

Generalisability of epileptiform patterns across time and patients

Hamid Karimi-Rouzbahani,^{1,2} Aileen McGonigal^{1,2,3}

Abstract

Complexity of epileptogenic zone (EZ) localisation contributes to failure of surgical resection to produce seizure freedom. This is to some extent a result of distinct patterns of epileptiform activity between (i.e., interictal) and during seizures (i.e., ictal) and their diversity across patients. This often leads to suboptimal localisation based on inspection of electroencephalography (EEG) features. We asked two open questions. First, whether neural signal reflecting epileptogenicity would be generalisable from interictal to ictal time window within each patient. This would be critical for patients who are monitored in hospital without having a seizure to help with EZ localisation, and more generally for understanding the predictive power of resting state (interictal) EEG data in determining EZ. Second, whether epileptiform patterns would generalise across patients, and if so, which aspects of those patterns are the most generalisable.

We used an intracranial EEG dataset that included fifty-five patients with lesional and non-lesional pathology, who had subsequently undergone cortical resection in frontal or temporal lobe with different levels of seizure freedom. We extracted a large set of simple to complex features from stereo-EEG (SEEG) and electrocorticographic (ECoG) neural signals recorded during interictal and ictal time windows. We fed those features to decision tree classifiers for EZ localisation and to quantify the diversity of ictal and interictal epileptiform patterns through a cross-time and cross-patient generalisation procedure.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 We observed significant evidence (*Bayes factor* $\gg 10$) for generalisability of patterns from
25 interictal to ictal time windows across patients, which were dominantly reflected in signal
26 power and high-frequency network-based features. Majority of patients showed consistent
27 patterns of epileptogenicity across interictal and ictal time windows, reflected in above-chance
28 area-under-curve (mean *AUC* = 0.6). We observed significant evidence (*Bayes factor* $\gg 10$)
29 that signal features of epileptogenic regions could generalise across patients in both interictal
30 and ictal time windows with significant evidence for higher generalisability in ictal than
31 interictal time window (mean *AUC* 0.75 vs. 0.59; *Bayes factor* $\gg 10$). While signal power and
32 moment features were the most contributory to the cross-patient generalisation in the interictal
33 window, signal complexity features were the most contributory in the ictal window.

34 These results provide new insights about features of epileptic neural activity that generalise
35 across interictal-ictal time windows and patients, which can have implications for both
36 qualitative and quantitative EZ localisation. The explainable machine-learning pipeline
37 developed here can guide future developments in epilepsy investigations.

38

39 **Author affiliations:**

40 1 Neurosciences Centre, Mater Hospital, South Brisbane, 4101, Australia

41 2 Mater Research Institute, University of Queensland, South Brisbane, 4101, Australia

42 3 Queensland Brain Institute, University of Queensland, St Lucia, 4072, Australia

43

44 Correspondence to: Hamid Karimi-Rouzbahani

45 hamid.karimi-rouzbahani@uq.edu.au

46

47 **Keywords:** quantitative analysis; epilepsy surgery; intracranial EEG; epileptiform activity;
48 feature extraction

49 Introduction

50 There are over 50 million people with epilepsy worldwide¹. Anti-seizure medications cannot
51 adequately control the disorder in about 30% of cases². If the epilepsy is considered focal (i.e.,
52 seizures arising from part of one hemisphere³), those with drug-resistant focal epilepsy may
53 undergo presurgical evaluation to detect areas involved in the generation of seizure activity,
54 which may require intracranial electroencephalography (EEG) in some. These areas can be
55 collectively referred to as the epileptogenic zone (EZ), a term that was conceptually developed
56 from stereo-electroencephalography (SEEG)⁴, a method of intracerebral recording based on
57 multiple depth electrodes. The EZ is considered as the region of primary seizure organization⁵.
58 After localisation, if the clinical risk-benefit ratio is deemed favourable for a specific patient,
59 the EZ can be removed and/or disconnected through surgical resection or laser-based ablation.
60 Despite great progress in use of multimodal approaches (e.g., magnetic resonance imaging
61 (MRI), electroencephalography (EEG), positron emission tomography (PET) scans, etc.) and
62 wealth of clinical expertise, precise localisation of the EZ often remains difficult and may lead
63 to failure to achieve seizure freedom^{6,7}.

64 Quantification methods have shown great promise in localising the EZ through quantification
65 of intracranial EEG signals⁸⁻¹⁰(see¹¹ for review). These methods generally investigate either
66 the interictal or the ictal time window (see Supplementary Table 1 for an overview). In the ictal
67 window, low voltage fast activity (LVFA), baseline shift, rhythmic spikes/spike-waves and
68 preictal low frequency spiking, were found to be the most prevalent epileptiform activities¹².
69 These characteristics were successfully extracted from signals and used for EZ localisation in
70 several studies¹³⁻¹⁹. In the interictal window, the traditional epileptiform characteristics include
71 interictal spikes/discharges²⁰ and high-frequency oscillations (HFOs²¹) with a debate on more
72 efficacy of one over the other, and ultimately possible increased predictive EZ by measuring
73 their co-occurrence²². Modelling approaches based on patient-specific imaging data can predict
74 spatial extent of epileptogenicity²³.

75 The relation between electrical seizure onset and electrical disturbances detectable between
76 seizures is of great clinical and neuroscientific importance and yet remains incompletely
77 known²⁰. Interictal spiking is a heterogeneous phenomenon that reflects the involvement of
78 different neuronal networks and mechanisms (e.g., synaptic conductance) in different regions
79 of an epileptic brain²⁴ and has shown predictive value in differentiating underlying
80 neuropathological substrates²⁵. In fact, the original concept of “epileptic focus” arose not from

81 seizure recordings, but from observations of interictal spiking during ECoG⁵. Basing surgical
82 excision extent on the zone of interictal spiking measured peri-operatively by ECoG was
83 thought to help improve likelihood of surgical outcome, albeit with variable accuracy²⁶. In
84 pioneering SEEG work²⁷, the regions involved by interictal spiking typically showed (partial)
85 overlap with the zone of primary seizure organization. Observations from clinical data of this
86 type as well as animal models suggest that interictal and ictal signal features may reflect some
87 similar neuronal mechanisms²⁴. Apart from spikes and HFOs, many other linear and nonlinear
88 signal features including randomness, power and entropy have shown success in localising EZ
89 in the interictal window^{28–35}. While many of the classical methods for EZ localisation relied on
90 univariate/single-channel signal activity, there has been a shift to multivariate/network-based
91 localisation^{10,35–42}, which aligns with the conceptualisation of epilepsy as a network disorder^{43–}
92 ⁴⁵ and has shown better performance than univariate methods^{10,38,42,46–48}.

93 Despite the large literature on EZ localisation, using various signal analysis approaches applied
94 to both interictal and ictal windows (Supplementary Table 1), the correspondence between the
95 two windows has remained unclear. This might be because of the distinct, pre-defined sets of
96 features which were looked for in the two windows and which appear visually different (e.g.,
97 interictal spikes and ictal LVFA). Nonetheless, if there are signal features which are shared
98 between the two windows, interictal activity, which represents most of the patient’s brain state
99 and is generally easier to record, could potentially be sufficient to predict EZ. As a first step to
100 explore this, we looked at a heterogeneous group of epilepsies studied with intracranial EEG,
101 available in an open-access dataset^{46,48}. We compared a large battery of explainable signal
102 characteristics, ranging from simple single-channel to computationally complex network-based
103 features, from both interictal and ictal time windows, to see which features generalise across
104 the two time-windows using the data from each individual patient (i.e., within-individual
105 across-time generalisation¹). Moreover, to see if there are features which are shared between
106 individuals, we also evaluated the generalisability of features across patients within each
107 individual time window (i.e., across-individual within-time generalisation). Finally, we
108 evaluated the effect of surgical outcome (seizure-free/not seizure-free), EZ, pathology of
109 epilepsy (lesional/non-lesional) and type of recording (SEEG/ECoG) on the EZ localisation
110 performances.

¹ In this manuscript, the word “generalisation” refers to testing machine learning classifiers on data from unseen time windows/patients rather than the conventional epilepsy definition of seizure propagation over the brain.

111 **Materials and methods**

112 **Dataset**

113 This study uses a well-structured open-access intracranial dataset which brings together data
114 from multiple centres^{46,48}. The dataset includes 57 patients who had been implanted with either
115 subdural grid/strip (termed “electrocorticography” (ECoG)⁴⁷) or SEEG as their presurgical
116 workup, and subsequently treated with surgical resection or laser ablation. Clinically
117 determined seizure onset channels were provided, as well as marking of channels which
118 overlap with the resection/ablation zone, which was rigorously determined by segmenting the
119 resection cavity. Two patients’ data were excluded from our analyses as one had no interictal
120 and the other no ictal recordings. Each patient had 2 interictal recordings and between 1 to 5
121 (*mean* = 3.7) ictal recordings/seizures (110 interictal and 204 ictal recordings over all patients).
122 The interictal data was selected from awake brain activities determined both by the selection
123 of day-time epochs (8 am – 8 pm) and the use of a custom non-REM sleep detector (explained
124 in detail in Bernabei et al.,⁴⁸). The interictal data were at least 2 hours before the beginning of
125 a seizure and at least 2 hours after a subclinical seizure, 6 hours after a focal seizure and 12
126 hours after a generalised seizure. The sampling frequencies of the signals varied across patients
127 and ranged from 256 to 1024 Hz. We adjusted the sampling rate of all datasets to 256 Hz across
128 patients. The details of the patients included in the analyses are provided in Supplementary
129 Table 2. Epileptogenic zones/resected areas ranged from frontal, frontoparietal, mesiofrontal,
130 temporal, mesiotemporal, parietal and insular areas.

131 **Pre-processing**

132 We used a 5-minute signal from each interictal recording (10 minutes per patient) and a 58-
133 second signal from each ictal recording (-30 to +28 seconds around the time of seizure onset).
134 Bad channels, as marked in the dataset, were excluded from analyses. An average of 105.6
135 contacts (*std* = 38.04) per patient remained for analysis after bad channels were removed from
136 the dataset. There was an average of 114.2 (*std* = 41.2) and 88.8 (*std* = 25.3) channels recorded
137 in patients implanted with SEEG and ECoG, respectively. Among these, an average of 12.87%
138 (*std* = 11.1%) of channels were in the EZ/resected area in each patient. We applied no filtering
139 or artefact removal on the dataset. As the low- and high-frequency noise is shared across both
140 groups of contacts, and as classifiers rely on the differences between classes rather than

141 similarities⁴⁹, we did not apply filters. Moreover, by not applying any filters, we allowed easier
142 replication of results in future studies as any choice of filters can potentially affect the results
143 in some way⁵⁰.

144 **Feature extraction**

145 We quantified the signal patterns by extracting 34 mathematically distinct features. Features
146 were extracted in 2s non-overlapping sliding windows along the interictal and ictal signals as
147 in previous studies⁵¹⁻⁵⁴. This led to 14 pre- and 14 post-seizure onset time windows in the ictal
148 period excluding the last window. To quantify changes to neural activities upon seizure onset,
149 we normalised the extracted post-seizure onset data by the pre-seizure onset data using equation
150 (1):

$$151 \quad Post(window) = \frac{Post(window) - mean(Pre)}{mean(Post) + mean(Pre)} \quad (1)$$

152 where *Pre* and *Post* refer to the arrays of 14 feature values extracted from neural data. This
153 led to 14 normalised ictal feature values which were used for analysis. In interictal data, we
154 down sampled the number of extracted feature samples ($n \sim 150$) to 28 samples using the
155 Matlab “resample” function. This led to approximately equal number of data points in interictal
156 and ictal windows, from 110 interictal and 204 ictal recordings. A range of simple to complex
157 signal features were extracted. All these features have been previously used to quantify EEG
158 patterns⁵⁵⁻⁵⁷ and the reader is referred to Supplementary Text 1 and the mentioned publications
159 for details. Briefly, we extracted four categories of signal features to obtain a relatively
160 comprehensive view of signal characteristics. These include the signal *moment* features,
161 nonlinear *complexity* features, *frequency*-domain features and *network*-based features.

162 **Multivariate pattern classification**

163 We used a standard multivariate pattern classification procedure to localise EZ (i.e., to
164 discriminate epileptogenic/resected and non-epileptogenic/non-resected contacts). We use the
165 term “epileptiform” patterns/activities in a general sense to refer to any patterns which
166 discriminated epileptogenic and non-epileptogenic contacts. Accordingly, the classification
167 performance indicates how discriminable were the signal patterns across these two sets of
168 contacts. We quantified the classification performance by area-under-the-curve (*AUC*) to
169 provide a comprehensive, threshold-free classification performance⁴⁹. As in recent studies^{48,58},
170 we used decision tree (DT) classifiers, and each contact was treated like an observation in

171 classification. Our DT classifiers used a random forest algorithm with 50 bags of feature
172 combinations. DT classifiers are well suited for nonlinear feature classifications and provide
173 insights into feature contributions. This method also provides a “feature contribution” metric
174 by permuting the observation/contact labels in each feature separately and quantifying its effect
175 on performance - contribution is in inverse proportion to performance drop. We performed
176 three distinct types of classifications - one within patient and time (non-generalisation) and two
177 which involved generalisation either across time or patients. In all three analyses, we classified
178 epileptogenic and non-epileptogenic contacts (i.e., EZ localisation). In the non-generalisation
179 classification, we performed the classification within the interictal and ictal time window
180 separately for each patient using a 10-fold cross-validation procedure. In the cross-time
181 generalisation, in each patient, we trained the classifier using the data from the two interictal
182 recordings and tested the classifier using all the ictal recordings ($mean = 3.7$). In the cross-
183 patient generalisation, in each time window (interictal/ictal), we trained the classifier using the
184 data from all patients minus one and tested the classifier using the data from the left-out patient
185 and repeated this procedure until every patient was used once for testing the classifier.

186 To equalise the number of epileptogenic to non-epileptogenic contacts (12.87% vs. 77.13% on
187 average, respectively) which is essential for avoiding bias toward one class in classification⁴⁹,
188 we used a down-sampling procedure in our analyses and repeated every classification of data
189 1000 times before averaging the results.

190 To generate chance-level performances, against which we could evaluate the validity of our
191 true classification performances, we shuffled (epileptogenic/non-epileptogenic) contact labels
192 1000 times and recalculated the classification performance leading to 1000 chance-level
193 classification results.

194 **Statistical analysis**

195 We used a Bayes Factor analysis for statistical inference⁵⁹. We compared the levels of *AUCs*
196 against chance-level *AUCs* as well as evaluated main effects on classifications. We used
197 standard rules of thumb for interpreting levels of evidence^{60,61}: Bayes factors between 3 and 10
198 and between 1/10 and 1/3 were interpreted as evidence for the alternative and null hypotheses,
199 respectively. Bayes factors > 10 and $< 1/10$ were interpreted as significant evidence for the
200 alternative and null hypotheses, respectively. We considered the Bayes factors which fell
201 between 1/3 and 3 as insufficient evidence either way. Insufficient evidence means that no
202 conclusions can be made about difference between a pair of variables.

203 To evaluate the evidence for the null and alternative hypotheses of at-chance and above-chance
204 classification, respectively, we compared the classification rates in each analysis and the
205 classification rates obtained from the chance-level classification results (e.g., panel A in all
206 figures). For that, we performed an unpaired Bayes factor *t-test* for alternative (i.e., difference
207 from chance; H1) and the null (i.e., no difference from chance; H0) hypotheses. To evaluate
208 the evidence for the null and alternative hypotheses of difference between classification levels
209 across analyses (e.g., Interictal vs. Ictal), we compared the classification rates obtained from
210 each of those analyses using paired Bayes factor *t-test*. To evaluate the main effects of resection
211 outcome, EZ, pathology (lesional/non-lesional) and type of recording (SEEG/ECOG), we used
212 a Bayes factor *ANOVA*, with these four factors as independent variables and
213 classification/generalisation *AUC* as the dependent variable. For statistical power in *ANOVA*,
214 we excluded patients with insular, frontoparietal, parietal and mesiofrontal resection which
215 were under-sampled ($n < 3$). The priors for all Bayes factor analyses were determined based
216 on Jeffrey-Zellner-Siow priors^{62,63} which are from the Cauchy distribution based on the effect
217 size that is initially calculated in the algorithm using *t-test*⁵⁹.

218 **Data and code availability**

219 The dataset used in this study was from previous studies and is available at
220 <https://openneuro.org/datasets/ds004100/versions/1.1.3>. The code developed for this project is
221 available at https://github.com/HamidKarimi-Rouzbahani/Intracranial_EEG_generalisation.

222 **Results**

223 We used a multivariate pattern analysis approach on features extracted from intracranial
224 SEEG/ECOG data in patients with epilepsy to address two main questions. First, we wondered
225 if there were similarities between the epileptiform patterns which discriminated epileptogenic
226 from non-epileptogenic areas in interictal and ictal time windows. Second, we wondered how
227 generalisable epileptiform patterns were across patients.

228

229 **How discriminable are epileptogenic and non-epileptogenic**
230 **contacts?**


231 As an initial step in our analyses, we quantified the discriminability of epileptogenic and non-
232 epileptogenic contacts. This was done for each patient and time window (interictal and ictal)
233 separately. There was significant evidence ($BF \gg 10$) for above-chance AUC which averaged
234 to 0.97 ($std = 0.03$) in the interictal and 0.91 ($std = 0.07$) in ictal time windows, respectively
235 (Fig. 1A). These showed that our multi-feature classification pipeline could robustly
236 differentiate epileptogenic from non-epileptogenic contacts.

237 Interestingly, there was significant evidence ($BF \gg 10$) for higher classification in the
238 interictal than ictal time window (Fig. 1A). This points to the importance of interictal neural
239 activities in localisation of EZ. While the classification performances were high across all
240 patients ($AUC > 0.8$), there was no correlation ($r = -0.17$, $p = 0.24$; *Pearson*) between the level
241 of $AUCs$ in interictal and ictal time windows across patients (Fig. 1C). This suggests that
242 patients with the clearest separation between epileptogenic and non-epileptogenic contacts in
243 interictal window did not necessarily show the clearest separation between those contacts in
244 the ictal window and vice versa.

245 We then evaluated the contribution of each feature to the performance (Fig. 1B). In interictal
246 data, *variance* from the moment features, *Hjorth mobility* from the complexity features, *beta-*
247 *band power* from the frequency features, and *gamma-band coherence* from the network
248 features were among the most contributory features. In ictal data, *variance* from the moment
249 features, *approximate entropy* from the complexity features, *gamma-band power* from the
250 frequency features, and *beta-band coherence* from the network features were among the most
251 contributory features. There was significant correlation between the features' contributions
252 across the two windows ($r = 0.73$, $p < 0.0001$; *Pearson*; Fig. 1D) suggesting that similar sets of
253 features dominantly contributed to the EZ localisation across interictal and ictal time windows.

254 Next, we evaluated the effect of outcome, region of resection (EZ), pathology and recording
255 type on the classification results in each window (Supplementary Fig. 1). In the interictal data,
256 there was evidence ($1/10 < BF < 1/3$) against any effect of outcome, region of resection,
257 pathology and recording type on classification results. In the ictal data, there was significant
258 evidence ($BF < 1/10$) against any effect of outcome, evidence ($3 < BF < 10$) for an effect of
259 region of resection, insufficient evidence ($1/3 < BF < 3$) for an effect of pathology and evidence
260 ($1/10 < BF < 1/3$) against any effect of recording type on classification results (Supplementary
261 Fig. 1). To check the direction of region of resection effect, we used Bayes-factor *t-test* which
262 showed insufficient evidence ($1 < BF < 3$) for higher classification in patients where the

263 epileptogenic zone/resection was in temporal than frontal and mesiotemporal area
 264 (Supplementary Fig. 1).



265

266 **Figure 1 Classification of contacts with and without epileptogenic activities in each patient. (A)** Area Under
 267 Curve (AUC) of classification performance for interictal and ictal classifications. Box plots show the distribution
 268 of data, its quartiles and median and whiskers indicate the maximum and minimum of the data over patients. Each

269 dot indicates the data from one patient. Numbers below the bars indicate Bayesian evidence for the difference
270 between true and null classification performances. Horizontal dashed line refers to theoretical chance-level
271 classification (0.5). Bayes factor reflecting evidence for the difference between interictal and ictal classifications
272 are also shown. $BF \gg 10$ indicates $BF > 100$. **(B)** Contribution of each feature to the classification performance
273 shown in A, calculated using random permutation. Yellow, pink, green and purple dots indicate moment,
274 complexity, frequency and network-based features. **(C)** *Pearson* correlation between interictal and ictal
275 classification performances across patients with each dot showing one patient. **(D)** *Pearson* correlation between
276 interictal and ictal feature contributions across features with each dot showing one feature. Correlation and the
277 corresponding p values are shown on top of panel **C** and **D** with the dashed line showing the theoretical perfect
278 positive correlation.

279

280 Our classifications used all signal features simultaneously. To check if any individual feature
281 could predict the resection outcome, we performed a direct comparison (unpaired Bayes factor
282 *t-test*) between feature contributions in patients who became seizure-free (Engel I) vs. not
283 seizure-free (Engel II-IV) outcomes (Supplementary Fig. 2). In interictal data, there was
284 evidence ($3 < BF < 10$) that signal *median* contributed to better EZ localisation in patients who
285 became seizure-free vs. those who did not. However, as *median* was among the least
286 contributory features overall (c.f., Fig. 1B), we prefer not to put too much weight on this result.
287 In ictal data, there was insufficient evidence ($1/3 < BF < 3$) for any feature to predict resection
288 outcome.

289 As our features relied on signal patterns which were relatively sustained, compared to transient
290 patterns such as interictal spikes or HFOs, we wondered whether accurate classification was
291 possible using even shorter time windows. To test this, we repeated the classifications using
292 the earliest, the middle and the latest 2-second time window of data in interictal and ictal data
293 separately. Interestingly, we found significant evidence ($BF \gg 10$) for above-chance *AUC* in
294 both interictal and ictal time, with significant evidence ($BF \gg 10$) for higher classification in
295 ictal than interictal data (Supplementary Fig. 3). This repeated the pattern observed when using
296 all windows of data in interictal and ictal periods (c.f., Fig. 1A).

297 **Do epileptiform patterns generalise across time windows?**

298 We showed that a correlated set of features contributed to EZ localisation in both interictal and
299 ictal windows (Fig. 1C), which might point to shared neural mechanisms underlying signal
300 patterns in both time windows. We wondered if we could localise the EZ in the ictal window
301 based on patterns of interictal activities. To test this, we trained our classifiers on interictal data


302 and tested them on ictal data for each patient separately. We observed that, while the
303 performance was lower (mean $AUC = 0.60$, $std = 0.1$; Fig. 2A) than those obtained by training
304 and testing the classifiers within each time window separately (c.f., Fig. 1A), there was still
305 significant evidence for above-chance cross-time generalisation (interictal to ictal; $BF \gg 10$).

306 Feature contribution results showed an advantage for *variance* from the moment features,
307 *Higuchi fractal dimension* from the complexity features, *delta-band power* from the frequency
308 features, and *gamma-band coherence* from network features (Fig. 2B). There was evidence
309 ($1/10 < BF < 1/3$) against any effect of outcome, region of resection, pathology and insufficient
310 evidence ($1/3 < BF < 3$) for an effect of recording type on the cross-time generalisation results
311 (Supplementary Fig. 4).

312 Note that we only used two 5-minute windows of interictal recording to train the classifiers,
313 which is relatively short given usual large clinical datasets of interictal activities recorded over
314 several days. The generalisation performance is predicted to improve with higher volumes and
315 more varied sets of training data. To check if increasing the diversity of the training data could
316 improve the generalisation performance, we trained the classifiers using the ictal data and
317 tested them using the interictal data. This would provide the classifiers with a more diverse
318 training set as ictal data were obtained from more recordings than interictal recordings (3.7 vs.
319 2). Numbers of observations were equalised between interictal and ictal time windows.

320 While there was significant evidence ($BF \gg 10$) for above-chance generalisation performance
321 when training on the ictal data, there was insufficient evidence ($BF = 0.91$) for higher cross-
322 time generalisation when the training data was from the ictal than interictal time windows.
323 Therefore, while a more diverse dataset seems to have improved the classification (shifted the
324 mean AUC from 0.6 up to 0.63), more data is needed to establish an improvement effect. There
325 was significant correlation ($r = 0.60$, $p < 0.001$, *Pearson*; Fig. 2C) between the level of
326 performance in interictal-to-ictal and ictal-to-interictal generalisations across patients. This
327 shows that patients who showed the best generalisation from interictal to ictal windows also
328 showed the highest generalisation in the opposite direction. This suggests that each patient has
329 a certain level of similarity between interictal and ictal epileptiform patterns. There was
330 significant correlation between the features' contributions across the interictal-to-ictal and
331 ictal-to-interictal generalisations ($r = 0.56$, $p < 0.001$; *Pearson*; Fig. 2D) suggesting that
332 generalisable epileptiform patterns were reflected in similar sets of features no matter if
333 generalising from interictal to ictal or vice versa.

334



335

336 **Figure 2 Classification of contacts with and without epileptogenic activities for each patient across time**
 337 **windows. (A)** AUC of cross-time generalisation performance for interictal-to-ictal and ictal-to-interictal
 338 generalisations. Box plots show the distribution of data, its quartiles and median and whiskers indicate the
 339 maximum and minimum of the data over patients. Each dot indicates the data from one patient. Numbers below
 340 the bars indicate Bayesian evidence for the difference between true and null generalisation performances.

341 Horizontal dashed line refers to theoretical chance-level generalisation (0.5). Bayes factor reflecting evidence for
342 the difference between interictal-to-ictal and ictal-to-interictal generalisations are shown. $BF \gg 10$ indicates BF
343 > 100 . **(B)** Contribution of each feature to the generalisation performance shown in A, calculated using random
344 permutation. Yellow, pink, green and purple dots indicate moment, complexity, frequency and network-based
345 features. **(C)** *Pearson* linear correlation between interictal-to-ictal and ictal-to-interictal generalisation
346 performances across patients with each dot showing one patient. **(D)** *Pearson* linear correlation between interictal-
347 to-ictal and ictal-to-interictal feature contributions across features with each dot showing one feature. Correlation
348 and the corresponding p values are shown on top of panel **C** and **D** with the dashed line showing the theoretical
349 perfect positive correlation.

350

351 In interictal-to-ictal generalisation data, there was evidence or significant evidence ($BF > 3$)
352 that features of *Katz fractal dimension*, *energy ratio*, *theta-band power* led to poorer EZ
353 localisation in patients with seizure-free vs. not seizure-free outcome (Supplementary Fig. 5).
354 In ictal-to-interictal generalisation, this pattern was repeated for features of *energy ratio* and
355 *delta-band power*. These suggest that specific features such as *energy ratio* might be more
356 informative for EZ localisation when they show differences between their interictal and ictal
357 patterns (i.e., as reflected in lower cross-time generalisability; Fig. 2B). This might mean that,
358 patients whose signals' *energy ratio* changes from interictal to ictal windows (e.g., through a
359 significant increase) have a higher chance for their EZ to be localised; energy ratio change was
360 indeed the basis for the original Epileptogenicity Index method¹³.


361

362 **Do epileptiform patterns generalise across patients?**

363 So far, our analyses focused on within-time classification of contacts and cross-time
364 generalisation of classifications both done within each patient. A clinically important aspect is
365 to ascertain the generalisability of epileptiform patterns across patients, and test the feasibility
366 of using the data from previous patients to help localise the EZ in new out-of-sample patients.
367 To test this, we trained classifiers on the data from all patients minus one and tested the
368 classifiers on the data from the left-out patient. This was done separately for interictal and ictal
369 windows.

370 In interictal data, there was significant evidence ($BF \gg 10$) for above chance cross-patient
371 generalisation (Fig. 3A), which suggests that there were interictal epileptiform patterns which
372 had similarities across patients. We evaluated the features' contribution to the generalisation
373 (Fig. 3B). Results showed an advantage for *kurtosis* from the moment features, *Higuchi fractal*

374 *dimension* from the complexity features, *beta-band power* from the frequency features, and
375 *gamma-band coherence* from the network features. There was significant evidence ($BF < 1/10$)
376 against any effect of outcome, evidence ($1/10 < BF < 1/3$) against any effect of region of
377 resection, insufficient evidence ($1/3 < BF < 3$) for an effect of pathology and significant
378 evidence ($BF > 10$) for an effect of recording type on the cross-patient generalisation results
379 (Supplementary Fig. 6). There was significant evidence ($BF = 12$) for higher generalisation to
380 test patients with resection in mesiotemporal than temporal and significant evidence ($BF \gg$
381 10) for higher generalisation to test patients with SEEG than ECoG recording (Supplementary
382 Fig. 6).



383

384

385 **Figure 3 Classification of contacts with and without epileptogenic activities across patients. (A)** AUC of
 386 cross-patient generalisation performance for interictal and ictal generalisations. Box plots show the distribution
 387 of data, its quartiles and median and whiskers indicate the maximum and minimum of the data over patients. Each
 388 dot indicates the data from one patient. Numbers below the bars indicate Bayesian evidence for the difference
 389 between true and null generalisation performances. Horizontal dashed line refers to theoretical chance-level

390 generalisation (0.5). Bayes factor reflecting evidence for the difference between interictal and ictal generalisations
391 are shown. $BF \gg 10$ indicates $BF > 100$. **(B)** Contribution of each feature to the generalisation performance
392 shown in A, calculated using random permutation. Yellow, pink, green and purple dots indicate moment,
393 complexity, frequency and network-based features. **(C)** *Pearson* linear correlation between interictal and ictal
394 generalisation performances across patients with each dot showing one patient. **(D)** *Pearson* linear correlation
395 between interictal-to-ictal and ictal-to-interictal feature contributions across features with each dot showing one
396 feature. Correlation and the corresponding p values are shown on top of panel **C** and **D** with the dashed line
397 showing the theoretical perfect positive correlation.

398

399 In ictal data, there was significant evidence ($BF \gg 10$) for above-chance cross-patient
400 generalisation (Fig. 3A) which suggests that there were ictal epileptiform patterns which had
401 similarities across patients. Results showed the highest contribution to generalisation by
402 *skewness* from the moment features (however very low compared to other features), *Hjorth*
403 *mobility* from the complexity features, *mean frequency* from the frequency features, and
404 *gamma-band coherence* from the network features. There was evidence ($1/10 < BF < 1/3$)
405 against any effect of outcome, insufficient evidence ($1/3 < BF < 3$) for an effect of region of
406 resection and pathology and significant evidence ($BF > 10$) for an effect of recording type on
407 the cross-patient generalisation. There was significant evidence ($BF \gg 10$) for higher
408 generalisation to test patients with resection in mesiotemporal than temporal and significant
409 evidence ($BF \gg 10$) for higher generalisation to test patients with SEEG than ECoG recording
410 (Supplementary Fig. 6).

411 There was significant correlation ($r = 0.73$, $p < 0.001$; *Pearson*) between the level of
412 generalisation in interictal and ictal time windows across patients (Fig. 3C). This suggests that
413 if a patient's data (i.e., testing set) has similarities to the pool of other patients' data (i.e.,
414 training set), this will reflect in both interictal and ictal generalisations. On the other hand,
415 patients with very distinct epileptiform activity patterns show this distinction across both
416 interictal and ictal time windows. There was no correlation ($r = -0.23$, $p = 0.19$; *Pearson*)
417 between informative features in the interictal and ictal time windows. This suggests that distinct
418 sets of features contributed to cross-patient generalisation in interictal and ictal time windows.

419 In interictal data, there was significant evidence ($BF \gg 10$; Bayes factor *t-test*) that
420 *approximate entropy* led to better EZ localisation in patients who became seizure-free vs. those
421 who did not (Supplementary Fig. 7). In ictal data, there was evidence or significant evidence
422 ($BF > 3$) that *mean* and *median* led to better EZ localisation in patients who became seizure-
423 free vs. those who did not and *median frequency* led to the opposite pattern. As these were all

424 among the least contributory features to the overall cross-patient generalisation performance
425 we avoid over-interpreting them.

426 Discussion

427 Precise localisation of epileptogenic zone has remained a challenging problem. It has recently
428 been highlighted that data and code sharing are fundamental to moving computational
429 epilepsy studies towards clinical translation¹¹. The current work uses one of the few open-
430 access SEEG/ECOG datasets which provides epochs of interictal and ictal activities with
431 meticulous labelling of electrode contacts, resection volume and clinical information
432 including surgical outcome^{46,48}. Using a rigorous ML-based pipeline, our study shows the
433 feasibility of establishing generalisability of patterns within individuals from interictal to ictal
434 periods, and across individuals during both interictal and ictal time windows. These results
435 make several contributions to EZ localisation, explained below.

436 First, to establish that our ML-based method could discriminate areas with and without
437 epileptiform activities, we classified epileptogenic and non-epileptogenic areas (EZ
438 localisation, based on clinician labelling of the dataset) within each patient and found
439 significant differences between the two classes of areas. At the individual patient level, we
440 observed a remarkable EZ localisation performance in the interictal time window, which
441 counter-intuitively surpassed that obtained in the ictal time window. Therefore, while majority
442 of available studies have been developed to localise EZ during the ictal time window¹³⁻¹⁹, this
443 study finds significant information within the interictal signal that can be utilised for EZ
444 localisation. It is important to note that our approach did not pre-select any specific feature
445 (such as spikes, HFO) as biomarkers *a priori*, but rather analysed the ensemble of the neural
446 signal over time, which appears to contain predictive information beyond these well-known
447 features, even when analysing time-windows as short as 2 seconds (c.f., Supplementary Fig.
448 3). This agrees with reports showing that interictal patterns are relatively stable over time^{36,40,64}
449 (also see^{65,66}).

450 While systematic comparison between interictal and ictal epileptiform patterns are rare in the
451 literature, our result aligns with a surface EEG study in children with MRI-visible lesions which
452 found better predictive value of interictal rather than ictal data⁶⁷. We observed that the most
453 informative features in interictal data included *variance*, *beta-band power*, *correlation* and
454 *gamma-band coherence*, which in order support previous studies finding information in

455 multiscale entropy in the gamma band^{28,30} (a complexity measure) and relative entropy³⁴(a
456 network measure). Interictal network studies have shown a gradient of within-area connectivity
457 decreasing progressively from epileptogenic regions to propagation regions to non-involved
458 zones^{39,41,54}, providing a proxy for EZ localisation. The prominence of network measures in all
459 of our analyses also aligns with a recent study showing greater information in network
460 measures compared to univariate power-based measures in EZ localisation⁴⁸. While we cannot
461 perfectly equalise the interictal and ictal data for fair comparison as there are systematic
462 differences in their collection time, number of epochs and potential artefacts in ictal signals,
463 these results provide valuable insights into the richness of interictal activity patterns for EZ
464 localisation.

465 The remarkable classification performance observed especially in the interictal window (>
466 0.90; Fig. 1A) supports the value of ML-based interictal localisation methods, which here used
467 multiple features. While these features could have overlapped in their selectivity, they worked
468 in synergy to detect as much non-overlapping information as possible. DT classifiers are good
469 at combining distinct combinations of features to generate representational spaces in which
470 classes can be separated. We also tested Support Vector Machine and Linear Discriminant
471 Analysis classifiers, but both provided poorer classification. Our approach of using a range of
472 simple-to-complex features is different from older localisation methods which used one main
473 feature such as high-to-low frequency energy ratio^{13,16}, and aligns with later studies which have
474 combined several features for EZ localisation^{17,31,68,69}, temporal detection of seizures⁷⁰ and
475 quantification of seizure severity⁷¹.

476 Second, we found prediction power in activity patterns of interictal data to localise EZ in the
477 ictal period. While previous studies have localised EZ in interictal and ictal windows, the
478 interictal-ictal correspondence has not been systematically investigated. In eleven patients with
479 epilepsy who had been implanted with ECoG, one study found that the template of
480 connectivity-based ictal epileptogenic areas could be helpful in informing the localisation of
481 EZ interictally⁷². One recent study investigated the fine-grained timing and direction of
482 interictal and ictal discharges using microelectrode grids, and suggested that interictal
483 discharges are traveling waves that traverse the same path as seizure discharges⁷³. After
484 confirming a consistent temporal ordering of discharges in interictal and ictal windows, another
485 study developed a novel source localisation method based on wave propagation, which
486 successfully localised the EZ⁷⁴. Our work evaluates the generalisability of a large battery of
487 epileptiform features from interictal to ictal time windows and vice versa. The drop in cross-

488 time generalisation performances (Fig. 2A) compared to the non-generalisation analysis (c.f.,
489 Fig. 1A) is supported by known differences in visualisable epileptogenic patterns from the
490 interictal to the ictal time window^{75,76}. In our study, the observed above-chance cross-time
491 generalisation had not been necessarily predictable. It could be the case that epileptogenic areas
492 would show higher value of a particular feature (e.g., power) than non-epileptogenic areas in
493 the interictal window with this pattern flipping in the ictal window. This would have been
494 detectable by our machine learning pipeline and would have reflected in below-chance (AUC
495 < 0.5) generalisation performance. The potential of using interictal recording to predict EZ
496 localisation is significant because many patients have insufficient or sometimes no seizures
497 during their one/two-week hospitalisation for EZ localisation. This is an important limitation
498 for visual localisation of EZ based on electrical patterns during seizures and for training ML
499 algorithms, which, like humans, need enough samples to learn and localise epileptiform
500 patterns from the data.

501 The third contribution of this work is showing that, despite clear inter-subject differences, there
502 were patterns of epileptiform activities which were shared across patients. Machine learning
503 allowed us to train the classifiers using data from one set of patients and test the generalisability
504 of patterns to the data from a new out-of-sample patient. While these performances were
505 expectedly lower in the cross-patient generalisation than within-patient classification (Fig. 3A
506 vs. Fig. 1A), this result is promising and informative. The decrease in performance can be
507 explained by large differences across patients' data including epilepsy characteristics as well
508 as distinct sampling of the brain, recording type, etc. Moreover, significant inter-subject
509 differences may be present in terms of patient-specific epileptogenic "signatures", the features
510 of which are detectable across both interictal and ictal time windows for that individual⁷⁷. On
511 the other hand, a few studies showed that specific patterns can be generalised across patients,
512 but only evaluated it in either interictal or ictal time window (Supplementary Table 1). A
513 universal repertoire of seizure patterns across species has previously been observed, which
514 suggests that some invariant properties characterise seizures under different physiological and
515 pathological conditions⁷⁸. Here, we showed that *ictal* epileptogenic patterns, especially those
516 captured by complexity features, were more generalisable across subjects than *interictal*
517 patterns. The present results also showed that SEEG recordings provided advantageous
518 generalisability compared to ECoG (Supplementary Fig. 6). This is likely explained by SEEG's
519 greater sampling of a wider range of brain structures, which contributes to a more consistent
520 sampling of the brain across patients⁷⁹. These cross-patient generalisable patterns make it

521 possible and desirable to use them on new out-of-sample data, to potentially build on these
522 results by testing larger datasets. To facilitate future testing in novel datasets, we have shared
523 our Matlab scripts.

524 One of the main concerns when using artificial intelligence in applications such as EZ
525 localisation is the explainability of algorithms. Lack of knowledge about how a ML algorithm
526 decides why a contact is classified as “epileptogenic” makes the algorithm less trustworthy for
527 clinicians⁸⁰, who may not be able to validate if a specific feature of a signal is indicative of
528 epileptogenicity or whether the algorithm is simply wrong. Methodologies incorporating
529 explainable features can mitigate the explainability issue and provide complementary insights
530 into the growing body of work in EZ localisation and seizure prediction, which tend to adopt
531 unexplainable ML algorithms such as deep neural networks^{81,82}. Every individual feature used
532 in our work has clear mathematical definition and has been validated in previous quantification
533 analysis of neural data^{55,56,83,84}. We also quantified the contribution of each feature in our
534 analyses, thus avoiding the “black box” effect encountered when using algorithms such as deep
535 neural networks. Accordingly, our proposed pipeline can be added as a primary feature
536 extractor to prediction pipelines to make them more explainable to humans. It is of note that,
537 while the mathematical definition of each of our features are clear, the neurophysiological
538 correlates of these features needs to be sought for in the future.

539 There are several future directions which can facilitate the translation of this work to clinical
540 practice. One can come through the improvement of the classification and generalisation
541 performance. We used relatively short time windows of interictal (5-minute windows) and ictal
542 (1-minute windows) data, both of which can be lengthened to potentially improve the
543 classification performance. We did not apply any filtering or artefact removal, as ML
544 classification algorithms are mainly sensitive to distinct patterns between classes (i.e., contacts
545 with and without epileptiform patterns) rather than patterns which are common between classes
546 (e.g., line noise). Nonetheless, one future direction would be to test if application of filters or
547 artefact removal algorithms in the pre-processing stage can improve classification
548 performance. Rather than an optimised work, the current study was only a feasibility effort to
549 establish the generalisability of patterns of activities across time within patients and within time
550 across patients. Another future direction would be to test the generalisability of the
551 classification pipeline to datasets from other centres, which have undergone meticulous clinical
552 evaluation and labelling. Finally, it would be interesting to evaluate the generalisability of the
553 proposed pipeline to non-invasive modalities such as scalp EEG and magnetoencephalography

554 (MEG). As the features extracted here are not modality-specific and rely on characteristics of
555 time series, these methods can be applied to sensor- or source-space E/MEG data. The
556 generalisability of these methods to non-invasive modalities is significant because current gold-
557 standard invasive methods of SEEG and ECoG suffer from incomplete or sub-optimal
558 sampling of the brain, and in addition these invasive methods are only indicated in a subset of
559 patients. Delineation of likely spatial extent of epileptogenic zones could in theory be optimised
560 using rigorous localisation methods developed here in conjunction with non-invasive E/MEG
561 recording modalities, especially in the interictal time window. This will provide a more
562 objective and fully automatic method for the localisation of EZ than current methods which
563 often rely on visual detection, manual annotation and operator-dependent analysis of
564 epileptiform patterns^{85,86}.

565 In conclusion, we showed that powerful classification patterns were embedded within the EEG
566 signal, which could reliably differentiate epileptogenic from non-epileptogenic contacts in
567 every individual. Such patterns could be identified in both interictal and ictal recordings
568 through features such as signal *variance*, *Hjorth mobility* and *complexity* as well as high-
569 frequency power and network features, without taking account of any predetermined figures
570 such as spikes, HFO or known ictal patterns. There were also features that could correctly
571 predict EZ in ictal recordings from interictal recordings. Again, high-frequency *power* and
572 network features were the most contributory features here. Finally, we showed that, while there
573 were differences between epileptiform patterns across patients suggesting subject-specific
574 effects, we could localise the EZ with well above chance precision using interictal and more
575 dominantly ictal activities. The proposed methods and results provide new evidence for
576 generalisability of epileptiform patterns across time and patients and open new avenues for
577 future methods developed for epileptogenic zone localisation. Clues from neural signal changes
578 could also provide new directions for investigating the biological correlates of interictal⁸⁷ and
579 ictal⁸⁸ epileptiform activity. Their explainable nature is important for further investigation of
580 pathophysiologic underpinnings of these signal changes. This could help contribute to efforts
581 to develop paradigm-shifting therapeutic possibilities in epilepsy including disease-modifying
582 treatments⁸⁹, as well as further refining network-based surgical treatments⁹⁰, seizure
583 forecasting⁹¹ and seizure detection⁹².

584 **Acknowledgements**

585 We would like to thank Mater Research Institute for supporting this study and Professor Brian
586 Litt's group for sharing their dataset online which allowed us to test our methods on their data.

587 **Funding**

588 No funding was received towards this work.

589 **Competing interests**

590 The authors report no competing interests.

591 **References**

- 592 1. Kwan P, Brodie MJ. Early Identification of Refractory Epilepsy. *New England Journal*
593 *of Medicine*. 2000;342(5):314-319. doi:10.1056/NEJM200002033420503
- 594 2. Chen Z, Brodie MJ, Liew D, Kwan P. Treatment Outcomes in Patients With Newly
595 Diagnosed Epilepsy Treated With Established and New Antiepileptic Drugs. *JAMA*
596 *Neurol*. 2018;75(3):279. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2017.3949
- 597 3. Fisher RS, Cross JH, French JA, et al. Operational classification of seizure types by the
598 International League Against Epilepsy: Position Paper of the ILAE Commission for
599 Classification and Terminology. *Epilepsia*. 2017;58(4):522-530. doi:10.1111/epi.13670
- 600 4. Talairach J, Bancaud J, Bonis A, Szikla G, Tournoux P. Functional Stereotaxic
601 Exploration of Epilepsy. *Stereotact Funct Neurosurg*. 1962;22(3-5):328-331.
602 doi:10.1159/000104378

- 603 5. Chauvel P. The Epileptogenic Zone: A Critical Reconstruction. In: *A Practical*
604 *Approach to Stereo EEG*. Springer Publishing Company; 2020.
605 doi:10.1891/9780826136930.0010
- 606 6. Najm I, Jehi L, Palmi A, Gonzalez-Martinez J, Paglioli E, Bingaman W. Temporal
607 patterns and mechanisms of epilepsy surgery failure. *Epilepsia*. 2013;54(5):772-782.
608 doi:10.1111/epi.12152
- 609 7. de Tisi J, Bell GS, Peacock JL, et al. The long-term outcome of adult epilepsy surgery,
610 patterns of seizure remission, and relapse: a cohort study. *The Lancet*.
611 2011;378(9800):1388-1395. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60890-8
- 612 8. Iasemidis LD, Chris Sackellares J, Zaveri HP, Williams WJ. Phase space topography
613 and the Lyapunov exponent of electrocorticograms in partial seizures. *Brain Topogr*.
614 1990;2(3):187-201. doi:10.1007/BF01140588
- 615 9. Bartolomei F, Lagarde S, Wendling F, et al. Defining epileptogenic networks:
616 Contribution of SEEG and signal analysis. *Epilepsia*. 2017;58(7):1131-1147.
617 doi:10.1111/epi.13791
- 618 10. Li A, Huynh C, Fitzgerald Z, et al. Neural fragility as an EEG marker of the seizure
619 onset zone. *Nat Neurosci*. 2021;24(10):1465-1474. doi:10.1038/s41593-021-00901-w
- 620 11. Bernabei JM, Li A, Revell AY, et al. Quantitative approaches to guide epilepsy surgery
621 from intracranial EEG. *Brain*. 2023;146(6):2248-2258. doi:10.1093/brain/awad007
- 622 12. Lagarde S, Buzori S, Trebuchon A, et al. The repertoire of seizure onset patterns in
623 human focal epilepsies: Determinants and prognostic values. *Epilepsia*. 2019;60(1):85-
624 95. doi:10.1111/epi.14604

- 625 13. Bartolomei F, Chauvel P, Wendling F. Epileptogenicity of brain structures in human
626 temporal lobe epilepsy: A quantified study from intracerebral EEG. *Brain*.
627 2008;131(7):1818-1830. doi:10.1093/brain/awn111
- 628 14. Aubert S, Wendling F, Regis J, et al. Local and remote epileptogenicity in focal cortical
629 dysplasias and neurodevelopmental tumours. *Brain*. 2009;132(11):3072-3086.
630 doi:10.1093/brain/awp242
- 631 15. Gnatkovsky V, Francione S, Cardinale F, et al. Identification of reproducible ictal
632 patterns based on quantified frequency analysis of intracranial EEG signals. *Epilepsia*.
633 2011;52(3):477-488. doi:10.1111/j.1528-1167.2010.02931.x
- 634 16. David O, Blauwblomme T, Job AS, et al. Imaging the seizure onset zone with stereo-
635 electroencephalography. *Brain*. 2011;134(10):2898-2911. doi:10.1093/brain/awr238
- 636 17. Grinenko O, Li J, Mosher JC, et al. A fingerprint of the epileptogenic zone in human
637 epilepsies. *Brain*. 2018;141(1):117-131. doi:10.1093/brain/awx306
- 638 18. Li J, Grinenko O, Mosher JC, Gonzalez-Martinez J, Leahy RM, Chauvel P. Learning to
639 define an electrical biomarker of the epileptogenic zone. *Hum Brain Mapp*.
640 2020;41(2):429-441. doi:10.1002/hbm.24813
- 641 19. Nakatani M, Inouchi M, Daifu-Kobayashi M, et al. Ictal direct current shifts contribute
642 to defining the core ictal focus in epilepsy surgery. *Brain Commun*. 2022;4(5).
643 doi:10.1093/braincomms/fcac222
- 644 20. De Curtis M, Jefferys JGR, Avoli M. *Interictal Epileptiform Discharges in Partial*
645 *Epilepsy: Complex Neurobiological Mechanisms Based on Experimental and Clinical*
646 *Evidence.*; 2012. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/>

- 647 21. Thomschewski A, Hincapié AS, Frauscher B. Localization of the epileptogenic zone
648 using high frequency oscillations. *Front Neurol.* 2019;10(FEB).
649 doi:10.3389/fneur.2019.00094
- 650 22. Roehri N, Pizzo F, Lagarde S, et al. High-frequency oscillations are not better
651 biomarkers of epileptogenic tissues than spikes. *Ann Neurol.* 2018;83(1):84-97.
652 doi:10.1002/ana.25124
- 653 23. Hashemi M, Vattikonda AN, Sip V, et al. The Bayesian Virtual Epileptic Patient: A
654 probabilistic framework designed to infer the spatial map of epileptogenicity in a
655 personalized large-scale brain model of epilepsy spread. *Neuroimage.*
656 2020;217:116839. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.116839
- 657 24. Avoli M, Biagini G, de Curtis M. Do Interictal Spikes Sustain Seizures and
658 Epileptogenesis? *Epilepsy Curr.* 2006;6(6):203-207. doi:10.1111/j.1535-
659 7511.2006.00146.x
- 660 25. Sklenarova B, Zatloukalova E, Cimbalnik J, et al. Interictal <sc>High-
661 Frequency</sc> Oscillations, Spikes, and Connectivity Profiles: a Fingerprint of
662 Epileptogenic Brain Pathologies. *Epilepsia.* Published online August 17, 2023.
663 doi:10.1111/epi.17749
- 664 26. JASPER HH, ARFEL-CAPDEVILLE G, RASMUSSEN T. Evaluation of EEG and
665 cortical electrographic studies for prognosis of seizures following surgical excision of
666 epileptogenic lesions. *Epilepsia.* 1961;2:130-137.
- 667 27. Bancaud J. La stéréo-électroencéphalographie dans l'épilepsie: informations
668 neurophysiopathologiques apportées par l'investigation fonctionnelle stéréotaxique:
669 rapport présenté a la Société d'électroencéphalographie de langue française. Published
670 online October 1965.

- 671 28. Andrzejak RG, Schindler K, Rummel C. Nonrandomness, nonlinear dependence, and
672 nonstationarity of electroencephalographic recordings from epilepsy patients. *Phys Rev*
673 *E Stat Nonlin Soft Matter Phys.* 2012;86(4). doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.86.046206
- 674 29. Mooij AH, Frauscher B, Amiri M, Otte WM, Gotman J. Differentiating epileptic from
675 non-epileptic high frequency intracerebral EEG signals with measures of wavelet
676 entropy. *Clinical Neurophysiology.* 2016;127(12):3529-3536.
677 doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2016.09.011
- 678 30. Sato Y, Ochi A, Mizutani T, Otsubo H. Low entropy of interictal gamma oscillations is
679 a biomarker of the seizure onset zone in focal cortical dysplasia type II. *Epilepsy and*
680 *Behavior.* 2019;96:155-159. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2019.01.030
- 681 31. Cimbalnik J, Klimes P, Sladky V, et al. Multi-feature localization of epileptic foci from
682 interictal, intracranial EEG. *Clinical Neurophysiology.* 2019;130(10):1945-1953.
683 doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2019.07.024
- 684 32. Mooij AH, Frauscher B, Gotman J, Huiskamp GJM. A skew-based method for
685 identifying intracranial EEG channels with epileptic activity without detecting spikes,
686 ripples, or fast ripples. *Clinical Neurophysiology.* 2020;131(1):183-192.
687 doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2019.10.025
- 688 33. Taylor PN, Papanavvas CA, Owen TW, et al. Normative brain mapping of interictal
689 intracranial EEG to localize epileptogenic tissue. *Brain.* 2022;145(3):939-949.
690 doi:10.1093/brain/awab380
- 691 34. Travnicek V, Klimes P, Cimbalnik J, et al. Relative entropy is an easy-to-use invasive
692 electroencephalographic biomarker of the epileptogenic zone. *Epilepsia.*
693 2023;64(4):962-972. doi:10.1111/epi.17539

- 694 35. Gallagher R, Sinha N, Pattnaik A, et al. Quantifying interictal intracranial EEG to predict
695 focal epilepsy. *ArXiv*. 2023;arXiv:2307.15170.
- 696 36. Dauwels J, Eskandar E, Cash S. Localization of seizure onset area from intracranial non-
697 seizure EEG by exploiting locally enhanced synchrony. In: *Proceedings of the 31st*
698 *Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology*
699 *Society: Engineering the Future of Biomedicine, EMBC 2009*. IEEE Computer Society;
700 2009:2180-2183. doi:10.1109/IEMBS.2009.5332447
- 701 37. Gazit T, Doron I, Sagher O, et al. Time-frequency characterization of
702 electrocorticographic recordings of epileptic patients using frequency-entropy
703 similarity: A comparison to other bi-variate measures. *J Neurosci Methods*.
704 2011;194(2):358-373. doi:10.1016/j.jneumeth.2010.10.011
- 705 38. Li A, Chennuri B, Subramanian S, et al. Using network analysis to localize the
706 epileptogenic zone from invasive EEG recordings in intractable focal epilepsy. *Network*
707 *Neuroscience*. 2018;2(2):218-240. doi:10.1162/netn_a_00043
- 708 39. Lagarde S, Roehri N, Lambert I, et al. Interictal stereotactic-EEG functional connectivity
709 in refractory focal epilepsies. *Brain-A Journal of Neurology*. 2018;(10):2966-2980.
710 doi:10.1093/brain/awy214i
- 711 40. Gunnarsdottir KM, Li A, Smith RJ, et al. Source-sink connectivity: a novel interictal
712 EEG marker for seizure localization. *Brain*. 2022;145(11):3901-3915.
713 doi:10.1093/brain/awac300
- 714 41. Johnson GW, Doss DJ, Morgan VL, et al. The Interictal Suppression Hypothesis in focal
715 epilepsy: network-level supporting evidence. *Brain*. 2023;146(7):2828-2845.
716 doi:10.1093/brain/awad016

- 717 42. Runfola C, Sheheitli H, Bartolomei F, Wang H, Jirsa V. In pursuit of the epileptogenic
718 zone in focal epilepsy:a dynamical network biomarker approach. *Commun Nonlinear*
719 *Sci Numer Simul.* 2023;117:106973. doi:10.1016/j.cnsns.2022.106973
- 720 43. Wendling F, Bellanger JJ, Bartolomei F, Chauvel P. Relevance of nonlinear lumped-
721 parameter models in the analysis of depth-EEG epileptic signals. *Biol Cybern.*
722 2000;83(4):367-378. doi:10.1007/s004220000160
- 723 44. Spencer SS. Neural Networks in Human Epilepsy: Evidence of and Implications for
724 Treatment. *Epilepsia.* 2002;43(3):219-227. doi:10.1046/j.1528-1157.2002.26901.x
- 725 45. Kramer MA, Cash SS. Epilepsy as a disorder of cortical network organization.
726 *Neuroscientist.* 2012;18(4):360-372. doi:10.1177/1073858411422754
- 727 46. Kini LG, Bernabei JM, Mikhail F, et al. Virtual resection predicts surgical outcome for
728 drug-resistant epilepsy. *Brain.* 2019;142(12):3892-3905. doi:10.1093/brain/awz303
- 729 47. Balatskaya A, Roehri N, Lagarde S, et al. The “Connectivity Epileptogenicity Index ”
730 (cEI), a method for mapping the different seizure onset patterns in
731 StereoElectroEncephalography recorded seizures. *Clinical Neurophysiology.*
732 2020;131(8):1947-1955. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2020.05.029
- 733 48. Bernabei JM, Sinha N, Arnold TC, et al. Normative intracranial EEG maps
734 epileptogenic tissues in focal epilepsy. *Brain.* 2022;145(6):1949-1961.
735 doi:10.1093/brain/awab480
- 736 49. Hart P, Stork D, Duda R. *Pattern Classification.* Hoboken: Wiley; 2000.
- 737 50. Trübutschek D, Yang YF, Gianelli C, et al. EEGManyPipelines: A large-scale, grass-
738 root multi-analyst study of EEG analysis practices in the wild. *OSF preprint, doi:*
739 *1031222/osf.io/jq342.* Published online 2022.

- 740 51. Kerr MSD, Burns SP, Gale J, Gonzalez-Martinez J, Bulacio J, Sarma S V. Multivariate
741 analysis of SEEG signals during seizure. In: *Proceedings of the Annual International*
742 *Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, EMBS.* ;
743 2011:8279-8282. doi:10.1109/IEMBS.2011.6092041
- 744 52. Wendling F, Chauvel P, Biraben A, Bartolomei F. From intracerebral EEG signals to
745 brain connectivity: Identification of epileptogenic networks in partial epilepsy. *Front*
746 *Syst Neurosci.* 2010;4. doi:10.3389/fnsys.2010.00154
- 747 53. Schindler K, Leung H, Elger CE, Lehnertz K. Assessing seizure dynamics by analysing
748 the correlation structure of multichannel intracranial EEG. *Brain.* 2007;130(1):65-77.
749 doi:10.1093/brain/awl304
- 750 54. Shah P, Bernabei JM, Kini LG, et al. High interictal connectivity within the resection
751 zone is associated with favorable post-surgical outcomes in focal epilepsy patients.
752 *Neuroimage Clin.* 2019;23. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2019.101908
- 753 55. Karimi-Rouzbahani H, Shahmohammadi M, Vahab E, Setayeshi S, Carlson T. Temporal
754 Variabilities Provide Additional Category-Related Information in Object Category
755 Decoding: A Systematic Comparison of Informative EEG Features. *Neural Comput.*
756 Published online August 30, 2021:1-46. doi:10.1162/neco_a_01436
- 757 56. Karimi-Rouzbahani H, Woolgar A. When the Whole Is Less Than the Sum of Its Parts:
758 Maximum Object Category Information and Behavioral Prediction in Multiscale
759 Activation Patterns. *Front Neurosci.* 2022;16. doi:10.3389/fnins.2022.825746
- 760 57. Karimi-Rouzbahani H. Evidence for multiscale multiplexed representation of visual
761 features in EEG. *BioRxiv* doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/20230709548296>. Published
762 online 2023.

- 763 58. Jiang H, Kokkinos V, Ye S, et al. Interictal SEEG Resting-State Connectivity Localizes
764 the Seizure Onset Zone and Predicts Seizure Outcome. *Advanced Science*. 2022;9(18).
765 doi:10.1002/advs.202200887
- 766 59. Rouder JN, Morey RD, Speckman PL, Province JM. Default Bayes factors for ANOVA
767 designs. *J Math Psychol*. 2012;56(5):356-374. doi:10.1016/j.jmp.2012.08.001
- 768 60. Dienes Z. Using Bayes to get the most out of non-significant results. *Front Psychol*.
769 2014;5. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00781
- 770 61. Lee MD, Wagenmakers EJ. Bayesian statistical inference in psychology: Comment on
771 Trafimow (2003). *Psychol Rev*. 2005;112(3):662-668. doi:10.1037/0033-
772 295X.112.3.662
- 773 62. Jeffreys H. *The Theory of Probability*. OuP Oxford; 1998.
- 774 63. Zellner A, Siow A. Posterior odds ratios for selected regression hypotheses. *Trabajos de*
775 *Estadística Y de Investigacion Operativa*. 1980;31(1):585-603.
776 doi:10.1007/BF02888369
- 777 64. Wang Y, Schroeder GM, Horsley JJ, et al. Temporal stability of intracranial
778 electroencephalographic abnormality maps for localizing epileptogenic tissue.
779 *Epilepsia*. 2023;64(8):2070-2080. doi:10.1111/epi.17663
- 780 65. Gliske S V., Irwin ZT, Chestek C, et al. Variability in the location of high frequency
781 oscillations during prolonged intracranial EEG recordings. *Nat Commun*.
782 2018;9(1):2155. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-04549-2
- 783 66. Conrad EC, Tomlinson SB, Wong JN, et al. Spatial distribution of interictal spikes
784 fluctuates over time and localizes seizure onset. *Brain*. 2020;143(2):554-569.
785 doi:10.1093/brain/awz386

- 786 67. Castro-Villablanca F, Moeller F, Pujar S, et al. Seizure outcome determinants in children
787 after surgery for single unilateral lesions on magnetic resonance imaging: Role of
788 preoperative ictal and interictal electroencephalography. *Epilepsia*. 2022;63(12):3168-
789 3179. doi:10.1111/epi.17425
- 790 68. Gnatkovsky V, De Curtis M, Pastori C, et al. Biomarkers of epileptogenic zone defined
791 by quantified stereo-EEG analysis. *Epilepsia*. 2014;55(2):296-305.
792 doi:10.1111/epi.12507
- 793 69. Wang Y, Yang Y, Li S, et al. Automatic Localization of Seizure Onset Zone Based on
794 Multi-Epileptogenic Biomarkers Analysis of Single-Contact from Interictal SEEG.
795 *Bioengineering*. 2022;9(12):769. doi:10.3390/bioengineering9120769
- 796 70. Shoeibi A, Ghassemi N, Alizadehsani R, et al. A comprehensive comparison of
797 handcrafted features and convolutional autoencoders for epileptic seizures detection in
798 EEG signals. *Expert Syst Appl*. 2021;163. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2020.113788
- 799 71. Gascoigne SJ, Waldmann L, Schroeder GM, et al. A library of quantitative markers of
800 seizure severity. *Epilepsia*. 2023;64(4):1074-1086. doi:10.1111/epi.17525
- 801 72. Ben-Jacob E, Doron I, Gazit T, Rephaeli E, Sagher O, Towle VL. Mapping and
802 assessment of epileptogenic foci using frequency-entropy templates. *Phys Rev E Stat*
803 *Nonlin Soft Matter Phys*. 2007;76(5). doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.76.051903
- 804 73. Smith EH, Liou JY, Merricks EM, et al. Title: Human interictal epileptiform discharges
805 are bidirectional traveling waves echoing ictal discharges. *Elife*. 2022;11.
806 doi:10.7554/eLife.73541

- 807 74. Diamond JM, Withers CP, Chapeton JI, Rahman S, Inati SK, Zaghoul KA. Interictal
808 discharges in the human brain are travelling waves arising from an epileptogenic source.
809 *Brain*. 2023;146(5):1903-1915. doi:10.1093/brain/awad015
- 810 75. Perucca P, Dubeau F, Gotman J. Widespread EEG changes precede focal seizures. *PLoS*
811 *One*. 2013;8(11). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0080972
- 812 76. Pearce A, Wulsin D, Blanco JA, Krieger A, Litt B, Stacey WC. Temporal changes of
813 neocortical high-frequency oscillations in epi-lepsy. *J Neurophysiol*. 2013;110:1167-
814 1179. doi:10.1152/jn.01009.2012.-High-frequency
- 815 77. Karoly PJ, Freestone DR, Boston R, et al. Interictal spikes and epileptic seizures: Their
816 relationship and underlying rhythmicity. *Brain*. 2016;139(4):1066-1078.
817 doi:10.1093/brain/aww019
- 818 78. Jirsa VK, Stacey WC, Quilichini PP, Ivanov AI, Bernard C. On the nature of seizure
819 dynamics. *Brain*. 2014;137(8):2210-2230. doi:10.1093/brain/awu133
- 820 79. Bernabei JM, Arnold TC, Shah P, et al. Electrocorticography and stereo EEG provide
821 distinct measures of brain connectivity: implications for network models. *Brain*
822 *Commun*. 2021;3(3). doi:10.1093/braincomms/fcab156
- 823 80. Kundu S. AI in medicine must be explainable. *Nat Med*. 2021;27(8):1328-1328.
824 doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01461-z
- 825 81. Saminu S, Xu G, Shuai Z, et al. Application of Deep Learning and WT-SST in
826 Localization of Epileptogenic Zone Using Epileptic EEG Signals. *Applied Sciences*.
827 2022;12(10):4879. doi:10.3390/app12104879

- 828 82. D.K. T, B.G P, Xiong F. Auto-detection of epileptic seizure events using deep neural
829 network with different feature scaling techniques. *Pattern Recognit Lett.* 2019;128:544-
830 550. doi:10.1016/j.patrec.2019.10.029
- 831 83. Boonyakitanont P, Lek-uthai A, Chomtho K, Songsiri J. A review of feature extraction
832 and performance evaluation in epileptic seizure detection using EEG. *Biomed Signal*
833 *Process Control.* 2020;57:1-28. doi:10.1016/j.bspc.2019.101702
- 834 84. Karimi-Rouzbahani H, Bagheri N, Ebrahimpour R. Average activity, but not variability,
835 is the dominant factor in the representation of object categories in the brain.
836 *Neuroscience.* 2017;346. doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2017.01.002
- 837 85. van Mierlo P, Vorderwülbecke BJ, Staljanssens W, Seeck M, Vulliémoz S. Ictal EEG
838 source localization in focal epilepsy: Review and future perspectives. *Clinical*
839 *Neurophysiology.* 2020;131(11):2600-2616. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2020.08.001
- 840 86. Plummer C, Vogrin SJ, Woods WP, Murphy MA, Cook MJ, Liley DTJ. Interictal and
841 ictal source localization for epilepsy surgery using high-density EEG with MEG: A
842 prospective long-term study. *Brain.* 2019;142(4):932-951. doi:10.1093/brain/awz015
- 843 87. Wendling F, Bartolomei F, Mina F, Huneau C, Benquet P. Interictal spikes, fast ripples
844 and seizures in partial epilepsies - combining multi-level computational models with
845 experimental data. *European Journal of Neuroscience.* 2012;36(2):2164-2177.
846 doi:10.1111/j.1460-9568.2012.08039.x
- 847 88. Gentiletti D, de Curtis M, Gnatkovsky V, Suffczynski P. Focal seizures are organized
848 by feedback between neural activity and ion concentration changes. *Elife.* 2022;11.
849 doi:10.7554/eLife.68541

- 850 89. Terrone G, Pauletti A, Pascente R, Vezzani A. Preventing epileptogenesis: A realistic
851 goal? *Pharmacol Res.* 2016;110:96-100. doi:10.1016/j.phrs.2016.05.009
- 852 90. Piper RJ, Richardson RM, Worrell G, et al. Towards network-guided neuromodulation
853 for epilepsy. *Brain.* 2022;145(10):3347-3362. doi:10.1093/brain/awac234
- 854 91. Karoly PJ, Cook MJ, Maturana M, et al. Forecasting cycles of seizure likelihood.
855 *Epilepsia.* 2020;61(4):776-786. doi:10.1111/epi.16485
- 856 92. González Otárula KA, Mikhaeil-Demo Y, Bachman EM, Balaguera P, Schuele S.
857 Automated seizure detection accuracy for ambulatory EEG recordings. *Neurology.*
858 2019;92(14):e1540-e1546. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000007237
- 859
- 860
- 861
- 862
- 863