

Baseline resting EEG measures differentiate rTMS treatment responders and non-responders

Pakin Kaewpijit¹, Paul B Fitzgerald^{2,3}, Kate Hoy⁴, Neil W Bailey^{2,3}

1. Bangkok Hospital, Bang Kapi, Bangkok, Thailand.
2. Monarch Research Institute, Monarch Mental Health Group, Sydney, NSW, Australia.
3. School of Medicine and Psychology, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia.
4. The Bionics Institute of Australia, East Melbourne, VIC Australia.

*Corresponding author: P Kaewpijit, pakin.kaewpijit@gmail.com, [2 Bangkok Hospital, Bang Kapi, Bangkok, Thailand, 10310.].

Funding Information

PBF is supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia Investigator grant (1193596). This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest

In the last 3 years PBF has received equipment for research from Neurosoft, Nexstim and Brainsway Ltd. He has served on scientific advisory boards for Magstim and LivaNova and received speaker fees from Otsuka. He has also acted as a founder and board member for TMS Clinics Australia and Resonance Therapeutics. KEH is a founder of Resonance Therapeutics. The other authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Background: Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) has been increasingly used worldwide in the treatment of depression, however, we currently lack the means to reliably predict whether patients will respond to the treatment. Recent research suggests that the neurophysiological measures of beta power and correlation dimension may have predictive potential, however, studies of beta power and correlation dimension to differentiate rTMS group response in individuals with major depression are limited.

Methods: Fifty treatment-resistant patients with major depressive disorder were recruited. Forty-two participants underwent baseline resting EEG sessions and 5-8 weeks of rTMS treatments and 12 participants were responders to the treatment. Beta power and correlation dimension from baseline resting EEG were compared between responders and non-responders.

Results: Responders demonstrated significantly lower beta power in baseline resting EEG, however, correlation dimension did not show a significant difference between groups.

Limitations: There were a small number of responders in this study.

Conclusion: Baseline resting beta power may help to differentiate responders from non-responders to rTMS treatment. However, further studies are needed with larger sample sizes.

Abbreviations: rTMS, repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation; fMRI, functional magnetic resonance imaging; sgACC, subgenual anterior cingulate cortex; DLPFC, dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; BL, baseline; EEG, electroencephalography; MDD, major depressive disorder; HAM-D, Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression; BDI-II, Beck depression inventory; MADRS, Montgomery Asberg Depression Rating Scale; RMS, root mean square; TANOVA, topographical analysis of variance

Introduction

Major depressive disorder (MDD) is a common psychiatric illness. Approximately 30% of patients with MDD do not respond to standard medication and psychological therapies¹. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) is an increasingly available and effective treatment but not all participants respond, with studies reporting a wide range of response and remission rates, 29-58% and 6-37%, respectively²⁻⁴. Due to the high cost and time-consuming nature of the standard rTMS protocol, an effective treatment-response predictor would help physicians make a more well-informed decision about whether to recommend rTMS treatment.

Many studies have attempted to find demographic and clinical variables that provide accurate prediction of treatment response, but to date, no studies have found a consistently (replicable) strong relationship to differentiate responders from non-responders⁵. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and electroencephalography (EEG) have been widely used for studying the pathophysiology and neural circuitry of depression and for testing potential treatment-response predictors. One fMRI study has shown that one of four subgroups categorised by pre-treatment functional connectivity had a greater response to rTMS treatment provided to the dorsomedial prefrontal area⁶. Unfortunately, flaws have been suggested in their statistical testing method, and a recent non-replication of their results has been reported⁷. Research has also indicated that stimulating a DLPFC target that is functionally negatively correlated with subgenual anterior cingulate cortex (sgACC) is the most effective target for depression symptoms reduction⁸. Moreover, a greater clinical response was associated with higher baseline sgACC metabolism and decreased sgACC metabolism after treatment⁹. These results are promising for the prediction of response to rTMS for depression, however, due to its cost, fMRI is not extensively available, especially in the clinical setting.

EEG is another measure that can potentially be used to predict treatment response. For the prediction of response to treatment for MDD, many types of EEG measures have been examined, including resting EEG, sleep EEG, event-related potentials (ERPs) and transcranial magnetic stimulation-evoked EEG (TMS-EEG)¹⁰⁻¹². Some EEG measures have been investigated both to help diagnose MDD and predict treatment response from both pharmacological treatment and other therapeutic interventions¹³. There have been resting EEG measures examined such as peak alpha frequency proximity to the stimulation frequency, the bispectrum of all frequency bands, and also nonlinear features (i.e., correlation dimension (CD), Lempel-Ziv complexity and Katz fractal dimension (KFD)) which have shown predictive potential^{14,15}. The relationship between peak alpha frequency proximity to the stimulation frequency and treatment response has been shown to predict response to rTMS treatment for depression¹⁵, a finding that has been replicated in an independent dataset, suggesting that it might reflect a generalisable predictor¹⁶. If other potential predictors can be demonstrated to replicate, a combination of these generalisable predictors might provide accurate and clinically applicable treatment response predictions. This provides strong justification for replication studies of potential treatment response predictors.

Beta oscillations are high-frequency brain activity ranged from 13-30 Hz. They can be seen in an awake state, especially when subjects are anxious, stressed or highly arousal. In the frontocentral regions, beta oscillations usually have maximal amplitude^{17,18}. Higher beta activity has also been found in patients with a recurrent depression¹⁹. Another measure that was also shown to provide predictive accuracy is the correlation dimension of the EEG, which is a way to measure the dimensionality of the data, which represents the trajectory of dynamical system. When the correlation dimension is low, there is low complexity in the system^{20,21}. In EEG analysis, the correlation dimension was first used to study human brain activity while sleeping²². It was found that there was less dimensionality in deeper sleep stages. The correlation dimension has also been used to differentiate people with and without depression with high accuracy compared to other non-linear features (i.e., detrended fluctuation analysis, Higuchi fractal and Lyapunov exponent)²³. Interestingly, two recent studies using machine learning techniques found that beta power and correlation dimension

accurately predicted clinical response to rTMS^{14,24}, holding promise for potential clinical application. However, robust determination of an effect that might be used clinically requires replication in independent datasets. As such, it is important to test if the effect replicates in other datasets. As such, we aimed to conduct an exploratory analysis of potential beta power and correlation dimension differences between responders and non-responders in an independent dataset, in order to confirm the findings of previous research. The objective of this study was to examine whether beta power and correlation dimension can differentiate responders to rTMS treatment from non-responders.

Methods

Participants

Participants included in the current study were identical to those reported in our previous research on resting EEG predictors of response to rTMS treatment for depression²⁵, which was part of a larger treatment study to assess the effect of switching rTMS treatment approach in the event of non-response²⁶. Here we report on data only from the MDD participants and only from the baseline EEG. We recruited 50 major depressive disorder participants. Participants were aged between 20 and 72 years. Inclusion criteria for the MDD group were a DSM-IV diagnosis of major depressive episode using the MINI V5.0.0²⁷, aged between 18–75, treatment resistant MDD at stage 2 of the Thase and Rush (1997) classification, a Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) score of >20, and no change to medication in the four weeks prior to screening or for the duration of the trial. As is usual in rTMS trials for treatment resistant depression, a number of participants in the MDD group were medicated²⁶. Exclusion criteria were: presence of an unstable medical condition or neurological disorder; history of seizure; contraindication to rTMS; or current pregnancy or lactating. Participants were also excluded if at sufficient risk of suicide to require immediate electroconvulsive therapy, or had a current DSM-IV diagnosis of substance abuse or dependence disorder, bipolar affective disorder, or schizophrenia spectrum disorders. Ethical approval was granted by the Alfred Hospital and Monash University's ethics committees, and all participants gave written informed consent.

Relevant to the current analyses, all participants had a baseline EEG session which was conducted prior to their first treatment session. Eight MDD participants were excluded from analysis because they withdrew from the study before the end of the first week of rTMS treatment. For the purposes of the current analyses of the remaining 42 MDD participants, we defined 12 as responders using a criteria of by >50% reduction in the 17-item Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (HAM-D), as per our previous research on measures that differentiated responders and non-responders in this dataset^{28,29}.

Procedure

The demographic and depression severity data were collected at baseline interview. We used the 17-item Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (HAM-D)²⁸, the Montgomery-Asberg depression rating scale (MADRS)³⁰ and the Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI-II)³¹ for assessing depression severity. MDD participants underwent unilateral left 10 Hz rTMS treatment for three weeks (five days per week). Responders at the end of the third week continued to receive an additional two weeks of titrated rTMS treatment (three sessions in week four and two sessions in week five). Non-responders at three weeks (defined as less than a 25% reduction in their MADRS scores at this three week timepoint) were randomised to either continue for the next three weeks with unilateral left 10 Hz rTMS treatment, switch to unilateral right 1 Hz rTMS, or switch to sequential bilateral rTMS consisting of right 1 Hz rTMS followed by left 10 Hz rTMS treatment. Individuals who had not responded by week three, but responded by week six were continued on an additional 2 weeks of titrated rTMS treatment using the treatment approach they had been switched to (three sessions in week seven and two sessions in week eight). All rTMS treatments were given at 110% of resting motor threshold. Left sided treatment consisted of 40 trains of 5 s durations with a 25 s inter-train

interval. Right sided rTMS consisted of 1 train of 1200 pulses. Bilateral rTMS combined these protocols but with only 900 right sided pulses. Treatments were given to the F3 and F4 electrode locations. MADRS and BDI-II measures were repeated at the end of week one and week three. The MADRS, BDI-II, and HAM-D were measured at week six, and at week eight for individuals who had not responded by week three, but had responded by week six.

EEG recordings and pre-processing were identical to Bailey et al. (2019)²⁵. All participants provided 63 or more noise free epochs of two seconds in length, which were available for analysis from eyes open and eyes closed resting recordings, providing enough trials for reliable analysis. Data were re-referenced to an averaged reference offline.

Beta Power analysis

EEG signal from each accepted epoch for each participant were submitted to a multitaper fast Fourier frequency transformation with a Hanning taper in order to calculate power in the beta band (12–30 Hz). Average power was calculated across the entire epoch within each frequency band, and then averaged across all trials from eyes open and eyes closed conditions together, resulting in a single value for each participant at each electrode. Statistical comparisons were made between groups and time points using these participant averages.

Correlation dimension analysis

Correlation dimension is a nonlinear measure that can be applied to EEG data to measure the complexity of EEG signals³². Average correlation dimension was calculated for each electrode for each epoch, then averaged across epochs resulting in a single value for each participant from each electrode in the eyes closed condition. Statistical comparison was made between groups using these participant averages.

Primary Comparisons

Primary statistical comparisons between groups in beta power EEG data were performed using RAGU³³. RAGU uses reference free root mean square (RMS) measures and randomisation statistics to compare neural response strength and scalp field differences across all electrodes without a priori assumptions about locations that show significant effects. RAGU controls for multiple comparisons in the spatial dimension by collapsing differences to a single scalp difference map value for comparisons of the distribution of activity across the scalp, and using the single RMS value from each participant for global neural activity strength comparisons. Further details about RAGU can be found in Koenig, Kottlow³³. Differences between groups in overall neural activity strength within the beta frequencies (across all electrodes) were compared using the RMS test. Differences between groups in the distribution of activity across the scalp were compared independently of amplitude using the topographical analysis of variance (TANOVA) after the recommended L2 normalization (which normalizes for global neural activity strength by converting data from each participant to the same RMS value). RMS and TANOVA tests were used to conduct repeated measure ANOVA design comparisons comparing beta power values averaged across all beta frequencies between responders and non-responders and within eyes open and eyes closed conditions. Because EEG measure can be affected by age³⁴, independent t-tests was used to compare mean age between responder and non-responder groups.

The primary comparison between groups for correlation dimension was a repeated measures ANOVA design, with 2 groups x 28 electrodes conducted in SPSS 26. Only the main effect of group or interaction between group and electrode was of interest.

Results

There were no significant differences in the ages of the responder and non-responder groups $t(40) = 0.4934$, $p = 0.6244$.

Beta power

A significant group difference was present in the RMS test for averaged beta power ($p = 0.026$, $\eta^2 = 0.114$) such that responders to rTMS displayed lower BL beta power compared to non-responders. No interaction between group and eyes open/closed was present ($p = 0.213$, $\eta^2 = 0.045$). No significant group difference was present in the TANOVA test for averaged beta power ($p = 0.624$, $\eta^2 = 0.019$), nor was there a significant interaction between group and eyes open/closed ($p = 0.903$, $\eta^2 = 0.012$), suggesting that no significant difference was present in the topographical distribution of beta activity between two groups.




Fig. 1. Mean root mean square value of beta power from responder and non-responder group. A significant difference was detected between responders and non-responders. Error bars reflect 95% confidence interval.

Correlation dimension

There was no significant group difference in eyes-closed correlation dimension ($F(1,40) = 0.570$, $p = 0.455$, $\eta^2 = 0.014$). Nor was there an interaction between group and electrode ($F(1,40) = 1.303$, $p = 0.138$, $\eta^2 = 0.032$).




Fig. 2. Mean correlation dimension values from responder and non-responder groups. No significant difference was detected. Error bars reflect 95% confidence interval.

Discussion

Our study aimed to examine whether previously reported baseline beta power and correlation dimension measures are generalizable at differentiating rTMS treatment responders and non-responders. Our results indicated that responders to rTMS treatment had significantly less beta power than non-responders in baseline resting EEG recordings in both eyes-open and eyes-closed combined conditions. The result was similar to those reported by Hasanzadeh et al., which they reported high predictive accuracy of 91.3% for beta power¹⁴, and Ebrahimzadeh et al.²⁴, who also reported that beta power predicted response to rTMS treatment for depression. However, our result extends their results by demonstrating that the differences in beta power are present in both the resting eyes-closed condition and the eyes open resting state (in contrast to the previous research which only examined the eyes closed state)¹⁴. There were differences in our rTMS treatment protocol compared to that tested by Hasanzadeh et al., but a similar number of rTMS sessions and similar treatment sites were applied. As such, our results indicate that beta power differentiates responders and non-responders to rTMS treatment for depression, indicating the finding replicates across multiple independent datasets, suggesting it may be a reliable and generalizable measure for differentiating responders and non-responders. This justifies further research using this measure, ideally using a prospective prediction study where participants are allocated to rTMS or another treatment based on their predicted responses. Interestingly, previous research has also indicated that both absolute and relative beta power are negatively associated with HAM-D score reduction in 6 weeks in pharmacological treatment (i.e., paroxetine)³⁵. Similarly, another study demonstrated that higher beta power at the baseline resting EEG was correlated with more severe depressive symptoms after 4 week of

antidepressant treatment³⁶. Therefore it is possible that beta power may be not only useful to differentiate responders and non-responders to rTMS treatment, but also to antidepressant medications.

In contrast to our findings for beta power, our results showed no differences in correlation dimension between groups. This lack of replication of the research by Hasanzadeh et al., which they reported high predictive accuracy of 87% for correlation dimension¹⁴, could be explained by differences in concurrent medications, different complexity measures and participants' age. However, if these differences explained the null result for the correlation dimension, it is not clear why the same would not be true for the beta finding. As such, it may be that the correlation dimension finding reported by Hasanzadeh et al., reflects a spurious finding. Alternatively, differences in study parameters, for example the EEG recording or pre-processing settings could also conceivably have affected our result, and it is possible these explain the difference between our studies. For example, there is evidence that correlation dimension increases with age in the healthy population because of the development and modification of neural cells and learning processes throughout lifespan³⁷, so potential differences in the ages of participants between in our study and that have Hasanzadeh could be a potential explanation for the conflict in our results. Nevertheless, research in correlation dimension in depressive population is limited³⁸ and needs further investigation.

Limitations

There are some limitations in this study. Firstly, the sample size was not large and the number of responders was only 12 participants. This may offer a potential explanation for our non-significant correlation dimension result. Moreover, a small sample size and only a few measures in this study limited our capacity to conduct a valid machine learning analysis in direct replication of Hasanzadeh to determine prediction accuracy. Secondly, participants were taking many medications which affect EEG³⁹, although we note that this factor is difficult to control for when conducting research in real clinical settings. Lastly, the rTMS protocol applied in this study was different to the FDA-approved rTMS protocol, as participants that showed signs of non-response at 3 weeks were re-randomised to either receive continued high-frequency left hemisphere rTMS treatment, or low-frequency right hemisphere rTMS treatment, or bilateral rTMS treatment. The difference of rTMS protocol and treatment stimulating sites across studies may affect EEG measures to an unknown degree so caution should be considered in interpreting our results.

Conclusions

Global beta power differentiated responders to rTMS treatment for depression from non-responders from baseline EEG data, in replication of two previous studies. Correlation dimension was not significantly different between two groups. Further studies are needed with larger sample size, standard rTMS protocol applied and the consideration of EEG recording type and concurrent medications to determine if these results might be considered in a prospective prediction study and also in clinical application.

References

1. Fava M, Davidson KG. Definition and epidemiology of treatment-resistant depression. *Psychiatr Clin North Am* 1996;19(2):179-200.
2. Berlim MT, van den Eynde F, Tovar-Perdomo S, Daskalakis ZJ. Response, remission and drop-out rates following high-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) for

- treating major depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized, double-blind and sham-controlled trials. *Psychol Med* 2014;44(2):225-39.
3. Carpenter LL, Janicak PG, Aaronson ST, Boyadjis T, Brock DG, Cook IA, et al. Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) for major depression: a multisite, naturalistic, observational study of acute treatment outcomes in clinical practice. *Depress Anxiety* 2012;29(7):587-96.
 4. Taylor SF, Bhati MT, Dubin MJ, Hawkins JM, Lisanby SH, Morales O, et al. A naturalistic, multi-site study of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation therapy for depression. *J Affect Disord* 2017;208:284-90.
 5. Fitzgerald PB, Hoy KE, Anderson RJ, Daskalakis ZJ. A STUDY OF THE PATTERN OF RESPONSE TO rTMS TREATMENT IN DEPRESSION. *Depress Anxiety* 2016;33(8):746-53.
 6. Drysdale AT, Grosenick L, Downar J, Dunlop K, Mansouri F, Meng Y, et al. Resting-state connectivity biomarkers define neurophysiological subtypes of depression. *Nat Med* 2017;23(1):28-38.
 7. Dinga R, Schmaal L, Penninx B, van Tol MJ, Veltman DJ, van Velzen L, et al. Evaluating the evidence for biotypes of depression: Methodological replication and extension of. *Neuroimage Clin* 2019;22:101796.
 8. Fox MD, Buckner RL, White MP, Greicius MD, Pascual-Leone A. Efficacy of transcranial magnetic stimulation targets for depression is related to intrinsic functional connectivity with the subgenual cingulate. *Biol Psychiatry* 2012;72(7):595-603.
 9. Baeken C, Marinazzo D, Everaert H, Wu GR, Van Hove C, Audenaert K, et al. The Impact of Accelerated HF-rTMS on the Subgenual Anterior Cingulate Cortex in Refractory Unipolar Major Depression: Insights From 18FDG PET Brain Imaging. *Brain Stimul* 2015;8(4):808-15.
 10. Steiger A, Pawlowski M. Depression and Sleep. *Int J Mol Sci* 2019;20(3).
 11. Wade EC, Iosifescu DV. Using Electroencephalography for Treatment Guidance in Major Depressive Disorder. *Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging* 2016;1(5):411-22.
 12. Strafella R, Chen R, Rajji TK, Blumberger DM, Voineskos D. Resting and TMS-EEG markers of treatment response in major depressive disorder: A systematic review. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2022;16:940759.
 13. Olbrich S, van Dinteren R, Arns M. Personalized Medicine: Review and Perspectives of Promising Baseline EEG Biomarkers in Major Depressive Disorder and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Neuropsychobiology* 2015;72(3-4):229-40.
 14. Hasanzadeh F, Mohebbi M, Rostami R. Prediction of rTMS treatment response in major depressive disorder using machine learning techniques and nonlinear features of EEG signal. *J Affect Disord* 2019;256:132-42.
 15. Corlier J, Carpenter LL, Wilson AC, Tirrell E, Gobin AP, Kavanaugh B, et al. The relationship between individual alpha peak frequency and clinical outcome with repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (rTMS) treatment of Major Depressive Disorder (MDD). *Brain Stimul* 2019;12(6):1572-8.
 16. Roelofs CL, Krepel N, Corlier J, Carpenter LL, Fitzgerald PB, Daskalakis ZJ, et al. Individual alpha frequency proximity associated with repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation outcome: An independent replication study from the ICON-DB consortium. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2021;132(2):643-9.
 17. Marcuse LV, Fields MC, Yoo J. Rowan's Primer of EEG (Second Edition). 2 ed: Elsevier; 2016.
 18. Abhang PA, Gawali BW, Mehrotra SC. Introduction to EEG- and Speech-Based Emotion Recognition. Academic Press; 2016.
 19. Matousek M. EEG patterns in various subgroups of endogenous depression. *Int J Psychophysiol* 1991;10(3):239-43.
 20. Cai H, Chen Y, Han J, Zhang X, Hu B. Study on Feature Selection Methods for Depression Detection Using Three-Electrode EEG Data. *Interdiscip Sci* 2018;10(3):558-65.
 21. Stam CJ. Nonlinear dynamical analysis of EEG and MEG: review of an emerging field. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2005;116(10):2266-301.

22. Babloyantz AS, J. M.; Nicolis, C. Evidence of chaotic dynamics of brain activity during the sleep cycle. *Phys Lett A* 1985;111(3):152-6.
23. Hosseinifard B, Moradi MH, Rostami R. Classifying depression patients and normal subjects using machine learning techniques and nonlinear features from EEG signal. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed* 2013;109(3):339-45.
24. Ebrahimzadeh E, Fayaz F, Rajabion L, Seraji M, Aflaki F, Hammoud A, et al. Machine learning approaches and non-linear processing of extracted components in frontal region to predict rTMS treatment response in major depressive disorder. *Front Syst Neurosci* 2023;17:919977.
25. Bailey NW, Hoy KE, Rogasch NC, Thomson RH, McQueen S, Elliot D, et al. Differentiating responders and non-responders to rTMS treatment for depression after one week using resting EEG connectivity measures. *J Affect Disord* 2019;242:68-79.
26. Fitzgerald PB, Hoy KE, Elliot D, McQueen S, Wambeek LE, Daskalakis ZJ. Exploring alternative rTMS strategies in non-responders to standard high frequency left-sided treatment: A switching study. *J Affect Disord* 2018;232:79-82.
27. Sheehan DV, Lecrubier Y, Sheehan KH, Amorim P, Janavs J, Weiller E, et al. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (M.I.N.I.): the development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10. *J Clin Psychiatry* 1998;59 Suppl 20:22-33;quiz 4-57.
28. Williams JB. A structured interview guide for the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1988;45(8):742-7.
29. Bailey NW, Hoy KE, Rogasch NC, Thomson RH, McQueen S, Elliot D, et al. Responders to rTMS for depression show increased fronto-midline theta and theta connectivity compared to non-responders. *Brain Stimul* 2018;11(1):190-203.
30. Montgomery SA, Asberg M. A new depression scale designed to be sensitive to change. *Br J Psychiatry* 1979;134:382-9.
31. Beck AT, Steer RA, Brown GK. Manual for the beck depression inventory-II. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation; 1996.
32. Baker GL, Gollub JP. Chaotic dynamics : an introduction. 2nd ed. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press; 1996.
33. Koenig T, Kottlow M, Stein M, Melie-Garcia L. Ragu: a free tool for the analysis of EEG and MEG event-related scalp field data using global randomization statistics. *Comput Intell Neurosci* 2011;2011:938925.
34. Jabes A, Klencklen G, Ruggeri P, Antonietti JP, Banta Lavenex P, Lavenex P. Age-Related Differences in Resting-State EEG and Allocentric Spatial Working Memory Performance. *Front Aging Neurosci* 2021;13:704362.
35. Knott V, Mahoney C, Kennedy S, Evans K. Pre-treatment EEG and it's relationship to depression severity and paroxetine treatment outcome. *Pharmacopsychiatry* 2000;33(6):201-5.
36. Iznak AF, Tiganov AS, Iznak EV, Sorokin SA. EEG-correlates and possible predictors of efficacy of treatment of endogenous depression. *Fiziol Cheloveka* 2013;39(4):49-57.
37. Anokhin AP, Birbaumer N, Lutzenberger W, Nikolaev A, Vogel F. Age increases brain complexity. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol* 1996;99(1):63-8.
38. Yang AC, Tsai SJ. Is mental illness complex? From behavior to brain. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry* 2013;45:253-7.
39. Aiyer R, Novakovic V, Barkin RL. A systematic review on the impact of psychotropic drugs on electroencephalogram waveforms in psychiatry. *Postgrad Med* 2016;128(7):656-64.