

1 **Altered functional connectivity relates to motor performance**
2 **deficits in bipolar but not unipolar depression**

3

4 Lara E. Marten^a, Aditya Singh^a, Anna M. Muellen^b, Sören M. Noack^a, Vladislav Kozyrev^{a,c,d},
5 Renate Schweizer^{c,e}, Roberto Goya-Maldonado^{a,e}

6 **Author affiliations:**

7 a Laboratory of Systems Neuroscience and Imaging in Psychiatry (SNIP-Lab), Department of
8 Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG), Von-Siebold-
9 Straße 5, 37075 Göttingen, Germany

10 b Cognitive Neuroscience Laboratory, German Primate Center, Kellnerweg 4, 37077
11 Göttingen, Germany

12 c Functional Imaging Laboratory, German Primate Center, Kellnerweg 4, 37077 Göttingen,
13 Germany

14 d Institute of Molecular and Clinical Ophthalmology Basel, Mittlere Straße 91, 4056 Basel,
15 Switzerland

16 e Leibniz ScienceCampus Primate Cognition, Kellnerweg 4, 37077 Göttingen, Germany

17

18 **Correspondence to:**

19 PD Dr. med. Roberto Goya-Maldonado

20 Universitätsmedizin Göttingen

21 Klinik für Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie

22 Labor für systemische Neurowissenschaften und Bildgebung in der Psychiatrie (SNIP-Lab)

23 Von-Siebold-Str. 5

24 D-37075 Göttingen

25 Germany

26 Phone: +49 551-39-22244

27 E-mail: roberto.goya@med.uni-goettingen.de

28

29 **Abstract**

30 Underpinnings of psychomotor deficits in bipolar and unipolar depression remain
31 underexplored. Here, we hypothesize that motor performance deficits in patients may be
32 partially explained by altered functional connectivities between hand primary motor cortex
33 and posterior cingulate cortex with supplementary motor area.

34 95 participants between 18-65 years of age, including bipolar depressed, unipolar depressed,
35 and sex-, age-, and education-matched healthy controls, participated in this observational
36 study with two separate visits about five weeks apart, during which the patients received
37 psychopharmacological treatment. Motor performance was measured with a finger-tapping-
38 task and related to functional connectivity from individual seeds in hand primary motor
39 cortex and posterior cingulate cortex as well as to the default mode and sensory motor
40 networks from resting state functional MRI data.

41 79 participants (45.6% females, 21 bipolar depressed, 27 unipolar depressed and 31 healthy
42 controls) were included in the analysis. Using a finger-tapping-task, the groups differed in
43 motor performance (ANOVA factor “group” $F(2,76) = 4.122$; $p = 0.020$) and bipolar
44 depressed but not unipolar depressed showed performance deficits compared to controls
45 (post-hoc-test $p = 0.023$ and $p = 0.158$ respectively). Behavioral performance correlated with
46 functional coupling of posterior cingulate cortex - supplementary motor area, but not with
47 coupling of primary motor cortex - supplementary motor area at cluster-wise correction level
48 $p FWEc < 0.05$. Correlation differences were seen in posterior cingulate cortex -
49 supplementary motor area (healthy controls>bipolar depressed, unipolar depressed>bipolar
50 depressed) at second visit and in primary motor cortex - supplementary motor area (bipolar
51 depressed>unipolar depressed) at both visits at cluster-wise correction level $p FWEc < 0.05$.
52 Motor performance did not relate to functional coupling of sensory motor network - anterior
53 (visit 1 $p = 0.375$, visit 2 $p = 0.700$) or - posterior (visit 1 $p = 0.903$, visit 2 $p = 0.772$)
54 default mode network.

55 Motor performance deficits were seen exclusively in bipolar depressed and related to reduced
56 posterior cingulate cortex - supplementary motor area functional connectivity at rest. Our
57 results shed new light on a possible disruption in the anticorrelation between these regions,
58 which seems fundamental for the preservation of motor skills. Given that nuisance factors
59 were controlled for in the study, it is unlikely that the main results are biased by lefthanders,
60 medication load, seed volumes, or differences in movements during MRI scanning. If these

61 findings are confirmed, new targeted non-invasive interventions, such as repetitive
62 transcranial magnetic stimulation, may be more effective against psychomotor deficits in
63 bipolar depression, when aimed at modulating the supplementary motor area.

64 **Keywords:** bipolar disorder; major depressive disorder; finger tapping; posterior cingulate
65 cortex; supplementary motor area

66 **Abbreviations**¹

67 **1. Introduction**

68 Psychomotor functioning involves processes that range from planning, initiating and
69 executing movements.^{1,for review see 2} Slower or inefficient information processing may derive
70 from alterations in particular neural regions, or entire networks, that are essential to the
71 circuitry.³⁻⁷ The precentral gyrus contains the primary motor cortex (M1), which is in charge
72 of starting the execution loop of movements of the contralateral limb.^{8,9} For the coordinated
73 adjustment of muscles implicated in the intended hand movement, the supplementary motor
74 area (SMA) integrates signals of frontal planning with sensorial, proprioceptive and cognitive
75 information from other brain regions and forwards it to the M1.^{8-10,for a review see 11} Another
76 pivotal region involved in successful motor responses is the posterior cingulate cortex (PCC),
77 a region belonging to the default mode network (DMN). PCC plays a role in integrating
78 signals from somatosensory areas and dorsal visual stream via parietal cortical areas for
79 spatial processing and action in space.^{for review see 12} In stroke patients with impairments in
80 motor performance, strengthened resting state functional connectivity between the M1 and
81 the PCC was found to be critical for improvements in motor performance.¹⁷ Studies have
82 shown that the PCC is also involved in emotional processing and rumination of negative
83 thoughts.¹³⁻¹⁶ This makes it an interesting target for research on depression, since
84 psychomotor symptoms in neuropsychiatric disorders may involve behaviors arising from

¹ **Abbreviations:** AAL = automated anatomical labeling; BD = Bipolar depressed; BDI-II = Beck-Depression-Rating-Scale second version; DMN = Default mode network; EPI = Echo planar imaging; FTT = Finger-tapping-task; gICA = group independent component analysis; GLM = general linear model; FWHM = full width at half maximum; HAMD = Hamilton depression rating scale; HC = Healthy controls; ICD-10 = International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems 10th Revision; M1 = Primary motor cortex; MADRS = Montgomery Åsberg Depression Rating Scale; MNI = Montreal Neurological Institute; MPRAGE = magnetization prepared rapid gradient echo; PCC = Posterior cingulate cortex; p FWE = family-wise error correction level; p FWEc = cluster-wise correction level; rmANOVA = repeated measures ANOVA; rs-fMRI = Resting state functional MRI; SCL-90-R = Symptom-Checklist-90-R; SMA = Supplementary motor area; SMN = Sensory motor network; UD = Unipolar depressed; UMG = University Medical Center Göttingen; YMRS = Young-Mania-Rating-Scale

85 more than just the motor circuitry.^{for review see 6} To broaden the understanding of the
86 contribution of M1 and PCC also in motor performance deficits in depression,¹⁸⁻²¹ studies
87 that unveil their longitudinal functional connectivity are crucial.

88 Deficits in psychomotor functioning is a typical symptom cluster of major depressive disorder
89 and the depressive phase of bipolar disorder^{22,23} and can make a decisive contribution to
90 unsuccessful treatment^{24,25} as well as to social functioning.²⁶ In spite of their impact on
91 patient outcomes, their manifestation is often assumed to be either part to residual symptoms
92 or medication side effects, leaving their neural correlates and development of potentially
93 targeted treatments poorly explored. The identification of more objective differences
94 involving motor performance and its neural correlates in groups of bipolar depressed (BD),
95 unipolar depressed (UD) patients and healthy controls (HC) could support the development of
96 novel biomarkers. Furthermore, such neurofunctional biomarkers of BD and UD can offer the
97 chance to better understand the basis of motor symptom manifestation and treatment
98 improvement,^{for review see 27} for example, by applying more targeted transcranial magnetic
99 stimulation (TMS) protocols.^{for review see 28}

100 Different paradigms can be used to assess and compare the motor performance of UD, BD,
101 HC and recovered patients.²⁹⁻³⁴ In the present study, we have chosen the finger-tapping-task
102 (FTT) paradigm, considering that it dismisses working memory,^{35,36} which allows clearer
103 conclusions about the movement process itself. It has been previously shown that motor
104 performance in FTT is impaired in BD,^{18,19} but not always in UD,^{5,20,21,37-39}. This reinforces
105 an importance of understanding the underlying brain mechanisms leading to such differences.
106 In light of possible residual motor symptoms,^{40,41} the fundamental evaluation of motor
107 performance, e.g. using the FTT, related to baseline M1 and PCC functional connectivity in
108 depressed subjects undergoing treatment remains unexplored to our knowledge. Therefore,
109 our aim with this study was to test whether resting state functional connectivity of M1 and
110 PCC with SMA, which is accessible on the MRI scanner to all patients, regardless of how
111 severely depressed they are, can explain behavioral differences in subjects. Functional
112 connectivity between the right M1 and the SMA, an integrative center of the sensory motor
113 network (SMN), can be a positive predictor of performance during the FTT in HC.⁴² Thus,
114 baseline functional dysconnectivities with the SMA could potentially explain behavioral
115 differences between BD and UD patients in contrast to HC.

116 Large-scale networks can differ according to mood states in bipolar disorder.⁴³⁻⁴⁵ A model
117 involving the interaction between the SMN and the DMN has been recently suggested to
118 explain psychomotor deficits in affective and many other disorders.^{for review see 6} In BD, it was
119 proposed that the interaction between networks is imbalanced towards the DMN in
120 depressive states, whereas imbalanced towards the SMN in manic states.^{43,46} While this
121 remains to be tested, evidence of hyperconnectivity between the SMN and the DMN in
122 bipolar patients in a depressed state seems to contradict this idea.⁴⁴ As the balanced coupling
123 between task positive and task negative networks is important for the proper execution of
124 motor tasks in HC,⁴⁷ we explore here whether the relationship between SMN-DMN networks
125 can better explain possible FTT differences between groups.

126 Thus, in the present investigation, we expect that FTT motor performance is impaired in BD
127 and UD in relation to HC, a difference that could decrease after antidepressant treatment. We
128 hypothesize that the functional connectivity of M1 and PCC (our regions of interest for the
129 seed analysis) with the SMA relates to FTT motor performance. Finally, we explore if the
130 cross-correlation between the entire SMN and DMN (rather than the regions of interest)
131 better explains differences in the level of motor performance.

132

133 **2. Materials and methods**

134 **2.1 Protocol**

135 The study was performed at the University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG) after approval
136 of the research protocol by the local Ethics Committee. All participants provided their verbal
137 and written informed consent after a detailed explanation of the research protocol. Patients
138 experiencing a depressive phase of major depressive disorder (UD) or bipolar disorder (BD)
139 (cf. ICD-10) and sex, age and education matched HC were recruited by announcements at the
140 local University, the UMG Psychiatric Center as well as the local Asklepios Psychiatric
141 Hospital.

142 All participants were between 18 and 65 years old. Exclusion criteria were: current or
143 previous brain injury, current or past neurological disease, current use of illegal drugs,
144 inability to perform the tasks or to undergo MRI sessions.

145 We collected individual information about the handedness⁴⁸ and being lefthanded was not an
146 exclusion criterion in order to consider all the handedness variability in the clinical sample.
147 And to consider the influence of this variable, we also complement the analyses with models
148 excluding lefthanders.

149 The study comprised two assessments of two consecutive days separated by approximately 5
150 weeks (Fig. 1). Between evaluations, patients received psychopharmacological treatment for
151 the depressive episode at the psychiatric hospital by their caregiver physicians, who were
152 independent in their treatment choices from the research group that conducted the study
153 (naturalistic design). HC participated in the same study protocol, but received no treatment.
154 All subjects were instructed to abstain from alcohol for at least 24 hours before and to refrain
155 from consuming nicotine or caffeine for at least two hours before the assessments. On each
156 day the participants performed the FTT, on the second day followed by a structured interview
157 led by a trained person and – in case of medication with measurable blood metabolites
158 (Supplementary Table 1) – a blood sample was taken immediately prior to the MRI session to
159 measure their blood medication levels.

160 Severity of symptoms in patients was assessed with the Montgomery Åsberg Depression
161 Rating Scale (MADRS), the Young-Mania-Rating-Scale (YMRS), and the Beck-Depression-
162 Rating-Scale second version (BDI-II), the first two rated within the structured interview, the
163 latter, self-rated. We used the BDI-II in all our groups as our primary scale to implement the
164 degree of depressive symptomatology in the analyses. The BDI-II is well correlated with
165 other-rated scales (MADRS, Hamilton depression rating scale (HAMD)) and has a focus on
166 cognitive aspects of depression and less on mood and anxiety or neurovegetative aspects,⁴⁹
167 which is in line with the research focus of this study. Furthermore, the BDI-II as a self-rated
168 scale showed more correlation to brain metabolism in resting state positron emission
169 tomography than HAMD as an other-rated scale, indicating that BDI-II can be more strongly
170 related to basal brain functioning.⁵⁰ To account for the amount of psychotropic medication
171 used per patient, an extended concept previously established as medication load⁵¹⁻⁵⁵ was
172 implemented (Supplementary material, chapter 1.1). In HC, to verify the absence of potential
173 psychiatric symptoms, the self-rated Symptom-Checklist-90-R (SCL-90-R) was used.

174 **2.2 Finger-Tapping-Task**

175 The FTT was performed on a computer with an adapted keyboard that contained only the
176 keys 1 to 4. The subjects tapped with the digits of the non-dominant hand not using the
177 thumb. The task consisted of 12 intervals of 30 seconds duration in which the tapping was
178 performed with intervals of 20 seconds without digit movements between them. The entire
179 tapping sequence was presented on the computer monitor with numbers associated with
180 digits: 1 = little finger, 2 = ring finger, 3 = middle finger, 4 = index finger. On the two days
181 of the first visit the sequence “4-1-3-2-4” was used, on the two days of the second visit the
182 sequence “1-4-2-3-1” was used (Fig. 1). The participants were instructed to press the keys as
183 fast and accurately as possible. No feedback was given on the performance of the task. The
184 mean from the number of correctly tapped sequences of the last three of the 12 tapping
185 intervals of the first days of the visits were used as a score to quantify the motor
186 performance – as they are expected to represent the performance plateau.^{36,56} The number of
187 correctly typed sequences accounts for speed and accuracy.^{35,36}

188 **2.3 Functional connectivity**


189 The functional and structural images were acquired with a 3T Siemens Magnetom Tim Trio,
190 on Syngo VB-17a (Erlangen, Germany) and a 32-channel head coil. Structural whole-brain
191 T1-weighted images were realized with a magnetization prepared rapid gradient echo
192 (MPRAGE) sequence (repetition time: 2250 ms, echo time: 3.26 ms, inversion time: 900 ms,
193 flip angle: 9°, field of view: 256 mm, spatial resolution: 1 mm x 1 mm, 176 slices, acquisition
194 time: 8:26 min) and a resulting voxel size of 1mm x 1mm x 1 mm.

195 Resting state functional MRI (rs-fMRI) was measured with an gradient echo EPI (echo planar
196 imaging) sequence (repetition time: 2500 ms, echo time: 33 ms, flip angle 70°, multi-band-
197 factor 3, field of view 210 mm, spatial resolution: 2 mm x 2 mm, 60 slides with 2 mm
198 thickness, distance factor 10%, 125 volumes (first 5 volumes deleted)) with a total acquisition
199 time of 5:25 min, voxel size of 2 mm x 2 mm x 2 mm and a slice orientation along the
200 anterior-posterior commissure.

201 Brain images were analyzed with SPM12 (www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm, Wellcome Trust
202 Centre for Neuroimaging, London, United Kingdom) based on MATLAB 2015b
203 (MathWorks, Natick, Massachusetts) The following preprocessing steps were performed:
204 default temporal high-pass filtering SPM12 at <0.008 Hz, slice-time-correction, realignment

205 with unwarping SPM12; spatial normalization with the deformation field from FreeSurfer
206 Version 6.0 (<https://surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu/>) run on an Ubuntu 18.0 to the standard
207 Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) 152 brain at 2 mm spatial resolution; spatial
208 smoothing with a Gaussian kernel of 6 mm full width at half maximum (FWHM); nuisance-
209 regression of white matter and cerebral spinal fluid as well as motion correction with an
210 automatized independent component analysis based cleaning procedure (ICA-AROMA v0.3-
211 bet, available from: <https://github.com/maartenmennes/ICA-AROMA>).⁵⁷ To ensure all
212 autocorrelative signal was regressed out, a visual inspection of all data for quality control was
213 performed. If potential noise artefacts remained, they were added as additional “noise”
214 components to the automatically identified by ICA-AROMA and the cleaning procedure was
215 rerun. In addition to this extensive correction of movement we also assessed potential bias
216 due to different extend of movement between the groups by comparing individual root mean
217 squares based on frame-by-frame displacement of adjacent volumes in mm between the
218 groups in an repeated measures ANOVA (rmANOVA).⁵⁸

219 Seed-based analyses aimed to address functional connectivity differences and its influences
220 on motor performance of the right hemisphere hand M1 and the PCC, especially to the SMA
221 as the core region of our hypotheses. To define the M1 gray matter seeds, we combined the
222 anatomical T1 information from the precentral gyrus from FreeSurfer segmentation with a
223 7 mm radius spherical seed, defined using the SPM toolbox MarsBaR version 0.44
224 (<http://marsbar.sourceforge.net/>), which was centered at the MNI-coordinates 40 -20 54 (x, y,
225 z) for the right hemisphere hand M1 from a meta-analysis of functional MRI data of hand
226 movement tasks.⁵⁹ The overlap between these two sources was carefully inspected for
227 consistency in every individual subject’s data (see an example for precise coverage of the
228 grey matter with a seed based on this technique in Fig. 1). To make sure that differences in
229 functional connectivity did not stem from differences in the seed volume, we checked if the
230 volume of the individualized masks differed between groups or time with an rmANOVA in
231 SPSS (for results see Supplementary material, chapter 2.2). The newly established seed
232 definition technique was also applied to create seeds for the PCC (MNI coordinates 0 -53 26
233 (x, y, z)) (for an example see Fig. 1), centered in the position used for the investigation of
234 motor impairments in stroke.¹⁷



235

236 **Figure 1 Methods (A)** Connectivity model between regions of interest: supplementary motor area (SMA) and
 237 right hemisphere hand primary motor cortex (M1) as part of the sensory motor network (red), posterior cingulate
 238 cortex (PCC) as part of the default mode network (blue); **(B)** Study design: unipolar (UD), bipolar (BD)
 239 depressed and healthy control subjects (HC) performed the finger-tapping-task (FTT) on both days of both
 240 visits, FTTa and FTT b versions as described in methods section. The data of the second days was not used for
 241 the analysis of motor performance. The clinical assessment and the MRI sessions took place on one of the days.
 242 The blood sample was taken as close as possible before the MRI measurement; **(C)** Seed definition technique:
 243 exemplification of the overlapping area (yellow) based on FreeSurfer individual segmentation of grey matter
 244 (green) and a spherical seed (red) at the MNI coordinates $x = 40, y = -20, z = 54$ of functional coordinates for
 245 right hemisphere hand motor cortex (M1)⁵⁹ **(D)** and at $x = 0, y = -53, z = 2$ for the posterior cingulate cortex¹⁷.

246 The time courses of these seeds were bandpass filtered (0.01 Hz – 0.1 Hz) before being
 247 included into a general linear model (GLM) in SPM12 for the first level analysis. According

248 to the known task-positive and task-negative activations in the right hemisphere hand M1 and
249 PCC respectively, we focused on brain regions positively correlated when seeding in the right
250 hemisphere hand M1 and regions negatively correlated (anticorrelated) when seeding in the
251 PCC.

252 To investigate potential full network interconnection deficiency between SMN and DMN in
253 depressive patients, a group independent component analysis (gICA) was performed using
254 MELODIC Version 3.14 in FSL (FMRIB's Software Library, www.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl),⁶⁰ to
255 be able to estimate correlation between the time courses of these networks in all groups
256 before and after intervention. The gICAs were performed for each group and each visit
257 separately. Then, all the components were inspected selecting the components reflecting
258 SMN, anterior DMN and posterior DMN. The time course of the network signal from every
259 subject was extracted separately for each selected component. For every subject a correlation
260 coefficient for the correlation between the time courses of the SMN and the anterior DMN as
261 well as for the correlation between the SMN and the posterior DMN was calculated using
262 MATLAB 2015b (MathWorks, Natick, Massachusetts).

263 **2.4 Statistical Analysis**

264 The FTT was analyzed with an rmANOVA for motor performance in IBM SPSS Statistics
265 Version 26. In the main analysis no covariates were included, but to check for influencing
266 effects, the analysis was repeated with the covariates sex, age, education, change of the
267 medication load and change in BDI-II, which have the potential to influence the motor
268 performance.^{25,61-65} Furthermore, models with only the patient groups were created to
269 consider potential effects of years since first episode, age of onset, number of depressive
270 episodes, change in MADRS and change in YMRS, which have been described in the
271 literature.^{29,63} The statistical threshold for the tests was set to two-tailed $p < 0.05$. If the
272 assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for the ANOVAs, we used the Bonferroni
273 post-hoc-test to correct for multiple testing. But if this assumptions was not met, we used the
274 Games-Howell post-hoc-test.

275 For the seed based rs-fMRI data, two SPM full factorial models with group and time as
276 factors were built for the two seeds in the second level analysis, one without covariates and
277 one with medication load as covariate-of-no-interest to control for potential differences
278 stemming from the load of medication the patients received. In addition, linear regressions

279 with functional connectivity of the seed and motor performance were calculated for the whole
280 study population.

281 The correlation coefficients were used for an rmANOVA model calculated in SPSS to
282 investigate whether possible correlations between the networks differed between groups or
283 time. Additionally, a linear regression was performed for each visit to test for a relationship
284 between the SMN-DMN time course correlations and the motor performance.

285 In regions belonging to our a priori hypothesis, we considered the statistical threshold at the
286 cluster-wise correction level ($p_{FWEc} < 0.05$) to reduce the probability of both false-positive
287 and false-negative results. Otherwise, we considered the family-wise error correction level ($p_{FWE} < 0.05$) to reduce the probability of false-positive results. The labeling of functional
288 imaging clusters was performed according to the automated anatomical labeling (AAL)
289 atlas.⁶⁶
290

291 **2.5 Data availability**

292 The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author
293 upon request. Due to restrictions in the data sharing consent obtained from the study
294 participants the data are not publicly available.

295 **3. Results**

296 From 95 participants, 11 were unable or unwilling to complete the entire study, one
297 participant performed the FTT with the wrong hand and four participants were excluded due
298 to abnormalities in the anatomical scans, e.g. intracranial epidermoid cysts. Therefore, data
299 from 79 participants (31 HC, 27 UD, 21 BD - 18 Type I, three Type II) were taken into final
300 analysis. One participant from each of the HC and BD groups and two participants of the UD
301 group were lefthanded.

302 **3.1 Characterization of groups**

303 The mean time between the two visits was 4.9 weeks (SD 0.8). A complete evaluation of the
304 characteristics between groups is presented in Table 1. In line with our matching, the groups
305 were comparable in terms of sex, age and years of education. The patient groups did not

306 differ in terms of the history of their disease measured by age of onset, years since first
307 episode and number of depressive episodes. The healthy controls did not exceed the threshold
308 of normality in the global severity index of the SCL-90-R score.

309 The severity of the depressive episode was evaluated during the study and at both visits the
310 patient groups showed comparable depressive episode severity according to the BDI-II
311 scores. The comparison of the difference in BDI-II scores of visit 1 and 2 between groups
312 revealed a significantly higher difference only for UD compared to HC (Table 1). An
313 rmANOVA with the BDI-II scores revealed a significant change between visit 1 and 2 that
314 seems driven by a stronger reduction in the patient groups (factor “time” $F(1,76) = 15.660$, p
315 < 0.001 ; interaction “group x time” $F(2,76) = 6.035$, $p = 0.004$; factor “group” $F(2,76) =$
316 41.138 , $p < 0.001$).

317 In MADRS, the severity of depressive symptoms was significantly higher in UD, but only at
318 the first visit (Table 1). An rmANOVA with the MADRS scores revealed a significant
319 reduction between visit 1 and 2 for both patient groups but stronger in UD than in BD (factor
320 “time” $F(1,46) = 21.067$, $p < 0.001$; interaction “group x time” $F(1,46) = 5.179$, $p = 0.028$;
321 factor “group” $F(1,46) = 8.903$, $p = 0.005$). There was a significant difference seen for
322 YMRS scores with BD showing higher scores and a stronger reduction across time than UD
323 in an rmANOVA (factor “time” $F(1,46) = 10.067$, $p = 0.003$; interaction “group x time”
324 $F(1,46) = 7.024$, $p = 0.011$; factor “group” $F(1,46) = 7.491$, $p = 0.009$).

325 Although only bipolar patients in the current depressive episode were recruited, the
326 symptoms were mixed in some patients. At the first visit, three bipolar patients showed
327 subclinical depressive symptoms ($BDI-II$ score ≤ 8 and $MADRS$ score ≤ 12), five showed
328 manic symptoms ($YMRS$ score > 9) and one showed both manic ($YMRS$ score of this subject
329 at visit 1 = 14) and depressive ($BDI-II$ score of this subject at visit 1 = 53; $MADRS$ score of
330 this subject at visit 1 = 28) symptoms. Even though being subclinical ($M_{YMRS} \leq 9$), the BD
331 group showed a significantly higher YMRS score on visit 1 compared to the UD, as well as a
332 greater change in YMRS score between the two visits. To confirm that the main results were
333 not driven by the individuals with manic symptoms characteristics or subclinical depressive
334 symptoms characteristics, we compared mean motor performance scores of the original BD
335 group, with a subgroup of BD with clinical depressive symptoms only, which showed
336 comparable values (BD visit 1 = 8.6 ± 4.6 ($M \pm SD$) (Fig. 2); BD visit 1 with clinical
337 depressive symptoms only: 8.4 ± 4.9 ($M \pm SD$)). We also repeated the imaging analysis of

338 linear regression of motor performance scores and functional connectivity of PCC seeds
 339 without the BD subjects showing manic, mixed or subclinical symptoms and the main results
 340 could still be identified.

341 No difference in medication load between patient groups was seen at visit 1 or visit 2, but the
 342 load in both visits was significantly higher compared to HC, since they were not medicated.
 343 Furthermore, the change in medication load between visit 1 and 2 was small in the patient
 344 groups (Table 1) and not distinguishable from the HC on an additional rmANOVA (factor
 345 “time” $F(1,76) = 2.431, p = 0.123$; interaction “group x time” $F(2,76) = 1.155, p = 0.320$;
 346 factor “group” $F(2,76) = 48.226, p < 0.001$). For a detailed description of medication taken
 347 by the patient groups see tables of chapter 2.1 in the Supplementary material.

348 **Table 1: Characteristics of the bipolar (BD), unipolar (UD) and healthy control (HC) groups**

	<i>Controls</i>	<i>Unipolar</i>	<i>Bipolar</i>	<i>Comparison p-value</i>	<i>Meaning of p</i>
N (% female)	31 (58.1%)	27 (40.7%)	21 (33.3%)	0.176 ^a	No difference between groups
Age in years	41.7 ± 14.3	39.6 ± 15.3	43.5 ± 9.8	0.591 ^b	No difference between groups
Education in years	16.5 ± 3.8	15.5 ± 3.1	16.8 ± 4.0	0.453 ^c	No difference between groups
Number lefthanders	1 (3.2%)	2 (7.4%)	1 (4.8%)	X ^d	X ^d
Age of first episode	X	29.5 ± 15.2	24.7 ± 9.5	0.182 ^b	No difference between groups
Years since first episode	X	10.1 ± 9.4	18.9 ± 13.5	0.161 ^b	No difference between groups
Number of depressive episodes	X	4.8 ± 3.8	7.2 ± 6.1	0.095 ^c	No difference between groups
Number of manic episodes	X	X	2.9 ± 3.6	X	X
Number of hypomanic episodes	X	X	3.3 ± 5.0	X	X
BDI-II visit 1	2.6 ± 3.7	29.5 ± 11.1	21.1 ± 16.7	<0.001 ^b	Games-Howell-Post-Hoc-Test: Difference HC and UD: p<0.001 , HC and BD: p<0.001 , UD and BD: p = 0.128
BDI-II visit 2	2.3 ± 4.2	20.2 ± 14.0	17.1 ± 13.1	<0.001 ^b	Games-Howell-Post-Hoc-Test: Difference HC and UD: p<0.001 , HC and BD: p<0.001 , UD and BD: p = 0.714
Delta BDI-II visit 2 – visit 1	-0.2 ± 2.6	-9.3 ± 11.9	-3.9 ± 13.3	0.009 ^b	Games-Howell-Post-Hoc-Test: Difference HC and UD: p = 0.002 , HC and BD: p = 0.437, UD and BD: p = 0.327
MADRS visit 1	X	24.2 ± 8.6	13.9 ± 10.6	0.001 ^c	Severity of depressive symptoms is higher in UD
MADRS visit 2	X	14.3 ± 10.2	10.5 ± 8.3	0.179 ^c	No difference between groups
Delta MADRS visit 2 – visit 1	X	-9.9 ± 10.3	-3.3 ± 9.3	0.028 ^c	Reduction in the severity of depressive symptoms is higher in UD
YMRS visit 1	X	1.7 ± 2.6	6.1 ± 6.9	0.012 ^b	Severity of manic symptoms (mixed episode) is higher in BD
YMRS visit 2	X	1.4 ± 1.7	2.3 ± 3.5	0.222 ^b	No difference between groups

Delta YMRS visit 2 – visit 1	X	-0.3 ± 2.1	-3.7 ± 6.2	0.025^b	Reduction in the severity of manic symptoms (mixed episode) is higher in BD
Medication load visit 1	0 ± 0	4.3 ± 3	4.5 ± 2.4	No p-value because of a variance of 0 in controls ^b	Games-Howell-Post-Hoc-Test: Difference HC and UD: p<0.001 , HC and BD: p<0.001 , UD and BD: p = 0.938
Medication load visit 2	0 ± 0	4.1 ± 2.6	3.8 ± 2.3	No p-value because of a variance of 0 in controls ^b	Games-Howell-Post-Hoc-Test: Difference HC and UD: p<0.001 , HC and BD: p<0.001 , UD and BD: p = 0.925
Delta medication load visit 2 – visit 1	0 ± 0	-0.2 ± 1.9	-0.7 ± 2.5	No p-value because of a variance of 0 in controls ^b	Games-Howell-Post-Hoc-Test: Difference HC and UD: p = 0.867, HC and BD: p = 0.405, UD and BD: p = 0.700

349 ^aChi-Square-Test-Pearson

350 ^bOne-way-ANOVA with Brown-Forsythe correction for inhomogeneity of variance

351 ^cOne-way-ANOVA with homogeneity of variance

352 ^dAnalysis repeated without lefthanders

353 Abbreviations: BD = Bipolar depressed; BDI-II = Beck-Depression-Rating-Scale second version; HC =


354 Healthy controls; MADRS = Montgomery Åsberg Depression Rating Scale; UD = Unipolar depressed ; YMRS

355 = Young-Mania-Rating-Scale

356 3.2 Behavioral results

357 The motor performance differed between groups (ANOVA factor “group” $F(2,76) = 4.122$;
 358 $p = 0.020$; Fig. 2) with BD showing a significantly reduced number of correctly performed
 359 finger tapping trials compared to the HC (Post-hoc-test $p = 0.023$). The UD group showed no
 360 performance impairment compared to HC (Post-hoc-test $p = 0.158$). The BD and UD showed
 361 no significant difference (Post-hoc-test $p = 1$).

362 All groups showed an improvement of their motor performance in visit 2 (ANOVA factor
 363 “time” $F(1,76) = 33.800$; $p < 0.001$). The improvement did not differ between the groups
 364 (interaction “group x time” $F(2,76) = 0.230$; $p = 0.795$).



365

366 **Figure 2 Motor performance scores** Marginal means (mean number of correctly tapped sequences per 30
367 seconds) and confidence intervals from repeated-measures ANOVA of motor performance scores for healthy
368 controls (HC, blue), unipolar (UD, pink) and bipolar (BD, green) patients. The values displayed in the graph are
369 HC visit 1 $M \pm SD = 12.7 \pm 6.1$, UD visit 1 $M \pm SD = 9.8 \pm 4.2$, BD visit 1 $M \pm SD = 8.6 \pm 4.6$, HC visit 2 $M \pm$
370 $SD = 14.4 \pm 5.8$, UD visit 2 $M \pm SD = 12.1 \pm 5.0$, BD visit 2 $M \pm SD = 10.8 \pm 4.7$. Significant differences are
371 seen only between HC and BD (ANOVA factor “group” $F(2,76) = 4.122$; $p = 0.020$) with BD showing a
372 significantly reduced number of correctly performed finger tapping trials compared to the HC (Post-hoc-test
373 $p = 0.023$).

374 By including the covariates sex, age, education, change of medication load and change in
375 BDI-II into the model, the difference in performance between the groups remains
376 significantly different (factor “group” $F(2,71) = 5.194$; $p = 0.008$) as does the comparable
377 performance improvement of the groups across the two visits (interaction “group x time”
378 $F(2,71) = 0.067$; $p = 0.935$). However, the general effect of the performance improvement
379 seen across the groups in visit 2 was not present anymore (factor “time” $F(1,71) = 0.002$;
380 $p = 0.966$).

381 Influences of covariates on the motor performance in general revealed a negative correlation
382 with age ($F(1,71) = 23.542$; $p < 0.001$) and a positive correlation with education

383 ($F(1,71) = 16.183$; $p < 0.001$) for all groups. When limiting the ANOVA to the patient
384 groups, an improvement across visits was present (factor “time” $F(1,46) = 23.042$;
385 $p < 0.001$), which did not differ between the groups (factor “group”; $F(1,46) = 1.010$; $p =$
386 0.320) nor showed an interaction with visits (interaction “group” x “time” , $F(1,46) < 0.001$;
387 $p = 0.999$). These results were maintained, when including the covariates years since first
388 episode, age of onset, number of depressive episodes, change in MADRS and change in
389 YMRS. An older age of first episode ($F(1,41) = 5.808$; $p = 0.021$) and more years since first
390 episode ($F(1,41) = 4.396$; $p = 0.042$) reduced the motor performance. An increase in YMRS
391 score was positively correlated with a change in motor performance (interaction time x
392 deltaYMRS $F(1,41) = 4.525$; $p = 0.039$), a change in MADRS was not (interaction “time x
393 deltaMADRS” $F(1,41) = 0.799$; $p = 0.377$). The number of depressive episodes showed a
394 negative correlation with change in performance (interaction “time x number of depressive
395 episodes” $F(1,41) = 8.489$; $p = 0.006$).


396 All results hold, when excluding the lefthanders from the analysis.

397 **3.3 Functional connectivity**

398 **3.3.1 PCC seed functional connectivity**

399 For each group, the seed based functional connectivity between the PCC and the SMA was
400 visible as a negative correlation at $p FWE < 0.05$ level, except for the BD group at visit 2.
401 This is in contrast to the seed based connectivity between PCC and M1, where no negative
402 correlation was identified at $p FWE < 0.05$ level in all groups and visits. Positive correlation
403 to the PCC was evidenced for regions of the DMN, namely angular gyri, precuneus, cingulate
404 gyri, and middle prefrontal regions (data not shown).


405 The connectivity between PCC and SMA was lower at visit 2 for BD in contrast to HC, as
406 well as to UD, at $p FWEc < 0.05$ level (Fig. 3). This remains the same, when excluding the
407 lefthanders from the model. No group differences in the functional PCC-SMA connectivity
408 were observed at visit 1. In addition, no differences in connectivity of PCC to M1 were
409 observed between groups or time. Lastly, all findings from the PCC seed analysis are
410 sustained, when medication load is included in the full factorial models as a regressor-of-no-
411 interest.



412

413 **Figure 3 PCC connectivity differences** Resting state functional connectivity differences of the posterior
414 cingulate cortex (PCC) at the second visit between the bipolar depressive subjects (BD2) and the unipolar
415 depressive (UD2) resp. control (HC2) subjects (p FWE c < 0.05). HC2 showed higher connectivity measured by
416 anticorrelation between the PCC and the bilateral SMA than BD2. UD2 showed higher connectivity measured
417 by anticorrelation between the PCC and the bilateral SMA than BD2. Colorbar represents t-values.


418 The linear regression of the PCC-SMA functional connectivity and the motor performance
419 scores revealed a positive correlation, i.e. the higher the performance the stronger the
420 negative functional connectivity between PCC-SMA (Fig.4). When excluding the lefthanders
421 from analysis the cluster in the SMA maintained at a level of p < 0.001 uncorrected, but did
422 not survive FWE c < 0.05 level anymore, most likely due to the reduced power by the lower
423 number of subjects in the analysis.



424

425 **Figure 4 PCC connectivity correlated with motor performance** Resting state functional connectivity of the
426 posterior cingulate cortex (PCC) linearly correlated with the motor performance in the finger-tapping-task (p
427 FWE c < 0.05). The motor performance is correlated with the connectivity (anticorrelation) strength between the
428 PCC and the left supplementary motor area (SMA). Colorbar represents t-values.

429 On the other hand, the linear regression of the PCC-M1 functional connectivity and the motor
430 performance scores showed no linear relationship. Above all, supporting the idea that lower
431 PCC-SMA anticorrelation in BD is related to their behavioral impairment, a partial overlap in
432 SMA is seen between the functional connectivity differences with other groups and the linear
433 regression with motor performance (Fig. 5). In other words, part of the SMA in BD relates to
434 both reduced performance in FTT and reduced functional connectivity to PCC, not M1.



435

436 **Figure 5 PCC connectivity overlaps in the SMA** Resting state functional connectivity differences of the
437 posterior cingulate cortex (PCC) between groups and connectivity of the PCC correlated with motor
438 performance overlap in the supplementary motor area (SMA) at an axial plane ($z_{MNI} = 56$, $p_{FWEc} < 0.05$). (A)
439 Healthy control subjects (HC2) show higher connectivity than the bipolar depressive subjects (BD2) at visit 2.
440 (B) Unipolar depressive subjects (UD2) present higher connectivity than the bipolar depressive subjects (BD2)


441 at visit 2. (C) The connectivity of the PCC to a part of the left SMA is correlated with the motor performance in
442 the finger-tapping-task. (D) The SMA connectivity clusters seen in (A, red), (B, blue) and (C, green) overlap in
443 different extensions, as represented in pink ($A \cap B$), yellow ($A \cap C$), turquoise ($B \cap C$) and white ($A \cap B \cap C$).

444 3.3.1 M1 seed based functional connectivity

445 The positive functional connectivity between the right hemisphere hand M1 and the SMA
446 could be shown at $p FWE < 0.05$ for each of the groups. Additionally, other parts of the
447 SMN, namely the pre- and postcentral gyrus bilaterally as well as bilateral temporal regions
448 were identified. No negative correlation was evidenced at $p FWE < 0.05$ (data not shown).

449 A higher connectivity between the M1 and the SMA was seen in HC compared to UD only at
450 visit 2 ($p FWEc < 0.05$) in the model where the medication load was inserted as regressor-of-
451 no-interest. When excluding the lefthanders from the model with medication load as a
452 regressor-of-no-interest, a higher connectivity between the right hemisphere hand M1 and the
453 SMA was also seen at visit 1 at $p FWEc < 0.05$ threshold.

454 Compared to UD, BD showed stronger connectivity between M1 and SMA on both visits
455 (Fig. 6). At the first visit, these clusters survived $p FWE < 0.05$ correction. At the second
456 visit, differences were more restricted and seen only in the left hemisphere at $p FWEc < 0.05$
457 level. These differences between BD and UD held in the model with medication load as a
458 regressor-of-no-interest as well as in the model without lefthanders. There was no
459 connectivity of the M1 that was stronger in UD than in BD.



460

461 **Figure 6 M1 connectivity difference** Differences in the resting state functional connectivity of the right
462 hemisphere hand motor area (M1) between bipolar (BD) and unipolar (UD) depressed participants at p
463 $FWEc < 0.05$. BD showed stronger connectivity than UD between M1 and the bilateral SMA in visit 1 than in
464 visit 2. No regions were evidenced in the UD>BD contrast. Colorbar represents t-values.

465 The linear regression of motor performance score and the right hemisphere hand M1-SMA
466 functional connectivity did not show SMA clusters that survived p FWEc < 0.05 correction,
467 i.e. there was no correlation between the motor performance and functional connectivity
468 between SMA and M1. This result remained when excluding the lefthanders from the model.
469 All groups did not show changes of their right hemisphere hand M1 connectivity across time.
470 Beyond our a priori hypotheses, higher connectivity in HC than UD at visit 2 between the
471 right hemisphere hand M1 and the right Rolandic operculum was seen (p FWE < 0.05). When
472 controlling for the medication load as a regressor-of-no-interest, the cluster at the right
473 Rolandic operculum was not seen. Furthermore, the cluster was not present, when excluding
474 the lefthanders from the analysis. There was no further difference between BD and HC in any
475 of these models.
476 Finally, to check for potential bias in the seed model, we evaluated whether differences in
477 movement exists during the scanning sessions, in spite of applying a strict motion correction
478 procedure in the analysis. When comparing the frame-by-frame displacement with root-
479 mean-squares⁵⁸ between the three groups, a difference was revealed, which do not seem to
480 stem from a difference between the HC-BD groups (post-hoc $p = 0.257$), but rather from a
481 trend between the UD-BD groups (post-hoc $p = 0.062$) (for detailed results see
482 Supplementary material, chapter 2.3).

483 **3.4 SMN-DMN correlation coefficients**

484 The correlation coefficients between SMN and DMN were computed and compared between
485 groups and across time in rmANOVAs (for results see Supplementary material, chapter 2.4,
486 Table 6). In the linear regressions, the motor performance scores neither showed a
487 relationship with the correlation of SMN and posterior DMN (visit 1: $r < 0.001$, $p = 0.903$;
488 visit 2: $r = 0.001$, $p = 0.772$), nor with the correlation of SMN and anterior DMN on any of
489 the visits (visit 1: $r = 0.005$, $p = 0.375$; visit 2: $r = 0.002$, $p = 0.700$). Similar to the models
490 with lefthanders, no linear relationship between SMN-DMN correlation and motor
491 performance was seen for visit 1 or visit 2.

492 **4. Discussion**

493 The current study examined the neural underpinnings of motor performance between groups
494 of BD, UD and HC participants with comparable sex, age, education, medication load and
495 history of disease. We identified a deficit in the FTT motor performance only in BD in
496 relation to HC, which decreased after five weeks of psychopharmacotherapy. As expected, an
497 association between the FTT motor performance and the negative functional connectivity
498 between PCC and SMA was evidenced, which in the explorative investigation did not extend
499 to the relationship between DMN-SMN correlations. Contrary to our expectations, an
500 association between FTT motor performance and positive functional connectivity between
501 M1 and SMA was not observed, suggesting that the contribution of M1 is less relevant than
502 that of PCC in this case.

503 Although the motor circuit is one of the best described in the literature,^{for review see 67} functional
504 brain alterations in motor areas as part of depressive episodes remain poorly explored. In line
505 with a former study showing the importance of the PCC-SMA connectivity for upper limb
506 motor tasks,¹⁷ we were able to show here that this connectivity also appears critical for the
507 FTT performance. Since connectivity between PCC-SMA is linearly correlated with the FTT
508 performance, which is impaired in BD compared to HC, one can assume that the functional
509 brain difference between groups would explain the behavioral difference in the FTT. Despite
510 these promising findings, one must consider that such results do not survive multiple testing
511 correction ($FWEc < 0.05$), when excluding the lefthanders, although they remain identifiable
512 at the threshold $p < 0.001$. Rather than the lack of such connectivity effects in the model
513 without lefthanders, the existence of these findings at this threshold supports the notion of a
514 drop in power in detecting statistical differences. To our knowledge, this is the first time that
515 PCC-SMA connectivity has been evaluated and identified as critical for motor performance
516 in a study involving depressive and healthy subjects.

517 Psychomotor alterations are commonly seen in BD and sometimes in UD compared to HC,
518 which has been suggested as a factor that negatively contributes to treatment response or even
519 remission.^{24,25} Therefore, this remains a very relevant topic of research. In line with a former
520 study comparing psychomotor performance in UD, BD and HC,³³ we report evidence that BD
521 are more likely to have an impairment in motor performance measured by the FTT. This
522 finding is also in line with the literature showing more robust FTT impairment in BD^{18,19} than

523 in UD, where it appears compromised only in some study samples.^{5,20,21,37-39} Overall,
524 learning effects seem to be present from the first FTT assessment to the second, differently
525 from previously shown.⁶⁸ In a keyboard naive population from Kenya, it was seen that such
526 learning effects only appeared in healthy controls and not in depressive subjects.³⁹ A possible
527 explanation for the improvement in the FTT performance could be that depressive patients in
528 our study were able to profit from treatment, which may have reflected at least partially in
529 their performance. This is an interesting hypothesis involving possible neuroplasticity
530 changes that could be addressed in the future.

531 The hypothesis that the resting state functional connectivity between the M1 and the SMA is
532 not only critical for the motor performance in HC,⁴² but also in UD and BD, was rejected
533 since the linear regressions with motor performance did not show correlated clusters in the
534 SMA when seeding the right hemisphere hand M1. As far as we know, this work is the first
535 providing evidence that right hemisphere hand M1-SMA connectivity is not critical for
536 influencing FTT motor performance in depressive subjects. Another possibility for negative
537 findings is that the seed method in Herszage *et al.*⁴² when detecting the functional
538 representation of the hand with transcranial magnetic stimulation for each subject, could have
539 been more precise. Since our method of seed determination includes not only functional but
540 also individual anatomical information, it would be interesting to compare the two seeding
541 methods in future studies to define the most promising way of detecting individual seeds.

542 Our results show that BD have a higher M1-SMA connectivity than UD at both timepoints.
543 Since we did not find behavioral differences in the FTT between the two patient groups, we
544 can only hypothesize that the M1-SMA connectivity might have relevance for other
545 symptoms of depression that were beyond the scope of this work. Groups, both BD and UD
546 were comparably depressed, in a moderate level according to BDI-II scores, but only the UD
547 improved significantly in the second evaluation, which might be a limitation when comparing
548 the longitudinal changes during treatment. We speculate that residual psychomotor symptoms
549 in BD, including the differences seen in neural correlates, may contribute for the limited
550 improvement since psychomotor retardation is known as a negative predictor for
551 antidepressant treatment response.⁶⁹ All individual seeds used for M1 and PCC functional
552 connectivity analysis have been carefully created and inspected for structural accuracy of
553 each individual anatomy aiming at the participant's hand knob. Furthermore, their volumes
554 did not differ across groups, which per se could lead to false conclusions. Finally, we

555 carefully controlled our main findings for medication load and movement during scanning
556 sessions, where we found no evidence that our main findings might have been biased from
557 these covariates. A trend difference of movement between groups should be kept in mind. To
558 best remove potential bias stemming from movement, we used movement correction with
559 ICA-AROMA which was shown to be very efficient⁷⁰ and extended it with manual checking
560 for artificial signals, so we believe that our results from BD-UD comparison are not biased by
561 movement. In our view, our results also open new research perspectives for the comparisons
562 between patient groups. For example, it may be interesting in the future to use motor
563 paradigms that comprise a motor planning component, which may be more sensitive in
564 detecting differences in behavior between UD and BD. This approach can be useful in new
565 ways to support early differential diagnosis where there is a clear clinical need.⁷¹

566 It was postulated that the imbalance between the SMN and the DMN is critical for motor
567 performance in depression.^{for review see 6} Therefore, it might be expected that the
568 interconnection between the SMN and DMN, as a task positive and a task negative network
569 respectively^{47,72}, is critical for motor performance in the FTT. To explore whether this model
570 could explain the motor performance differences in a more consistent way than our seed
571 model would, we computed individual correlation coefficients between SMN and DMN. The
572 idea that the SMN-DMN connectivity is critical for FTT was rejected, since no linear
573 relationship between correlation coefficients and the motor performance were revealed. It is
574 possible that a model taking into account the imbalance between whole networks containing
575 many regions is likely to oversimplify more complex neural mechanisms in this case.

576 Some potential limitations need to be mentioned, which make our results be viewed with
577 caution. Our sample size is comparable to other studies, but likely modest taking into account
578 the limited power in detecting differences when excluding the lefthanders. Therefore, a
579 replication of our findings with larger samples is prudent. Another important aspect is the use
580 of medication, which has been very tightly controlled, but still could have influenced the
581 results in unpredictable ways. Probably due to fast switches in mood, not all BD were rated
582 with depressive symptoms at a clinical threshold at the day of testing and some also showed a
583 combination of depressive and manic symptoms (mixed episode), which might be a limitation
584 of this study but reflects clinical reality. Noteworthy, considering that BD can be often
585 misdiagnosed as UD,⁷¹ we observed the occurrence of manic symptoms in one patient part of
586 the UD group, for whom the YMRS was in the clinical range. Nevertheless, all patients

587 included in this study had a long history of disease and a diagnosis confirmed by multiple
588 caregivers of the clinical setting, which reduces the risk of a BD being misdiagnosed as
589 UD.^{71,73}

590 In conclusion, our seed model supports the notion that functional connectivity between PCC-
591 SMA explains the FTT performance in healthy and depressed individuals, but the functional
592 connectivity between M1-SMA does not. Reinforcing the relevance and originality of these
593 findings, the SMN-DMN correlation did not explain motor performance as the seed model.

594 **5. Funding**

595 This work was supported by the University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG) and the
596 German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (Bundesministerium fuer Bildung und
597 Forschung, BMBF: 01 ZX 1507, ‘‘PreNeSt - e:Med’’).

598 **6. Competing interests**

599 The authors report no competing interests.

600 **7. Acknowledgements**

601 We would like to thank PD Dr. Peter Dechent and Dr. Carsten Schmidt-Samoa for their
602 support and advice.

603 **8. References**

- 604 1. Gardini S, Venneri A, McGeown WJ, et al. Brain Activation Patterns Characterizing
605 Different Phases of Motor Action: Execution, Choice and Ideation. *Brain Topogr.*
606 2016;29(5):679-692. doi:10.1007/s10548-016-0491-5
- 607 2. Grafton ST, Hamilton AF de C. Evidence for a distributed hierarchy of action
608 representation in the brain. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2007;26(4):590-616.
609 doi:10.1016/j.humov.2007.05.009
- 610 3. Witt ST, Laird AR, Meyerand ME. Functional neuroimaging correlates of finger-
611 tapping task variations: An ALE meta-analysis. *NeuroImage.* 2008;42(1):343-356.
612 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.04.025

- 613 4. Liberg B, Adler M, Jonsson T, et al. The neural correlates of self-paced finger tapping
614 in bipolar depression with motor retardation. *Acta Neuropsychiatr.* 2013;25(1):43-51.
615 doi:10.1111/j.1601-5215.2012.00659.x
- 616 5. Genzel L, Dresler M, Cornu M, et al. Medial Prefrontal-Hippocampal Connectivity and
617 Motor Memory Consolidation in Depression and Schizophrenia. *Biol Psychiatry.*
618 2015;77(2):177-186. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.06.004
- 619 6. Northoff G, Hirjak D, Wolf RC, Magioncalda P, Martino M. All roads lead to the motor
620 cortex: psychomotor mechanisms and their biochemical modulation in psychiatric
621 disorders. *Mol Psychiatry.* Published online June 17, 2020:1-11. doi:10.1038/s41380-
622 020-0814-5
- 623 7. Sarkheil P, Odysseos P, Bee I, Zvyagintsev M, Neuner I, Mathiak K. Functional
624 connectivity of supplementary motor area during finger-tapping in major depression.
625 *Compr Psychiatry.* 2020;99:152166. doi:10.1016/j.comppsy.2020.152166
- 626 8. Roland PE, Larsen B, Lassen NA, Skinhoj E. Supplementary motor area and other
627 cortical areas in organization of voluntary movements in man. *J Neurophysiol.*
628 1980;43(1):118-136. doi:10.1152/jn.1980.43.1.118
- 629 9. Boschert J, Hink RF, Deecke L. Finger movement versus toe movement-related
630 potentials: Further evidence for supplementary motor area (SMA) participation prior to
631 voluntary action. *Exp Brain Res.* 1983;52(1):73-80. doi:10.1007/BF00237151
- 632 10. Jo H-G, Habel U, Schmidt S. Role of the supplementary motor area in auditory sensory
633 attenuation. *Brain Struct Funct.* 2019;224(7):2577-2586. doi:10.1007/s00429-019-
634 01920-x
- 635 11. Nachev P, Kennard C, Husain M. Functional role of the supplementary and pre-
636 supplementary motor areas. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 2008;9(11):856-869.
637 doi:10.1038/nrn2478
- 638 12. Rolls ET. The cingulate cortex and limbic systems for emotion, action, and memory.
639 *Brain Struct Funct.* 2019;224(9):3001-3018. doi:10.1007/s00429-019-01945-2
- 640 13. Berman MG, Peltier S, Nee DE, Kross E, Deldin PJ, Jonides J. Depression, rumination
641 and the default network. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci.* 2011;6(5):548-555.
642 doi:10.1093/scan/nsq080
- 643 14. Ho TC, Connolly CG, Henje Blom E, et al. Emotion-Dependent Functional
644 Connectivity of the Default Mode Network in Adolescent Depression. *Biol Psychiatry.*
645 2015;78(9):635-646. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.09.002
- 646 15. Preuss A, Bolliger B, Schicho W, et al. SSRI Treatment Response Prediction in
647 Depression Based on Brain Activation by Emotional Stimuli. *Front Psychiatry.*
648 2020;11:1071. doi:10.3389/fpsy.2020.538393
- 649 16. Zhou H-X, Chen X, Shen Y-Q, et al. Rumination and the default mode network: Meta-
650 analysis of brain imaging studies and implications for depression. *NeuroImage.*
651 2020;206:116287. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116287

- 652 17. Wu CW, Lin S-HN, Hsu L-M, et al. Synchrony Between Default-Mode and
653 Sensorimotor Networks Facilitates Motor Function in Stroke Rehabilitation: A Pilot
654 fMRI Study. *Front Neurosci.* 2020;14. doi:10.3389/fnins.2020.00548
- 655 18. Coffman JA, Bornstein RA, Olson SC, Schwarzkopf SB, Nasrallah HA. Cognitive
656 impairment and cerebral structure by MRI in bipolar disorder. *Biol Psychiatry.*
657 1990;27(11):1188-1196. doi:10.1016/0006-3223(90)90416-Y
- 658 19. Shinn AK, Yuksel C, Masters G, et al. Procedural memory consolidation after a night of
659 sleep in bipolar disorder with psychotic features. *Schizophr Res.* 2019;210:299-300.
660 doi:10.1016/j.schres.2018.12.044
- 661 20. Hueng T-T, Lee IH, Guog Y-J, et al. Is a patient-administered depression rating scale
662 valid for detecting cognitive deficits in patients with major depressive disorder?
663 *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci.* 2011;65(1):70-76. doi:10.1111/j.1440-1819.2010.02166.x
- 664 21. Lee CJ, Lee L-T, Tsai HC, et al. Factors related to metabolic parameters in medicated
665 patients with major depressive disorder—a naturalistic study. *Psychiatry Res.*
666 2018;268:28-33. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2018.06.061
- 667 22. World Health Organization, ed. *The ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioural*
668 *Disorders: Diagnostic Criteria for Research.* World Health Organization; 1993.
- 669 23. American Psychiatric Association, American Psychiatric Association, eds. *Diagnostic*
670 *and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-5.* 5th ed. American Psychiatric
671 Association; 2013.
- 672 24. Ulbricht CM, Dumenci L, Rothschild AJ, Lapane KL. Changes in Depression Subtypes
673 Among Men in STAR*D: A Latent Transition Analysis. *Am J Mens Health.*
674 2018;12(1):5-13. doi:10.1177/1557988315607297
- 675 25. Janzing JGE, Birkenhäger TK, van den Broek WW, Breteler LMT, Nolen WA, Verkes
676 R-J. Psychomotor Retardation and the prognosis of antidepressant treatment in patients
677 with unipolar Psychotic Depression. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2020;130:321-326.
678 doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.07.020
- 679 26. Young KS, Parsons CE, Stein A, Kringelbach ML. Motion and emotion: depression
680 reduces psychomotor performance and alters affective movements in caregiving
681 interactions. *Front Behav Neurosci.* 2015;9:26. doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00026
- 682 27. Almeida JRC, Phillips ML. Distinguishing between Unipolar Depression and Bipolar
683 Depression: Current and Future Clinical and Neuroimaging Perspectives. *Biol*
684 *Psychiatry.* 2013;73(2):111-118. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2012.06.010
- 685 28. Downar J, Daskalakis ZJ. New Targets for rTMS in Depression: A Review of
686 Convergent Evidence. *Brain Stimulat.* 2013;6(3):231-240.
687 doi:10.1016/j.brs.2012.08.006
- 688 29. Swann AC, Katz MM, Bowden CL, Berman NG, Stokes PE. Psychomotor performance
689 and monoamine function in bipolar and unipolar affective disorders. *Biol Psychiatry.*
690 1999;45(8):979-988. doi:10.1016/S0006-3223(98)00172-3

- 691 30. Werf-Eldering MJ van der, Burger H, Holthausen EAE, Aleman A, Nolen WA.
692 Cognitive Functioning in Patients with Bipolar Disorder: Association with Depressive
693 Symptoms and Alcohol Use. *PLOS ONE*. 2010;5(9):e13032.
694 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0013032
- 695 31. Sasayama D, Hori H, Teraishi T, et al. More severe impairment of manual dexterity in
696 bipolar disorder compared to unipolar major depression. *J Affect Disord*.
697 2012;136(3):1047-1052. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2011.11.031
- 698 32. Snyder HR. Major Depressive Disorder is Associated with Broad Impairments on
699 Neuropsychological Measures of Executive Function: A Meta-Analysis and Review.
700 *Psychol Bull*. 2013;139(1):81-132. doi:10.1037/a0028727
- 701 33. Blackburn IM. Mental and Psychomotor Speed in Depression and Mania. *Br J*
702 *Psychiatry*. 1975;126(4):329-335. doi:10.1192/bjp.126.4.329
- 703 34. Popescu C, Ionescu R, Jipescu I, Popa S. Psychomotor functioning in unipolar and
704 bipolar affective disorders. *Romanian J Neurol Psychiatry Rev Roum Neurol Psychiatr*.
705 1991;29(1-2):17-33.
- 706 35. Walker MP, Brakefield T, Morgan A, Hobson JA, Stickgold R. Practice with Sleep
707 Makes Perfect: Sleep-Dependent Motor Skill Learning. *Neuron*. 2002;35(1):205-211.
708 doi:10.1016/S0896-6273(02)00746-8
- 709 36. Walker MP, Brakefield T, Seidman J, Morgan A, Hobson JA, Stickgold R. Sleep and
710 the Time Course of Motor Skill Learning. *Learn Mem*. 2003;10(4):275-284.
711 doi:10.1101/lm.58503
- 712 37. Dresler M, Kluge M, Genzel L, Schüssler P, Steiger A. Impaired off-line memory
713 consolidation in depression. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2010;20(8):553-561.
714 doi:10.1016/j.euroneuro.2010.02.002
- 715 38. Dresler M, Kluge M, Pawlowski M, Schüssler P, Steiger A, Genzel L. A double
716 dissociation of memory impairments in major depression. *J Psychiatr Res*.
717 2011;45(12):1593-1599. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2011.07.015
- 718 39. Genzel L, Ali E, Dresler M, Steiger A, Tesfaye M. Sleep-dependent memory
719 consolidation of a new task is inhibited in psychiatric patients. *J Psychiatr Res*.
720 2011;45(4):555-560. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2010.08.015
- 721 40. Rock PL, Roiser JP, Riedel WJ, Blackwell AD. Cognitive impairment in depression: a
722 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychol Med*. 2014;44(10):2029-2040.
723 doi:10.1017/S0033291713002535
- 724 41. Roca M, Monzón S, Vives M, et al. Cognitive function after clinical remission in
725 patients with melancholic and non-melancholic depression: A 6 month follow-up study.
726 *J Affect Disord*. 2015;171:85-92. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2014.09.018
- 727 42. Herszage J, Dayan E, Sharon H, Censor N. Explaining Individual Differences in Motor
728 Behavior by Intrinsic Functional Connectivity and Corticospinal Excitability. *Front*
729 *Neurosci*. 2020;14. doi:10.3389/fnins.2020.00076

- 730 43. Martino M, Magioncalda P, Huang Z, et al. Contrasting variability patterns in the
731 default mode and sensorimotor networks balance in bipolar depression and mania. *Proc*
732 *Natl Acad Sci.* 2016;113(17):4824-4829. doi:10.1073/pnas.1517558113
- 733 44. Liu M, Wang Y, Zhang A, et al. Altered dynamic functional connectivity across mood
734 states in bipolar disorder. *Brain Res.* 2021;1750:147143.
735 doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2020.147143
- 736 45. Goya-Maldonado R, Brodmann K, Keil M, Trost S, Dechent P, Gruber O.
737 Differentiating unipolar and bipolar depression by alterations in large-scale brain
738 networks. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2016;37(2):808-818. doi:10.1002/hbm.23070
- 739 46. Russo D, Martino M, Magioncalda P, Inglese M, Amore M, Northoff G. Opposing
740 Changes in the Functional Architecture of Large-Scale Networks in Bipolar Mania and
741 Depression. *Schizophr Bull.* 2020;46(4):971-980. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbaa004
- 742 47. Kelly AMC, Uddin LQ, Biswal BB, Castellanos FX, Milham MP. Competition between
743 functional brain networks mediates behavioral variability. *NeuroImage.* 2008;39(1):527-
744 537. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.08.008
- 745 48. Oldfield RC. The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory.
746 *Neuropsychologia.* 1971;9(1):97-113. doi:10.1016/0028-3932(71)90067-4
- 747 49. Uher R, Farmer A, Maier W, et al. Measuring depression: comparison and integration of
748 three scales in the GENDEP study. *Psychol Med.* 2008;38(2):289-300.
749 doi:10.1017/S0033291707001730
- 750 50. Milak MS, Keilp J, Parsey RV, Oquendo MA, Malone KM, Mann JJ. Regional brain
751 metabolic correlates of self-reported depression severity contrasted with clinician
752 ratings. *J Affect Disord.* 2010;126(1):113-124. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2010.03.002
- 753 51. Phillips ML, Travis MJ, Fagiolini A, Kupfer DJ. Medication Effects in Neuroimaging
754 Studies of Bipolar Disorder. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2008;165(3):313-320.
755 doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2007.07071066
- 756 52. Hassel S, Almeida JR, Kerr N, et al. Elevated striatal and decreased dorsolateral
757 prefrontal cortical activity in response to emotional stimuli in euthymic bipolar disorder:
758 no associations with psychotropic medication load. *Bipolar Disord.* 2008;10(8):916-
759 927. doi:10.1111/j.1399-5618.2008.00641.x
- 760 53. Versace A, Almeida JRC, Hassel S, et al. Elevated Left and Reduced Right
761 Orbitomedial Prefrontal Fractional Anisotropy in Adults With Bipolar Disorder
762 Revealed by Tract-Based Spatial Statistics. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2008;65(9):1041-
763 1052. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.65.9.1041
- 764 54. Almeida JRC, Akkal D, Hassel S, et al. Reduced gray matter volume in ventral
765 prefrontal cortex but not amygdala in bipolar disorder: significant effects of gender and
766 trait anxiety. *Psychiatry Res.* 2009;171(1):54-68.
767 doi:10.1016/j.psychresns.2008.02.001

- 768 55. Hassel S, Almeida JR, Frank E, et al. Prefrontal cortical and striatal activity to happy
769 and fear faces in bipolar disorder is associated with comorbid substance abuse and
770 eating disorder. *J Affect Disord.* 2009;118(1-3):19-27. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2009.01.021
- 771 56. Manoach DS, Thakkar KN, Stroynowski E, et al. Reduced overnight consolidation of
772 procedural learning in chronic medicated schizophrenia is related to specific sleep
773 stages. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2010;44(2):112. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2009.06.011
- 774 57. Pruijm RHR, Mennes M, van Rooij D, Llera A, Buitelaar JK, Beckmann CF. ICA-
775 AROMA: A robust ICA-based strategy for removing motion artifacts from fMRI data.
776 *NeuroImage.* 2015;112:267-277. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.02.064
- 777 58. Van Dijk KRA, Sabuncu MR, Buckner RL. The influence of head motion on intrinsic
778 functional connectivity MRI. *NeuroImage.* 2012;59(1):431-438.
779 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.07.044
- 780 59. Hardwick RM, Rottschy C, Miall RC, Eickhoff SB. A quantitative meta-analysis and
781 review of motor learning in the human brain. *Neuroimage.* 2013;67:283-297.
782 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.11.020
- 783 60. Beckmann CF, Smith SM. Probabilistic independent component analysis for functional
784 magnetic resonance imaging. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging.* 2004;23(2):137-152.
785 doi:10.1109/TMI.2003.822821
- 786 61. Shaw ED, Stokes PE, Mann JJ, Manevitz AZ. Effects of lithium carbonate on the
787 memory and motor speed of bipolar outpatients. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 1987;96(1):64-69.
788 doi:10.1037/0021-843X.96.1.64
- 789 62. Shimoyama I, Ninchoji T, Uemura K. The Finger-Tapping Test: A Quantitative
790 Analysis. *Arch Neurol.* 1990;47(6):681-684.
791 doi:10.1001/archneur.1990.00530060095025
- 792 63. Calugi S, Cassano GB, Litta A, et al. Does psychomotor retardation define a clinically
793 relevant phenotype of unipolar depression? *J Affect Disord.* 2011;129(1-3):296-300.
794 doi:10.1016/j.jad.2010.08.004
- 795 64. Jiménez-Jiménez FJ, Calleja M, Alonso-Navarro H, et al. Influence of age and gender in
796 motor performance in healthy subjects. *J Neurol Sci.* 2011;302(1):72-80.
797 doi:10.1016/j.jns.2010.11.021
- 798 65. Prigatano GP, Goncalves CWP, Oliveira SB de, Denucci SM, Pereira RM, Braga LW.
799 Kinematic recordings while performing a modified version of the Halstead Finger
800 Tapping Test: Age, sex, and education effects. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol.* 2020;42(1):42-
801 54. doi:10.1080/13803395.2019.1665170
- 802 66. Tzourio-Mazoyer N, Landeau B, Papathanassiou D, et al. Automated Anatomical
803 Labeling of Activations in SPM Using a Macroscopic Anatomical Parcellation of the
804 MNI MRI Single-Subject Brain. *NeuroImage.* 2002;15(1):273-289.
805 doi:10.1006/nimg.2001.0978
- 806 67. Arber S. Motor Circuits in Action: Specification, Connectivity, and Function. *Neuron.*
807 2012;74(6):975-989. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2012.05.011

- 808 68. Fischer S, Hallschmid M, Elsner AL, Born J. Sleep forms memory for finger skills.
809 *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2002;99(18):11987-11991. doi:10.1073/pnas.182178199
- 810 69. Caligiuri MP, Gentili V, Ebersson S, Kelsoe J, Rapaport M, Gillin JC. A quantitative
811 neuromotor predictor of antidepressant non-response in patients with major depression.
812 *J Affect Disord.* 2003;77(2):135-141. doi:10.1016/S0165-0327(02)00107-6
- 813 70. Pruim RHR, Mennes M, Buitelaar JK, Beckmann CF. Evaluation of ICA-AROMA and
814 alternative strategies for motion artifact removal in resting state fMRI. *NeuroImage.*
815 2015;112:278-287. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.02.063
- 816 71. Hirschfeld RMA, Vornik LA, Lewis L. Perceptions and Impact of Bipolar Disorder:
817 How Far Have We Really Come? Results of the National Depressive and Manic-
818 Depressive Association 2000 Survey of Individuals With Bipolar Disorder. *J Clin*
819 *Psychiatry.* 2003;64(2):161-174.
- 820 72. Fox MD, Snyder AZ, Vincent JL, Corbetta M, Van Essen DC, Raichle ME. The human
821 brain is intrinsically organized into dynamic, anticorrelated functional networks. *Proc*
822 *Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2005;102(27):9673-9678. doi:10.1073/pnas.0504136102
- 823 73. Ghaemi SN, Sachs GS, M. Chiou A, Pandurangi AK, Goodwin FK. Is bipolar disorder
824 still underdiagnosed? Are antidepressants overutilized? *J Affect Disord.* 1999;52(1):135-
825 144. doi:10.1016/S0165-0327(98)00076-7
- 826