1	Resting-state EEG distinguishes depression in Parkinson's disease
2 3 4	Arturo I Espinoza <sup>1</sup> , Patrick May <sup>2</sup> , Md Fahim Anjum <sup>2</sup> , Arun Singh <sup>3</sup> , Rachel C Cole <sup>1</sup> , Nicholas Trapp <sup>4</sup> , Soura Dasgupta <sup>2</sup> , Nandakumar S Narayanan <sup>1</sup>
5	<sup>1</sup> Department of Neurolean University of Jense <sup>2</sup> Department of Electrical and Computer
ט ד	Engineering University of Iowa, <sup>3</sup> Division of Resia Riomedical Sciences, Sanford School of
7 8	Medicine University of South Dakota <sup>4</sup> Department of Psychiatry University of Iowa
9	Wedenie, Oniversity of South Dakota, Department of Fsychiatry, Oniversity of Iowa
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
25 27	
24	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	*Corresponding Author
35 26	Nandakumar Narayanan
30 27	169 Newton Road
38	Pannajohn Riomedical Discovery Building 5336
39	University of Iowa, Iowa City, 52242
40	319-353-5698

# 42 HIGHLIGHTS

4	3
4	4

- We used EEG to analyze depression in Parkinson's disease.
- Depressed Parkinson's patients had distinct spectral EEG features.
- 47
- 48 Machine-learning algorithms could accurately distinguish depression in Parkinson's disease.

### 50 ABSTRACT

**Introduction:** Depression is a non-motor symptom of Parkinson's disease (PD). PD-related 51 52 depression is hard to diagnose and the neurophysiological basis is poorly understood. Depression can markedly affect cortical function, which suggests that scalp electroencephalography (EEG) 53 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 electrodes. From two minutes of resting-state EEG we found that LEAPD-based machine 63 64 learning could robustly distinguish between PD patients with and without depression with 97% accuracy, and between PD patients with depression and non-PD patients with depression with 65 66 100% accuracy. We verified the robustness of our finding by confirming that the classification 67 accuracy declines gracefully as data are truncated. **Conclusions:** We demonstrated the efficacy of the LEAPD algorithm in identifying PD patients 68 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  $\sim 20\% - 40\%$  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, including dopamine and serotonin [10]. These projection systems affect cortical physiology 84 85 [11,12]. Cortical regions can be profoundly dysfunctional in PD [13] and in depression [14]. One technique that is particularly well-suited to capture cortical neurophysiology is 86 87 electroeencephalography (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]. Quantititave EEG (qEEG) studies have found spectral differences that distinguished PD vs 90 depresson [15]. Furthermore, prefrontal cortical regions are responsive to targeted interventions, 91 such as transcranial magnetic stimulation [16]. Here, we tested the hypothesis that spectral 92 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	

106

### 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 prior work for details of cognitive assessments [18]. Demographics and other clinical details are 118 119 presented in Table S1 and were compared between groups by non-parametric Wilcoxon tests. We recruited 12 demographically-similar depressed patients without PD (5 women; Table 120 S1) from the University of Iowa's depression and neuromodulation clinic. These patients were 121 122 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 Institutional Review Board (IRB). Demographics of patients and control subjects are 125 126 summarized in Table S1. 127 **EEG recording and analysis** 128 Resting-state EEG was collected from patients while they sat in a quiet room with their 129

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	contamined 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 <i>pwelch</i> 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)

LEAPD is an algorithm for binary classification of the spectral content of EEG signals. 146 147 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 particular, a LEAPD index between 0 and 1 is generated for each EEG recording, using the 150 151 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 square of the prediction error [21] for that time series. The number of coefficients n, is called the 156 LPC order. These coefficients are put in a vector of dimension *n* with one entry for each 157 158 coefficient. An LPC vector is generated by substracting the mean. Each LPC vector is viewed as a point in the *n*-dimensional space. LPC vectors of each group lies on distinct affine subspaces. 159 For example those for PDDEP roughly lie on one affine subspace while those of PD on another. 160 161 An affine subspace is the generalization of a one-dimensional line or a two-dimensional plane in larger dimensions. The LEAPD index of a recording is as below, where  $D_1$  is the distance of its 162 LPC vector from the affine subspace of one group and  $D_2$  is the distance from the affine 163 subspace of the other group: 164

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

165

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is used to identify the affine subspace of a given 166 167 dimension that best fits the LPC vectors of each group. Parameters used to control the learning process include: (1) the cutoff frequencies of the filter used to process the EEG data; (2) the 168 length of the LPC vector (LPC order); and (3) the dimension of the affine subspace. 169 170 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 PDDEP and DEP vs PD at each channel. Two-channel LEAPD values were computed by taking 172 173 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 combinations. 175

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	

#### 187 **RESULTS**

PD patients with and without depression had similar age (p = 0.23), motor function as 188 measured by UPDRS (p = 0.22), and cognitive profiles as measured by the MOCA (p = 0.94189 value; Table S1). We collected resting-state EEG data and compared scalp topography of relative 190 power for PD patients vs PD patients with depression (PDDEP) at delta (1-4 Hz), theta (4-8 Hz), 191 192 alpha (8–13 Hz), beta (13–30 Hz), and gamma bands (30–80 Hz; Figure 1A). We also compared scalp topography for PDDEP vs non-PD patients with depression (DEP; Figure 1B). These data 193 illustrate that there can be band-specific differences that distinguish depression in PD. 194 195 Our machine learning approach, LEAPD, compress power spectra into a series of autoregressive coefficients that holistically captures the shape of each power spectra with a few 196 numbers [17,20]. Here, we used LEAPD to classify PD vs PDDEP and PDDEP vs DEP from 197 single channels, as well as combinations of two channels (Figure 2). 198



**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.

- 199We 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%
- and for TP8 was 86% (Figure 3A). Combining both CP3
- and TP8 resulted in an overall LOOCV classification
- accuracy of 97%. These channels had distinct LEAPD
- indices between PD and PDDEP (CP3: p = 0.00009,
- 206 Cohen's d = 1.8; TP8: p = 0.0.00004, 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.



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

210

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



**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

- 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
- 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





### 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 two minutes of resting-state data from a single electrode, achieving accuracies of 97% for PD 238 patients with and without depression and 100% for PD vs non-PD patients with depression. 239 240 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 consistent finding is abnormal cortical function [14,23]. Scalp EEG studies have found 243 dysfunctional alpha rhythms in depressed patients [24,25], a finding that we report here 244 245 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]

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

neurophysiology is common, such as during deep-brain stimulation surgeries, and they may be 257 258 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 differentiate depression and dementia in PD [15]. An early study which averages across all EEG 261 electrodes reported distinct scalp topography of depressed PD patients, focusing on alpha 262 263 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 distinguish PD patients with depression from both PD patients and non-PD patients with 267 268 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 potential of machine-learning for identifying PD patients with depression. 272 In this manuscript, we illustrate these effects from relatively high-performing channels: 273 274 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 identificiation 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 from the method used with non-PD patients, limiting comparisons between these groups. Finally, 282 283 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 spectral changes in PD patients with depression compared to PD patients without depression and 285 286 non-PD patients with depression. We report that LEAPD-based machine learning approaches can identify EEG signals from PD patients with depression. These data could help illuminate the 287 cortical neurophysiology of PD-related depression and could help lead to new biomarkers or 288 289 diagnostic tools.

290

# 292 AUTHOR DECLARATION

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

294

### 295 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

297

299

### 300 **References**

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

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

385

386

## 388 Supplementary Tables

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

### characteristics

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

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

391	<sup>a</sup> Non-parametric Wilcoxon test was used for comparison between PD vs PDDEP subjects. <sup>b</sup> Non-
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.

# 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%%	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







# Gamma (30-80 Hz)







**Binary Classification** 





