

# Alterations in Resting-State Functional Connectivity and Dynamics in Schizophrenia as a Result of Global not Local Processes

Christoph Metzner<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>, Cristiana Dimulescu<sup>1,4</sup>, Fabian Kamp<sup>1,5,6</sup>, Sophie Fromm<sup>1,7</sup>, Peter J Uhlhaas<sup>2,8</sup> and Klaus Obermayer<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Neural Information Processing Group, Institute of Software Engineering and Theoretical Computer Science, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany

<sup>3</sup>School of Physics, Engineering and Computer Science, University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, United Kingdom

<sup>4</sup>Bernstein Center for Computational Neuroscience Berlin, Berlin, Germany

<sup>5</sup>Max Planck School of Cognition, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Science, Leipzig, Germany

<sup>6</sup>Center for Lifespan Psychology, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany

<sup>7</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany

<sup>8</sup>Institute of Neuroscience and Psychology, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom

Correspondence\*:

Christoph Metzner, Neural Information Processing Group, Institute of Software Engineering and Theoretical Computer Science, Technische Universität Berlin, Marchstrasse 23, 10587 Berlin, Germany  
cmetzner@ni.tu-berlin.de

## 2 ABSTRACT

3 We examined changes in large-scale functional connectivity and temporal dynamics and  
4 their underlying mechanisms in schizophrenia (ScZ) through measurements of resting-state  
5 functional magnetic resonance imaging (rs-fMRI) data and computational modelling. The rs-fMRI  
6 measurements from patients with chronic ScZ (n=38) and matched healthy controls (n=43), were  
7 obtained through the public schizConnect repository. Computational models were constructed  
8 based on diffusion-weighted MRI scans and fit to the experimental rs-fMRI data. We found  
9 decreased large-scale functional connectivity across sensory and association areas and for  
10 all functional subnetworks for the ScZ group. Additionally global synchrony was reduced in  
11 patients while metastability was unaltered. Perturbations of the computational model revealed  
12 that decreased global coupling and increased background noise levels both explained the  
13 experimentally found deficits better than local changes to the GABAergic or glutamatergic system.

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

14 The current study suggests that large-scale alterations in ScZ are more likely the result of global  
15 rather than local network changes.

16 **Keywords:** schizophrenia, resting-state fMRI, computational model, large-scale networks, functional connectivity, temporal dynamics

## 1 INTRODUCTION

17 ScZ is a severe mental disorder with a high burden of disease (Lopez and Murray (1998); Charlson et al.  
18 (2018)). However, the underlying mechanisms remain elusive. While no single brain area accounting for  
19 the heterogeneous symptom profiles has been identified, the notion that ScZ can be understood in terms  
20 of a general dysconnectivity has emerged (Friston et al. (1995); Friston (1999); Bullmore et al. (1997);  
21 Pettersson-Yeo et al. (2011)).

22 Experimental evidence for the dysconnection hypothesis comes from neuroimaging studies. Analyses of  
23 resting-state fMRI connectivity have shown widespread changes of functional connectivity. However, there  
24 is still a debate whether correlations of neural activity between regions are decreased (Liang et al. (2006);  
25 Bluhm et al. (2007)) or increased in ScZ (Zhou et al. (2007)). There is also growing evidence for possible  
26 longitudinal changes of functional connectivity over the course of the disorder. Anticevic et al. (2015)  
27 demonstrated that prefrontal cortical connectivity is increased in early-course ScZ while the opposite  
28 pattern was observed in chronic ScZ patients. Going beyond pairwise correlations between brain regions,  
29 graph theoretic measurements have identified reductions in integration, hierarchy, clustering, efficiency and  
30 small-worldness (Bassett et al. (2008); Liu et al. (2008); Bullmore and Sporns (2009); Lynall et al. (2010)).

31 Yet, the origin of functional dysconnectivity patterns in ScZ is still unclear. One hypothesis is that  
32 cellular and synaptic changes associated with ScZ disrupt local processing and thus impact on large-scale  
33 connectivity. Indeed changes at the microcircuit level have been identified in ScZ. Excitatory and inhibitory  
34 neurotransmission is disturbed, for example a reduced excitatory drive onto GABAergic inhibitory neurons  
35 (Chung et al. (2016, 2022)) and a decreased inhibitory output (Hashimoto et al. (2003); Morris et al. (2008);  
36 Moyer et al. (2012)). Changes to the glutamatergic system, such as increased recurrent excitation, have  
37 been suggested to lead to deficits in large-scale connectivity with a gradient along the cortical hierarchy  
38 (Yang et al. (2016)).

39 Computational models of large-scale brain circuits can be used to investigate dynamical circuit  
40 mechanisms linking local ScZ-associated alterations to global changes in the functional organisation  
41 of the brain. Leveraging such computational models, studies have shown that decreases in global inter-  
42 regional connectivity strengths can lead to wide-spread functional disruptions (Cabral et al. (2013)),  
43 increased global signal variance (Yang et al. (2014)) and altered topological characteristics of functional  
44 brain networks (Cabral et al. (2012b,a)) resembling ScZ. However, except for Yang et al. (2014), these  
45 studies only investigated a global scaling of the inter-regional connectivity. Yang et al. (2014) manipulated  
46 local and global neuronal coupling and demonstrated that both could increase signal variance as seen in  
47 ScZ but did not explore their potentially differential effects on large-scale functional connectivity. Thus, so  
48 far the effect of ScZ-associated local changes to glutamatergic and GABAergic neurotransmission and the  
49 effect of increased background noise on large-scale functional connectivity has not been explored.

50 To address this question, we quantified functional connectivity differences in a data set of healthy controls  
51 and chronic ScZ patients. We then implemented local microcircuit and global network parameter changes  
52 in a computational model of large-scale cortical dynamics and compare the resulting connectivity changes  
53 to the experimental data. Furthermore, we also explored the temporal dynamics of the resting-state brain

54 and characterised potential deficits in large-scale synchrony and metastability in ScZ patients and compared  
55 them to the different computational models, thus identifying mechanistic links underlying these changes.

## 2 MATERIAL AND METHODS

### 56 2.1 Patient Sample

57 The study sample was collected through the Center for Biomedical Research Excellence (COBRE) led by  
58 Dr. Vince Calhoun (more information here: [http://fcon\\_1000.projects.nitrc.org/indi/retro/cobre.html](http://fcon_1000.projects.nitrc.org/indi/retro/cobre.html)) and  
59 obtained from the SchizConnect database (<http://schizconnect.org>). This sample has previously been used  
60 by our group to explore structural deficits in patients with ScZ (Dimulescu et al. (2021)). From the sample  
61 of 43 patients and 43 healthy control participants, we excluded 5 patients due to missing resting-state  
62 functional MRI (rs-fMRI) data or artefacts/excessive motion identified during the pre-processing. We  
63 thus analyzed a final sample of 43 healthy control subjects and 38 patients with schizophrenia, which we  
64 will refer to as the COBRE sample. All patients were receiving antipsychotic medication (see Table 1).  
65 Symptom severity in patients was assessed using the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) (Kay  
66 et al. (1989)). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants, and the study was reviewed  
67 and approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of New Mexico.

### 68 2.2 Anatomical data

69 Data collection for the COBRE sample was performed using a Siemens Magnetom Trio 3T MR scanner.  
70 Structural images (high resolution T1-weighted) were acquired using a five-echo MPRAGE sequence with  
71 the following parameters: repetition time (TR) = 2530 ms; echo time (TE) = 1.64, 3.5, 5.36, 7.22, 9.08 ms;  
72 inversion time (TI) = 1200 ms; flip angle (FA) = 7°; field of view (FOV) = 256 mm × 256 mm; matrix =  
73 256 × 256; slice thickness = 1 mm; 192 sagittal slices. Diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) data were acquired  
74 using a single-shot EPI sequence with TR/TE = 9000/84 ms; FA = 90°; FOV = 256 mm × 256 mm; matrix  
75 = 128 × 128; slice thickness = 2 mm without gap; 72 axial slices; 30 non-collinear diffusion gradients ( $b$   
76 = 800 s/mm<sup>2</sup>) and 5 non-diffusion-weighted images ( $b = 0$  s/mm<sup>2</sup>) equally interspersed between the 30  
77 gradient directions. For more information see also Cetin et al. (2014).

78 For model validation we additionally used a subset of 156 healthy participants from the human  
79 connectome project (HCP), which we will refer to as the HCP sample. The diffusion-weighted data  
80 were collected with multiband diffusion sequence (HCP version available at  
81 <http://www.cmrr.umn.edu/multiband>). Three different gradient tables are used, each with 90 diffusion  
82 weighting directions and six  $b = 0$  acquisitions. More information can be found at  
83 <https://www.humanconnectome.org/study/hcp-young-adult/document/1200-subjects-data-release>.

### 84 2.3 Resting-state functional MRI data

85 COBRE data was acquired using single-shot full k-space echo-planar imaging (EPI) with ramp sampling  
86 correction using the intercommissural line (AC-PC) as a reference (TR: 2 s, TE: 29 ms, matrix size: 64x64,  
87 32 slices, voxel size: 3x3x4 mm<sup>3</sup>). The resting-state scans were acquired in the axial plane with with an  
88 ascending slice order (multi slice method; interleaved). For more information see Aine et al. (2017). For the  
89 COBRE data set, we preprocessed the rsfMRI data using the FSL FEAT toolbox (Woolrich et al. (2001)).  
90 For each data set, we discarded the first five volumes. We corrected head motion using the FSL McFLIRT  
91 algorithm and subsequently high-pass filtered the data with a filter cutoff of 100 s. We linearly registered  
92 each functional image to the corresponding anatomical image of that subject using FLIRT. We then used

93 the mean volume of the data to create a brain mask using BET. Using the ICA FIX FSL toolbox (Griffanti  
94 et al. (2014); Salimi-Khorshidi et al. (2014)), we conducted MELODIC ICA and removed artefactual  
95 components (motion, non-neuronal physiological artefacts, scanner artefacts, and other nuisance sources).  
96 Finally, we transformed the high-resolution mask volumes from MNI to individual subject functional space  
97 and extracted the average BOLD time courses for each cortical region in the AAL2 parcellation scheme  
98 using the `fslmeans` command from `Fslutils`.

99 Acquisition details for the functional MRI data from the HCP S1200 release can be found here:  
100 <https://www.humanconnectome.org/study/hcp-young-adult/document/1200-subjects-data-release>. For the  
101 HCP data set, we used the data preprocessed according to Glasser et al. (2013) and extracted the average  
102 BOLD time courses for each cortical region as described above.

## 103 2.4 Measures of connectivity and temporal dynamics

104 We used the average global brain connectivity (GBC) measure (Cole et al. (2010, 2011)) to assess the  
105 changes in connectivity strength. To assess alterations in temporal dynamics we used synchrony and  
106 metastability (Deco et al. (2017)). Because of the computational model being restricted to cortical areas,  
107 we also restricted our connectivity analysis to cortical areas. However, including subcortical regions did  
108 not substantially change the findings (see Supplementary Material).

109 Specifically, we define the functional connectivity matrix (FC) as the matrix of Pearson correlations of  
110 the BOLD signal between two brain areas over the whole time range of acquisition. From the FC matrices  
111 we calculate the global brain connectivity (GBC) of a single brain region  $i$  as follows (see also Cole et al.  
112 (2010, 2011)):

$$GBC(i) = \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_j FC(i, j) \right),$$

113 where  $n$  is the number of regions. The average global GBC can then be defined as the average GBC over all  
114 cortical regions  $i$ . To calculate the average GBC for a functional subnetwork or generally a set of regions,  
115 one simply averages over the regional GBC values for the respective regions.

116 To assess the temporal dynamics of the functional networks, we used the Kuramoto order parameter as a  
117 measure of synchrony and its standard deviation as a measure of metastability, i.e. the variability of the  
118 states of phase configurations over time (see for example Deco et al. (2017)). Here the Kuramoto order  
119 parameter  $R(t)$  is defined as

$$R(t) = \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n e^{i\phi_k(t)} \right|,$$

120 where again  $n$  is the number of regions and  $\phi_k(t)$  is the instantaneous phase of the BOLD signal in region  
121  $k$ . It measures the global level of synchronization of the BOLD signals from all regions, where a low level  
122 close to 0 reflects an almost uniform distribution of the signal phases, and a high value close to 1 reflects  
123 near equality of the signal phases. To calculate  $R$ , we band-pass filtered the signal in the narrowband  
124 0.04-0.07 Hz (see Deco et al. (2017)) and then extracted the instantaneous phases of the signals at every  
125 time step using the Hilbert transform.

## 126 2.5 Computational network model

127 We use a whole-brain network model, where the connectivity, connection strength and delay between  
128 network nodes (i.e. brain regions) is derived from brain imaging data. As a model of single-node activity  
129 dynamics we employ a mean-field description of a spiking neural network of an excitatory and an inhibitory  
130 neural population, where the individual neurons are described by the adaptive exponential integrate-and-fire  
131 model (AdEx model; Brette and Gerstner (2005)), developed in our group (Augustin et al. (2017); Cakan  
132 and Obermayer (2020)). The following section describes the model in detail.

### 133 2.5.1 Single-Node model

134 A mean-field neural mass model based on a spiking network of coupled excitatory and inhibitory  
135 populations, the so-called ALN model (Augustin et al. (2017)), was implemented. The mean-field  
136 description offers a drastic speed-up of simulations on the order of about 4 orders of magnitude compared  
137 to the spiking model while still retaining its dynamical states and its biophysical parameters. The model  
138 has been extensively validated against simulations with the detailed spiking network and overall shows  
139 very good agreement (Cakan and Obermayer (2020)).

140 The mean-field reduction of the spiking neural network utilises the Fokker-Planck approach, i.e. the fact  
141 that in the limit of an infinite network size and under the assumption of a sparse, random connectivity,  
142 the distribution  $p(V)$  of the membrane potentials and the mean firing rate  $r_a$  of a population  $a$ , can be  
143 described by a Fokker-Planck equation (Brunel (2000)). However, to calculate the potential distribution a  
144 partial differential equation has to be solved, which is computationally costly. Therefore, the dynamics of  
145 a population is captured by a low-dimensional linear-nonlinear cascade model, and can be described by  
146 a set of ordinary differential equations (Fourcaud-Trocmé et al. (2003); Ostojic and Brunel (2011)). The  
147 mathematical derivation and the underlying assumptions have been detailed in (Augustin et al. (2017)), and  
148 we will only provide the final set of model equations in this manuscript.

149 A single network node in the whole-brain model is represented by the population activity of two  
150 interconnected neural populations, an excitatory population  $E$  and an inhibitory population  $I$ . The dynamics  
151 of the membrane currents of a population  $a \in \{E, I\}$ , are governed by the following equations:

$$152 \tau_a \frac{d\mu_a}{dt} = \mu_a^{syn}(t) + \mu_a^{ext}(t) + \mu_a^{ou}(t) - \mu_a(t) \quad (1)$$

$$153 \mu_a^{syn} = J_{aE} \bar{s}_{aE}(t) + J_{aI} \bar{s}_{aI}(t) \quad (2)$$

$$\sigma_a^2(t) = \sum_{b \in \{E, I\}} \frac{2J_{ab}^2 \sigma_{s,ab}^2(t) \tau_{s,b} \tau_m}{(1 + r_{ab}(t)) \tau_m + \tau_{s,b}} + \sigma_{ext,a}^2 \quad (3)$$

154 In the above equations  $\mu_a$  describes the total mean membrane currents,  $\mu_a^{syn}$  the currents from synaptic  
155 activity,  $\mu_a^{ext}$  the currents from any sources of external input,  $\mu_a^{ou}$  the external noise input,  $\tau_m$  the membrane  
156 time constant (calculated from the membrane capacitance  $C$  and the leak conductance  $g_L$ ), and  $\tau_{s,b}$  the  
157 synaptic time constant. Furthermore,  $\sigma_a^2$  is the variance of the membrane currents, and  $J_{ab}$  represent the  
158 maximum synaptic current when all synapses from population  $b$  to population  $a$  are active. The dynamics  
159 of the synapses are described by

$$\frac{d\bar{s}_{ab}}{dt} = \tau_{s,b}^{-1} ((1 - \bar{s}_{ab}(t)) r_{ab}(t) - \bar{s}_{ab}(t)) \quad (4)$$



$$\frac{d\sigma_{s_{ab}}^2}{dt} = \tau_{s,b}^{-2}(1 - \bar{s}_{ab}(t))^2 \rho_{ab}(t) + (\rho_{ab}(t) + 2\tau_{s,b}(r_{ab}(t) + 1)\sigma_{s_{ab}}^2(t)) \quad (5)$$

160 where  $\bar{s}_{ab}$  represents the mean of the fraction of all active synapses, which lies in the range  $[0, 1]$ , with the  
161 extreme cases being no active synapses and no inactive synapses, respectively. Furthermore,  $\sigma_{s_{ab}}^2$  is the  
162 variance of  $s_{ab}$ .

163 The timescale  $\tau_a = \Phi_T(\mu_a, \sigma_a)$  of the input-dependent adaptation, the average membrane potential  
164  $\bar{V}_E = \Phi_E(\mu_E, \sigma_E)$ , and the instantaneous population spike rate  $r_a = \Phi_r(\mu_a, \sigma_a)$  are computed every time  
165 step by means of precomputed transfer functions. The mean  $r_{ab}$  and the variance  $\rho_{ab}$  of the effective input  
166 rate from population b to population a can be described by

$$r_{ab} = \frac{c_{ab}}{J_{ab}} \tau_{s,b} (K_b \cdot r_b(t - d_{ab}) + \delta_{abE} \cdot K_{gl} \sum_{j=0}^N C_{ij}(r_b - D_{ij})) \quad (6)$$

167 and

$$\rho_{ab} = \frac{c_{ab}^2}{J_{ab}^2} \tau_{s,b}^2 (K_b \cdot r_b(t - d_{ab}) + \delta_{abE} \cdot K_{gl} \sum_{j=0}^N C_{ij}^2(r_b - D_{ij})) \quad (7)$$

168 given a certain delay for the spike transmission  $d_{ab}$ . Here  $c_{ab}$  represent the amplitude of the post-synaptic  
169 current resulting from one individual spike (for  $s_{ab} = 0$ ). Furthermore,  $K_{gl}$  scales the global coupling in  
170 the network, and  $C_{ij}$  and  $D_{ij}$  define the connection strengths and the connection delays between regions,  
171 estimated from the fibre count and fibre length matrices, respectively. Finally,  $\delta_{abE} = 1$  for  $a = b = E$  and  
172 0 otherwise restricting coupling between regions to be exclusively from excitatory to excitatory populations.

173 The adaptive exponential integrate-and-fire model explicitly accounts for the evolution of a slow  
174 adaptation currents that represents both subthreshold and spike-triggered adaptation currents. The  
175 subthreshold adaptation current is described by the adaptation conductance  $\alpha$  and the spike-triggered  
176 adaptation current is denoted by  $\beta$ . In the limit of infinite population sizes, an adiabatic approximation can  
177 be employed to describe the mean adaptation current in terms of the mean population firing rate. The mean  
178 adaptation current  $\bar{I}_A$  can be understood as an inhibitory membrane current whose dynamics are governed  
179 by

$$\frac{d\bar{I}_A}{dt} = \tau_A^{-1}(\alpha(\bar{V}_E(t) - E_A) - \bar{I}_A) - \beta r_E(t). \quad (8)$$

180 The individual populations  $a$  of a single region of the whole-brain network receive an external input  
181 current with a given mean  $\mu_a^{ext}(t)$  and a standard deviation  $\sigma_a^{ext}(t)$ . This background input current can be  
182 thought to represent baseline input from extracortical areas in the brain. Additionally, the regions also  
183 receive a noise input current  $\mu_a^{ou}(t)$  modelled as an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with a mean of 0 described  
184 by

$$\frac{d\mu_a^{ou}}{dt} = -\frac{\mu_a^{ou}}{\tau_{ou}} + \sigma_{ou}\xi(t). \quad (9)$$

185 Here  $\xi(t)$  is a white noise process drawn from a normal distribution with a mean of 0 and a variance of 1.  
186  $\sigma_{ou}$  determines the fluctuation amplitude of the noise around its mean.

187 To determine the mean external input to the E ( $\mu_{Eext}$ ) and I ( $\mu_{Iext}$ ) populations, the noise strength  $\sigma_{ou}$ ,  
188 the subthreshold adaptation conductance  $\alpha$  and spike-triggered adaptation increment  $\beta$  parameters for the

189 model in the control condition, we used an evolutionary optimization procedure as described in Cakan et al.  
190 (2022). We compared the simulated BOLD FC to the empirical rsfMRI data. We initialized the algorithm  
191 with a random population of  $N_{init} = 160$  individuals and repeated the evolutionary block with  $N_{pop} = 80$   
192 individuals for 100 generations. Initial parameter values were selected from a uniform distribution across  
193 the following intervals for the model parameters:  $\mu_{Ext} \in [0.0, 4.0] \text{ mV/ms}$ ,  $\mu_{Int} \in [0.0, 4.0] \text{ mV/ms}$ ,  
194  $\sigma_{ou} \in [0.0, 0.3]$ ,  $a \in [0.0, 40.0] \text{ nS}$ , and  $b \in [0.0, 40.0] \text{ pA}$ . The global coupling strength was set as in  
195 Figure 2 of Cakan et al. (2022). All other model parameters were set as given in Table 1 in Cakan et al.  
196 (2022) and they are summarised in Table 2.

### 197 2.5.2 BOLD model

198 In order to compare the model output, i.e. the neural activity of the regions, to the BOLD signal of the  
199 rs-fMRI data, the firing rates of the excitatory population of each region had to be converted into model  
200 BOLD signal timecourses. Here, we used the well-established Balloon-Windkessel model (Friston et al.  
201 (2000); Deco et al. (2013)), for specific parameters see Friston et al. (2003).

### 202 2.5.3 Network connectivity

203 Structural images were preprocessed employing a semi-automatic pipeline implemented in the FSL  
204 toolbox ([www.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl](http://www.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl), FMRIB, Oxford). For the anatomical T1-weighted images we used the  
205 brain extraction toolbox (BET) in FSL to remove non-brain tissue and to generate the brain masks. After  
206 manual quality checks, 80 cortical regions were defined according to the automatic anatomical labelling  
207 (AAL2) atlas (Rolls et al. (2015)). For the diffusion-weighted images, we performed a brain extraction as  
208 well and corrected the images for head motion and eddy current distortions afterwards. Probabilistic fibre  
209 tracking, using the Bayesian Estimation of Diffusion Parameters Obtained using Sampling Techniques  
210 (BEDPOSTX) and the PROBTRACKX algorithms implemented in FSL (Behrens et al. (2007)), was then  
211 used with 5,000 random seeds per voxel to extract individual connectomes. Since the tractography does not  
212 yield directionality information and the connectome matrices are non-symmetric, we explicitly enforced  
213 symmetry by averaging the entries from region  $i$  to region  $j$  and from region  $j$  to region  $i$  for all pairs of  
214 regions. Furthermore, we normalised each connectome by dividing each matrix entry by the maximum  
215 matrix entry, thus ensuring compatibility between participants. The resulting connectome then determines  
216 the relative coupling strength between regions in the above described computational whole-brain model.  
217 The fibre tracking also yielded matrix fibre lengths for each participant, which, when multiplied with the  
218 signal speed, determines the delay of signal propagation between any two regions in the model.

### 219 2.5.4 Modelling ScZ-associated changes

220 We implemented four different sets of parameter changes that are thought to represent the following four  
221 ScZ-associated alterations: 1) local GABAergic inhibition, 2) local glutamatergic excitation of inhibitory  
222 cells, 3) global interregional coupling, and 4) global noise levels.

223 First, we systematically reduced GABAergic inhibition in the model. Postmortem gene expression studies  
224 have robustly demonstrated reduced levels of parvalbumine (PV) and somatostatin (SST) expression in PV  
225 (Hashimoto et al. (2003)) and SST (Morris et al. (2008)) interneurons together with a reduction of  $GAD_{65}$   
226 and  $GAD_{67}$  (Hashimoto et al. (2003)), in cortical regions in ScZ. We implemented these changes as a  
227 reduction of the inhibitory weights  $J_{EI}$  and  $J_{II}$  in the ALN model of the regional dynamics. We varied  
228 the strength of the inhibition onto the excitatory population  $J_{EI}$  and onto the inhibitory population  $J_{II}$   
229 simultaneously in the range from 100% to 60% in steps of 5%.

230 Next, we systematically reduced the glutamatergic, excitatory drive onto inhibitory neurons in our model  
231 of regional activity. These changes reflected the reduced and more varied colocalization of glutamatergic  
232 pre- and postsynaptic markers on PV interneurons in dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) (Chung et al.  
233 (2016, 2022)). Specifically, we reduced the excitatory weight onto inhibitory neurons  $J_{IE}$  in the ALN  
234 model in a range from 100% to 60% in steps of 5%.

235 Global dysconnectivity might also be explained by a simple reduction of the global connectivity strength.  
236 Therefore, to test whether the differences we found experimentally could alternatively be explained by an  
237 overall network decoupling, we reduced the global coupling strength  $K_{gl}$  in the range from 100% to 60%  
238 in steps of 5%.

239 Finally, the global alterations of functional connectivity might also be the result of an increase in  
240 background noise disrupting functional connectivity in the network (Winterer et al. (2000); Winterer and  
241 Weinberger (2004); Winterer et al. (2004)). Consequently, we increased the global background noise  $\sigma_{ou}$  in  
242 a range from 100% to 140% in steps to 5%, to test whether a global increase in noise level can account for  
243 the connectivity differences found in the experimental data.

## 244 2.5.5 Simulation details

245 Simulations were implemented using the neurolib Python framework (Cakan et al. (2021)). The  
246 differential equations of the model were solved numerically using an Euler forward scheme with a time  
247 step of 0.1 ms. For all described simulations the duration was 70 s and we discarded the transient response  
248 in the first 5 s before calculating any of the above described measures. To assess the robustness of our  
249 results, we created 40 virtual subjects by changing the seed for the random number generator underlying  
250 the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck noise process. These 40 virtual subjects were then kept fixed for all implemented  
251 changes allowing for a direct comparison to the default, 'healthy' condition.

## 3 RESULTS

### 252 3.1 Demographic and clinical characteristics

253 The control and the patient group did not differ significantly in terms of age and gender (see Table 1).  
254 Patients also did not show a change in symptomatology or type/dose of antipsychotic medication during  
255 the three months before the assessment (for more details see Aine et al. (2017)).

### 256 3.2 Global differences in connectivity strength and temporal dynamics between ScZ 257 patients and healthy controls

258 Global GBC was significantly reduced in patients with ScZ (effect size  $g = -0.65$ ; see Figure 1 a) and  
259 Table 3). Comparing both groups a substantial shift from high GBC towards medium to low GBC values  
260 occurs in ScZ patients (Figure 1 b) and Table 3). Synchrony, as measured by the Kuramoto order parameter  
261 was lower in the patient group (effect size  $g = -0.44$ ; see Figures 1 c) and Table 3). However, variability  
262 in synchrony, measured by metastability, did not significantly differ between groups (Figure 1 d) and Table  
263 3).

264 Reductions of functional connectivity strengths affected all seven subnetworks (effect sizes ranging  
265 from  $g = -0.57$  to  $g = -0.83$ ; see Table 3), with the dorsal-attention, the somato-motor and the visual  
266 subnetworks showing the strongest effects (Figure 1 f)).



267 We further tested whether the GBC differences we found were specific to association areas as indicated  
268 by a previous study (Yang et al. (2016)). We grouped the default mode subnetwork, the control subnetwork  
269 and the ventral attention subnetwork together as the association areas and the somatomotor subnetwork, the  
270 visual subnetwork and the dorsal attention subnetwork as the sensory areas. We found reduced GBC for  
271 ScZ patients in both groupings, with the sensory areas showing an even stronger effect than the association  
272 areas (effect sizes  $g = -0.78$  for sensory areas versus  $g = -0.61$  for association areas, see Figure 1 e) and  
273 Table 3).

### 274 3.3 Mechanisms underlying connectivity and dynamics alterations

#### 275 3.3.1 Control model

276 We derived a model of healthy large-scale cortical activity that matched the behaviour of the control  
277 group data from the COBRE study well in terms of functional connectivity (Figures 2 b) and d)). The  
278 correlation between simulated FC (simFC) and empirical FC (empFC) ( $r = 0.33 \pm 0.09$ ; Figure 2 e)) was  
279 higher than the correlation between empirical structural (empSC) and empFC ( $r = 0.19 \pm 0.07$ ; Figure2  
280 e)).

281 To further assert that the default model captures the resting-state functional connectivity of healthy  
282 subjects well, we also validated the model behaviour against a set of 156 subjects from the HCP S1200  
283 release. Here, we also found a good fit for functional connectivity (Figure 2 c) and d)).

284 Overall, the model functional connectivity correlated well with the empirical functional connectivity of  
285 individual HCP subjects ( $r = 0.43 \pm 0.08$ ; see Figure 2 e)). This correlation was again substantially higher  
286 than the correlation of structural connectivity and empirical functional connectivity ( $r = 0.20 \pm 0.08$ ; see  
287 Figure 2 e)).

#### 288 3.3.2 Modelling ScZ-associated alterations

289 We systematically performed perturbations to four key aspects of the model that have been associated  
290 with schizophrenia: 1) local GABAergic inhibition, 2) local glutamatergic excitation of inhibitory cells, 3)  
291 global interregional coupling, and 4) global noise levels.

292 We found that changing the inhibitory weights (model perturbation 1) did not alter the global GBC  
293 and the GBCs for sensory and association areas significantly. Furthermore, the changes did not alter the  
294 synchrony and the metastability (see Supplementary Table S3). As for the local changes to the inhibitory  
295 system, changes to the glutamatergic excitatory drive to the inhibitory population (model perturbation 2)  
296 did not result in significant changes in GBC on all levels, synchrony and metastability (see Supplementary  
297 Table S4).

298 A reduction of global coupling (model perturbation 3) resulted in a strong decrease in global brain  
299 connectivity as well as connectivity within the sensory and association systems (Table 4). Additionally,  
300 synchrony decreased strongly and metastability increased for larger reductions (Table 4).

301 An increase in noise levels (model perturbation 4) yielded a strong decrease in global brain connectivity  
302 as well as connectivity within the sensory and association systems, even stronger than for the global  
303 coupling changes (Table 5). Additionally, synchrony decreased strongly and metastability increased for  
304 larger noise strengths (Table 5).

## 4 DISCUSSION

### 4.0.1 Global changes in connectivity and temporal dynamics

Evidence for large-scale dysconnectivity in functional networks has been accumulated over the last years in ScZ (Liang et al. (2006); Bluhm et al. (2007); Bassett et al. (2008); Liu et al. (2008); Bullmore and Sporns (2009)). However, it is still unclear, how these changes relate to changes on the microscopic level. To address this gap, we analysed resting-state fMRI data from healthy participants and patients with chronic ScZ. We identified a global reduction in functional connectivity that affected both sensory and association areas equally and that was present for all functional subnetworks together with a moderate decrease of temporal synchrony. Using a biophysical network model, we found that a decrease in global coupling or an increase in global noise levels could explain the connectivity reduction and the increase in synchrony best, whereas local changes to the glutamatergic or GABAergic system did not produce changes matching our experimental findings. However, both changes also yielded an increase in metastability in our model, which we did not find in the experimental data.

Our findings of reduced global brain connectivity are in line with previous research. For example, Lynall et al. (2010) and Bassett et al. (2012) both found significantly reduced global integration in patients with schizophrenia. However, we did not find stronger connectivity disturbances in association areas compared to sensory areas, as previously reported (Yang et al. (2016)).

Our analysis of the temporal dynamics of the activity, i.e. synchrony and metastability, revealed a decrease in synchrony but no change in metastability. Our finding of unchanged metastability is in line with previous findings of Lee et al. (2018) on the same dataset but in contrast to very recent work from Hancock et al. (2023a), proposing metastability as a candidate biomarker for schizophrenia. However, we have to note that Hancock et al. (2023a) introduced a new measure of metastability with increased sensitivity to detect the differences between healthy controls and ScZ patients. This new measure of metastability did not rely on predefined brain parcellations but rather flexibly defined recurring spatio-temporal modes, so-called 'communities' where single brain regions may be grouped into more than one community. As this approach was not applicable to our computational network model we did not employ it in our analysis. Overall, several different metastability measures have been proposed and have been applied in different contexts in neuroscience (Hancock et al. (2023b)).

### 4.0.2 Mechanistic explanations of global changes in ScZ

Reduced global coupling and increased global noise levels are in line with earlier modelling studies. For example, several studies, using both simple phase oscillator models and dynamic mean-field models, have shown that a decrease of global coupling compared to the best model fit to human resting-state data led to a decrease in connectivity and a more random, less integrated graph structure (Cabral et al. (2012a, 2013, 2012b)). Similar to the model presented here, the operating point is chosen close to a bifurcation point from a silent down state to a limit-cycle which produces oscillating activity. In this regime, both functional connectivity and temporal dynamics best match empirical data. Therefore, the reduced coupling or the increased global noise disturbs this specific state and thus reduces global connectivity, synchrony and more complex network properties.

Previous work on the effects of changes to the glutamatergic and GABAergic system has demonstrated profound alterations on the cortical microcircuit level. For example, numerous computational studies have shown that ScZ-associated changes on the microcircuit level can lead to substantial reductions in gamma power in auditory steady-state response tasks (Metzner et al. (2016); Metzner and Steuber (2021); Metzner

346 et al. (2019); Vierling-Claassen et al. (2008)). Since local gamma oscillations have been hypothesized to at  
347 least partially determine the large-scale functional connectivity and temporal dynamics of resting-state  
348 activity (Cabral et al. (2014, 2022)), it seems surprising that changes to either of the systems did not  
349 produce changes in global brain connectivity in our model. One reason for the lack of impact of the changes  
350 might be that we applied them homogeneously. In the work presented here, we only varied glutamatergic or  
351 GABAergic strength globally, i.e. without any spatial heterogeneity. Therefore, it seems plausible that these  
352 changes disturbed the local, regional nodes all in a similar fashion and thereby did not substantially alter  
353 their interrelation, thus not changing global brain connectivity. Indeed, several studies have demonstrated  
354 that heterogeneous models of cortex, which explicitly incorporate regional differences in dynamics, match  
355 experimental resting-state functional connectivity more accurately (Demirtaş et al. (2019); Kong et al.  
356 (2021)). Importantly, these regional differences in dynamics covary with expression profiles for markers  
357 of glutamatergic and GABAergic neurotransmission and E-I balance (Burt et al. (2018); Demirtaş et al.  
358 (2019)). Therefore, a more detailed, heterogeneous model might be able to shed more light on the effect of  
359 E-I balance changes associated with ScZ on large-scale functional networks.

#### 360 4.0.3 Limitations

361 The computational model that we have employed in this study, while generally showing a very good fit to  
362 the experimental data, is not fully biophysically realistic. Moreover, the model used an average connectome  
363 and was not able to provide subject-specific, individual results for each participant. Furthermore, the  
364 anatomic parcellation (AAL2 Rolls et al. (2015)) is relatively coarse-grained with a number of 80 cortical  
365 regions.

366 The ALN model that was used to simulate regional activity has been demonstrated to approximate cortical  
367 resting-state activity (Cakan and Obermayer (2020); Cakan et al. (2022)). However, it is restricted to the  
368 cortex. Including subcortical regions such as the thalamus into whole-brain models is still in its infancy  
369 and rarely goes beyond coupling a single cortical and thalamic region (e.g. Jajcay et al. (2022), but see  
370 Griffiths et al. (2020)).

371 The ALN model also presents a simplification of the regional circuitry as it approximates and neglects  
372 both the variability of cell types, especially the diversity of inhibitory interneurons, and the laminar structure  
373 of the cortex. Therefore, the inclusion of more detailed models of regional activity, both in terms of cell  
374 type diversity and of laminar structure and connectivity, seems likely to further our understanding of ScZ  
375 dysconnectivity and its underlying mechanisms.

376 Lastly, the regional ALN model we used had the same parameters regardless of the cortical region  
377 it represented, i.e. we implemented a homogeneous model in that respect. As already discussed above,  
378 cortical regions are known to differ in various important aspects, whose incorporation are likely to provide  
379 additional insight into the pathophysiology of schizophrenia.

#### 380 4.0.4 Conclusion

381 The current study provides further evidence of large-scale changes in connectivity and temporal dynamics  
382 in ScZ through the analysis of resting-state fMRI. Furthermore, through computational modelling, it  
383 provides novel evidence that these changes are likely the result of global reductions in coupling or increases  
384 noise levels and not of changes to local recurrent connectivity. These findings emphasize the effect of  
385 global alterations in ScZ and have possible implications for the development of treatments.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

386 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial  
387 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

## FUNDING

388 CM and PJU were supported through the Einstein Stiftung Berlin (A-2020-613).

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

389 The datasets analyzed for this study can be obtained via *schizconnect.org*. The code for the computational  
390 model can be found here <https://github.com/ChristophMetzner/FrontiersPsychiatry2023>.

## REFERENCES

- 391 Aine, C., Bockholt, H. J., Bustillo, J. R., Cañive, J. M., Caprihan, A., Gasparovic, C., et al. (2017).  
392 Multimodal neuroimaging in schizophrenia: description and dissemination. *Neuroinformatics* 15,  
393 343–364
- 394 Anticevic, A., Corlett, P. R., Cole, M. W., Savic, A., Gancsos, M., Tang, Y., et al. (2015). N-methyl-d-  
395 aspartate receptor antagonist effects on prefrontal cortical connectivity better model early than chronic  
396 schizophrenia. *Biological Psychiatry* 77, 569–580
- 397 Augustin, M., Ladenbauer, J., Baumann, F., and Obermayer, K. (2017). Low-dimensional spike rate models  
398 derived from networks of adaptive integrate-and-fire neurons: comparison and implementation. *PLoS*  
399 *computational biology* 13, e1005545
- 400 Bassett, D. S., Bullmore, E., Verchinski, B. A., Mattay, V. S., Weinberger, D. R., and Meyer-Lindenberg, A.  
401 (2008). Hierarchical organization of human cortical networks in health and schizophrenia. *Journal of*  
402 *Neuroscience* 28, 9239–9248
- 403 Bassett, D. S., Nelson, B. G., Mueller, B. A., Camchong, J., and Lim, K. O. (2012). Altered resting state  
404 complexity in schizophrenia. *Neuroimage* 59, 2196–2207
- 405 Behrens, T. E., Berg, H. J., Jbabdi, S., Rushworth, M. F., and Woolrich, M. W. (2007). Probabilistic  
406 diffusion tractography with multiple fibre orientations: What can we gain? *neuroimage* 34, 144–155
- 407 Bluhm, R. L., Miller, J., Lanius, R. A., Osuch, E. A., Boksman, K., Neufeld, R., et al. (2007). Spontaneous  
408 low-frequency fluctuations in the bold signal in schizophrenic patients: anomalies in the default network.  
409 *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 33, 1004–1012
- 410 Brette, R. and Gerstner, W. (2005). Adaptive exponential integrate-and-fire model as an effective description  
411 of neuronal activity. *Journal of neurophysiology* 94, 3637–3642
- 412 Brunel, N. (2000). Dynamics of sparsely connected networks of excitatory and inhibitory spiking neurons.  
413 *Journal of computational neuroscience* 8, 183–208
- 414 Bullmore, E. and Sporns, O. (2009). Complex brain networks: graph theoretical analysis of structural and  
415 functional systems. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 10, 186–198
- 416 Bullmore, E. T., Frangou, S., and Murray, R. (1997). The dysplastic net hypothesis: an integration of  
417 developmental and dysconnectivity theories of schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia research* 28, 143–156
- 418 Burt, J. B., Demirtaş, M., Eckner, W. J., Navejar, N. M., Ji, J. L., Martin, W. J., et al. (2018). Hierarchy  
419 of transcriptomic specialization across human cortex captured by structural neuroimaging topography.  
420 *Nature neuroscience* 21, 1251–1259




- 421 Cabral, J., Castaldo, F., Vohryzek, J., Litvak, V., Bick, C., Lambiotte, R., et al. (2022). Metastable  
422 oscillatory modes emerge from synchronization in the brain spacetime connectome. *Communications*  
423 *Physics* 5, 184
- 424 Cabral, J., Fernandes, H. M., Van Hartevelt, T. J., James, A. C., Kringelbach, M. L., and Deco, G. (2013).  
425 Structural connectivity in schizophrenia and its impact on the dynamics of spontaneous functional  
426 networks. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* 23
- 427 Cabral, J., Hugues, E., Kringelbach, M. L., and Deco, G. (2012a). Modeling the outcome of structural  
428 disconnection on resting-state functional connectivity. *Neuroimage* 62, 1342–1353
- 429 Cabral, J., Kringelbach, M., and Deco, G. (2012b). Functional graph alterations in schizophrenia: a result  
430 from a global anatomic decoupling? *Pharmacopsychiatry* 45, S57–S64
- 431 Cabral, J., Luckhoo, H., Woolrich, M., Joensson, M., Mohseni, H., Baker, A., et al. (2014). Exploring  
432 mechanisms of spontaneous functional connectivity in meg: how delayed network interactions lead to  
433 structured amplitude envelopes of band-pass filtered oscillations. *Neuroimage* 90, 423–435
- 434 Cakan, C., Dimulescu, C., Khakimova, L., Obst, D., Flöel, A., and Obermayer, K. (2022). Spatiotemporal  
435 patterns of adaptation-induced slow oscillations in a whole-brain model of slow-wave sleep. *Frontiers in*  
436 *computational neuroscience* 15, 800101
- 437 Cakan, C., Jajcay, N., and Obermayer, K. (2021). neurolib: a simulation framework for whole-brain neural  
438 mass modeling. *Cognitive Computation* , 1–21
- 439 Cakan, C. and Obermayer, K. (2020). Biophysically grounded mean-field models of neural populations  
440 under electrical stimulation. *PLoS computational biology* 16, e1007822
- 441 Cetin, M. S., Christensen, F., Abbott, C. C., Stephen, J. M., Mayer, A. R., Cañive, J. M., et al. (2014).  
442 Thalamus and posterior temporal lobe show greater inter-network connectivity at rest and across sensory  
443 paradigms in schizophrenia. *Neuroimage* 97, 117–126
- 444 Charlson, F. J., Ferrari, A. J., Santomauro, D. F., Diminic, S., Stockings, E., Scott, J. G., et al. (2018).  
445 Global epidemiology and burden of schizophrenia: findings from the global burden of disease study  
446 2016. *Schizophrenia bulletin* 44, 1195–1203
- 447 Chung, D. W., Fish, K. N., and Lewis, D. A. (2016). Pathological basis for deficient excitatory drive to  
448 cortical parvalbumin interneurons in schizophrenia. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 173, 1131–1139
- 449 Chung, D. W., Geramita, M. A., and Lewis, D. A. (2022). Synaptic variability and cortical gamma  
450 oscillation power in schizophrenia. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 179, 277–287
- 451 Cole, M. W., Anticevic, A., Repovs, G., and Barch, D. (2011). Variable global dysconnectivity and  
452 individual differences in schizophrenia. *Biological psychiatry* 70, 43–50
- 453 Cole, M. W., Pathak, S., and Schneider, W. (2010). Identifying the brain's most globally connected regions.  
454 *Neuroimage* 49, 3132–3148
- 455 Deco, G., Kringelbach, M. L., Jirsa, V. K., and Ritter, P. (2017). The dynamics of resting fluctuations in the  
456 brain: metastability and its dynamical cortical core. *Scientific reports* 7, 3095
- 457 Deco, G., Ponce-Alvarez, A., Mantini, D., Romani, G. L., Hagmann, P., and Corbetta, M. (2013). Resting-  
458 state functional connectivity emerges from structurally and dynamically shaped slow linear fluctuations.  
459 *Journal of Neuroscience* 33, 11239–11252
- 460 Demirtaş, M., Burt, J. B., Helmer, M., Ji, J. L., Adkinson, B. D., Glasser, M. F., et al. (2019). Hierarchical  
461 heterogeneity across human cortex shapes large-scale neural dynamics. *Neuron* 101, 1181–1194
- 462 Dimulescu, C., Gareayaghi, S., Kamp, F., Fromm, S., Obermayer, K., and Metzner, C. (2021). Structural  
463 differences between healthy subjects and patients with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder: A  
464 graph and control theoretical perspective. *Frontiers in Psychiatry* , 991




- 465 Fourcaud-Trocmé, N., Hansel, D., Van Vreeswijk, C., and Brunel, N. (2003). How spike generation  
466 mechanisms determine the neuronal response to fluctuating inputs. *Journal of neuroscience* 23, 11628–  
467 11640
- 468 Friston, K. J. (1999). Schizophrenia and the disconnection hypothesis. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 99,  
469 68–79
- 470 Friston, K. J., Frith, C. D., et al. (1995). Schizophrenia: a disconnection syndrome. *Clin Neurosci* 3, 89–97
- 471 Friston, K. J., Harrison, L., and Penny, W. (2003). Dynamic causal modelling. *Neuroimage* 19, 1273–1302
- 472 Friston, K. J., Mechelli, A., Turner, R., and Price, C. J. (2000). Nonlinear responses in fmri: the balloon  
473 model, volterra kernels, and other hemodynamics. *NeuroImage* 12, 466–477
- 474 Glasser, M. F., Sotiropoulos, S. N., Wilson, J. A., Coalson, T. S., Fischl, B., Andersson, J. L., et al. (2013).  
475 The minimal preprocessing pipelines for the human connectome project. *Neuroimage* 80, 105–124
- 476 Griffanti, L., Salimi-Khorshidi, G., Beckmann, C. F., Auerbach, E. J., Douaud, G., Sexton, C. E., et al.  
477 (2014). Ica-based artefact removal and accelerated fmri acquisition for improved resting state network  
478 imaging. *Neuroimage* 95, 232–247
- 479 Griffiths, J. D., McIntosh, A. R., and Lefebvre, J. (2020). A connectome-based, corticothalamic model of  
480 state-and stimulation-dependent modulation of rhythmic neural activity and connectivity. *Frontiers in*  
481 *computational neuroscience* 14, 575143
- 482 Hancock, F., Rosas, F. E., McCutcheon, R. A., Cabral, J., Dipasquale, O., and Turkheimer, F. E. (2023a).  
483 Metastability as a candidate neuromechanistic biomarker of schizophrenia pathology. *Plos one* 18,  
484 e0282707
- 485 Hancock, F., Rosas, F. E., Zhang, M., Mediano, P. A., Luppi, A., Cabral, J., et al. (2023b). Metastability  
486 demystified—the foundational past, the pragmatic present, and the potential future
- 487 Hashimoto, T., Volk, D. W., Eggan, S. M., Mirnics, K., Pierri, J. N., Sun, Z., et al. (2003). Gene expression  
488 deficits in a subclass of gaba neurons in the prefrontal cortex of subjects with schizophrenia. *Journal of*  
489 *Neuroscience* 23, 6315–6326
- 490 Jajcay, N., Cakan, C., and Obermayer, K. (2022). Cross-frequency slow oscillation–spindle coupling in a  
491 biophysically realistic thalamocortical neural mass model. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* 16,  
492 769860
- 493 Kay, S. R., Opler, L. A., and Lindenmayer, J.-P. (1989). The positive and negative syndrome scale (panss):  
494 rationale and standardisation. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 155, 59–65
- 495 Kong, X., Kong, R., Orban, C., Wang, P., Zhang, S., Anderson, K., et al. (2021). Sensory-motor cortices  
496 shape functional connectivity dynamics in the human brain. *Nature communications* 12, 6373
- 497 Lee, W. H., Doucet, G. E., Leiby, E., and Frangou, S. (2018). Resting-state network connectivity and  
498 metastability predict clinical symptoms in schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia research* 201, 208–216
- 499 Liang, M., Zhou, Y., Jiang, T., Liu, Z., Tian, L., Liu, H., et al. (2006). Widespread functional disconnectivity  
500 in schizophrenia with resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging. *NeuroReport* 17, 209–213
- 501 Liu, Y., Liang, M., Zhou, Y., He, Y., Hao, Y., Song, M., et al. (2008). Disrupted small-world networks in  
502 schizophrenia. *Brain* 131, 945–961
- 503 Lopez, A. D. and Murray, C. C. (1998). The global burden of disease, 1990–2020. *Nature medicine* 4,  
504 1241–1243
- 505 Lynall, M.-E., Bassett, D. S., Kerwin, R., McKenna, P. J., Kitzbichler, M., Muller, U., et al. (2010).  
506 Functional connectivity and brain networks in schizophrenia. *Journal of Neuroscience* 30, 9477–9487
- 507 Metzner, C., Schweikard, A., and Zurowski, B. (2016). Multifactorial modeling of impairment of evoked  
508 gamma range oscillations in schizophrenia. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* 10, 89

- 509 Metzner, C. and Steuber, V. (2021). The beta component of gamma-band auditory steady-state responses  
510 in patients with schizophrenia. *Scientific Reports* 11, 20387
- 511 Metzner, C., Zurowski, B., and Steuber, V. (2019). The role of parvalbumin-positive interneurons in  
512 auditory steady-state response deficits in schizophrenia. *Scientific reports* 9, 18525
- 513 Morris, H. M., Hashimoto, T., and Lewis, D. A. (2008). Alterations in somatostatin mrna expression in  
514 the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex of subjects with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder. *Cerebral*  
515 *Cortex* 18, 1575–1587
- 516 Moyer, C. E., Delevich, K. M., Fish, K. N., Asafu-Adjei, J. K., Sampson, A. R., Dorph-Petersen, K.-A.,  
517 et al. (2012). Reduced glutamate decarboxylase 65 protein within primary auditory cortex inhibitory  
518 boutons in schizophrenia. *Biological Psychiatry* 72, 734–743
- 519 Ostojic, S. and Brunel, N. (2011). From spiking neuron models to linear-nonlinear models. *PLoS*  
520 *computational biology* 7, e1001056
- 521 Pettersson-Yeo, W., Allen, P., Benetti, S., McGuire, P., and Mechelli, A. (2011). Dysconnectivity in  
522 schizophrenia: where are we now? *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 35, 1110–1124
- 523 Rolls, E. T., Joliot, M., and Tzourio-Mazoyer, N. (2015). Implementation of a new parcellation of the  
524 orbitofrontal cortex in the automated anatomical labeling atlas. *Neuroimage* 122, 1–5
- 525 Salimi-Khorshidi, G., Douaud, G., Beckmann, C. F., Glasser, M. F., Griffanti, L., and Smith, S. M. (2014).  
526 Automatic denoising of functional mri data: combining independent component analysis and hierarchical  
527 fusion of classifiers. *Neuroimage* 90, 449–468
- 528 Vierling-Claassen, D., Siekmeier, P., Stufflebeam, S., and Kopell, N. (2008). Modeling gaba alterations in  
529 schizophrenia: a link between impaired inhibition and altered gamma and beta range auditory entrainment.  
530 *Journal of neurophysiology* 99, 2656–2671
- 531 Winterer, G., Coppola, R., Goldberg, T. E., Egan, M. F., Jones, D. W., Sanchez, C. E., et al. (2004).  
532 Prefrontal broadband noise, working memory, and genetic risk for schizophrenia. *American Journal of*  
533 *Psychiatry* 161, 490–500
- 534 Winterer, G. and Weinberger, D. R. (2004). Genes, dopamine and cortical signal-to-noise ratio in  
535 schizophrenia. *Trends in neurosciences* 27, 683–690
- 536 Winterer, G., Ziller, M., Dorn, H., Frick, K., Mulert, C., Wuebben, Y., et al. (2000). Schizophrenia:  
537 reduced signal-to-noise ratio and impaired phase-locking during information processing. *Clinical*  
538 *Neurophysiology* 111, 837–849
- 539 Woolrich, M. W., Ripley, B. D., Brady, M., and Smith, S. M. (2001). Temporal autocorrelation in univariate  
540 linear modeling of fmri data. *Neuroimage* 14, 1370–1386
- 541 Yang, G. J., Murray, J. D., Repovs, G., Cole, M. W., Savic, A., Glasser, M. F., et al. (2014). Altered global  
542 brain signal in schizophrenia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111, 7438–7443
- 543 Yang, G. J., Murray, J. D., Wang, X.-J., Glahn, D. C., Pearlson, G. D., Repovs, G., et al. (2016). Functional  
544 hierarchy underlies preferential connectivity disturbances in schizophrenia. *Proceedings of the National*  
545 *Academy of Sciences* 113, E219–E228
- 546 Yeo, B. T., Krienen, F. M., Sepulcre, J., Sabuncu, M. R., Lashkari, D., Hollinshead, M., et al. (2011). The  
547 organization of the human cerebral cortex estimated by intrinsic functional connectivity. *Journal of*  
548 *neurophysiology*
- 549 Zhou, Y., Liang, M., Tian, L., Wang, K., Hao, Y., Liu, H., et al. (2007). Functional disintegration in  
550 paranoid schizophrenia using resting-state fmri. *Schizophrenia Research* 97, 194–205

## 5 FIGURES



**Figure 1. Global differences in functional connectivity and temporal dynamics between healthy controls and ScZ patients.** a) Comparison of average GBC per participant for the two groups. Individual dots represent average GBC for one participant. The difference plot on the right shows the difference between the groups in terms of effect size. b) Histogram of region-wise GBC values for the two groups. The histogram displays the region-wise GBC data pooled for all participants in each group. c) Synchrony comparison between the two groups. Each dot represents the mean Kuramoto order parameter (a measure of synchrony) for one participant. The difference plot on the right shows the group difference in terms of effect size. d) Metastability comparison between the two groups. Each dot represents the metastability of one participant. The difference plot on the right shows the group difference in terms of effect size. e) Comparison of global brain connectivity for association areas (Asso. comprising: DMN, Cont, Sal/VAttn) and sensory areas (Sen. comprising: Sommot, Vis, DAttn). f) Comparison of global brain connectivity for the seven functional networks from Yeo et al. (2011): Somato-motor subnetwork (SomMot), Control subnetwork (Cont), Default mode subnetwork (Def), Saliency/Ventral attention subnetwork (Sal/VAttn), Dorsal attention subnetwork (DAttn), Limbic subnetwork (Lim), Visual subnetwork (Vis).



**Figure 2. Computational model** a) Modelling approach combining a model for the regional dynamics with anatomical input that defines the structural network. b) Average FC matrix for the COBRE sample c) Average FC matrix for the HCP sample d) Model FC matrix e) comparison of the correlation of empSC to empFC (blue) and the correlation of simFC and empFC (yellow) for the COBRE (left) and the for the HCP (right) data sets.

## 6 TABLES

	HC	ScZ	Statistics, <i>p</i> value
Group size	43	38	-
Age (y)	36.70(11.04)	38.97(13.67)	$t=0.82$ , $p=0.41$
Gender	11F/32M	10F/27M	$\chi^2=0.02$ , $p=0.88$
PANSS positive	-	14.92(5.04)	-
PANSS negative	-	14.81(5.31)	-
PANSS general	-	29.49(8.37)	-
PANSS total	-	59.22(78)	-
CPZ-equivalent dosage	-	396.26(330.91)	-
Illness duration (y)	-	17.19(12.61)	-

**Table 1.** Demographics and clinical characteristics. Data are shown as mean(standard deviation). Age differences between groups were compared using an independent samples t-test and differences in gender distribution using a chi-square test. Antipsychotic medication is reported as chlorpromazine (CPZ)-equivalent dosage.



Parameter	Value	Description
$\mu_E^{ext}$	1.63 mV/ms	Mean external input to E
$\mu_I^{ext}$	0.05 mV/ms	Mean external input to I
$\sigma_{ou}$	0.19	Noise strength
$\tau_{ou}$	5.0 ms	Noise time constant
$K_e$	800	Number of excitatory inputs per neuron
$K_i$	200	Number of inhibitory inputs per neuron
$C_{EE}, C_{IE}$	0.3 mV/ms	Maximum AMPA PSC amplitude
$C_{EI}, C_{II}$	0.5 mV/ms	Maximum GABA PSC amplitude
$J_{EE}$	2.4 mV/ms	Maximum synaptic current from E to E
$J_{IE}$	2.6 mV/ms	Maximum synaptic current from E to I
$J_{EI}$	-3.3 mV/ms	Maximum synaptic current from I to E
$J_{II}$	-1.6 mV/ms	Maximum synaptic current from I to I
$\tau_{s,E}$	2 ms	Excitatory synaptic time constant
$\tau_{s,I}$	5 ms	Inhibitory synaptic time constant
$d_E$	4 ms	Synaptic delay to excitatory neurons
$d_I$	2 ms	Synaptic delay to inhibitory neurons
$C$	200 pF	Membrane capacitance
$g_L$	10 nS	Leak conductance
$\tau_m$	$C/g_L$	Membrane time constant
$E_L$	-65 mV	Leak reversal potential of the AdEx model
$\Delta_T$	1.5 mV	Threshold slope factor of the AdEx model
$V_T$	-50 mV	Threshold voltage of the AdEx model
$V_s$	-40 mV	Spike voltage threshold of the AdEx model
$T_{net}$	1.5 ms	Refractory time of the AdEx model
$\sigma^{ext}$	1.5 mV/ $\sqrt{ms}$	Standard deviation of external input
$E_A$	-80 mV	Adaptation reversal potential
$\alpha$	28.26 nS	Subthreshold adaptation conductance
$\beta$	24.04 pA	Spike-triggered adaptation increment
$\tau_A$	200 ms	Adaptation time constant
$K_{gl}$	250.0	Global coupling strength
$v_{gl}$	20.0 m/s	Global signal speed

**Table 2. Network parameters.** Overview of the different parameter values for the whole-brain model employed here.

	Mean difference	Hedges' g	95% CI	p value
Global cortical GBC	-0.11	-0.65	[-1.11 -0.18]	p=0.0056
Global cortical synchrony	-0.12	-0.44	[-0.89 0.04]	p=0.0488
Global cortical metastability	-0.005	-0.39	[-0.81 0.07]	p=0.0850
GBC Sensory areas	-0.12	-0.78	[-1.26 -0.29]	p=0.0004
GBC Association areas	-0.09	-0.61	[-1.07 -0.14]	p=0.0076
GBC Somato-motor (SomMot)	-0.12	-0.74	[-1.20 -0.26]	p=0.0008
GBC Control (Cont)	-0.09	-0.57	[-1.03 -0.10]	p=0.0110
GBC Default mode (Def)	-0.09	-0.57	[-1.03 -0.11]	p=0.0110
GBC Salience/Ventral attention (Sal/VAtn)	-0.11	-0.69	[-1.14 -0.21]	p=0.0024
GBC Dorsal attention (DAtn)	-0.12	-0.83	[-1.31 -0.33]	p=0.0001
GBC Limbic (Lim)	-0.08	-0.59	[-1.02 -0.13]	p=0.0102
GBC Visual (Vis)	-0.11	-0.77	[-1.26 -0.29]	p=0.0010

**Table 3. Local and global group differences.** Overview of the global and local differences in functional connectivity and temporal dynamics between the healthy control and the ScZ patient group.

	95%	90%	85%	80%
Avg. global GBC	-0.035 [-0.45]	<b>-0.089 [-1.12]</b>	<b>-0.153 [-1.88]</b>	<b>-0.205 [-2.49]</b>
Avg. GBC sen.	-0.039 [-0.47]	<b>-0.097 [-1.16]</b>	<b>-0.169 [-1.99]</b>	<b>-0.231 [-2.68]</b>
Avg. GBC ass.	-0.032 [-0.40]	<b>-0.089 [-1.10]</b>	<b>-0.159 [-1.91]</b>	<b>-0.215 [-2.49]</b>
Synchrony	-0.008 [-0.10]	-0.040 [-0.53]	<b>-0.093 [-1.29]</b>	<b>-0.155 [-2.20]</b>
Metastability	-0.001 [-0.05]	0.001 [0.03]	0.001 [0.04]	0.007 [0.26]
	75%	70%	65%	60%
Avg. global GBC	<b>-0.238 [-3.16]</b>	<b>-0.258 [-3.63]</b>	<b>-0.265 [-3.89]</b>	<b>-0.264 [-4.02]</b>
Avg. GBC sen.	<b>-0.275 [-3.45]</b>	<b>-0.302 [-3.98]</b>	<b>-0.311 [-4.32]</b>	<b>-0.311 [-4.45]</b>
Avg. GBC ass.	<b>-0.250 [-3.15]</b>	<b>-0.273 [-3.66]</b>	<b>-0.282 [-3.94]</b>	<b>-0.282 [-4.13]</b>
Synchrony	<b>-0.215 [-3.01]</b>	<b>-0.266 [-4.00]</b>	<b>-0.298 [-4.76]</b>	<b>-0.313 [-5.23]</b>
Metastability	0.018 [0.70]	<b>0.026 [1.22]</b>	<b>0.032 [1.32]</b>	<b>0.035 [1.47]</b>


**Table 4. ScZ-associated changes of global coupling.** Comparison of average global GBC, average GBC in sensory areas, average GBC in association areas, average synchrony and average metastability for reduced global coupling (from 95% to 60% in steps of 5%). Shown are the mean differences, i.e. the mean of the default condition minus the respective reduced global coupling condition and in brackets the effect size (Hedge's  $g$ ). The mean in each condition is calculated over the 40 virtual subjects. Significant differences, i.e. a permutation  $p$  value of  $< 0.001$ , are highlighted in bold. Permutation tests were performed using 5,000 permutations of labels.

	105%	110%	115%	120%
Avg. global GBC	<b>-0.078 [-0.98]</b>	<b>-0.129 [-1.60]</b>	<b>-0.199 [-2.56]</b>	<b>-0.260 [-3.56]</b>
Avg. GBC sen.	<b>-0.082 [-0.98]</b>	<b>-0.139 [-1.64]</b>	<b>-0.215 [-2.59]</b>	<b>-0.285 [-3.64]</b>
Avg. GBC ass.	<b>-0.078 [-0.95]</b>	<b>-0.133 [-1.58]</b>	<b>-0.204 [-2.51]</b>	<b>-0.268 [-3.57]</b>
Synchrony	-0.050 [-0.67]	<b>-0.080 [-1.05]</b>	<b>-0.121 [-1.83]</b>	<b>-0.168 [-2.42]</b>
Metastability	0.008 [0.26]	0.006 [0.21]	0.010 [0.37]	0.014 [0.52]
	125%	130%	135%	140%
Avg. global GBC	<b>-0.313 [-4.58]</b>	<b>-0.362 [-5.71]</b>	<b>-0.383 [-6.07]</b>	<b>-0.394 [-6.08]</b>
Avg. GBC sen.	<b>-0.345 [-4.86]</b>	<b>-0.399 [-6.01]</b>	<b>-0.424 [-6.39]</b>	<b>-0.433 [-6.30]</b>
Avg. GBC ass.	<b>-0.323 [-4.56]</b>	<b>-0.373 [-5.62]</b>	<b>-0.396 [-6.15]</b>	<b>-0.408 [-6.22]</b>
Synchrony	<b>-0.202 [-2.97]</b>	<b>-0.230 [-3.62]</b>	<b>-0.244 [-3.95]</b>	<b>-0.261 [-4.17]</b>
Metastability	0.018 [0.70]	<b>0.019 [0.75]</b>	<b>0.026 [1.03]</b>	<b>0.027 [1.02]</b>

**Table 5. ScZ-associated changes of noise parameters.** Comparison of average global GBC, average GBC in sensory areas, average GBC in association areas, average synchrony, and average metastability with increased noise (from 105% to 140% in steps of 5%). Shown are the mean differences, i.e. the mean of the default condition minus the respective increased noise condition and in brackets the effect size (Hedge's  $g$ ). The mean in each condition is calculated over the 40 virtual subjects. Significant differences, i.e. a permutation  $p$  value of  $< 0.001$ , are highlighted in bold. Permutation tests were performed using 5,000 permutations of labels.

## 7 SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES AND FIGURES

### 551 7.1 Figures



**Figure 1. Global differences in functional connectivity and temporal dynamics.** a) Comparison of average GBC per participant for the two groups. Individual dots represent average GBC for one participant. The difference plot on the right shows the difference between the groups in terms of effect size. b) Histogram of region-wise GBC values for the two groups. The histogram displays the region-wise GBC data pooled for all participants in each group. c) Synchrony comparison between the two groups. Each dot represents the mean Kuramoto order parameter (a measure of synchrony) for one participant. The difference plot on the right shows the group difference in terms of effect size. d) Metastability comparison between the two groups. Each dot represents the metastability of one participant. The difference plot on the right shows the group difference in terms of effect size.

552 7.2 Tables

Region	Hedges' g	p value
Precentral L	-0.69	0.0024
Precentral R	-0.68	0.0024
Frontal Sup 2 L	-0.70	0.0018
Frontal Sup 2 R	-0.49	0.0318
Frontal Mid 2 L	-0.56	0.0126
Frontal Mid 2 R	-0.43	0.0608
Frontal Inf Oper L	-0.72	0.0014
Frontal Inf Oper R	-0.67	0.0042
Frontal Inf Tri L	-0.68	0.0030
Frontal Inf Tri R	-0.59	0.0092
Frontal Inf Orb 2 L	-0.53	0.0212
Frontal Inf Orb 2 R	-0.41	0.0644
Rolandic Oper L	-0.61	0.0078
Rolandic Oper R	-0.67	0.0032
Supp Motor Area L	-0.75	0.0006
Supp Motor Area R	-0.84	0.0006
Olfactory L	-0.26	0.2536
Olfactory R	-0.16	0.4704
Frontal Sup Medial L	-0.51	0.0242
Frontal Sup Medial R	-0.52	0.0206
Frontal Med Orb L	-0.40	0.0736
Frontal Med Orb R	-0.42	0.0600
Rectus L	-0.52	0.0264
Rectus R	-0.32	0.1518
OFCmed L	-0.47	0.0404
OFCmed R	-0.31	0.1728
OFCant L	-0.30	0.1932
OFCant R	-0.28	0.2026
OFCpost L	-0.43	0.0578
OFCpost R	-0.51	0.0186
OFClat L	-0.60	0.0094
OFClat R	-0.13	0.5442
Insula L	-0.74	0.0018
Insula R	-0.65	0.0050
Cingulate Ant L	-0.49	0.0296
Cingulate Ant R	-0.51	0.0248
Cingulate Mid L	-0.87	0.0002
Cingulate Mid R	-0.82	0.0002
Cingulate Post L	-0.57	0.0132
Cingulate Post R	-0.35	0.1174
Calcarine L	-0.82	0.0002
Calcarine R	-0.76	0.0016
Cuneus L	-0.77	0.0010
Cuneus R	-0.61	0.0064
Lingual L	-0.89	<0.0001
Lingual R	-0.85	0.0002

**Table 6. Regional effect sizes** Effect sizes and p values for the comparison of the control and the patient group in average GBC for each of the 90 regions of the AAL2 parcellation.

Region	Hedges' g	p value
Occipital Sup L	-0.71	0.0012
Occipital Sup R	-0.72	0.0024
Occipital Mid L	-0.85	0.0002
Occipital Mid R	-0.92	<0.0001
Occipital Inf L	-0.84	0.0004
Occipital Inf R	-0.56	0.014
Fusiform L	-0.89	0.0002
Fusiform R	-0.98	<0.0001
Postcentral L	-0.70	0.0024
Postcentral R	-0.70	0.002
Parietal Sup L	-0.85	<0.0001
Parietal Sup R	-0.94	<0.0001
Parietal Inf L	-0.85	<0.0001
Parietal Inf R	-0.51	0.025
SupraMarginal L	-0.56	0.0132
SupraMarginal R	-0.61	0.0072
Angular L	-0.53	0.0184
Angular R	-0.51	0.0234
Precuneus L	-0.88	0.003
Precuneus R	-0.69	0.001
Paracentral Lobule L	-0.72	0.0126
Paracentral Lobule R	-0.58	0.0106
Heschl L	0.59	0.0028
Heschl R	-0.70	<0.0001
Temporal Sup L	-0.96	<0.0001
Temporal Sup R	-0.83	0.0076
Temporal Pole Sup L	-0.6	0.001
Temporal Pole Sup R	-0.77	0.001
Temporal Mid L	-0.81	0.0008
Temporal Mid R	-0.87	<0.0001
Temporal Pole Mid L	-0.68	0.0026
Temporal Pole Mid R	-0.77	0.0008
Temporal Inf L	-0.37	0.0972
Temporal Inf R	-0.6	0.009

**Table 7. Regional effect sizes - ctd.** Effect sizes and p values for the comparison of the control and the patient group in average GBC for each of the 90 regions of the AAL2 parcellation.



	95%	90%	85%	80%
Avg. global GBC	0.001 [0.02]	0.003 [0.04]	0.003 [0.04]	0.003 [0.04]
Avg. GBC sen.	0.002 [0.02]	0.003 [0.04]	0.003 [0.03]	0.002 [0.02]
Avg. GBC ass.	0.001 [0.02]	0.004 [0.04]	0.005 [0.06]	0.006 [0.06]
Synchrony	0.003 [0.04]	0.006 [0.08]	0.008 [0.10]	0.006 [0.08]
Metastability	-0.001 [-0.04]	-0.002 [-0.05]	-0.002 [-0.05]	-0.001 [-0.02]
	75%	70%	65%	60%
Avg. global GBC	0.004 [0.05]	0.007 [0.08]	0.005 [0.06]	0.013 [0.16]
Avg. GBC sen.	0.003 [0.03]	0.005 [0.06]	0.003 [0.03]	0.012 [0.13]
Avg. GBC ass.	0.007 [0.08]	0.010 [0.11]	0.008 [0.09]	0.016 [0.19]
Synchrony	0.009 [0.12]	0.001 [0.01]	-0.003 [-0.04]	-0.005 [-0.06]
Metastability	-0.005 [-0.14]	-0.001 [-0.02]	0.004 [0.13]	0.007 [0.22]

**Table 8. ScZ-associated changes of GABA parameters** Comparison of average global GBC, average GBC in sensory areas, average GBC in association areas, average synchrony and average metastability for different conditions with reduced GABAergic output from 95% to 60% in steps of 5%. Shown are the mean differences (i.e. the mean of the default condition minus the respective reduced GABA condition. The mean in each condition is calculated over the 40 virtual subjects.) and in brackets the effect size (Hedge's *g*). Significant differences, i.e. a permutation *p* value of < 0.001 is highlighted in bold. Permutation tests were performed using 5,000 permutations of labels.

	95%	90%	85%	80%
Avg. global GBC	0.008 [0.09]	0.006 [0.07]	0.003 [0.04]	0.010 [0.11]
Avg. GBC sen.	0.005 [0.07]	0.004 [0.05]	0.001 [0.07]	0.005 [0.06]
Avg. GBC ass.	0.010 [0.12]	0.007 [0.08]	0.005 [0.06]	0.010 [0.12]
Synchrony	0.011 [0.14]	-0.004 [-0.06]	-0.005 [-0.07]	-0.005 [-0.06]
Metastability	-0.006 [-0.17]	0.005 [0.14]	0.006 [0.18]	0.004 [0.13]
	75%	70%	65%	60%
Avg. global GBC	-0.003 [-0.03]	-0.002 [-0.02]	0.012 [0.15]	0.006 [0.08]
Avg. GBC sen.	-0.008 [-0.09]	-0.010 [-0.11]	0.005 [0.06]	-0.005 [-0.06]
Avg. GBC ass.	-0.003 [-0.03]	-0.005 [-0.05]	0.007 [0.08]	-0.001 [-0.01]
Synchrony	-0.013 [-0.16]	-0.013 [-0.15]	-0.017 [-0.20]	-0.024 [-0.31]
Metastability	0.003 [0.09]	0.004 [0.12]	0.001 [0.03]	0.010 [0.29]

**Table 9. ScZ-associated changes of glutamatergic parameters** Comparison of average global GBC, average GBC in sensory areas, average GBC in association areas, average synchrony and average metastability for different conditions with reduced glutamatergic output from 95% to 60% in steps of 5%. Shown are the mean differences (i.e. the mean of the default condition minus the respective reduced glutamate condition. The mean in each condition is calculated over the 40 virtual subjects.) and in brackets the effect size (Hedge's *g*). Significant differences, i.e. a permutation *p* value of < 0.001 is highlighted in bold. Permutation tests were performed using 5,000 permutations of labels.