Betweenness Centrality of the phase-locking value at electrode level in alpha band
betw cen e-plv beta	Betweenness Centrality of the phase-locking value at electrode level in beta band
betw cen e-plv delta	Betweenness Centrality of the phase-locking value at electrode level in delta band
betw cen e-plv gamma	Betweenness Centrality of the phase-locking value at electrode level in gamma band
betw cen e-plv theta	Betweenness Centrality of the phase-locking value at electrode level in theta band
betw cen s-ips alpha	Betweenness Centrality of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in alpha band
betw cen s-ips beta	Betweenness Centrality of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in beta band

betw cen s-ips delta	Betweenness Centrality of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in delta band
betw cen s-ips gamma	Betweenness Centrality of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in gamma band
betw cen s-ips theta	Betweenness Centrality of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in theta band
betw cen s-lcoh alpha	Betweenness Centrality of the lagged coherence at source level in alpha band
betw cen s-lcoh beta	Betweenness Centrality of the lagged coherence at source level in beta band
betw cen s-lcoh delta	Betweenness Centrality of the lagged coherence at source level in delta band
betw cen s-lcoh gamma	Betweenness Centrality of the lagged coherence at source level in gamma band
betw cen s-lcoh theta	Betweenness Centrality of the lagged coherence at source level in theta band
betw cen s-lps alpha	Betweenness Centrality of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in alpha band
betw cen s-lps beta	Betweenness Centrality of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in beta band
betw cen s-lps delta	Betweenness Centrality of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in delta band
betw cen s-lps gamma	Betweenness Centrality of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in gamma band
betw cen s-lps theta	Betweenness Centrality of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in theta band
clust coeff e-dtf alpha	Clustering Coefficient of the directed transfer function at electrode level in alpha band
clust coeff e-dtf beta	Clustering Coefficient of the directed transfer function at electrode level in beta band
clust coeff e-dtf delta	Clustering Coefficient of the directed transfer function at electrode level in delta band
clust coeff e-dtf gamma	Clustering Coefficient of the directed transfer function at electrode level in gamma band
clust coeff e-dtf theta	Clustering Coefficient of the directed transfer function at electrode level in theta band
clust coeff e-icoh alpha	Clustering Coefficient of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in alpha band
clust coeff e-icoh beta	Clustering Coefficient of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in beta band
clust coeff e-icoh delta	Clustering Coefficient of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in delta band
clust coeff e-icoh gamma	Clustering Coefficient of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in gamma band
clust coeff e-icoh theta	Clustering Coefficient of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in theta band
clust coeff e-plv alpha	Clustering Coefficient of the phase-locking value at electrode level in alpha band
clust coeff e-plv beta	Clustering Coefficient of the phase-locking value at electrode level in beta band
clust coeff e-plv delta	Clustering Coefficient of the phase-locking value at electrode level in delta band
clust coeff e-plv gamma	Clustering Coefficient of the phase-locking value at electrode level in gamma band
clust coeff e-plv theta	Clustering Coefficient of the phase-locking value at electrode level in theta band

clust coeff s-ips alpha	Clustering Coefficient of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in alpha band
clust coeff s-ips beta	Clustering Coefficient of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in beta band
clust coeff s-ips delta	Clustering Coefficient of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in delta band
clust coeff s-ips gamma	Clustering Coefficient of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in gamma band
clust coeff s-ips theta	Clustering Coefficient of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in theta band
clust coeff s-lcoh alpha	Clustering Coefficient of the lagged coherence at source level in alpha band
clust coeff s-lcoh beta	Clustering Coefficient of the lagged coherence at source level in beta band
clust coeff s-lcoh delta	Clustering Coefficient of the lagged coherence at source level in delta band
clust coeff s-lcoh gamma	Clustering Coefficient of the lagged coherence at source level in gamma band
clust coeff s-lcoh theta	Clustering Coefficient of the lagged coherence at source level in theta band
clust coeff s-lps alpha	Clustering Coefficient of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in alpha band
clust coeff s-lps beta	Clustering Coefficient of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in beta band
clust coeff s-lps delta	Clustering Coefficient of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in delta band
clust coeff s-lps gamma	Clustering Coefficient of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in gamma band
clust coeff s-lps theta	Clustering Coefficient of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in theta band
coeff of var ampl alpha	Range EEG coefficient of variation in alpha band
coeff of var ampl beta	Range EEG coefficient of variation in beta band
coeff of var ampl delta	Range EEG coefficient of variation in delta band
coeff of var ampl gamma	Range EEG coefficient of variation in gamma band
coeff of var ampl theta	Range EEG coefficient of variation in theta band
correlation dimension	Full-band EEG Correlation Dimension
dfa exponent alpha	Detrended Fluctuation Analysis exponent in alpha band
dfa exponent beta	Detrended Fluctuation Analysis exponent in beta band
dfa exponent delta	Detrended Fluctuation Analysis exponent in delta band
dfa exponent gamma	Detrended Fluctuation Analysis exponent in gamma band
dfa exponent theta	Detrended Fluctuation Analysis exponent in theta band
hfd alpha	Higuchi's Fractal Dimension in alpha band
hfd beta	Higuchi's Fractal Dimension in beta band
hfd delta	Higuchi's Fractal Dimension in delta band
hfd gamma	Higuchi's Fractal Dimension in gamma band
hfd theta	Higuchi's Fractal Dimension in theta band
hjorth activity	Full-band EEG Hjorth parameter activity
hjorth complexity	Full-band EEG Hjorth parameter complexity
hjorth mobility	Full-band EEG Hjorth parameter mobility

hurst exponent	Full-band Hurst Exponent
kfd alpha	Katz's Fractal Dimension in alpha band
kfd beta	Katz's Fractal Dimension in beta band
kfd delta	Katz's Fractal Dimension in delta band
kfd gamma	Katz's Fractal Dimension in gamma band
kfd theta	Katz's Fractal Dimension in theta band
kurtosis ampl alpha	Kurtosis of the amplitude in alpha band
kurtosis ampl beta	Kurtosis of the amplitude in beta band
kurtosis ampl delta	Kurtosis of the amplitude in delta band
kurtosis ampl gamma	Kurtosis of the amplitude in gamma band
kurtosis ampl theta	Kurtosis of the amplitude in theta band
life time alpha	Life-time statistics of alpha bursts
life time beta	Life-time statistics of beta bursts
life time delta	Life-time statistics of delta bursts
life time gamma	Life-time statistics of gamma bursts
life time theta	Life-time statistics of theta bursts
lyapunov exponent	Full-band EEG Lyapunov Exponent
lzc exhaustive	Lempel-Ziv complexity exhaustive
lzc primitive	Lempel-Ziv complexity primitive
mean ampl alpha	Mean amplitude of the envelope in alpha band
mean ampl beta	Mean amplitude of the envelope in beta band
mean ampl delta	Mean amplitude of the envelope in delta band
mean ampl gamma	Mean amplitude of the envelope in gamma band
mean ampl theta	Mean amplitude of the envelope in theta band
microstates temporal	EEG microstates temporal parameters: mean duration, time coverage and occurrence
microstates transitions	EEG microstates transition probabilities
mod index alpha-beta	Modulation Index of alpha phase on beta amplitude
mod index alpha-gamma	Modulation Index of alpha phase on gamma amplitude
mod index beta-gamma	Modulation Index of beta phase on gamma amplitude
mod index delta-alpha	Modulation Index of delta phase on alpha amplitude
mod index delta-beta	Modulation Index of delta phase on beta amplitude
mod index delta-gamma	Modulation Index of delta phase on gamma amplitude
mod index theta-alpha	Modulation Index of theta phase on alpha amplitude
mod index theta-beta	Modulation Index of theta phase on beta amplitude
mod index theta-gamma	Modulation Index of theta phase on gamma amplitude
node str e-dtf alpha	Node Strength of the directed transfer function at electrode level in alpha band
node str e-dtf beta	Node Strength of the directed transfer function at electrode level in beta band
node str e-dtf delta	Node Strength of the directed transfer function at electrode level in delta band
node str e-dtf gamma	Node Strength of the directed transfer function at electrode level in gamma band
node str e-dtf theta	Node Strength of the directed transfer function at electrode level in theta band
node str e-icoh alpha	Node Strength of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in alpha band
node str e-icoh beta	Node Strength of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in beta band
node str e-icoh delta	Node Strength of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in delta band

node str e-icoh gamma	Node Strength of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in gamma band
node str e-icoh theta	Node Strength of the imaginary part of coherency at electrode level in theta band
node str e-plv alpha	Node Strength of the phase-locking value at electrode level in alpha band
node str e-plv beta	Node Strength of the phase-locking value at electrode level in beta band
node str e-plv delta	Node Strength of the phase-locking value at electrode level in delta band
node str e-plv gamma	Node Strength of the phase-locking value at electrode level in gamma band
node str e-plv theta	Node Strength of the phase-locking value at electrode level in theta band
node str s-ips alpha	Node Strength of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in alpha band
node str s-ips beta	Node Strength of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in beta band
node str s-ips delta	Node Strength of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in delta band
node str s-ips gamma	Node Strength of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in gamma band
node str s-ips theta	Node Strength of the instantaneous phase synchronization at source level in theta band
node str s-lcoh alpha	Node Strength of the lagged coherence at source level in alpha band
node str s-lcoh beta	Node Strength of the lagged coherence at source level in beta band
node str s-lcoh delta	Node Strength of the lagged coherence at source level in delta band
node str s-lcoh gamma	Node Strength of the lagged coherence at source level in gamma band
node str s-lcoh theta	Node Strength of the lagged coherence at source level in theta band
node str s-lps alpha	Node Strength of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in alpha band
node str s-lps beta	Node Strength of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in beta band
node str s-lps delta	Node Strength of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in delta band
node str s-lps gamma	Node Strength of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in gamma band
node str s-lps theta	Node Strength of the lagged phase synchronization at source level in theta band
relative ampl alpha	Relative spectral amplitude in alpha band
relative ampl beta	Relative spectral amplitude in beta band
relative ampl delta	Relative spectral amplitude in delta band
relative ampl gamma	Relative spectral amplitude in gamma band
relative ampl theta	Relative spectral amplitude in theta band
rqa determinism	Full-band EEG Recurrence Quantification Analysis Determinism
rqa entropy	Full-band EEG Recurrence Quantification Analysis Entropy
rqa laminarity	Full-band EEG Recurrence Quantification Analysis Laminarity
rqa max diagonal	Full-band EEG Recurrence Quantification Analysis Maximal diagonal line length
rqa max vertical	Full-band EEG Recurrence Quantification Analysis Maximal vertical line length
rqa mean diagonal	Full-band EEG Recurrence Quantification Analysis Mean diagonal line length
rqa rte	Full-band EEG Recurrence Quantification Analysis Recurrence times entropy
rqa trapping time	Full-band EEG Recurrence Quantification Analysis Trapping time
sample entropy	Full-band EEG Sample Entropy
skewness ampl alpha	Skewness of the amplitude in alpha band
skewness ampl beta	Skewness of the amplitude in beta band
skewness ampl delta	Skewness of the amplitude in delta band

skewness ampl gamma	Skewness of the amplitude in gamma band
skewness ampl theta	Skewness of the amplitude in theta band
source ampl alpha	Spectral amplitude in alpha band at source level
source ampl beta	Spectral amplitude in beta band at source level
source ampl delta	Spectral amplitude in delta band at source level
source ampl gamma	Spectral amplitude in gamma band at source level
source ampl theta	Spectral amplitude in theta band at source level
spectral entropy alpha	Spectral Entropy in alpha band
spectral entropy beta	Spectral Entropy in beta band
spectral entropy delta	Spectral Entropy in delta band
spectral entropy gamma	Spectral Entropy in gamma band
spectral entropy theta	Spectral Entropy in theta band
std ampl alpha	Standard deviation of the amplitude of the envelope in alpha band
std ampl beta	Standard deviation of the amplitude of the envelope in beta band
std ampl delta	Standard deviation of the amplitude of the envelope in delta band
std ampl gamma	Standard deviation of the amplitude of the envelope in gamma band
std ampl theta	Standard deviation of the amplitude of the envelope in theta band
waiting time alpha	Waiting-time statistics of alpha bursts
waiting time beta	Waiting-time statistics of beta bursts
waiting time delta	Waiting-time statistics of delta bursts
waiting time gamma	Waiting-time statistics of gamma bursts
waiting time theta	Waiting-time statistics of theta bursts

Supplementary Table 2 - Prediction of SANS and SAPS scores, when using each EEG feature separately as well as all features together (last line), by Partial Least Squares Regression with leave-one-out cross-validation.

Features	<i>r</i>		RMSE		Features (continued)	<i>r</i>		RMSE	
	SANS	SAPS	SANS	SAPS		SANS	SAPS	SANS	SAPS
ampl total power gamma	0.133	0.098	5.136	3.148	lyapunov exponent	0.077	0.187	5.183	3.117
ampl total power theta	0.084	0.022	5.165	3.164	mean ampl gamma	0.133	0.098	5.136	3.148
asymmetry ampl alpha	0.376	0.107	4.861	3.148	mean ampl theta	0.084	0.022	5.165	3.164
asymmetry ampl theta	0.371	0.472	4.921	2.801	microstates temporal	0.063	-0.017	5.185	3.196
betw cen e-plv delta	0.206	0.287	5.109	3.040	microstates transitions	0.207	0.121	5.067	3.150
betw cen e-plv gamma	0.434	0.357	4.718	2.948	mod index alpha- gamma	0.400	0.279	4.832	3.029
betw cen s-ips beta	0.393	0.318	4.793	3.007	mod index delta- alpha	0.114	0.136	5.158	3.132
betw cen s-lcoh gamma	0.369	0.290	4.828	3.025	mod index delta- beta	0.168	0.308	5.153	3.031
clust coeff e-icoh theta	0.122	-0.020	5.140	3.175	mod index delta- gamma	0.131	0.292	5.167	3.016
clust coeff e-plv beta	0.301	0.026	5.037	3.167	node str e-icoh gamma	0.152	0.223	5.129	3.072
clust coeff e-plv delta	0.167	0.114	5.127	3.137	node str e-icoh theta	0.120	-0.006	5.165	3.175
clust coeff e-plv gamma	0.186	0.157	5.124	3.130	node str e-plv alpha	0.154	0.013	5.121	3.166
clust coeff e-plv theta	0.083	0.046	5.172	3.159	node str e-plv beta	0.315	0.091	4.987	3.154
clust coeff s-ips theta	0.297	0.106	4.959	3.144	node str e-plv delta	0.191	0.153	5.111	3.119
clust coeff s-lcoh theta	0.004	-0.020	5.216	3.174	node str e-plv gamma	0.211	0.188	5.096	3.103
clust coeff s-lps gamma	0.006	0.232	5.226	3.076	node str e-plv theta	0.166	0.106	5.121	3.139
clust coeff s-lps theta	0.065	-0.001	5.190	3.174	node str s-ips alpha	0.189	0.188	5.110	3.099
coeff of var ampl alpha	0.376	0.062	4.798	3.174	node str s-ips theta	0.243	0.130	5.022	3.138
coeff of var ampl beta	0.081	0.248	5.176	3.060	node str s-lcoh gamma	0.112	0.242	5.171	3.073

coeff of var ampl theta	0.044	0.197	5.204	3.091	node str s-lcoh theta	0.050	0.077	5.202	3.158
dfa exponent alpha	-0.060	0.019	5.231	3.171	node str s-lps gamma	0.065	0.169	5.216	3.115
dfa exponent beta	0.059	0.070	5.201	3.155	node str s-lps theta	0.106	0.052	5.174	3.165
hfd alpha	0.050	0.056	5.191	3.148	relative ampl beta	0.041	0.201	5.195	3.097
hfd beta	0.055	0.084	5.194	3.150	relative ampl theta	-0.057	0.123	5.229	3.131
hfd delta	0.046	0.337	5.194	2.984	skewness ampl beta	0.260	0.238	5.024	3.066
hfd theta	0.378	0.087	4.798	3.139	skewness ampl theta	0.128	0.179	5.151	3.106
hurst exponent	0.065	0.117	5.187	3.137	spectral entropy alpha	0.344	0.149	4.950	3.130
kfd delta	0.141	0.118	5.130	3.140	spectral entropy delta	0.248	0.155	5.049	3.118
kfd gamma	0.140	0.183	5.135	3.102	spectral entropy gamma	0.083	0.174	5.176	3.106
kfd theta	0.097	0.422	5.146	2.868	spectral entropy theta	0.047	0.129	5.202	3.130
kurtosis ampl alpha	0.113	0.094	5.156	3.142	std ampl gamma	0.174	0.090	5.100	3.152
kurtosis ampl gamma	0.264	0.149	5.017	3.162	std ampl theta	0.131	0.025	5.127	3.162
kurtosis ampl theta	0.175	0.333	5.100	2.984	waiting time beta	0.081	0.122	5.184	3.151
life time beta	0.141	0.060	5.144	3.168	waiting time gamma	0.301	0.097	4.939	3.142
life time gamma	0.295	0.097	4.958	3.142	All Features	0.837	0.832	2.835	1.752

Supplementary Table 3 - Number of components and number of variables used for the prediction of SANS and SAPS scores, when using each EEG feature separately as well as features together (last line), by Partial Least Squares Regression.

Features	Number of Components		Number of Variables		Features (continued)	Number of Components		Number of Variables	
	SANS	SAPS	SANS	SAPS		SANS	SAPS	SANS	SAPS
ampl total power gamma	1	1	2	5	lyapunov exponent	1	1	2	8
ampl total power theta	1	1	40	2	mean ampl gamma	1	1	2	5
asymmetry ampl alpha	2	1	29	3	mean ampl theta	1	1	40	2
asymmetry ampl theta	2	2	26	21	microstates temporal	1	2	2	4
betw cen e-plv delta	1	1	8	7	microstates transitions	1	2	2	6
betw cen e-plv gamma	2	1	23	5	mod index alpha-gamma	3	1	18	4
betw cen s-ips beta	1	1	12	10	mod index delta-alpha	1	1	3	27
betw cen s-lcoh gamma	1	1	9	6	mod index delta-beta	1	2	6	24
clust coeff e-icoh theta	1	1	10	2	mod index delta-gamma	1	1	3	3
clust coeff e-plv beta	4	1	14	13	node str e-icoh gamma	1	1	3	2
clust coeff e-plv delta	2	1	4	4	node str e-icoh theta	1	1	11	2
clust coeff e-plv gamma	2	1	24	2	node str e-plv alpha	1	1	2	64
clust coeff e-plv theta	1	1	5	2	node str e-plv beta	4	1	11	3
clust coeff s-ips theta	2	1	5	5	node str e-plv delta	2	1	4	4
clust coeff s-lcoh theta	1	1	3	4	node str e-plv gamma	2	1	5	2
clust coeff s-lps gamma	1	2	3	50	node str e-plv theta	1	1	3	3
clust coeff s-lps theta	1	1	2	2	node str s-ips alpha	1	1	3	6
coeff of var ampl alpha	2	1	11	10	node str s-ips theta	1	1	3	6
coeff of var ampl beta	1	1	2	5	node str s-lcoh gamma	1	2	2	42

coeff of var ampl theta	1	1	2	2	node str s-lcoh theta	1	1	4	4
dfa exponent alpha	1	1	2	54	node str s-lps gamma	1	1	2	7
dfa exponent beta	1	1	6	2	node str s-lps theta	1	1	2	2
hfd alpha	1	1	2	37	relative ampl beta	1	2	4	9
hfd beta	1	1	2	2	relative ampl theta	1	1	2	2
hfd delta	1	2	2	16	skewness ampl beta	1	1	6	4
hfd theta	3	1	5	24	skewness ampl theta	1	1	11	7
hurst exponent	1	1	6	6	spectral entropy alpha	5	2	23	3
kfd delta	1	1	2	11	spectral entropy delta	2	1	19	2
kfd gamma	1	1	6	2	spectral entropy gamma	1	1	2	3
kfd theta	1	4	53	7	spectral entropy theta	1	1	6	3
kurtosis ampl alpha	1	1	2	13	std ampl gamma	1	1	8	5
kurtosis ampl gamma	2	1	14	2	std ampl theta	1	1	50	4
kurtosis ampl theta	1	1	2	7	waiting time beta	1	1	2	5
life time beta	1	1	11	3	waiting time gamma	2	1	12	3
life time gamma	2	1	9	9	All Features	4	6	185	196

2. Supplementary Methods

EEG Data Pre-Processing

Offline EEG data were downsampled to 256 Hz (128 Hz for the microstates analysis) and preprocessed using an automatic pipeline (APP; da Cruz et al., 2018). APP included the following steps: filtering via a bandpass filter of 1-100 Hz (1-40 Hz for the microstates analysis); removal of line-noise (CleanLine; www.nitrc.org/projects/cleanline); re-referencing to the bi-weight estimate of the mean of all electrodes; removal and 3D spline interpolation of bad electrodes; removal of bad epochs; independent component analysis to remove artifacts related to eye movements, muscle activity and bad electrodes (not conducted for the connectivity analysis); and re-referencing to the common average.

Time-Domain Amplitude Features

The most straight forward analysis of EEG signals is the quantification of its time-domain amplitude features. For that, we first filtered the EEG signal of each channel into five frequency bands (delta (1 - 4 Hz), theta (4 - 8 Hz), alpha (8 - 13 Hz), beta (13 - 30 Hz), gamma (30 - 70 Hz)). Then, for each frequency band, we computed several amplitude features: total power, mean of the envelope, standard deviation of the envelope, skewness of the signal amplitude, and kurtosis of the signal amplitude. The EEG signal was divided into 4-second epochs and the features were calculated for each epoch. Then the mean across epochs is used for group comparisons and main analyses.

Amplitude Total Power

If $y(t)$ is the time domain EEG signal of a given channel at time t , the amplitude total power is given by

$$Total\ Power = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |y(t)|^2$$

where T is the total time.

Mean and Standard Deviation of the Envelope

If $\mathcal{H}(y(t))$ is the Hilbert transform of the time domain EEG signal $y(t)$, then the envelope of the signal is given by

$$Envelope(t) = |\mathcal{H}(y(t))|^2$$

and the measures of centrality and variability are given by the mean and standard deviation of the envelope.

Skewness and Kurtosis of the Signal

If \bar{y} and y_{SD} are the mean and standard deviation of the EEG signal $y(t)$, respectively, then the skewness of the signal is given by

$$Skewness = \frac{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |y(t) - \bar{y}|^3}{y_{SD}^3}$$

and the kurtosis of the signal is given by

$$Kurtosis = \frac{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |y(t) - \bar{y}|^4}{y_{SD}^4}$$

Range EEG

Similar to EEG Data Pre-Processing

Offline EEG data were downsampled to 256 Hz (128 Hz for the microstates analysis) and preprocessed using an automatic pipeline (APP; da Cruz et al., 2018). APP included the following steps: filtering via a bandpass filter of 1-100 Hz (1-40 Hz for the microstates analysis); removal of line-noise (CleanLine; www.nitrc.org/projects/cleanline); re-referencing to the bi-weight estimate of the mean of all electrodes; removal and 3D spline interpolation of bad electrodes; removal of bad epochs; independent component analysis to remove artifacts related to eye movements, muscle activity and bad electrodes (not conducted for the connectivity analysis); and re-referencing to the common average.

Time-Domain Amplitude Features, range EEG was introduced as a way to quantify the amplitude of the EEG data (O'Reilly et al., 2012). However, unlike the previously described features, range EEG focuses on a peak-to-peak measure of the EEG amplitude. Here, before calculating the range EEG features, we first filtered the EEG signal of each channel into five frequency bands (delta, theta, alpha, beta, gamma). Then, for each frequency band, we calculated the range EEG and two of its features: coefficient of variation and asymmetry. If $y(t)$ is the EEG signal, then over a time segment s the difference between the maximum and the minimum is given by

$$diff(s) = \max(y(t)w(t - s\Delta)) - \min(y(t)w(t - s\Delta))$$

where $w(t)$ is a window (here, a 4-second Hanning window) and Δ is a time-shift factor related to the percentage of overlap (here, we used 50%). Then, the range EEG is given by

$$rEEG(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{50}{\log 50} \log(diff(s)) & \text{if } diff(s) > 50 \\ diff(s) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Coefficient of variation

If \overline{rEEG} is the mean range EEG and $rEEG_{SD}$ is the standard deviation of the range EEG, the coefficient of variation of the range EEG ($rEEG_{CV}$) is given by

$$rEEG_{CV} = \frac{rEEG_{SD}}{rEEG}$$

Asymmetry

If $rEEG_{median}$, $rEEG_{5\%}$, and $rEEG_{95\%}$ are the median, 5 and 95 percentile of the range EEG, respectively, and we let $A = rEEG_{median} - rEEG_{5\%}$ and $B = rEEG_{95\%} - rEEG_{median}$, then the range EEG asymmetry is given by

$$rEEG_{asymmetry} = \frac{B - A}{A + B}$$

The $rEEG_{asymmetry}$ ranges from -1 to 1, with values close to 0 representing symmetry and values close to -1 and 1 indicating asymmetry of the range EEG.

Hjorth Parameters

Hjorth parameters are descriptive statistical properties of the EEG time-domain signal and provide a bridge between time and frequency domain interpretation of the EEG signal (Hjorth, 1970). There are 3 Hjorth parameters: Activity, Mobility, and Complexity. The EEG signal was divided into 4-second epochs and the 3 Hjorth parameters were calculated for each epoch. Then, for each parameter, the mean across epochs was used for group comparisons and main analyses.

Activity

The Activity parameter quantifies the power of the signal. If $y(t)$ is the time domain EEG signal of a given channel, then Activity is the variance of the signal ($var(y(t))$).

Mobility

The Mobility parameter is an approximation of the mean frequency of the signal and is computed as

$$Mobility = \sqrt{\frac{var\left(\frac{dy(t)}{dt}\right)}{var(y(t))}}$$

where $dy(t)/dt$ is the first derivative of the signal with respect to time.

Complexity

The Complexity parameter is sensitive to changes in the frequency of the signal as it quantifies the deviations from a pure sinusoidal signal. It is computed as

$$Complexity = \frac{Mobility\left(\frac{dy(t)}{dt}\right)}{Mobility(y(t))}$$

Relative Spectral Amplitude

Fourier analysis is the most common method to decompose an EEG time series into frequency components. The analysis of the amplitude spectrum gives us the magnitude of the Fourier coefficients at different frequencies. It is thought that activity in high frequencies reflects processing within brain areas and activity in low frequencies is thought to reflect communication between brain areas (Uhlhaas & Singer, 2010; von Stein & Sarnthein, 2000). Here, for each of the 5 frequency bands (delta, theta, alpha, beta, and gamma), we computed their relative spectral amplitude. If $Y(f)$ is the spectral amplitude of the Fourier transform of the EEG signal $y(t)$ at frequency f , then, the relative amplitude for each frequency band is given by

$$\text{Relative Amplitude}(f_i, f_j) = \frac{\sum_{k=f_i}^{f_j} Y(k) / f_j - f_i}{\sum_{k=f_a}^{f_z} Y(k) / f_z - f_a}$$

where f_i and f_f are the boundaries of the frequency band of interest (e.g., for delta band, f_i and f_f are 1 and 4 Hz, respectively) and f_a and f_z are the boundaries of all the frequencies considered. Here, f_a and f_z are 1 and 70 Hz, respectively. For each of the 5 frequency bands, the relative amplitude was computed for non-overlapping windows of 4 seconds. Then for each frequency band the mean across windows was used for group comparisons and main analyses.

Source Spectral Amplitude

Besides quantifying the spectral amplitude in the electrode space, we also quantified the spectral amplitude in the source space. The three-dimensional cortical current source densities were computed using the software LORETA (Pascual-Marqui et al., 2011). First, the EEG data of each electrode is converted to the frequency domain using the Fourier transform and the cross-spectrum is obtained for each time epoch. Then, the cortical activity was reconstructed from the scalp signals, using the exact low-resolution electromagnetic tomography (eLORETA) algorithm to a space of 6239 gray matter voxels as implemented in LORETA. We defined 80 regions of interest (ROI; 40 per hemisphere) from the Automated Anatomical Labelling (AAL) atlas, similar to a previous schizophrenia EEG study (Andreou et al., 2015). We defined 5 frequency bands of interest (delta, theta, alpha, beta and gamma) and, for each frequency band, we computed the average current source densities for the 80 ROIs from the eLORETA solution space.

Modulation Index

Low-frequency brain oscillations exert a modulatory effect on high-frequency activity, potentially, allowing optimal coordination between large-scale networks and more local functional brain sub-systems (Canolty & Knight, 2010). Such cross-frequency interactions may occur via phase-amplitude coupling (PAC) and can be quantified using a modulation index (Tort et al., 2010). First, the phase and amplitude values are obtained from the band-pass filtered signals, f_p and f_A respectively, using Hilbert transform. Then, all

the instantaneous phases from -180 to 180 corresponding to f_p are binned into 18 values. The bins take a mean amplitude value \bar{a} and a vector of normalized amplitude values is defined as P given by

$$P(i) = \frac{\bar{a}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \bar{a}_i}$$

where N is 18. If there is no effect of the phase of f_p on f_A , the values of P would be roughly uniformly distributed. MI calculates the deviation of P from a uniform distribution using Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence, which provides a value on how similar two distributions are. KL divergence is defined as

$$KL(U, X) = \ln(N) - H(P)$$

where $H(P)$ is the Shannon's information entropy given by

$$H(P) = - \sum_{i=1}^N P(i) \ln P(i)$$

Finally, the modulation index (MI) is defined as

$$MI = \frac{KL(U, X)}{\ln(N)}$$

Before estimating the MI, we segmented the continuous EEG signals into non-overlapping 4-second segments. The mean MI across non-overlapping segments is used for group comparisons and main analyses. We quantified 8 modulation indexes corresponding to: delta phase-alpha amplitude, delta phase-beta amplitude, delta phase-gamma amplitude, theta phase-alpha amplitude, theta phase-beta amplitude, theta phase-gamma amplitude, alpha phase-beta amplitude, alpha phase-gamma amplitude, and beta phase-gamma amplitude.

Fractal Dimension

Fractal dimension (FD) of a signal is a measure of the signal's irregularity and self-similarity in the time domain. It is different from the dimension of an attractor which is calculated in a phase-space. For EEG signals, FD values lie between 1 and 2, with high values associated with higher self-similarity (Eke et al., 2002). Here, we first filtered the EEG signal of each channel into the 5 frequency bands and for each frequency band we computed two FD: Katz's Fractal Dimension, and Higuchi's Fractal Dimension. The EEG signal was divided into 4 seconds epochs and the features were calculated for each epoch. Then, for each method, the mean across epochs was used for group comparisons and main analyses.

Katz's Fractal Dimension

Katz's method for FD (KFD) calculation is derived from the EEG time series by computing the sum (L) as well as the average (a) of the Euclidean distances between successive points of the sequence, and the maximum distance between the first point and all other points of the sequence (d) (Katz, 1988). Then the KFD is given by

$$KFD = \frac{\log(L/a)}{\log(d/a)}$$

Higuchi's Fractal Dimension

Higuchi's method for FD (HFD) calculation is derived from the EEG time series $y(t)$ by first deriving k new subsample sets (y_k) (Higuchi, 1988). Then the length of each y_k (L_m) is given by

$$L_m(k) = \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{T-1}{Mk} \sum_{i=1}^M |y(m+ik) - y(m+(i-1)k)| \right)$$

where $m = 1, 2, \dots, k$, T is the total number of samples, and $M = (T - m)/k$. The length of the signal is given by

$$L(k) = \sum_{m=1}^k L_m(k)$$

and it is proportional to k^{-D} , where D is the fractal dimension. Finally, $L(k)$ is plotted against k ($k = 1, 2, \dots, k_{max}$; here, $k_{max} = 25$) on a double logarithm scale. The data should fall on a straight line, with the slope equal to the FD of $y(t)$.

Hurst Exponent

The Hurst Exponent was introduced by Harold Hurst as a measure of the long-term memory of a time series (Hurst, 1957). Hurst exponent ranges from 0 to 1. Values larger than 0.5 suggest long-term positive autocorrelation, values smaller than 0.5 indicate anti-persistent behavior, while a Hurst exponent of 0.5 suggests that the time-series is truly random. EEG time series tend to have Hurst exponents around 0.7 (Vorobyov & Cichocki, 2002).

For a time series $y(t)$, with T samples, we can calculate a cumulative deviate series as

$$Y(t, T) = \sum_{t=1}^T y(t) - \bar{y}$$

where \bar{y} is the mean T samples. Then the range of the accumulated values is given by

$$R = \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} (Y(t, T)) - \min_{1 \leq t \leq T} (Y(t, T))$$

If S is the standard deviation of the time series $y(t)$, the Hurst exponent H is related to the ratio R/S by

$$\frac{R}{S} = (cT)^H$$

where c is a constant (usually set to 0.5).

Here, we divided the EEG signal of each channel into 4-second epochs and used the code provided by (Davidson, 2006) to estimate the full band Hurst exponent. Then the mean across epochs was used for group comparisons and main analyses.

Detrended Fluctuation Analysis

Detrended fluctuation analysis (DFA) provides a suitable framework to analyze long-range ($> 1s$) temporal autocorrelations and the scaling behavior of brain oscillations (Hardstone et al., 2012). DFA is performed on the amplitude envelopes of band-pass filtered EEG time series. Here, we performed the DFA for the 5 frequency bands. The cumulative of the amplitude envelope is calculated as

$$Y(t) = \sum_{t'=1}^T A(t')$$

where $A(t)$ is the amplitude envelope, obtained using Hilbert transform. The integrated signal is subsequently split into 20 sets of 50% percent overlapping windows with sizes varying from 1 to 25 seconds. The windows were equidistant according to a logarithmic scale. The signals in each window are detrended using a least-squares fit and the fluctuation function is obtained. The fluctuation function is expressed as

$$F^2(\tau) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^T [Y(t) - Y_{\tau}(t)]^2$$

where τ is the window size of the subset defined initially, and N is the number of samples corresponding to the window size. The square-root of the fluctuation functions for each window are plotted on log-log axes with respect to the window sizes and a line is fitted to the data. The slope of the fitted line provides the DFA exponent which quantifies long-range temporal correlations (< 0.5 : anti-correlated; ~ 0.5 : uncorrelated; > 0.5 : correlated; ~ 1 : pink noise; > 1 : non-stationary).

Life and Waiting Times

The structure of brain oscillations in short-to-mid temporal scales ($< 1s$) is estimated using life-and waiting-times (Montez et al., 2009). The analysis is performed on the instantaneous amplitude of the band-pass filtered signals, obtained using Hilbert transform. Here, we calculated the life and waiting times for the 5 frequency bands. The median of the amplitude envelope is set as a threshold, which allows

identifying the onset and end of a burst. The time during which the amplitudes exceed or stay below the threshold is defined as life or waiting time respectively. The statistics of interest are the 95th percentiles of the empirical cumulative distributions of the life or waiting times.

Entropy in the Time-Domain

Entropy, in the sense of dynamical systems, provides a powerful approach to understanding biological systems by quantifying the amount of information contained in a time series like EEG. Here, we used two common ways to quantify the entropy of the time-domain of EEG signals: approximate entropy (Pincus et al., 1991) and sample entropy (Richman & Moorman, 2000). First we split the EEG data into non-overlapping 4-second epochs and for each epoch we estimated the embedding dimension m and the lag τ , using the delay embedding theorem (Takens, 1981) as implemented in the *phaseSpaceRecons* function of the Predictive Maintenance MATLAB Toolbox. Then, we estimated the approximate and sample entropy for each epoch and take the mean across epochs for the main analyses. Small values of approximate and sample entropy reflect repeatability of the signal and high values indicate irregularity.

Approximate Entropy

If $y(t)$ is the EEG time series with length T , m is the embedding dimension, and r the radius of similarity (here, we set $r = 0.2 \times std(y(t))$), then we can embed the signal in blocks $Y_m(i) = \{y(i), y(i+1), \dots, y(i+m-1)\}$ and $Y_m(j) = \{y(j), y(j+1), \dots, y(j+m-1)\}$. The distance between $Y_m(i)$ and $Y_m(j)$ is given by

$$d[Y_m(i), Y_m(j)] = \max_{k=1,2,\dots,m} (|y(i+k-1) - y(j+k-1)|)$$

If we let $N(i)$ be the number of within range points, at point i , given by

$$N(i) = \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^T \mathbf{1}(d[Y_m(i), Y_m(j)] < r)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the indicator operator, and let $C_m(i) = N(i)/(T - m + 1)$, we can compute the average logarithm of $C_m(i)$ as

$$\Psi(m) = \frac{1}{T - m + 1} \sum_{j=1}^{T-m+1} \log(C_m(i))$$

Then, the approximate entropy is given by

$$ApEn = \Psi(m) - \Psi(m+1)$$

Sample Entropy

Sample entropy was introduced by Richman and Moorman as a measure of complexity, which contrary to approximate entropy, does not include self-similarity patterns (Richman & Moorman, 2000). Similar to approximate entropy, if we have embedded times series in blocks with m dimensions ($Y_m(i), Y_m(j)$) as well as with $m + 1$ dimensions ($Y_{m+1}(i), Y_{m+1}(j)$), we calculate A = the number of template vectors having $d[Y_m(i), Y_m(j)] < r$ and B = the number of template vectors having $d[Y_{m+1}(i), Y_{m+1}(j)] < r$. Then, the sample entropy can be calculated as

$$SampEn = -\log\left(\frac{A}{B}\right)$$

Spectral Entropy

Besides time-domain, entropy can also be calculated in the spectral domain as a measure of information of a signal. Spectral entropy quantifies the irregularity of the EEG signal, i.e., the peakedness, or flatness of the EEG power spectrum (Inouye et al., 1991). Here, for each of the 5 frequency bands (delta, theta, alpha, beta, and gamma), we computed their spectral entropy for non-overlapping windows of 4 seconds. Then the mean across windows is used for group comparisons and main analyses

For the spectral entropy calculation, we first calculated the power spectral density (PSD) via Fourier transform. Then, given two frequencies of interest f_i and f_f (i.e., the boundaries of a frequency band of interest; for delta band, for example, f_i and f_f are 1 and 4 Hz, respectively), the PSD between these two frequencies is normalized (PSD_n) by the total energy in the EEG segment. Finally, the spectral entropy is calculated using the Shannon Entropy as

$$SE(f_i, f_f) = - \sum_{f=f_i}^{f_f} PSD_n(f) \log(PSD_n(f))$$

Complexity

EEG exhibits complex nonlinear behavior with nonlinear dynamical properties. This complexity should not be seen as randomness but as an intermediate condition between randomness and order (Stam, 2005). High values of complexity are associated with highly distributed and desynchronized neural generators of the EEG signal, while low values of complexity are associated with local and synchronized generators (Ibáñez-Molina et al., 2018). Here, we computed three estimates of the complexity of the EEG signal: Lempel-Ziv complexity (which is based on algorithmic complexity), Lyapunov Exponent, and Correlation Dimension (which are chaos-based estimates of complexity). The EEG signal was divided into 4-second epochs and the features were calculated for each epoch. Then the mean across epochs is used for group comparisons and main analyses.

Lempel-Ziv Complexity

Lempel-Ziv Complexity (LZC) was introduced as a measure of complexity of finite sequences and is related to the number of steps by which a given sequence is presumed to be generated (Lempel & Ziv, 1976). In essence, given a string (in our case an EEG signal), LZC estimates the number of bits of the shortest computer that can generate the string. The first step of the LZC computation is to transform the EEG signal ($y(t)$) into a binary sequence $P = s(1), s(2), \dots, s(n)$, by thresholding the signal based on the median (y_{median}):

$$s(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } y(i) < y_{median} \\ 1 & \text{if } y(i) > y_{median} \end{cases}$$

Then the sequence P is scanned from left to right and every time that a new sequence of consecutive numbers is found one unit is added to a complexity counter ($C(n)$). Finally, the complexity counter is normalized by the length of the sequence P (L) and the LZC is given by

$$LZC = \frac{C(n)}{L/\log_2(L)}$$

Here, we used the code provide by Thai (2019), to estimate the LZC based on the decomposition of the sequence P into an exhaustive and a primitive production process. The exhaustive LZC and the primitive LZC can be seen as lower and upper limit of the complexity, respectively.

Lyapunov Exponent

The complexity of an EEG time series $y(t)$ can be considered a chaotic phenomenon (Stam, 2005). One of the most important properties of a chaotic system is its sensitive dependence on initial conditions. Lyapunov exponents can be used to quantify how a slight perturbation in the initial conditions can cause divergent trajectories in a system. Given two phase space trajectories with initial separation vector $\delta\mathbf{y}_0$, the rate at which these two trajectories diverge can be estimated by

$$|\delta\mathbf{y}(t)| \approx e^{\lambda t} |\delta\mathbf{y}_0|$$

where λ is the Lyapunov exponent. Because the rate of divergence can be different for different orientations of the initial separation vector, it is common to refer to the Largest Lyapunov exponent (LLE) since it characterizes the stability of a system (positive LLE is unstable and negative LLE is stable). Here, we used the code provided by Mohammadi (2009) to estimate the LLE of the EEG signal. The code is based on Rosenstein's method to estimate the LLE (Rosenstein et al., 1993) and uses the False Nearest Neighbors and the Symplectic Geometry methods to choose the embedding dimension m (Hegger & Kantz, 1999; Lei et al., 2002).

Correlation Dimension

As a measure of chaotic signal complexity, Correlation Dimension (D_2) can be seen as the number of independent variables or degrees of freedom that describe the behavior of a dynamic system (Stam, 2005). In the EEG literature, D_2 is often interpreted as a proxy of the integration of information in the

brain. To estimate D_2 , we first estimated the embedding dimension m and the lag τ of the EEG time series $y(t)$ with length T using the delay embedding theorem (Takens, 1981) as implemented in the *phaseSpaceRecons* function of the Predictive Maintenance MATLAB Toolbox. Second, we embedded the signal in blocks $Y_m(i) = \{y(i), y(i+1), \dots, y(i+m-1)\}$ and $Y_m(j) = \{y(j), y(j+1), \dots, y(j+m-1)\}$. The distance between $Y_m(i)$ and $Y_m(j)$ is given by

$$d[Y_m(i), Y_m(j)] = \max_{k=1,2,\dots,m} (|y(i+k-1) - y(j+k-1)|)$$

Then we calculated the number of within range points, at point i ($N_i(R)$), as

$$N_i(R) = \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^T \mathbf{1}(d[Y_m(i), Y_m(j)] < R)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the indicator operator and R is the radius of similarity (we used Matlab's function *correlationDimension* default value). Finally, the correlation integral $C(R)$ is given by

$$C(R) = \frac{2}{T(T-1)} \sum_{i=1}^T N_i(R)$$

and D_2 is the slope of $C(R)$ vs. R .

Recurrence Quantification Analysis

Recurrence plots (RPs) and recurrence quantification analysis (RQA) are nonlinear methods that permit to explore several aspects of the dynamics of complex systems, such as EEG signals, in a reconstructed phase space (Eckmann et al., 1987; N Marwan et al., 2007). Mathematically, the RPs are expressed as

$$R_{i,j}(\varepsilon) = \Theta(\varepsilon - \|\vec{y}_i - \vec{y}_j\|), \quad i, j = 1, \dots, N$$

where \vec{y}_i is the phase space reconstruction of the time series $y(t)$, Θ corresponds to the Heaviside function, $\|\cdot\|$ to the Euclidean norm, and ε to the recurrence threshold. If the system is close enough (determined by ε) to a previously visited state, a 1 will be assigned to the RP in the corresponding (i, j) coordinates, a value of 0 otherwise. The structures of the RP are quantified using RQA complexity measures. To build the recurrence plots, continuous EEG signals were split into non-overlapping 4-second segments. For each segment, a phase space is reconstructed using the delay embedding theorem (Takens, 1981) as implemented in the function *phaseSpaceRecons* of the Predictive Maintenance MATLAB Toolbox. We extracted 8 different measures from the recurrence matrix using the CRP Toolbox for MATLAB (Marwan, 2017) and used the mean across segments group comparisons and main analyses. The recurrence threshold is set for each EEG channel at each time-window as the 10th percentile of the distribution of distances.

Determinism

If the trajectory of a system is similar at different moments in time, the RP will produce diagonal lines parallel to the main diagonal. Determinism quantifies the proportion of recurrence points (denoted as “1” in the recurrence matrix) that form diagonal lines and is defined as

$$DET = \frac{\sum_{l=l_{min}}^N l P(l)}{\sum_{l=1}^N l P(l)}$$

where $P(l)$ indicates a distribution of diagonal lines. We set l_{min} to 2.

Entropy

The complexity of the distribution of diagonal lines can be quantified using Shannon’s information entropy

$$ENTR = - \sum_{l=l_{min}}^N p(l) \ln p(l)$$

where $p(l) = P(l)/N_l$ indicates the probability of finding a diagonal line of a given length l . If the system shows periodicity, the value of entropy will be low.

Laminarity

If a system evolves subtly, or if it is “trapped” in a state, the recurrence plot will reflect vertical structures. Laminarity quantifies the proportion of recurrence points forming vertical lines and is defined as

$$LAM = \frac{\sum_{v=v_{min}}^N v P(v)}{\sum_{v=1}^N v P(v)}$$

where $P(v)$ denotes the distribution of all vertical lines that exceed two points ($v_{min} = 2$).

Maximal Diagonal Line Length

The maximal diagonal line length of the distribution of diagonal lines is defines as

$$L_{max} = \max(\{l_i\}_{i=1}^{N_l})$$

where N_l indicates the total number of vertical lines. The inverse of L_{max} is related to the divergence of the system.

Maximal Vertical Line Length

The utility of the vertical structures in the recurrence plots is mainly related to the detection of chaos-chaos transitions (Marwan et al., 2002). The maximal length of vertical lines is also a recurrence statistic of interest and is expressed as

$$V_{max} = \max(\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{N_v})$$

where N_v indicates the total number of vertical lines.

Mean Diagonal Line Length

Given the nature of diagonal structures on recurrence plots, the mean length of diagonal lines provides a value for the predictability of the system. It is formulated as

$$L = \frac{\sum_{l=l_{min}}^N l P(l)}{\sum_{l=l_{min}}^N P(l)}$$

where $P(l)$ indicates a distribution of diagonal lines.

Recurrence Times Entropy

Recurrence times entropy (RTE) denotes the entropy of the frequency distribution of vertical “white” or not-recurrent segments, which provide information about the time that it takes for the system to return to previously visited states. The entropy of recurrence times is thus formulated as

$$RTE = -\frac{1}{\ln(T_{max})} \sum_{tw=1}^{T_{max}} p(tw) \ln p(tw)$$

where T_{max} is the maximum white vertical line length, and $p(tw)$ is the probability of finding a white segment of length tw .

Trapping Time

The mean vertical line length, also denoted in the literature as trapping time is formulated as

$$TT = \frac{\sum_{v=v_{min}}^N v P(v)}{\sum_{v=v_{min}}^N P(v)}$$

where $P(v)$ indicates the distribution of vertical lines. Trapping time provides information on the average time during which the system does not evolve significantly or stays within the limits of the recurrence neighborhood. Similar to the case of Laminarity, we set $v_{min} = 2$.

Microstates Analysis

EEG microstates are on-going scalp potential topographies that remain stable for around 60 to 120 ms before changing to another topography that remains stable again, suggesting quasi-simultaneity of activity of large scale brain networks (Lehmann et al., 1987). Four recurrent and dominant classes of microstates (commonly labeled A, B, C, and D, based on their topographies) are observed in resting-state

EEG, explaining around 65 to 84% of the variance of the data (Michel & Koenig, 2018). EEG microstates are closely related to resting-state networks found in resting-state functional magnetic resonance (Britz et al., 2010). Here, we used Cartool (Brunet et al., 2011) to extract the above-mentioned four microstate classes from the EEG data and compute their temporal parameters as well as the transition probability from one microstate class to another one.

Temporal Parameters of EEG microstates

We conducted the same analysis as in da Cruz et al. (2020). For each participant and microstate class, we computed three microstate temporal parameters: mean duration, time of coverage, and frequency of occurrence. Mean duration (in ms) is the average time that a given microstate is present uninterruptedly. Time of coverage (%) is the percentage of the total recording time spent in a given microstate. Occurrence is the average number of times a given microstate occurred per second.

Transition Probabilities

To investigate the transition probability from one microstate class to another one, also known as the syntax analysis, we computed the occurrence frequency of transitions from one class to all the others (Lehmann et al., 2005). After normalization to fractions of all between-class transitions of the participant, we obtained, for each participant, the observed probability of each possible transition. Twelve transitions between microstates classes (sum of transitions from one of the 4 classes to all the remaining 3 classes) were obtained for each subject. Similarly to Lehmann and colleagues (2005), given the occurrence of each microstate class, we also calculated the expected transition probability for each possible transition. We then used the difference between the expected and the observed transition probabilities for the statistical analyses.

Functional Connectivity Analysis (across electrodes)

Normal brain functioning requires coordinated flow of information between different brain areas. A way to quantify this flow of information is through functional connectivity analysis. Formally, functional connectivity is defined as the statistical relationship between the measures of activity of spatially distant neurophysiological events over time (Friston, 1994). In EEG, functional connectivity can be assessed both at the electrode and source level. Here, we describe how we conducted the connectivity estimation in the electrode space. All connectivity estimation measures were computed on a spatial Laplacian transformed EEG, also commonly referred to as current source density (CSD) or scalp current density (SCD) (Kayser & Tenke, 2006). The analysis was conducted on FieldTrip (Oostenveld et al., 2010). First, the spatial Laplacian transformed EEG time-series were converted into the frequency domain by using multitaper frequency transformation. Then we calculated the connectivity matrices for the directed transfer function, the imaginary part of coherency, and the phase-locking value. Finally, we performed a network analysis on the connectivity matrices to characterize them with a small number of measures. Please see Network Analysis for more information.

Directed Transfer Function (DTF)

Directed Transfer Function (DTF) was first introduced by Kaminski and Blinowska as a method to determine the direction and frequency content of brain activity flow (Kaminski & Blinowska, 1991). DTF is based on the transfer function $H(f)$ of a multivariate autoregressive (MVAR) model, describing the causal influence of electrode l on electrode k at a frequency f as follows:

$$DTF_{l \rightarrow k}(f) = \frac{|H_{kl}(f)|^2}{\sum_{j=1}^J |H_{kj}(f)|^2}$$

where J is the total number of electrodes. DTF is zero only if there is no delay between electrode l and electrode k . For more information, see (Kaminski & Blinowska, 1991).

Imaginary Part of Coherency

Coherence measures the phase coupling between electrode k and electrode l (Nunez et al., 1997). If $Y_{kt}(f)$ is the Fourier transform of the time series $y(t)$ of electrode k , then the cross-spectrum of electrode k and electrode l is given by

$$S_{kl}(f) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T Y_{kt}(f) Y_{lt}^*(f)$$

Then the complex coherence at frequency f is given by

$$C_{kl}(f) = \frac{S_{kl}(f)}{(S_{kk}(f) S_{ll}(f))^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

Here, we used the imaginary part of coherency since it minimizes effects of volume conduction (Nolte et al., 2004).

Phase-Locking Value

Phase-Locking Value (PLV) was introduced by Lachaux et al. as a method to detect frequency specific phase coupling between two signals (Lachaux et al., 1999). If $\Phi_{kt}(f)$ is the phase of the Fourier coefficient of electrode k of the time segment $y(t)$ at frequency f , then PLV between the electrode k and electrode l at frequency f is given by

$$PLV_{kl}(f) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \exp(i(\Phi_{kt}(f) - \Phi_{lt}(f)))$$

Functional Connectivity Analysis (across brain regions)

Besides conducting functional connectivity analysis across electrodes, we also conducted the analysis in the source space across brain regions. Functional connectivity analysis at the source level was conducted

using the software LORETA (Pascual-Marqui et al., 2011). Cortical activity was reconstructed from scalp EEG signals, using the exact low-resolution electromagnetic tomography (eLORETA) algorithm, to a space of 6239 gray matter voxels as implemented in LORETA. We defined 80 seeds of interest (40 per hemisphere) from the Automated Anatomical Labelling (AAL) atlas, similar to a previous schizophrenia EEG study (Andreou et al., 2015). From the solution space, we included all gray matter voxels within a range of 10-mm radius of the seed. Connectivity between reconstructed brain sources was calculated for each frequency band using three different methods: instantaneous phase synchronization, lagged phase synchronization, and lagged coherence. Finally, we performed a network analysis on the connectivity matrices to characterize them with a small number of measures. Please see Network Analysis for more information.

Instantaneous and lagged phase synchronization

Nonlinear interactions between two time-series may be quantified in the frequency domain using the measure of phase synchronization (Pascual-Marqui, 2007). The instantaneous phase synchronization is defined as

$$\varphi_{k,l}^2(\omega) = \{\text{Re}[f_{k,l}(\omega)]\}^2 + \{\text{Im}[f_{k,l}(\omega)]\}^2$$

which, to reduce the effects of instantaneous non-physiological components, can be reformulated as the lagged phase synchronization given by

$$\varphi_{k,l}^2(\omega) = \frac{\{\text{Im}[f_{k,l}(\omega)]\}^2}{1 - \{\text{Re}[f_{k,l}(\omega)]\}^2}$$

where

$$f_{k,l}(\omega) = \frac{1}{N_R} \sum_{a=1}^{N_R} \left[\frac{k_a(\omega)}{|k_a(\omega)|} \right] \left[\frac{l_a^*(\omega)}{|l_a(\omega)|} \right]$$

with the Fourier transforms of the signals denoted as $k_a(\omega)$ and $l_a(\omega)$, N_R accounting for the number of epochs, and the superscript “*” indicating a complex conjugate. $\text{Re}[c]$ and $\text{Im}[c]$ are respectively the real and imaginary part of a complex number c , with brackets indicating the modulus.

Lagged coherence

Linear lagged connectivity measures the lagged linear dependence between two time-series without being affected by the covariance structure within each time series (Pascual-Marqui, 2007). Lagged coherence is defined as

$$\rho_{k,l}^2(\omega) = \frac{\{\text{Im}[f_{k,l}(\omega)]\}^2}{[f_{k,k}(\omega)][f_{l,l}(\omega)] - \{\text{Re}[f_{k,l}(\omega)]\}^2}$$

where, $f_{k,l}$, contrary to the phase synchronization cases, is not normalized, and thus there is an effect of amplitude on the estimation.

Network Analysis

Network analysis provides a way to characterize brain networks with a small number of neurobiological meaningful measures (Rubinov & Sporns, 2010). We conducted the analysis on FieldTrip (Oostenveld et al., 2010) with the Brain Connectivity Toolbox (Rubinov & Sporns, 2010). From the connectivity matrices obtained with directed transfer function, imaginary part of coherency, and phase-locking value in the electrode space as well as instantaneous and lagged phase synchronization, and lagged coherence in the source space, we calculated the node strength, the clustering coefficient, and the betweenness centrality. We applied the analysis to the whole spectrum and aggregated the results into the 5 frequency bands.

Node Strength

Node strength is the typical measurement for quantifying the level of node centrality. Important electrodes or brain regions interact with many other electrodes or regions, facilitating functional integration and measures of node centrality assess the importance of individual nodes (Rubinov & Sporns, 2010). Given a node i , its strength is defined as the sum of all the weights of all edges of the node i as follows

$$S_i = \sum_j^N w_{ij}$$

where w_{ij} is the weight of node i to node j (Opsahl et al., 2010).

Clustering Coefficient

Clustering coefficient qualifies the level of connection of a node with other neighboring nodes (Onnela et al., 2005). Given a node i , the clustering coefficient is calculated as follows

$$C_i = \frac{2}{k_i(k_i - 1)} \sum_{j,k} (w_{ij}w_{jk}w_{ki})^{1/3}$$

where w_{ij} is the weight of node i to node j and k is the degree of the node.

Betweenness Centrality

Betweenness centrality is based on the idea that central nodes take part in many short paths in a network and, therefore, are considered key controls of information flow (Freeman, 1978). More specifically, it is

defined as the fraction of all shortest paths in the network that pass through a given node (Brandes, 2001). Betweenness centrality is calculated as follows

$$B(i) = \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} \frac{\sigma_{jk}(i)}{\sigma_{jk}}$$

where $\sigma_{jk}(i)$ is the shortest path of two nodes that contain i .

3. Supplementary References

- Andreou, C., Nolte, G., Leicht, G., Polomac, N., Hanganu-Opatz, I. L., Lambert, M., Engel, A. K., & Mulert, C. (2015). Increased Resting-State Gamma-Band Connectivity in First-Episode Schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 41(4), 930–939. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbu121>
- Brandes, U. (2001). A faster algorithm for betweenness centrality. *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 25(2), 163–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022250X.2001.9990249>
- Britz, J., Van De Ville, D., & Michel, C. M. (2010). BOLD correlates of EEG topography reveal rapid resting-state network dynamics. *NeuroImage*, 52(4), 1162–1170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.02.052>
- Brunet, D., Murray, M. M., & Michel, C. M. (2011). Spatiotemporal Analysis of Multichannel EEG: CARTOOL. *Intell. Neuroscience*, 2011, 2:1–2:15. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/813870>
- Canolty, R. T., & Knight, R. T. (2010). The functional role of cross-frequency coupling. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 14(11), 506–515. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.09.001>
- da Cruz, J. R., Chicherov, V., Herzog, M. H., & Figueiredo, P. (2018). An automatic pre-processing pipeline for EEG analysis (APP) based on robust statistics. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 129(7), 1427–1437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2018.04.600>
- da Cruz, J. R., Favrod, O., Roinishvili, M., Chkonia, E., Brand, A., Mohr, C., Figueiredo, P., & Herzog, M. H. (2020). EEG microstates are a candidate endophenotype for schizophrenia. *Nature Communications*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-16914-1>
- Davidson, B. (2006). *Hurst exponent* (1.0.0.0) [Matlab]. <https://ch.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/9842-hurst-exponent>
- Eckmann, J.-P., Kamphorst, S. O., & Ruelle, D. (1987). Recurrence Plots of Dynamical Systems. *Europhysics Letters (EPL)*, 4(9), 973–977. <https://doi.org/10.1209/0295-5075/4/9/004>
- Eke, A., Herman, P., Kocsis, L., & Kozak, L. R. (2002). Fractal characterization of complexity in temporal physiological signals. *Physiological Measurement*, 23(1), R1–R38. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0967-3334/23/1/201>
- Freeman, L. C. (1978). Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification. *Social Networks*, 1(3), 215–239. Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733\(78\)90021-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733(78)90021-7)
- Friston, K. J. (1994). Functional and effective connectivity in neuroimaging: A synthesis. *Human Brain Mapping*, 2(1–2), 56–78. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.460020107>
- Hardstone, R., Poil, S.-S., Schiavone, G., Jansen, R., Nikulin, V. V., Mansvelder, H. D., & Linkenkaer-Hansen, K. (2012). Detrended Fluctuation Analysis: A Scale-Free View on Neuronal Oscillations. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2012.00450>
- Hegger, R., & Kantz, H. (1999). Improved false nearest neighbor method to detect determinism in time series data. *Physical Review E*, 60(4), 4970–4973. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.60.4970>
- Higuchi, T. (1988). Approach to an irregular time series on the basis of the fractal theory. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 31(2), 277–283. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789\(88\)90081-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789(88)90081-4)
- Hjorth, B. (1970). EEG analysis based on time domain properties. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, 29(3), 306–310. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694\(70\)90143-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(70)90143-4)
- Hurst, H. E. (1957). A Suggested Statistical Model of some Time Series which occur in Nature. *Nature*, 180(4584), 494–494. <https://doi.org/10.1038/180494a0>

- Ibáñez-Molina, A. J., Lozano, V., Soriano, M. F., Aznarte, J. I., Gómez-Ariza, C. J., & Bajo, M. T. (2018). EEG Multiscale Complexity in Schizophrenia During Picture Naming. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2018.01213>
- Inouye, T., Shinosaki, K., Sakamoto, H., Toi, S., Ukai, S., Iyama, A., Katsuda, Y., & Hirano, M. (1991). Quantification of EEG irregularity by use of the entropy of the power spectrum. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, 79(3), 204–210. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694\(91\)90138-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(91)90138-T)
- Kaminski, M. J., & Blinowska, K. J. (1991). A new method of the description of the information flow in the brain structures. *Biological Cybernetics*, 65(3), 203–210. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00198091>
- Katz, M. J. (1988). Fractals and the analysis of waveforms. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 18(3), 145–156. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-4825\(88\)90041-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-4825(88)90041-8)
- Kayser, J., & Tenke, C. E. (2006). Principal components analysis of Laplacian waveforms as a generic method for identifying ERP generator patterns: I. Evaluation with auditory oddball tasks. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 117(2), 348–368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2005.08.034>
- Lachaux, J.-P., Rodriguez, E., Martinerie, J., & Varela, F. J. (1999). Measuring phase synchrony in brain signals. *Human Brain Mapping*, 8(4), 194–208. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0193\(1999\)8:4<194::AID-HBM4>3.0.CO;2-C](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0193(1999)8:4<194::AID-HBM4>3.0.CO;2-C)
- Lehmann, D., Ozaki, H., & Pal, I. (1987). EEG alpha map series: Brain micro-states by space-oriented adaptive segmentation. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, 67(3), 271–288. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694\(87\)90025-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(87)90025-3)
- Lehmann, Dietrich, Faber, P. L., Galderisi, S., Herrmann, W. M., Kinoshita, T., Koukkou, M., Mucci, A., Pascual-Marqui, R. D., Saito, N., Wackermann, J., Winterer, G., & Koenig, T. (2005). EEG microstate duration and syntax in acute, medication-naïve, first-episode schizophrenia: A multi-center study. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging*, 138(2), 141–156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2004.05.007>
- Lei, M., Wang, Z., & Feng, Z. (2002). A method of embedding dimension estimation based on symplectic geometry. *Physics Letters A*, 303(2), 179–189. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601\(02\)01164-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601(02)01164-7)
- Lempel, A., & Ziv, J. (1976). On the Complexity of Finite Sequences. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 22(1), 75–81. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.1976.1055501>
- Marwan, N. (2017). *Cross recurrence plot toolbox for MATLAB* (5.22) [Matlab].
- Marwan, N., Carmenromano, M., Thiel, M., & Kurths, J. (2007). Recurrence plots for the analysis of complex systems. *Physics Reports*, 438(5–6), 237–329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2006.11.001>
- Marwan, Norbert, Wessel, N., Meyerfeldt, U., Schirdewan, A., & Kurths, J. (2002). Recurrence-plot-based measures of complexity and their application to heart-rate-variability data. *Physical Review E*, 66(2). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.66.026702>
- Michel, C. M., & Koenig, T. (2018). EEG microstates as a tool for studying the temporal dynamics of whole-brain neuronal networks: A review. *NeuroImage*, 180, 577–593. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.11.062>
- Mohammadi, S. (2009). LYAPROSEN: MATLAB function to calculate Lyapunov exponent. In *Statistical Software Components*. Boston College Department of Economics. <https://ideas.repec.org/c/boc/bocode/t741502.html>

- Montez, T., Poil, S.-S., Jones, B. F., Manshanden, I., Verbunt, J. P. A., van Dijk, B. W., Brussaard, A. B., van Ooyen, A., Stam, C. J., Scheltens, P., & Linkenkaer-Hansen, K. (2009). Altered temporal correlations in parietal alpha and prefrontal theta oscillations in early-stage Alzheimer disease. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(5), 1614–1619. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0811699106>
- Nolte, G., Bai, O., Wheaton, L., Mari, Z., Vorbach, S., & Hallett, M. (2004). Identifying true brain interaction from EEG data using the imaginary part of coherency. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 115(10), 2292–2307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2004.04.029>
- Nunez, P. L., Srinivasan, R., Westdorp, A. F., Wijesinghe, R. S., Tucker, D. M., Silberstein, R. B., & Cadusch, P. J. (1997). EEG coherency: I: statistics, reference electrode, volume conduction, Laplacians, cortical imaging, and interpretation at multiple scales. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, 103(5), 499–515. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0013-4694\(97\)00066-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0013-4694(97)00066-7)
- Onnela, J.-P., Saramäki, J., Kertész, J., & Kaski, K. (2005). Intensity and coherence of motifs in weighted complex networks. *Physical Review E*, 71(6), 065103. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.71.065103>
- Oostenveld, R., Fries, P., Maris, E., & Schoffelen, J.-M. (2010). FieldTrip: Open Source Software for Advanced Analysis of MEG, EEG, and Invasive Electrophysiological Data. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2011, e156869. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/156869>
- Opsahl, T., Agneessens, F., & Skvoretz, J. (2010). Node centrality in weighted networks: Generalizing degree and shortest paths. *Social Networks*, 32(3), 245–251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2010.03.006>
- O'Reilly, D., Navakatikyan, M. A., Filip, M., Greene, D., & Van Marter, L. J. (2012). Peak-to-peak amplitude in neonatal brain monitoring of premature infants. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 123(11), 2139–2153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2012.02.087>
- Pascual-Marqui, R. D. (2007). Instantaneous and lagged measurements of linear and nonlinear dependence between groups of multivariate time series: Frequency decomposition. *ArXiv:0711.1455 [Stat]*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0711.1455>
- Pascual-Marqui, R. D., Lehmann, D., Koukkou, M., Kochi, K., Anderer, P., Saletu, B., Tanaka, H., Hirata, K., John, E. R., Prichep, L., Biscay-Lirio, R., & Kinoshita, T. (2011). Assessing interactions in the brain with exact low-resolution electromagnetic tomography. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 369(1952), 3768–3784. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2011.0081>
- Pincus, S. M., Gladstone, I. M., & Ehrenkranz, R. A. (1991). A regularity statistic for medical data analysis. *Journal of Clinical Monitoring*, 7(4), 335–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01619355>
- Richman, J. S., & Moorman, J. R. (2000). Physiological time-series analysis using approximate entropy and sample entropy. *American Journal of Physiology-Heart and Circulatory Physiology*, 278(6), H2039–H2049. <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpheart.2000.278.6.H2039>
- Rosenstein, M. T., Collins, J. J., & De Luca, C. J. (1993). A practical method for calculating largest Lyapunov exponents from small data sets. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 65(1), 117–134. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789\(93\)90009-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789(93)90009-P)
- Rubinov, M., & Sporns, O. (2010). Complex network measures of brain connectivity: Uses and interpretations. *NeuroImage*, 52(3), 1059–1069. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.10.003>

- Stam, C. J. (2005). Nonlinear dynamical analysis of EEG and MEG: Review of an emerging field. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 116(10), 2266–2301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2005.06.011>
- Takens, F. (1981). Detecting strange attractors in turbulence. In D. Rand & L.-S. Young (Eds.), *Dynamical Systems and Turbulence, Warwick 1980* (Vol. 898, pp. 366–381). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0091924>
- Thai, Q. (2019). *Calc_lz_complexity* (1.9.0.0) [Matlab]. https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/38211-calc_lz_complexity
- Tort, A. B. L., Komorowski, R., Eichenbaum, H., & Kopell, N. (2010). Measuring Phase-Amplitude Coupling Between Neuronal Oscillations of Different Frequencies. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 104(2), 1195–1210. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00106.2010>
- Uhlhaas, P. J., & Singer, W. (2010). Abnormal neural oscillations and synchrony in schizophrenia. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 100–113. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2774>
- von Stein, A., & Sarnthein, J. (2000). Different frequencies for different scales of cortical integration: From local gamma to long range alpha/theta synchronization. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 38(3), 301–313. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8760\(00\)00172-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8760(00)00172-0)
- Vorobyov, S., & Cichocki, A. (2002). Blind noise reduction for multisensory signals using ICA and subspace filtering, with application to EEG analysis. *Biological Cybernetics*, 86(4), 293–303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00422-001-0298-6>