

1 **Resting-state EEG distinguishes depression in Parkinson’s disease**

2
3 Arturo I Espinoza¹, Patrick May², Md Fahim Anjum², Arun Singh³, Rachel C Cole¹, Nicholas
4 Trapp⁴, Soura Dasgupta², Nandakumar S Narayanan¹

5
6 ¹Department of Neurology, University of Iowa, ²Department of Electrical and Computer
7 Engineering, University of Iowa, ³Division of Basic Biomedical Sciences, Sanford School of
8 Medicine, University of South Dakota, ⁴Department of Psychiatry, University of Iowa
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 ***Corresponding Author**

35 Nandakumar Narayanan
36 nandakumar-narayanan@uiowa.edu
37 169 Newton Road
38 Pappajohn Biomedical Discovery Building—5336
39 University of Iowa, Iowa City, 52242
40 319-353-5698

42 **HIGHLIGHTS**

43

44 • We used EEG to analyze depression in Parkinson's disease.

45

46 • Depressed Parkinson's patients had distinct spectral EEG features.

47

48 • Machine-learning algorithms could accurately distinguish depression in Parkinson's
49 disease.

50 **ABSTRACT**

51 **Introduction:** Depression is a non-motor symptom of Parkinson's disease (PD). PD-related
52 depression is hard to diagnose and the neurophysiological basis is poorly understood. Depression
53 can markedly affect cortical function, which suggests that scalp electroencephalography (EEG)
54 may be able to distinguish depression in PD.

55 **Methods:** We recruited 18 PD patients, 18 PD patients with depression, and 12
56 demographically-similar non-PD patients with clinical depression. All patients were on their
57 usual medications. We collected resting-state EEG in all patients and compared cortical brain
58 signal features between patients with and without depression. We used a machine-learning
59 algorithm that harnesses the entire power spectrum (linear predictive coding of EEG Algorithm
60 for PD: LEAPD), to distinguish between groups.

61 **Results:** We found differences between PD patients with and without depression in the alpha
62 band (8-13 Hz) globally and in the beta (13-30 Hz) and gamma (30-80 Hz) bands in the central
63 electrodes. From two minutes of resting-state EEG we found that LEAPD-based machine
64 learning could robustly distinguish between PD patients with and without depression with 97%
65 accuracy, and between PD patients with depression and non-PD patients with depression with
66 100% accuracy. We verified the robustness of our finding by confirming that the classification
67 accuracy declines gracefully as data are truncated.

68 **Conclusions:** We demonstrated the efficacy of the LEAPD algorithm in identifying PD patients
69 with depression from PD patients without depression and controls with depression. Our data
70 provide insight into cortical mechanisms of depression and could lead to novel
71 neurophysiologically-based biomarkers for non-motor symptoms of PD.

72 INTRODUCTION

73 Depression is a prominent non-motor symptom of Parkinson’s disease (PD) [1]. PD-
74 related depression affects ~20%–40% of PD patients, several times the expected prevalence
75 within this population [2]. Importantly, this aspect of PD is often missed by physicians,
76 contributing to morbidity and decreased quality of life [3–6]. Despite its significance and impact
77 [7], it is unclear which brain circuits contribute to PD-related depression [8]. Determining which
78 brain circuits are involved could lead to the development of new diagnostic tools to identify PD-
79 related depression, as well as targeted treatments such as neuromodulation [9]. A fast and
80 accurate neurophysiologically-based diagnostic tool may also facilitate neuromodulation. In
81 addition, a better understanding of depression in PD may help us illuminate fundamental
82 mechanisms of both diseases.

83 PD and depression involve several overlapping circuits and associated neurotransmitters,
84 including dopamine and serotonin [10]. These projection systems affect cortical physiology
85 [11,12]. Cortical regions can be profoundly dysfunctional in PD [13] and in depression [14].
86 One technique that is particularly well-suited to capture cortical neurophysiology is
87 electroencephalography (EEG), which uses scalp electrodes to record activity from the cortex
88 via an array of scalp electrodes. An early EEG study comparing depressed and non-depressed PD
89 patients found widespread differences in alpha bands (8-13 Hz) in posterior and frontal sites [7].
90 Quantitative EEG (qEEG) studies have found spectral differences that distinguished PD vs
91 depression [15]. Furthermore, prefrontal cortical regions are responsive to targeted interventions,
92 such as transcranial magnetic stimulation [16]. Here, we tested the hypothesis that spectral
93 features of EEG can distinguish PD patients with depression.

94 We tested this hypothesis by collecting resting-state scalp EEG in PD patients with and
95 without depression. We compared these data with control patients with depression but without
96 PD. We report three main results. First, PD patients with depression had globally attenuated
97 alpha (8–13 Hz) rhythms, as well as attenuated central beta (13–30 Hz) and gamma (30–80 Hz)
98 rhythms relative to PD patients without depression. Second, PD patients with depression had
99 strong global differences in gamma rhythms relative to non-PD patients with depression. Third,
100 we used a linear predictive coding of EEG Algorithm for PD (LEAPD) formulated by Anjum et
101 al. [17,20], which provides binary classification based on resting-state EEG power spectra.
102 LEAPD-based classification accurately identified PD patients with depression relative to PD
103 patients and non-PD depressed patients. Collectively, these data implicate cortical rhythms in
104 PD-related depression, which could lead to novel targeted therapies or new diagnostic
105 biomarkers for this important non-motor aspect of PD.

106

107

108 **METHODS**

109 **Participants**

110 36 PD patients (11 women; Table S1) were recruited from clinics at the University of Iowa. A
111 movement-disorders physician examined all PD patients to verify that they met the diagnostic
112 criteria recommended by the United Kingdom PD Society Brain Bank criteria. Depression was
113 quantified using the Geriatric Depression Scale in PD patients; a score of 5 to 15 was considered
114 depressed). In addition, the motor Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) was
115 administered to all PD patients by a qualified rater, along with other clinical metrics, such as the
116 Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MOCA) and behavioral assays. Data were collected with
117 patients taking all medications as prescribed and PD patients were in the "ON" state. See our
118 prior work for details of cognitive assessments [18]. Demographics and other clinical details are
119 presented in Table S1 and were compared between groups by non-parametric Wilcoxon tests.

120 We recruited 12 demographically-similar depressed patients without PD (5 women; Table
121 S1) from the University of Iowa's depression and neuromodulation clinic. These patients were
122 diagnosed with depression by the Patient Health Questionnaire-9, with a value of 9 to 27. A
123 psychiatrist evaluated all patients, and patients took their medications as prescribed.

124 We obtained written informed consent from all participants according to the University of Iowa's
125 Institutional Review Board (IRB). Demographics of patients and control subjects are
126 summarized in Table S1.

127

128 **EEG recording and analysis**

129 Resting-state EEG was collected from patients while they sat in a quiet room with their
130 eyes open for two minutes. Scalp EEG signals were collected from 64 channels of an EEG

131 actiCAP (Brain Products GmbH) using a high-pass filter with a 0.1-Hz cutoff and a sampling
132 frequency of 500 Hz. Electrode Pz was used as a reference, and electrode FPz was used as the
133 ground. We used recording methods described previously in detail using a custom EEG cap with
134 Iz, I1, and I2 leads in place of FT9, PO3, and PO4 leads; these leads were not analyzed [17–19].
135 We also removed FP1, FP2, FT10, TP9, and TP10 channels as these channels are often
136 contaminated by artifact, resulting in 56 channels for pre- and post-processing. EEG activity at the
137 reference electrode Pz was recovered by computing the average reference. Bad channels and bad
138 epochs were identified using the FASTER algorithm and the *pop_rejchan* function from
139 EEGLAB and were then interpolated and rejected, respectively. Eye blinks were removed using
140 independent component analysis (ICA). All channels were low-pass filtered at 100 Hz. Power
141 was calculated using the *pwelch* function and was normalized to the mean power between 0–100
142 Hz for each channel. Scalp topography was plotted using *topoplot* from EEGLAB in delta (1-4
143 Hz), theta (4-8 Hz), alpha (8-13 Hz), beta (13-30 Hz), and gamma (30-80 Hz; Figure 1) bands.

144

145 **Machine learning using Linear predictive coding algorithms for PD (LEAPD)**

146 LEAPD is an algorithm for binary classification of the spectral content of EEG signals.
147 This approach was developed by Anjum et al. [17,20] to distinguish between PD patients and
148 control participants. We implemented LEAPD to compare PD patients with depression (PDDEP)
149 vs PD patients without depression (PD) and PDDEP vs depressed patients without PD (DEP). In
150 particular, a LEAPD index between 0 and 1 is generated for each EEG recording, using the
151 procedure outlined below. In each of the two problems, a threshold of 0.5 is used to distinguish
152 between two groups. For example, if the LEAPD index for an EEG recording is below 0.5 then it
153 is deemed to be in Group A and if above 0.5 it is classified as belonging to Group B.

154 In LEAPD, an EEG time series from a channel is processed using linear predictive
155 coding (LPC) to encode the signal into coefficients of an autoregressive model minimizing the
156 square of the prediction error [21] for that time series. The number of coefficients n , is called the
157 LPC order. These coefficients are put in a vector of dimension n with one entry for each
158 coefficient. An LPC vector is generated by subtracting the mean. Each LPC vector is viewed as
159 a point in the n -dimensional space. LPC vectors of each group lies on distinct affine subspaces.
160 For example those for PDDEP roughly lie on one affine subspace while those of PD on another.
161 An affine subspace is the generalization of a one-dimensional line or a two-dimensional plane in
162 larger dimensions. The LEAPD index of a recording is as below, where D_1 is the distance of its
163 LPC vector from the affine subspace of one group and D_2 is the distance from the affine
164 subspace of the other group:

$$LEAPD\ Index = \frac{D_2}{D_1 + D_2}.$$

165
166 Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is used to identify the affine subspace of a given
167 dimension that best fits the LPC vectors of each group. Parameters used to control the learning
168 process include: (1) the cutoff frequencies of the filter used to process the EEG data; (2) the
169 length of the LPC vector (LPC order); and (3) the dimension of the affine subspace.

170 We quantified differences between LEAPD values for each channel using non-parametric
171 Wilcoxon *ranksum* tests. In addition, we used a classifier to calculate the accuracy of PD vs
172 PDDEP and DEP vs PD at each channel. Two-channel LEAPD values were computed by taking
173 the geometric mean of the LEAPD values for each channel. We then used a classifier on all two-
174 channel combinations, and we presented results only from selected high-performing
175 combinations.

176 As the dataset was small, we could not perform out-of-sample prospective tests to
177 validate the accuracy of the model. However, we tested the robustness of the results by
178 examining LEAPD performance on truncated data. In all instances leave-one-out cross validation
179 (LOOCV) was used to quantify performance. LOOCV uses the entire dataset without one test
180 sample to predict each test sample, which protects against the overfitting common with small
181 datasets. We report data from individual channels and combinations of channels that yielded the
182 a) highest accuracy in discriminating PD vs PDDEP and PDDEP vs DEP, and b) were the most
183 robust on truncated data.

184

185

186

187 RESULTS

188 PD patients with and without depression had similar age ($p = 0.23$), motor function as
189 measured by UPDRS ($p = 0.22$), and cognitive profiles as measured by the MOCA ($p = 0.94$
190 value; Table S1). We collected resting-state EEG data and compared scalp topography of relative
191 power for PD patients vs PD patients with depression (PDDEP) at delta (1-4 Hz), theta (4-8 Hz),
192 alpha (8-13 Hz), beta (13-30 Hz), and gamma bands (30-80 Hz; Figure 1A). We also compared
193 scalp topography for PDDEP vs non-PD patients with depression (DEP; Figure 1B). These data
194 illustrate that there can be band-specific differences that distinguish depression in PD.

195 Our machine learning approach, LEAPD, compress power spectra into a series of
196 autoregressive coefficients that holistically captures the shape of each power spectra with a few
197 numbers [17,20]. Here, we used LEAPD to classify PD vs PDDEP and PDDEP vs DEP from
198 single channels, as well as combinations of two channels (Figure 2).




Figure 1: Scalp topography of relative EEG power in PD patients with depression . A) Relative power in PD patients with depression (PDDEP) compared to PD patients without depression for delta (1-4 Hz), theta (4-8 Hz), alpha (8-13 Hz), beta (13-30 Hz), and gamma (30-80 Hz). B) Relative power in PDDEP compared to non-PD patients with depression (DEP). Electrodes are indicated by black dots; electrodes with significant differences between groups via ranksum testing are shown with white diamonds. Data from 18 PD, 18 PDDEP and 12 DEP.

199 We first used LEAPD to discriminate 18 PD from
200 18 PDDEP patients across all EEG electrodes (Figure
201 3A). Single-channel accuracy for channel CP3 was 86%
202 and for TP8 was 86% (Figure 3A). Combining both CP3
203 and TP8 resulted in an overall LOOCV classification
204 accuracy of 97%. These channels had distinct LEAPD
205 indices between PD and PDDEP (CP3: $p = 0.00009$,
206 Cohen's $d = 1.8$; TP8: $p = 0.00004$, Cohen's $d = 1.8$;
207 CP3+TP8: $p < 0.001$; Cohen's $d = 3.25$; Figure 3B).
208 Receiver-operator curves (ROCs) for these channels in
209 predicting PD vs PDDEP are shown in Figure 3C.

210

211 In addition, we found that LEAPD was highly accurate in differentiating 12 PDDEP
212 patients (selected at random from 18 total) from 12 DEP patients, with 96% single-channel
213 signal accuracy for electrode CPz and 92% for electrode CP4. Combining both channels resulted
214 in 100% classification accuracy (Figure 3F). For these electrodes, LEAPD distinguished PDDEP vs
215 DEP (Figure 3D; CPz: $p = 0.00004$, Cohen's $d = 4.3$; CP4: $p = 0.0007$, Cohen's $d = 2.0$;
216 CP4+CPz: $p = 0.0004$; Cohen's $d = 4.3$; Figure 3E).




Figure 2: LEAPD Classification approach: Flow chart of classification.




Figure 3: Machine-learning classification of LEAPD. A) We constructed LEAPD indices from LPC coefficients from electrodes CP3 and TP8 for PD patients without depression (PD) vs PD patients with depression (PDDEP). B) Receiver-operating curves (ROC) for single-channel performance of CP3, TP8, and CP3+TP8 combined, and C) channel performance across single electrodes. Data from 18 PD and 18 PDDEP patients. D) We also generated LEAPD indices for PDDEP (green) compared to depressed patients without PD (DEP; dark green) at CP4, CPz, and CP4+CPz combined. E) ROC curves and F) single channel performance across single electrodes. Data from 12 PDDEP and 12 DEP patients.

217 Additionally, we performed a truncation analysis of CP3, TP8, and CP3+TP8 combined
 218 for PD vs PDDEP and of CPz, CP4, and CPz+CP4 combined for DEP vs PDDEP. Recorded
 219 EEG data were truncated from full-length samples to samples that were a fraction of the original
 220 length. LEAPD analysis was then performed on the shortened signal using the same
 221 hyperparameters as those of the original signal. Truncation fractions of 0.05, 0.33 and 0.67 were
 222 tested. Performance of the channels at each truncation fraction is shown in Table S2. Although
 223 truncation did reduce the accuracy of the channels, each channel still retained significant
 224 discriminatory ability at shorter signal lengths. The performance degraded gracefully with
 225 truncation, indicating that the signals chosen are likely measuring a fundamental difference in

226 EEG behavior between classes, rather than an artifact of overfitting. It is notable that accuracy of
227 greater than 85% was achieved from two minutes of resting-state EEG signals. Performance on
228 truncated data is shown in Figure 4 for channels of interest for PD vs PDDEP (Figure 4A) and
229 PDDEP vs DEP (Figure 4B). Collectively, these data suggest that spectral features of scalp EEG
230 can distinguish depression in PD.

231

232

233




Figure 4: Truncation analysis of LEAPD-based classification. A) Data from PD vs PDDEP for 5, 33, 67, and 100% of data for PDDEP vs PD for CP3, TP8, and CP3+TP8 and B) PDDEP vs DEP for CP4, CPz, and CP4 + CPz.

234 **DISCUSSION**

235 We explored the cortical basis of depression in PD using resting-state scalp EEG. We
236 found that PD patients with depression had central differences in beta and gamma rhythms. We
237 used LEAPD, a spectral machine-learning approach, to detect differences in EEG signals from
238 two minutes of resting-state data from a single electrode, achieving accuracies of 97% for PD
239 patients with and without depression and 100% for PD vs non-PD patients with depression.
240 These data indicate that PD patients with depression can be accurately differentiated from PD
241 patients without depression and from depressed non-PD patients using machine learning.

242 Depression is a complex disorder [22] involving many brain networks; however, one
243 consistent finding is abnormal cortical function [14,23]. Scalp EEG studies have found
244 dysfunctional alpha rhythms in depressed patients [24,25], a finding that we report here
245 comparing PD patients with and without depression. Beta rhythms can be profoundly abnormal
246 in PD [26] and our data here indicate that depression decreases resting-state beta, alpha, and
247 gamma rhythms in PD. We find that many cortical regions are implicated in PD-related
248 depression, including prefrontal and parietal regions that have been found in prior studies of
249 depression [14,27]

250 These data suggest that EEG, which is relatively inexpensive and ubiquitously available,
251 can identify PD patients with depression. This is important because depression can be missed in
252 PD [3–5], and electrophysiological diagnostic tools may aid in this effort. We report that our
253 spectral approach can rapidly, robustly, and accurately identify EEG signals from PD patients
254 with depression. Our results are in line with previous efforts to use LEAPD to identify local field
255 potentials from animal models of PD and EEG data recorded from PD patients and controls
256 [17,20]. LEAPD-based techniques might have additional utility in settings where

257 neurophysiology is common, such as during deep-brain stimulation surgeries, and they may be
258 helpful for closed-loop control applications. Apart from being robust and accurate, LEAPD is
259 amenable to fast implementation and can serve as a trigger mechanism for brain stimulation.

260 Our work is supported by prior qEEG studies describing that a single parameter can
261 differentiate depression and dementia in PD [15]. An early study which averages across all EEG
262 electrodes reported distinct scalp topography of depressed PD patients, focusing on alpha
263 rhythms [7]. Our study is supportive of these differences, and we are able to localize these
264 results to the left frontal electrodes. In addition, we find broader differences over central
265 electrodes in beta and gamma bands, which may have been averaged out in prior work that
266 averaged EEG signals from multiple electrodes. Finally, we used advanced machine-learning to
267 distinguish PD patients with depression from both PD patients and non-PD patients with
268 depression. Recent work has reported frontal differences in sleep in PD patients with
269 depression[28], as well as differences between midline event-related potentials between PD
270 patients with and without depression [29]. Our study extends these findings and helps define the
271 spectral topography of resting-state EEG in PD patients with depression, and demonstrates the
272 potential of machine-learning for identifying PD patients with depression.

273 In this manuscript, we illustrate these effects from relatively high-performing channels:
274 CP3/TP8 in PD vs PDDEP and CP4/CPz in PDDEP vs DEP. We chose these exemplars to
275 illustrate high-performing channel combinations from each comparison. However, we note that
276 channels also had high performance, and could be used for classification and identification of
277 depression in PD.

278 Our study has several limitations. First, our sample size was limited, although in line with
279 prior EEG studies in PD patients with depression [28,29]. Second, all of our patients were

280 medicated, and it is possible that medications could influence these EEG signals [30]. Third, our
281 method of diagnosing depression and quantifying symptom burden in PD patients was distinct
282 from the method used with non-PD patients, limiting comparisons between these groups. Finally,
283 our LEAPD approach did not include an out-of-sample prospective test, though the truncation
284 analysis does remove concerns of overfitting. Despite these shortfalls, our findings describe
285 spectral changes in PD patients with depression compared to PD patients without depression and
286 non-PD patients with depression. We report that LEAPD-based machine learning approaches can
287 identify EEG signals from PD patients with depression. These data could help illuminate the
288 cortical neurophysiology of PD-related depression and could help lead to new biomarkers or
289 diagnostic tools.

290

291

292 **AUTHOR DECLARATION**

293 None of the authors have any potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

294

295 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

296 This data was supported by NIH P20NS123151 and R01NS100849 to NSN.

297

298

299

300 **References**

- 301 [1] K.R. Chaudhuri, P. Odin, The challenge of non-motor symptoms in Parkinson's disease, *Prog. Brain*
302 *Res.* 184 (2010) 325–341. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6123\(10\)84017-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6123(10)84017-8).
- 303 [2] A. Lieberman, Depression in Parkinson's disease – a review, *Acta Neurol. Scand.* 113 (2006) 1–8.
304 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0404.2006.00536.x>.
- 305 [3] H. Allain, S. Schuck, N. Maudui, Depression in Parkinson's disease: Must be properly diagnosed
306 and treated to avoid serious morbidity, *BMJ.* 320 (2000) 1287–1288.
307 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.320.7245.1287>.
- 308 [4] S. Muzerengi, H. Lewis, M. Edwards, E. Kipps, A. Bahl, P. Martinez-Martin, K.R. Chaudhuri, Non-
309 motor symptoms in Parkinson's disease: an underdiagnosed problem, *Aging Health.* 2 (2006) 967–
310 982. <https://doi.org/10.2217/1745509X.2.6.967>.
- 311 [5] M.H.M. Timmer, M.H.C.T. van Beek, B.R. Bloem, R.A.J. Esselink, What a neurologist should
312 know about depression in Parkinson's disease, *Pract. Neurol.* 17 (2017) 359–368.
313 <https://doi.org/10.1136/practneurol-2017-001650>.
- 314 [6] A.F.G. Leentjens, M. Van den Akker, J.F.M. Metsemakers, R. Lousberg, F.R.J. Verhey, Higher
315 incidence of depression preceding the onset of Parkinson's disease: a register study, *Mov. Disord.*
316 *Off. J. Mov. Disord. Soc.* 18 (2003) 414–418. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.10387>.
- 317 [7] S.R. Filipović, N. Čovičković-Šternić, M. Stojanović-Svetel, D. Lečić, V.S. Kostić, Depression in
318 Parkinson's disease: an EEG frequency analysis study, *Parkinsonism Relat. Disord.* 4 (1998) 171–
319 178. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1353-8020\(98\)00027-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1353-8020(98)00027-3).
- 320 [8] D. Aarsland, S. Pålhagen, C.G. Ballard, U. Ehrt, P. Svenningsson, Depression in Parkinson
321 disease—epidemiology, mechanisms and management, *Nat. Rev. Neurol.* 8 (2012) 35–47.
322 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2011.189>.
- 323 [9] N.L. Bormann, N.T. Trapp, N.S. Narayanan, A.D. Boes, Developing Precision Invasive
324 Neuromodulation for Psychiatry, *J. Neuropsychiatry Clin. Neurosci.* 33 (2021) 201–209.
325 <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.neuropsych.20100268>.
- 326 [10] N.S. Narayanan, R.L. Rodnitzky, E.Y. Uc, Prefrontal dopamine signaling and cognitive symptoms
327 of Parkinson's disease, *Rev. Neurosci.* 24 (2013) 267–278. <https://doi.org/10.1515/revneuro-2013-0004>.
- 328
- 329 [11] S. Ghosal, B.D. Hare, R.S. Duman, Prefrontal cortex GABAergic deficits and circuit dysfunction in
330 the pathophysiology and treatment of chronic stress and depression, *Curr. Opin. Behav. Sci.* 14
331 (2017) 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2016.09.012>.
- 332 [12] Y.-C. Kim, N.S. Narayanan, Prefrontal D1 Dopamine-Receptor Neurons and Delta Resonance in
333 Interval Timing., *Cereb. Cortex N. Y. N* 1991. (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhy083>.
- 334 [13] A.Y. Deutch, Prefrontal cortical dopamine systems and the elaboration of functional corticostriatal
335 circuits: implications for schizophrenia and Parkinson's disease, *J. Neural Transm. Gen. Sect.* 91
336 (1993) 197–221.
- 337 [14] M.S. George, T.A. Ketter, R.M. Post, Prefrontal cortex dysfunction in clinical depression,
338 *Depression.* 2 (1994) 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.1002/depr.3050020202>.
- 339 [15] A. Primavera, P. Novello, Quantitative electroencephalography in Parkinson's disease, dementia,
340 depression and normal aging, *Neuropsychobiology.* 25 (1992) 102–105.
341 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000118817>.
- 342 [16] M.S. George, Z. Nahas, M. Molloy, A.M. Speer, N.C. Oliver, X.-B. Li, G.W. Arana, S.C. Risch,
343 J.C. Ballenger, A controlled trial of daily left prefrontal cortex TMS for treating depression, *Biol.*
344 *Psychiatry.* 48 (2000) 962–970. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223\(00\)01048-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223(00)01048-9).
- 345 [17] M.F. Anjum, S. Dasgupta, R. Mudumbai, A. Singh, J.F. Cavanagh, N.S. Narayanan, Linear
346 predictive coding distinguishes spectral EEG features of Parkinson's disease, *Parkinsonism Relat.*
347 *Disord.* 79 (2020) 79–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.parkreldis.2020.08.001>.

- 348 [18] A. Singh, R.C. Cole, A.I. Espinoza, A. Evans, S. Cao, J.F. Cavanagh, N.S. Narayanan, Timing
349 variability and midfrontal ~ 4 Hz rhythms correlate with cognition in Parkinson's disease, *NPJ*
350 *Park. Dis.* 7 (2021) 14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41531-021-00158-x>.
- 351 [19] A. Singh, R.C. Cole, A.I. Espinoza, D. Brown, J.F. Cavanagh, N.S. Narayanan, Frontal theta and
352 beta oscillations during lower-limb movement in Parkinson's disease, *Clin. Neurophysiol. Off. J.*
353 *Int. Fed. Clin. Neurophysiol.* 131 (2020) 694–702. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2019.12.399>.
- 354 [20] M.F. Anjum, J. Haug, S.L. Alberico, S. Dasgupta, R. Mudumbai, M.A. Kennedy, N.S. Narayanan,
355 Linear Predictive Approaches Separate Field Potentials in Animal Model of Parkinson's Disease,
356 *Front. Neurosci.* 14 (2020) 394. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2020.00394>.
- 357 [21] B.S. Atal, The history of linear prediction, *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.* 23 (2006) 154–161.
358 <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2006.1598091>.
- 359 [22] M. aan het Rot, S.J. Mathew, D.S. Charney, Neurobiological mechanisms in major depressive
360 disorder, *CMAJ Can. Med. Assoc. J.* 180 (2009) 305–313. <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.080697>.
- 361 [23] S. Zhao, J. Kong, S. Li, Z. Tong, C. Yang, H. Zhong, Randomized controlled trial of four protocols
362 of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for treating the negative symptoms of schizophrenia,
363 *Shanghai Arch. Psychiatry.* 26 (2014) 15–21. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-0829.2014.01.003>.
- 364 [24] I.H. Gotlib, EEG Alpha Asymmetry, Depression, and Cognitive Functioning, *Cogn. Emot.* 12
365 (1998) 449–478. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026999398379673>.
- 366 [25] R. Thibodeau, R.S. Jorgensen, S. Kim, Depression, anxiety, and resting frontal EEG asymmetry: A
367 meta-analytic review, *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* 115 (2006) 715–729. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.115.4.715>.
- 368 [26] N. Jenkinson, P. Brown, New insights into the relationship between dopamine, beta oscillations and
369 motor function, *Trends Neurosci.* 34 (2011) 611–618. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2011.09.003>.
- 370 [27] J.L. Stewart, D.N. Towers, J.A. Coan, J.J.B. Allen, The oft-neglected role of parietal EEG
371 asymmetry and risk for major depressive disorder, *Psychophysiology.* 48 (2011) 82–95.
372 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2010.01035.x>.
- 373 [28] K. Liu, Q. Ma, M. Wang, Comparison of Quantitative Electroencephalogram During Sleep in
374 Depressed and Non-Depressed Patients with Parkinson's Disease, *Med. Sci. Monit. Int. Med. J.*
375 *Exp. Clin. Res.* 25 (2019) 1046–1052. <https://doi.org/10.12659/MSM.913931>.
- 376 [29] N.N.W. Dissanayaka, T.R. Au, A.J. Angwin, K.K. Iyer, J.D. O'Sullivan, G.J. Byrne, P.A. Silburn,
377 R. Marsh, G.D. Mellick, D.A. Copland, Depression symptomatology correlates with event-related
378 potentials in Parkinson's disease: An affective priming study, *J. Affect. Disord.* 245 (2019) 897–
379 904. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.11.094>.
- 380 [30] R. Aiyer, V. Novakovic, R.L. Barkin, A systematic review on the impact of psychotropic drugs on
381 electroencephalogram waveforms in psychiatry, *Postgrad. Med.* 128 (2016) 656–664.
382 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00325481.2016.1218261>.
- 383
384

385

386

387

388 **Supplementary Tables**

Table S1: Demographic, disease, non-motor, motor, and cognitive characteristics

	PD (N = 18)	PDDEP (N = 18)	<i>p</i> Value	Cohen's <i>d</i>	DEP (N = 12)	<i>p</i> Value	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Demographics and Disease							
Gender, M/F	11/7	14/4	-	-	7/5	-	-
Age, years	68.3 (2.0)	65.8 (1.7)	^a 0.23	^a 0.32	62.1 (1.8)	^b 0.17	^b 0.54
Disease duration, years	4.4 (0.5)	6.7 (0.9)	^a 0.12	^a 0.70	23.7 (4.6)	^b <0.01	^b 1.64
LEDD, mg/day	838.6 (98.1)	983.8 (135.5)	^a 0.60	^a 0.29	-	-	-
Cognition Characteristics							
MOCA (0-30)	23.6 (1.0)	23.6 (0.9)	^a 0.94	^a 0.01	26.8 (0.6)	^b 0.03	^b 0.97
Non-Motor Characteristics							
GDS (0-15)	2.2 (0.3)	8.4 (0.7)	^a <0.01	^a 2.91	-	-	-
PHQ-9 (0-27)	-	-	-	-	15.9 (1.6)	-	-
Motor Characteristics							
UPDRS III (0-56)	14.2 (1.9)	16.5 (1.4)	^a 0.22	^a 0.33	-	-	-

389 Values are expressed as mean (standard error of mean).

390

391 ^aNon-parametric Wilcoxon test was used for comparison between PD vs PDDEP subjects. ^bNon-
392 parametric Wilcoxon test was used for comparison between PDDEP vs DEP subjects.
393 Abbreviations: Male, M; Female, F; Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MOCA; Geriatric Depression
394 Scale, GDS; Patient Health Questionnaire-9, PHQ-9; motor Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale,
395 UPDRS III.
396

397 **Table S2: Truncation analysis accuracy across datasets**

398

Dataset	DEP vs PDDEP			PD vs PDDEP		
Channel TF	CPz	CP4	CPz + CP4	CP3	TP8	CP3 + TP8
0.05	75%	58.3%	66.7%	52.78%	55.6%	61.1%
0.33	79.2%	75.0%	83.3%	61.1%	61.1%	66.7%
0.66	91.7%	95.8%	95.8%	72.2%	61.1%	75%
1	95.8%	91.7%	100%	86.1%	86.1%	97.2%


399

400


401

APD
vs
PDDEP


Delta (1-4 Hz)




Theta (4-8 Hz)




Alpha (8-13 Hz)




Beta (13-30 Hz)




Gamma (30-80 Hz)

**B**PDDEP
vs
DEP


Delta (1-4 Hz)




Theta (4-8 Hz)




Alpha (8-13 Hz)




Beta (13-30 Hz)



Gamma (30-80 Hz)


1
Relative Power (dB)
-1




Binary Classification

A PD vs. PDDEP


medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.16.22271060>; this version posted February 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




B




C



D PDDEP vs. DEP



E



F

