1	Generalisable functional imaging classifiers of schizophrenia have multifunctionality as
2	trait, state, and staging biomarkers
3	
4	Running title: Functional imaging classifiers of schizophrenia
5	

6 Authors:

- 7 Takahiko Kawashima, MD^{1†*}, Ayumu Yamashita, PhD^{2,3†}, Yujiro Yoshihara, MD, PhD¹, Yuko
- 8 Kobayashi, MD¹, Naohiro Okada, MD, PhD^{4,5}, Kiyoto Kasai, MD, PhD^{4,5,6}, Ming-Chyi
- 9 Huang, MD, PhD^{7,8}, Akira Sawa, MD, PhD^{9,10,11,12,13,14}, Junichiro Yoshimoto, PhD^{2,15,16},
- 10 Okito Yamashita, PhD^{2,17}, Toshiya Murai, MD, PhD¹, Jun Miyata, MD, PhD^{1,18}, Mitsuo
- 11 Kawato, PhD^{2,19*}, and Hidehiko Takahashi, MD, PhD^{1,20,21*}

12 Affiliations:

- ¹³ ¹Department of Psychiatry, Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan
- 14 ²Brain Information Communication Research Laboratory Group, Advanced
- 15 Telecommunications Research Institute International, Kyoto, Japan
- ³Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo,
- 17 Japan
- ⁴Department of Neuropsychiatry, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo,

1 Tokyo, Japan

- ² ⁵The International Research Centre for Neurointelligence (WPI-IRCN) at The University of
- 3 Tokyo Institutes for Advanced Study (UTIAS), The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan
- 4 ⁶UTokyo Institute for Diversity and Adaptation of Human Mind (UTIDAHM), The
- 5 University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan
- ⁶ ⁷Department of Addiction Sciences, Taipei City Psychiatric Center, Taipei City Hospital,
- 7 Taipei, Taiwan
- 8 ⁸Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, College of Medicine, Taipei Medical
- 9 University, Taipei, Taiwan
- ⁹Department of Psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD,
- 11 USA
- ¹⁰Department of Neuroscience, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore,
- 13 MD, USA
- 14 ¹¹Department of Biomedical Engineering, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine,
- 15 Baltimore, MD, USA
- 16 ¹²Department of Pharmacology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore,
- 17 MD, USA

¹³Department of Genetic Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore,

2 MD, USA

- 3 ¹⁴Department of Mental Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health,
- 4 Baltimore, MD, USA
- 5 ¹⁵ Department of Biomedical Data Science, Fujita Health University School of Medicine,
- 6 Toyoake, Japan
- 7 ¹⁶International Centre for Brain Science (ICBS), Fujita Health University, Toyoake, Japan
- 8 ¹⁷RIKEN, Centre for Advanced Intelligence Project, Tokyo, Japan
- 9 ¹⁸Department of Psychiatry, Aichi Medical University, Nagakute, Japan
- ¹⁹XNef Incorporation, Kyoto, Japan
- ²⁰Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Sciences, Graduate School of Medical and
- 12 Dental Sciences, Tokyo Medical and Dental University, Tokyo, Japan
- ¹³²¹Centre for Brain Integration Research, Tokyo Medical and Dental University, Tokyo, Japan
- 14 *†*These authors contributed equally to this work.
- 15 *Corresponding authors:

- 1 Takahiko Kawashima
- 2 Address: 6th floor, North ward building, Kyoto University Hospital, 54
- 3 Shogoin-Kawaharacho, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8507, Japan
- 4 Phone: +81-75-751-4947
- 5 Fax: +81-75-751-3378
- 6 E-mail: tkawashima@kuhp.kyoto-u.ac.jp
- 7 Mitsuo Kawato
- 8 Address: 2-2-2 Hikaridai, Seika-cho, Souraku-gun, Kyoto 619-0288, Japan
- 9 Phone: +81-774-95-1058
- 10 Fax: +81-774-95-1236
- 11 E-mail: kawato@atr.jp
- 12 Hidehiko Takahashi
- 13 Address: 1-5-45, Yushima, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8510, Japan
- 14 Phone: +81-3-5803-5238
- 15 Fax: +81-3-5803-0135
- 16 E-mail: hidepsyc@tmd.ac.jp

1 ABSTRACT

2 Schizophrenia spectrum disorder (SSD) is one of the top causes of disease burden; similar to 3 other psychiatric disorders, SSD lacks widely applicable and objective biomarkers. This study 4 aimed to introduce a novel resting-state functional connectivity (rs-FC) magnetic resonance 5 imaging (MRI) biomarker for diagnosing SSD. It was developed using customised machine learning on an anterogradely and retrogradely harmonised dataset from multiple sites, 6 7 including 617 healthy controls and 116 patients with SSD. Unlike previous rs-FC MRI 8 biomarkers, this new biomarker demonstrated a notable accuracy rate of 77.3% in an 9 independent validation cohort, including 404 healthy controls and 198 patients with SSD from 10 seven different sites, effectively mitigating across-scan variability. Importantly, our biomarker 11 specifically identified SSD, differentiating it from other psychiatric disorders. Our analysis 12 identified 47 important FCs significant in SSD classification, several of which are involved in 13 SSD pathophysiology. Beyond their potential as trait markers, we explored the utility of these 14 FCs as both state and staging markers. First, based on aggregated FCs, we built prediction 15 models for clinical scales of trait and/or state. Thus, we successfully predicted delusional 16 inventory scores (r=0.331, P=0.0177), but not the overall symptom severity (r=0.128, 17 P=0.178). Second, through comprehensive analysis, we uncovered associations between 18 individual FCs and symptom scale scores or disease stages, presenting promising candidate 19 FCs for state or staging markers. This study underscores the potential of rs-FC as a clinically 20 applicable neural phenotype marker for SSD and provides actionable targets to 21 neuromodulation therapies.

1 INTRODUCTION

Diagnosis of schizophrenia spectrum disorder (SSD) relies on diagnostic criteria that
categorise disorders based solely on signs and symptoms. There are currently no widely
applicable objective biomarkers¹ that can distinguish individuals with SSD from their healthy
counterparts.

6 Generating an SSD classifier using resting-state functional connectivity (rs-FC) 7 magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is an emerging research topic. However, the practical use of these classifiers is hindered by several key challenges²⁻⁵. First, there is an accuracy problem. 8 In studies with a large sample size and external validation^{6,7}, classifier performance was below 9 10 biomarker requirements (approximately 80%). Accuracy typically decreases with increase in sample size (N>200) in whole-brain imaging biomarkers⁸. A machine learning algorithm 11 12 requiring many explanatory variables (i.e. FCs) needs more data to achieve accuracy and 13 generalisability; however, large training samples from multiple facilities may cause a large site effect, deteriorating data quality⁹. Second, there is an issue with generalisability. Most previous 14 15 studies have used only internal or limited external validation and lacked genuinely independent cohorts obtained in multiple sites not involved in the initial research¹⁰. Third, across-session 16 variability poses a problem. The reliability of rs-fMRI is questionable over repeated tests¹¹. 17 18 Finally, there is a lack of specificity in potential biomarkers identified in rs-FC MRI studies 19 focusing on specific disorders. Overcoming these issues is crucial for determining truly 20 effective biomarkers for clinical use in SSD.

Although disease trait markers assist early intervention, state markers estimate dynamic changes in response to treatment^{12,13} and staging markers aid disease prevention or personalising interventions¹⁴. In SSD research, few studies have succeeded in developing state markers using neuroimaging, and for staging markers, there is no consensus on biological

1 staging models¹⁵.

2	Patient biological data may simultaneously encompass information on traits, states,
3	and disease stages. As machine learning exploits these features without making distinctions,
4	diagnostic markers developed using machine learning may also function as state and/or staging
5	markers. Previous rs-FC biomarker studies reported multiple aggregated FCs as
6	biomarkers ^{16,17} ; however, whether individual FCs can be used as one or more of these three
7	types of biomarkers remains unexplored. A previous study showed that FCs originally
8	identified as diagnostic markers dynamically changed after treatment ¹⁸ ; thus, they also
9	functioned as state markers. Nevertheless, thoroughly investigating individual FCs has not
10	been attempted, making it difficult to determine whether any FCs can benefit early disease
11	detection and intervention as a trait marker or treatment target selection and drug discovery as a
12	surrogate marker.
13	Our study focused on two key areas (Figure 1). First, we aimed to develop a clinically
14	viable rs-FC biomarker for SSD, addressing the challenges mentioned above. Second, we
15	aimed to investigate whether the diagnostic biomarker can be used as state and staging markers.
16	The findings of this study can help develop new approaches for improving the diagnosis and
17	treatment of various psychiatric disorders, not only SSD.

1 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2 Participants

3	We used two independent multi-disorder datasets: one for developing classifiers ('discovery
4	dataset') and the other for validating the classifiers ('validation dataset'). Participant
5	characteristics are presented in Table 1 and Supplementary Table 1. There was no overlap of
6	participants between the discovery and validation datasets.
7	The discovery dataset comprised data from four sites: Kyoto University Siemens
8	TimTrio scanner, Showa University (SWA), Centre of Innovation in Hiroshima University, and
9	University of Tokyo (UTO). The dataset included 1 045 participants consisting of 617 healthy
10	controls (HCs), 116 patients with SSD (which includes schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder,
11	and delusional disorder), 148 patients with major depressive disorder (MDD), 125 patients
12	with autism spectrum disorder (ASD), and 39 patients with bipolar disorder (BP).
13	The validation dataset comprised international cohorts, including the Japanese cohort
14	from Hiroshima Kajikawa Hospital, Hiroshima Rehabilitation Centre, Hiroshima University
15	Hospital, Kyoto University Siemens Trio scanner, and Kyoto University Siemens Prisma
16	scanner. It also included the Taiwanese cohort (Taipei Medical University) and the Centre of
17	Biomedical Research Excellence open dataset
18	(http://fcon_1000.projects.nitrc.org/indi/retro/cobre.html), along with the Johns Hopkins
19	University cohort (United States), which included HCs and patients with early-stage SSD. The
20	total number of participants was 708 (405 HCs, 198 patients with SSD, and 105 patients with
21	MDD).
22	Clinical scale scores: Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) ¹⁹ and Peters et

al. Delusions Inventory (PDI) 21-item version²⁰ and information about the dosage of

antipsychotics were available from a subset of participants in both datasets (Supplementary
 Table 2).

This study was conducted in accordance with the recommendations of the review boards of institutions affiliated with the principal investigators—namely, Hiroshima University, Kyoto University, SWA, and UTO. Most of the material data in this study can be downloaded from the DecNef Project Brain Data Repository²¹ (https://bicr-resource.atr.jp/srpbsopen/).

8 Data acquisition

9 All data in the discovery dataset were collected using a unified protocol developed by a 10 national project (Strategic Research Program for Brain Science [SRPBS] & Brain/Mind Beyond) in Japan²¹. The MRI data comprised a T1-weighted structural image, rs-fMRI 11 12 acquired using an echo-planar imaging technique, and field map images. The duration of 13 rs-fMRI was 10 min. The participants were instructed to relax, stay awake, fixate on the central 14 crosshair mark, and not concentrate on specific things. The MRI data for the validation dataset 15 included a structural image and rs-fMRI similar to the discovery dataset; however, some of the 16 data lacked fieldmap images. Scanning parameters for the validation dataset varied by site. The 17 duration of rs-fMRI was approximately 4–6 min. Detailed imaging parameters for both 18 datasets are provided in Supplementary Table 3.

19 Preprocessing

The data were preprocessed according to a previous report²². fMRIPrep version 20.1.11 was used for data preprocessing²³. First, the first four volumes of the rs-fMRI scan were discarded for T1 equilibration. The preprocessing steps were as follows: slice-timing correction, realignment, coregistration, susceptibility-induced distortion correction using field maps,

segmentation of a T1-weighted structural image, normalisation to Montreal Neurological
 Institute space, and spatial smoothing with an isotropic Gaussian kernel of 6 mm full-width at
 half-maximum. For the participants without field maps in the validation dataset, we applied
 'fieldmap-less' distortion correction implemented in fMRIPrep. Further details of the pipeline
 are available at http://fmriprep.readthedocs.io/en/latest/workflows.html.

6 Signal extraction

7 We used two approaches for fMRI signal extraction: (1) a surface-based approach following the Human Connectome Project pipelines (using the ciftify toolbox version $2.3.2^{24}$, we 8 9 converted volume-based MRI data into data based on 'greyordinate' [cortical grey matter 10 surface vertices and subcortical grey matter voxels]) and (2) an approach based on the regions 11 of interest (ROIs). For reliable surface-based brain parcellation, we adopted the ROIs from Glasser et al.²⁵ (379 parcels in total, comprising 360 cortical parcels as surface ROIs and 19 12 13 subcortical parcels as volume ROIs). Using these approaches, we extracted BOLD signal time courses from 379 ROIs. To compare these ROIs with conventional annotations of brain areas 14 and intrinsic brain networks, we referred to the Anatomical Automatic Labelling (AAL) and Ji 15 et al.²⁶, respectively. 16

17 Noise removal

18 We used component-based noise correction (CompCor)²⁷ to detect physiological noise.

19 Anatomical CompCor was applied to the subcortical white matter and cerebrospinal fluid

20 regions, and the top five principal components were estimated as physiological noise, except

21 for one participant who had only four components. Accordingly, we regressed out these

22 components together with six head-motion parameters and averaged the signals over the entire

23 brain.

1 Temporal filtering

- 2 We used temporal bandpass filtering ranging from 0.01 to 0.08 Hz^{28} to the time series of
- 3 rs-fMRI to extract the low-frequency brain activity characterising resting state.

4 Data scrubbing

- 5 We removed volumes with considerable head motion based on framewise displacement $(FD)^{29}$.
- 6 FD was calculated as the sum of the absolute displacements in translation and rotation between
- 7 two consecutive volumes. We removed volumes with FD >0.5 mm, as proposed in a previous
- 8 study²⁹. In addition, participants whose scrubbed volume ratio exceeded the mean +3 S.D. were
- 9 excluded.

10 Calculation of the FC matrices

We defined FC as the temporal correlation of rs-fMRI BOLD signals between two ROIs. We calculated Pearson's correlation coefficient of the preprocessed BOLD time series between each pair of ROIs out of Glasser's 379 ROIs. Fisher's Z-transformed values of the correlation coefficients constituted an FC matrix for each participant, where the total number of FC was $\binom{379}{2} = 71\ 631.$

16 Harmonisation of the site differences

We harmonised the site effects in the discovery dataset prospectively²¹ using a unified imaging protocol under the SRPBS & Brain/Mind Beyond project and retrospectively using the travelling subject method⁹. Regarding the travelling subject method, site effects were separately estimated as measurement bias and sampling bias from the rs-fMRI data of these travelling subjects, each of whom underwent scans at multiple sites⁹. We subtracted the estimated measurement bias to obtain harmonised connectivity data (see Supplementary Text
 1). For the validation dataset, we applied the ComBat harmonisation method^{30–32}. In the
 execution of ComBat harmonisation, we inputted the diagnosis, PANSS total score, PDI total
 score, age, sex, handedness, and duration of illness (DOI) (for patients with SSD) as auxiliary
 variables to correct measurement bias.

6 Diagnostic classifiers for SSD

7 Next, we constructed classifiers to differentiate patients with SSD from HCs using machine 8 learning based on 71 631 FC values as features. In subsequent sections, we used only the data 9 of HCs and patients with SSD, except for generalising the models to other disorders. Initially, 10 we used a customised sparse learning algorithm, specifically least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO), similar to our previous work on MDD²⁶. The sparse method in 11 12 LASSO can prevent overfitting and simultaneously select important features (for the detailed 13 methodology, refer to **Supplementary Text 2**). Although we used LASSO to identify important FCs for SSD classification, we applied a voting method³³ to enhance the 14 classification performance of the LASSO classifiers. 15

16 **Building LASSO classifiers**

As illustrated in **Supplementary Figure 1a**, we implemented a nested 10-fold cross validation (CV) scheme. In the outer loop, we divided the discovery dataset into 10 folds. After leaving one fold as the test set, the remaining nine folds were used as the training set. To minimise the bias arising from the imbalance between the number of patients with SSD and HCs, we conducted subsampling with undersampling simultaneously. We randomly sampled the same number (*N*=102) of HCs and SSDs from the training set, creating a subsample. During subsampling and undersampling, we matched the mean ages of HCs and SSDs. We fit

1 the logistic regression model to the subsample while tuning a hyperparameter with an 2 inner-loop 10-fold CV (for the detailed methodology, see **Supplementary Text 2**). By 3 repeating random subsampling and fitting the model 10 times, we obtained 10 classifiers. We 4 then predicted SSD probability for each participant in the test set. By applying the 10 classifiers 5 built from a training set to a test set in each CV, we obtained the probability values for the 6 participant as the classifier outputs. When the mean probability value was >0.5, we considered 7 the participant's class as SSD; otherwise, as HC. Finally, by repeating the above procedure 10 8 times in the outer loop, 100 classifiers were obtained. 9 We evaluated the performance of the classifiers using the following indices: an area

10 under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC), accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, and

11 Matthews' correlation coefficient (MCC) (see **Supplementary Text 3** for details).

12 Independent validation of LASSO classifiers

To assess the generalisability of the obtained classifiers, we tested them on the validation dataset. We applied the 100 classifiers to each participant in the validation dataset to compute diagnostic probability values for each participant (**Supplementary Figure 1b**). We classified a participant as having SSD if the average probability value was >0.5.

We also performed a statistical analysis of the classification performance for independent validation using a permutation test. We created 100 quasi-classifiers using the same procedure as for building genuine classifiers, with the participants' classes permutated in the discovery dataset. We predicted the diagnosis in the same manner as mentioned above using the quasi-classifiers on the validation dataset for each permutation. By repeating random permutations 500 times and obtaining null distributions of the AUC and MCC, we evaluated the statistical significance of the true classifiers.

1 Identifying important FCs for predicting diagnosis

2 We investigated which FCs were utilised to predict the diagnosis in each classifier by 3 identifying the nonzero coefficients in LASSO. We counted the number of classifiers (out of 4 100) that selected each FC as an explanatory variable. We performed a permutation test to 5 identify the most informative FCs from 71 631 FCs. Each time we randomly permutated the 6 class labels of participants in the discovery dataset, we built 100 quasi-classifiers using 10-fold 7 CV with 10-time subsampling, following the methodology described in the previous section 8 (see 'Building LASSO classifiers' section). We determined the maximum counts for which 9 each FC was selected as a predictive explanatory variable using 100 quasi-classifiers for each 10 permutation. This procedure was repeated 100 times, resulting in a null distribution of 100 11 values for the maximum selection count. An FC was considered significantly informative 12 ('important FC') when the selection count in the genuine 100 classifiers exceeded the threshold 13 that corresponded to P < 0.05 in the null distribution.

14 Voting classifiers

In addition to logistic regression with LASSO, we attempted to enhance the performance by introducing a voting method³³. We incorporated support vector machine³⁴, random forest³⁵, light gradient boosting machine³⁶, and multi-layer perceptron³⁷ as representative algorithms. For each algorithm, we conducted CV, subsampling with undersampling, and training on the discovery dataset following the same procedure used to build the LASSO classifiers (for detailed methodology, see **Supplementary Text 4**).

To statistically compare the classification capability of the voting classifiers with that of the LASSO classifiers, we used the R programmes Compbdt and pROC. Using Compbdt³⁸, we compared the two classifiers based on their sensitivity and specificity using the McNemar

1 test. We used pROC to conduct DeLong's test on the AUC. The significance level for all tests

2 was set at P < 0.05.

3 Application of the classifiers to other psychiatric disorders

4 We assessed the specificity of the classifiers for SSD by applying them to data from 5 participants with other mental disorders, MDD, ASD, and BP. Regarding the LASSO 6 classifiers, we applied 100 classifiers to all the patients with these disorders from the discovery 7 and validation datasets. If the output probability was >0.5, the participants were assumed to 8 have SSD-like characteristics. Regarding the voting classifiers, we applied 500 classifiers to 9 the same patients, and the participants were assumed to be SSD-like if over half (>250) of the 10 classifiers predicted as such. The discovery dataset included patients with MDD, ASD, and BP, 11 whereas the validation dataset only included patients with MDD. The outputs of the classifiers 12 for HC and SSD were used for the comparison with MDD, ASD, and BP. Specifically, the 13 output for test data in the 10-fold CV was used in the discovery dataset, and the output of 100 14 classifiers was used in the validation dataset. 15 To evaluate if the classifying results of patients with any of the other disorders (MDD, 16 ASD, BP) had similarity to HC, SSD, or neither, we conducted a two-sided binomial test 17 (significance level, P < 0.05). We also assessed whether each probability density curve was 18 differently distributed using the two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. We conducted this test 19 for every combination of HC, SSD, MDD, ASD, and BP; thus, 10 combinations were obtained

21 Prediction of clinical scores using important FCs

20

Another objective of this study was to determine the extendibility of the trait marker to the stateor disease stage. In the first part of this investigation, we attempted to predict the scores of two

in total. The level of significance was P < 0.05/10 = 0.005 (Bonferroni-corrected).

1 clinical scales with important FCs in the aggregate so we could aid clinical assessment and 2 estimate the extent to which our biomarker could function as a trait and/or state marker using 3 the PDI and PANSS total scores. These scales have been widely used to assess delusional thinking and psychotic syndrome³⁹. PDI may reflect trait²⁰ and state⁴⁰, whereas the PANSS 4 may reflect the overall symptom severity of psychosis at that time point $(state)^{41}$. 5 6 We predicted the scores on the clinical scales (PDI and PANSS total scores) using important FCs as explanatory variables. We applied a nested 10-fold CV scheme to the 7 8 discovery dataset (only SSD participants with available target scale scores) to build prediction 9 models (Supplementary Figure 2a). In the outer loop, we divided the discovery dataset into 10 10 folds. After leaving one fold as the test set, we used the remaining nine folds as the training 11 set. We fitted the linear regression model to the training set (the *LinearRegression* module in 12 scikit-learn version 0.24.1). In the inner loop, we searched for the most suitable number of 13 important FCs to be used as features to avoid overfitting (for the detailed methodology, see 14 Supplementary Text 5 and Supplementary Figure 2b). We predicted the score for each 15 participant in the test set using a linear regression model with the best number of features for 16 the fold. Using 10-fold CV, we obtained 10 models with different numbers of features. For the 17 validation dataset, we averaged the outputs from the 10 models to create the final predicted 18 score (**Supplementary Figure 2c**). At any step of this analysis, the predicted value was 19 adjusted within the range of the scale score (if the prediction was lower than the lowest possible 20 value, it was adjusted to the lowest possible value, and vice versa). 21 We conducted a permutation test to assess the evaluation metrics statistically. 22 Specifically, we permutated clinical labels (diagnosis and symptom scores) against FC values, 23 created quasi-models following the same procedure as the genuine models, and repeated these 24 steps 500 times to obtain a null distribution of the evaluation metrics. Differences were 25 considered statistically significant if each evaluation metric for the genuine models was better

1 than the cut-off value of P=0.05 of the null distribution.

2 Separately identifying FCs associated with the state

3 Next, we explored the roles of individual FCs. To identify the FCs associated with state (i.e. 4 symptom scale scores), we performed multiple regression analyses on each of the important 5 FCs. We selected PANSS as the state index because it dynamically changes with treatment and 6 has been used as a representative scale for the state of schizophrenia. All HC participants and 7 patients with SSD having data on PANSS scores across the discovery and validation datasets 8 were included in the analysis. We examined two models of the PANSS: the original three-factor model¹⁹ composed of positive, negative, and general pathological factors and the five-factor 9 model⁴¹ composed of positive, negative, disorganised, excited, and depressed factors. Because 10 11 the general pathological factor was not categorised as a specific symptom dimension, we used 12 only positive and negative factors as explanatory variables for the three-factor model.

Owing to the exploratory nature of this analysis, we converted the PANSS scores into
explanatory variables in two ways: by min–max normalisation and binary dummy variables.
The formula to fit was the same for both methods:

16
$$FC = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_t + \sum_{j=1}^{n_{factor}} \left(\beta_{j+1} x_{s_j} \right) + e$$
 (Eq. 1)

17 where x_t represents the trait or diagnosis (HC: 0, SSD: 1), x_{s_i} represents the existence of

18 symptoms for the *j*th factor of the PANSS, and *e* represents a random error.

19 Conversion 1. Min-max normalisation of the scores

20 The value x_{s_i} was determined using the following formula:

21
$$x_{s_j} = \frac{m_j - \min(m_j)}{\max(m_j) - \min(m_j)} \quad \text{(Eq. 2)}$$

22 where m_j represents the participant's average score in the *j*th factor of the PANSS and

23 $\min(m_i)$ (or $\max(m_i)$) represents the minimum (or maximum) average score of the *j*th

1 PANSS factor across all patients with SSD with available PANSS subscore data.

2 Conversion 2. Binarising the scores

3
$$x_{s_j} = \begin{cases} 0 & if \ m_j \le 2\\ 1 & if \ m_j > 2 \end{cases}$$
 (Eq. 3)

4 The value x_{s_i} was determined as in Eq.3 as three points or more is considered pathological in

5 PANSS rating.

All s_j for HC participants were assumed to be zero. In the regression analysis for each FC, the FC was regarded as a potential state marker when any of the coefficient estimates for PANSS factor ($\beta_{(j+1)}$, $j = 1, 2, ..., n_{factor}$) was nonzero at a significance level P < 0.05 with a one-sample *t*-test. We reported FCs as being significant only when the state's coefficient concerned ($\beta_{(j+1)}$) was of the same sign as *w* of the FC in terms of consistency with the underlying LASSO classifiers.

12 Identifying FCs associated with the disease stage

Finally, we constructed another multiple regression model to identify FCs associated with the disease stage of SSD, which could be referred to as 'staging' markers. Following a pre-existing definition^{42,43}, we divided the SSD group into an early-stage psychosis subgroup (DOI of <5years) and a chronic-stage subgroup (DOI of ≥ 5 years). We formulated a regression model similar to that described in the previous section:

$$FC = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_t + \beta_2 x_e + \beta_3 x_c + \beta_4 x_a + e$$
 (Eq. 4)

19 such that
$$x_e = \begin{cases} 1 & if \ DOI < 5 \ yrs. \\ 0 & if \ DOI \ge 5 \ yrs. \end{cases}$$
, $x_c = \begin{cases} 0 & if \ DOI < 5 \ yrs. \\ 1 & if \ DOI \ge 5 \ yrs. \end{cases}$ (Eq. 5)

where x_e represents the early stage of SSD, x_c represents the chronic stage, and x_t and ewere defined in the same way as in Eq. 1. The value x_a , the age of the participant, was introduced as a covariate because the DOI was supposed to correlate with age. All HC participants and patients with SSD with DOI data across the discovery and validation datasets

1 were included in the analysis. Using this model, we categorised important FCs into six groups 2 based on which trait, early/chronic stage, was significantly associated: (1) trait only, (2) early 3 stage only, (3) chronic stage only, (4) trait and early stage, (5) trait and chronic stage, and (6) all 4 three. In terms of consistency with our classifiers and within the coefficients, every coefficient 5 estimate concerned must be of the same sign as w.; statistical significance was determined at 6 the level P < 0.05, with a one-sample t-test for each coefficient estimate. Considering the 7 relative instability of the model fit due to singularity, we adopted the bootstrap method (1,000 8 iterations) to count the number of times a certain FC was sorted into each category.

1 **RESULTS**

2 Datasets

- 3 Fifty-one participants whose scrubbed rs-fMRI volumes exceeded +3 standard deviations
- 4 (SDs) were excluded from all datasets. Therefore, 1,015 participants in the discovery dataset
- 5 and 683 participants in the validation dataset were included for further analyses. Through the
- 6 scrubbing process, 9.2±17.9% (mean±SD) of whole volumes per rs-fMRI scan were removed
- 7 across all datasets.

8 Performance of the LASSO classifiers

9 Within the discovery dataset, classification accuracy was 79.6%, with an AUC of 0.876.
10 Sensitivity, specificity, and MCC were 81.5%, 79.2%, and 0.484, respectively. The density
11 curve of HCs and patients with SSD is shown in Figure 2a, where a patient with a predicted
12 probability of >0.5 was classified as a patient and vice versa. The curves for each site are
13 shown in Figure 2b.

14 Within the validation dataset, the classifiers distinguished patients with SSD from 15 HCs with 77.3% accuracy and an AUC of 0.824, similar to the results from the discovery 16 dataset (Figure 2c, d). Sensitivity, specificity, and MCC were 69.2%, 81.1%, and 0.490, 17 respectively. A permutation test revealed that the AUC and MCC were significantly high 18 (P < 0.001). At JHU, the classifiers correctly distinguished HCs in most cases (specificity, 19 83.6%), but not patients with SSD (sensitivity, 40.6%). The probability density curve of SSD 20 was closer to that of HC (P=0.37, two-sided binomial test), although the distribution of the two 21 curves was significantly different (P=0.013, two-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test), 22 suggesting that patients with early-stage SSD at JHU fell between chronic-stage SSD and HC.

1 Important FCs for predicting diagnosis

- 2 At P < 0.05 in the permutation test, the FCs selected by ≥ 17 classifiers were deemed important.
- 3 Ultimately, we identified 47 important FCs, as shown in Figure 3a, b and detailed in

4 Supplementary Table 4.

Furthermore, we investigated the detailed patterns of FC value differences between
the HC and SSD groups and their reproducibility across the two datasets by plotting the mean
values for 47 FCs, facilitating a comparison between the datasets (Figure 3c). The relationship
between the mean FC values of the HC and SSD groups was maintained in the validation
dataset for 44 of 47 FCs.

10 Voting classifiers
11 Supplementary Figure 3a, b displays the probability density curve of the voting classifier's

12 output through 10-fold CV in the discovery dataset.

13 Independent validation for all sites in the validation dataset is presented in

14 Supplementary Figure 3c, d. We conducted statistical tests to compare the performance of the

15 voting classifiers with that of the LASSO classifiers. Sensitivity was significantly higher for

- 16 the voting classifiers than for the LASSO classifiers (*P*<0.001, McNemar test, two-sided).
- 17 However, specificity showed no significant difference between groups (P=0.192, McNemar
- 18 test, two-sided). The AUC of the voting classifiers was 0.841, which was not significantly
- 19 different from that of LASSO classifiers (*P*=0.11, DeLong's test).

20 Supplementary analyses on classifiers' characteristics

LASSO and voting classifiers were built on subsamples in which the mean ages of the
 HC and SSD groups were matched to mitigate the confounding effect of age. Furthermore, we

1 evaluated whether the classifiers' performance was influenced by confounding factors (see 2 **Supplementary Text 6** and **Supplementary Table 5**). Consequently, the performance of 3 voting classifiers could be partly influenced by age but not by other potential confounding 4 factors. In contrast, the LASSO classifiers were unaffected by any potential confounding 5 variables. 6 We also investigated how the classification performance varied based on disease severity in the validation dataset. Following a previous report⁴⁴, we identified subgroups with 7 8 different severities based on PANSS total scores: mild (PANSS <58, N=55), moderate 9 (58<PANSS575, N=36), marked (75<PANSS595, N=20), severe (95<PANSS5116, N=1), and 10 most severe (116<PANSS, N=0). Except for the severe and most severe subgroups, each of 11 which contained only one or no participants, the sensitivity by subgroup was highest in the 12 marked subgroup, followed by the mild and moderate subgroups (Supplementary Table 6). 13 This order of performance was consistent for the LASSO and voting classifiers, but the 14 disparity among the subgroups decreased for the voting classifiers compared with the LASSO, 15 suggesting that voting classifiers can predict classes with less imbalance across different 16 disease severity levels.

17 Classifier specificity for SSD

The LASSO classifiers revealed that the patients with ASD and BP did not exhibit high- or low-SSD-like characteristics. However, patients with MDD were less SSD-like ($P=2.24\times10^{-7}$), resembling the HCs (**Supplementary Figure 4, Supplementary Table 7**). Voting classifiers showed a similar pattern. These results suggest that both classifiers exhibited high specificity for SSD.

Moreover, we investigated whether each probability density curve was distributed
 differently. The LASSO and voting classifiers revealed that the curve of each non-SSD

- 1 disorder had a significantly different distribution from those of HC and SSD in the discovery
- 2 and validation datasets (Supplementary Table 8). Furthermore, the curves for any two
- 3 non-SSD disorders showed no significant differences.

4 Prediction of clinical scale scores using important FCs

- 5 Regarding PDI total scores, the results of 10-fold CV in the discovery dataset were acceptable
- 6 (r=0.231, 95% confidence interval [CI]=[0.00101–0.438], P=0.0492, two-sided, mean
- 7 absolute error [MAE]=40.0). Weak correlations between the actual and predicted scores were
- 8 observed in the validation dataset (r=0.331, 95% CI=[0.0609–0.556], $R^2=0.110$, P=0.0177,
- 9 two-sided, MAE=55.5) (Figure 4a). A permutation test was conducted to objectively assess
- 10 whether the evaluation metrics were satisfactory. The correlation coefficients were
- 11 significantly high ($P_{perm}=0.01$) and MAE significantly low ($P_{perm}=0.018$).
- 12 Concerning PANSS total scores, the 10-fold CV in the discovery dataset resulted in no
- 13 correlation between actual and predicted scores (r=-0.0065, 95% CI=[-0.199-0.186],
- 14 *P*=0.948, two-sided, MAE=17.5). The model did not predict scores in the validation dataset

15 either (r=0.128, 95% CI=[-0.0588-0.306], $R^2=0.016$, P=0.178, two-sided, MAE=16.8)

16 (Figure 4b).

17 In summary, we predicted the PDI total score more efficiently than the PANSS total

18 score, suggesting that, collectively, the important FCs may function as trait and state markers.

19 Individual FCs associated with PANSS factors

20 In total, 17 FCs were significantly associated with the PANSS factors. Using the three-factor

- 21 model of PANSS, we identified significant associations in FCs #45 (R.TPOJ1 and R.Thalamus,
- 22 with the PANSS positive factor) and #8 (L.1 and R.3b, with the PANSS negative factor),
- regardless of the score conversion method (Table 2, Supplementary Table 9). With the

1	five-factor model of PANSS, we found that the significantly associated FCs, regardless of
2	conversion method, were FCs #18 (L.FOP1 and R.Putamen), #41 (R.6a and R.PoI1), #43
3	(R.FOP4 and R.Putamen) with the excited factor, and FC #27 (R.RSC and R.SFL) with the
4	depressed factor.
5	When the coefficient estimate was significant only for a state (not for the trait), such
6	FCs were assumed to be 'pure' state markers. We found nine FCs (Table 2). Among these FCs

7 FC #27 (R.RSC and R.SFL) was the only one consistently identified as a 'pure' state marker,

8 regardless of conversion method.

9 Individual FCs associated with disease stage

10 Figure 4c presents the results of categorising important FCs into subgroups associated with 11 trait (diagnosis), the early stage, or the chronic stage of SSD using the bootstrapping method 12 (1,000 iterations). We assumed that an FC belonged to a certain category with consistent 13 regression results for over half (>500) of the iterations. Subsequently, the important FCs were 14 categorised most frequently as 'trait and chronic stage' (61.7%), followed by 'trait and early 15 stage' (6.4%), 'trait only' (2.1%), and 'trait, early, and chronic stage' (2.1%). No FCs were 16 categorised as 'early stage only' or 'chronic stage only,' indicating that we did not identify any 17 pure staging markers.

1 **DISCUSSION**

2	We developed rs-FC classifiers for SSD based on harmonised multicentre data and validated it
3	using large-sample independent data. This study also aimed to maximise the potential of the
4	rs-FC biomarker to function as a state marker and a staging marker.
5	The accuracy of the identified diagnostic marker was approximately 80% for the
6	discovery dataset. It demonstrated comparable performance in an external validation with
7	seven international cohorts; this presents a sharp contrast to previous studies ¹⁰ . This
8	achievement was possible through bi-directional (prospective and retrospective) harmonisation
9	and with optimised machine learning method. Against the concerns on session variability of
10	rsfMRI, we reduced the variability and improved generalisability to independent validation
11	cohorts through spatial averaging of 100 classifiers, each analysing tens of FCs. Furthermore, a
12	previous study ⁴⁵ revealed that test-retest reliability was acceptable with the same methodology
13	as demonstrated in this study.
14	The LASSO and voting classifiers exhibited distinct performance characteristics.
15	Voting classifiers demonstrated superiority in sensitivity and a more balanced profile over
16	LASSO classifiers, with the accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity falling within a narrow range
17	(LASSO: 69.2-81.1%, voting: 74.7-78.8%) in independent validation.
18	We identified important FCs that significantly contributed more frequently to SSD
19	classification in LASSO classifiers. Based on AAL, the putamen, insula, thalamus, and
20	cingulum were among the top ROIs most frequently found in the important FCs
21	(Supplementary Table 10). In schizophrenia research, these are consistently implicated in
22	grey matter volume reduction ⁴⁶ or FC abnormality ^{47,48} . Moreover, these ROIs were associated
23	with the cortico-striatal-thalamic-cortical loop and salience network, both recognised for their
24	pivotal roles in the psychopathology of SSD ⁴⁹ . In the context of FC, hypoconnectivity between

1	the putamen and anterior cingulate cortex (FC #13, #30, #37, #38) in the SSD group aligns with
2	a previous report ⁵⁰ , where greater ACC-putamen connectivity predicted better treatment
3	response. Conversely, in the SSD group, the thalamus exhibited increased connectivity with
4	various cortical ROIs (FC #11, #12, #24, #25, #35, #36, and #45), corresponding with a report ⁵¹
5	on thalamocortical connectivity in schizophrenia, implying disrupted information filtering in
6	SSD, consistent with the literature ⁵² . Therefore, these important FCs aptly reflected the neural
7	correlates of schizophrenia and were considered trait markers of SSD.
8	We observed that our classifiers exhibited high specificity for SSD, whereas other
9	diagnoses (MDD, ASD, and BP) did not show specificity for HC or SSD. These psychiatric
10	disorders share several characteristics with SSD in the alteration pattern of brain function $^{53-55}$.
11	Moreover, these disorders have similar phenotypes (e.g. cortical thickness) and genotypes ⁵⁶ .
12	Thus, our biomarkers may, to some extent, reflect neural changes common to psychiatric
13	disorders ⁵⁷ .
14	The second objective of this study was to dissect the biomarker into a 'trait marker'
15	and other components. Using aggregated important FCs, we achieved an acceptable level of
16	prediction for the PDI but not for the PANSS, indicating that aggregated FCs were more
17	strongly associated with traits. Few groups have reported successful prediction of symptoms
18	using $FC^{58,59}$; however, these studies lacked external validation. In this study, the predicted PDI
19	total score was significantly correlated to the actual score in the discovery and validation
20	datasets.
21	Using multiple regression analysis, we identified state markers individually. Using the
22	three-factor model of the PANSS, we observed a significant association between positive
23	scores and FC #45 and negative scores and FC #8, irrespective of the score conversion method.
24	Evidence suggests that FC #45 significantly correlates with positive symptoms ⁶⁰ . FC #8 also
25	showed a significant association with the negative and disorganised factors of the five-factor

1 model, which could be linked to the finding that interhemispheric connectivity of the precentral and postcentral gyri were negatively correlated with the PANSS total score⁶¹. 2 3 We discovered interesting overlaps of ROIs in the potential state marker FCs. 4 Concerning negative and depressed factors, sensorimotor areas were noticeable. Specific 5 functional alterations in these ROIs related to neurological soft signs (NSSs) have been reported⁶². Moreover, NSSs correlate with PANSS negative scores and depression scale 6 scores⁶³. The excited factor seems to involve the putamen, insula, Rolandic operculum, and 7 middle cingulum, regions likely to be associated with aggression⁶⁴. The Rolandic operculum 8 9 and middle cingulum are related to aggression via disruption of the cognitive control network⁶⁵. 10 11 Neuromodulation can be a novel psychiatric treatment, and one of the promising 12 techniques is neurofeedback (Nef). There is accumulating evidence on the therapeutic effect of Nef targeting FCs^{66,67}. Our findings on state markers will benefit future FC-Nef in target 13 14 selection. 15 Although we did not discover any pure staging markers, our results provide a 16 compelling argument for 'trait and early stage' markers exemplified by FCs #16, #20, and #23. 17 FCs #20 and #23 represented connections between regions around the superior temporal sulcus 18 (STS) or gyrus (STG). A task-based fMRI study on working memory showed attenuated activity in the STG in patients with early-stage psychosis compared with HCs⁶⁸. Moreover, the 19 cortical thickness of the insula (an ROI in FC #16) and the STS region are reduced in 20 21 early-stage psychosis⁶⁹. These suggest that our biomarker partly include staging marker. 22 Additionally, the fact that the probability curve for patients with early-stage psychosis at JHU 23 lies in the middle between the HC and SSD groups may also support this argument. 24 This study has some limitations. First, the participants with SSD in our study were 25 mostly medicated; hence, the applicability of our results to drug-naive patients cannot be

1	guaranteed. Second, we only confirmed that our classifiers distinguished patients with SSD
2	from healthy individuals, not from individuals with other psychiatric disorders exhibiting
3	psychotic symptoms. Further studies are required to test the classifiers for these disorders to
4	maximise the clinical applicability.
5	In conclusion, we developed robust and clinically usable classifiers for SSD using a
6	combination of cutting-edge strategies. While constructing the classifiers, we identified FCs
7	that may play key roles in SSD pathophysiology. We also demonstrated that these 'important
8	FCs' had multiple functions as SSD trait, state, or staging markers. Our findings shed new light
9	on the early diagnosis of SSD and the selection of targets for neuromodulation.

1 Acknowledgements

- 2 We thank Editage (www.editage.com) for the English language editing.
- 3

4 Funding

- 5 This study was supported by KAKENHI JP (23H04979) from the Ministry of Education,
- 6 Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan, AMED (Grant Numbers: JP23dm0307008,
- 7 JP19dm0207069, JP18dm0307001, JP18dm0307004, JP18dm0307008, and
- 8 JP18dm0307009), and CREST (JPMJCR22P3) from the Japan Science and Technology
- 9 Agency. OY received support from the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development
- 10 (AMED) (Grant Number JP23dm0307009). TM received support from a Grant-in-Aid for
- 11 Transformative Research Areas (A) (Japan Society for The Promotion of Science,
- 12 JP21H05173), Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) (Japan Society for The Promotion of
- 13 Science, 21H02849), and Strategic International Brain Science Research Promotion Program
- 14 (Brain/MINDS Beyond) (21dm0307102h0003) of the AMED. JM received support from the
- 15 AMED (Grant Number JP21uk1024002) and KAKENHI (JP20H05064).
- 16

17 Author contributions

- 18 T.K., A.Y., M.K., and H.T. designed the study. T.K., Y.Y., Y.K., N.O, K.K., M-C.H., A.S., T.M.,
- 19 J.M., and H.T. recruited participants for the study and collected their clinical and imaging data.
- 20 T.K. and A.Y. performed the data analysis. T.K., A.Y., and J.M. wrote the original draft of the
- 21 manuscript. T.K., A.Y., Y.Y., Y.K., N.O, K.K., M-C.H., A.S., J.Y., O.Y., T.M., J.M., M.K., and
- 22 H.T. reviewed and revised the manuscript.

23

24 Conflict of interest

25 MK is an inventor of patents owned by the Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute

- 1 International related to the present work (PCT/JP2014/061544 [WO2014178323] and
- 2 JP2015-228970/6195329). AY and MK are inventors of a patent application submitted by the
- 3 Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International related to the present work
- 4 (JP2018-192842).

1 **REFERENCES**

- 2 1. Abi-Dargham, A. & Horga, G. The search for imaging biomarkers in psychiatric
- 3 disorders. Nat. Med. 22, 1248–1255 (2016).
- 4 2. Kraguljac, N. V. et al. Neuroimaging biomarkers in schizophrenia. Am. J. Psychiatry
- 5 appi.ajp.2020.2 (2021) doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.20030340.
- 6 3. Cai, X. et al. Generalizability of machine learning for classification of schizophrenia
- 7 based on resting state functional MRI data. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* **41**, 172–184 (2020).
- 8 4. Parkes, L., Satterthwaite, T. D. & Bassett, D. S. Towards precise resting-state fMRI
- 9 biomarkers in psychiatry: synthesizing developments in transdiagnostic research, dimensional
- 10 models of psychopathology, and normative neurodevelopment. Curr. Opin. Neurobiol. 65,
- 11 120–128 (2020).
- 12 5. Steyerberg, E. W. & Harrell, F. E. Prediction models need appropriate internal,
- 13 internal-external, and external validation. J. Clin. Epidemiol. 69, 245-247 (2016).
- 14 6. Winterburn, J. L. *et al.* Can we accurately classify schizophrenia patients from healthy
- 15 controls using magnetic resonance imaging and machine learning? A multi-method and
- 16 multi-dataset study. Schizophr. Res. 214, 3–10 (2019).

17 7. Li, C. et al. Classification of Schizophrenia Spectrum Disorder Using Machine

- 18 Learning and Functional Connectivity: Reconsidering the Clinical Application.
- 19 http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.05.30.20118026 (2020)
- 20 doi:10.1101/2020.05.30.20118026.
- 21 8. Schnack, H. G. & Kahn, R. S. Detecting neuroimaging biomarkers for psychiatric
- 22 disorders: Sample size matters. *Front. Psychiatry* 7, (2016).
- 23 9. Yamashita, A. et al. Harmonization of resting-state functional MRI data across
- 24 multiple imaging sites via the separation of site differences into sampling bias and

1 measurement bias. *PLOS Biol.* **17**, e3000042 (2019).

2 10. Porter, A. *et al.* A meta-analysis and systematic review of single vs. multimodal

3 neuroimaging techniques in the classification of psychosis. *Mol. Psychiatry* **28**, 3278–3292

4 (2023).

5 11. Noble, S., Scheinost, D. & Constable, R. T. A decade of test-retest reliability of

6 functional connectivity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *NeuroImage* 203, 116157

7 (2019).

8 12. Lema, Y. Y., Gamo, N. J., Yang, K. & Ishizuka, K. Trait and state biomarkers for

9 psychiatric disorders: Importance of infrastructure to bridge the gap between basic and clinical

10 research and industry: Trait and state biomarkers in psychiatry. Psychiatry Clin. Neurosci. 72,

11 482–489 (2018).

12 13. Spellman, T. & Liston, C. Toward circuit mechanisms of pathophysiology in

13 depression. Am. J. Psychiatry 177, 381–390 (2020).

14 14. McGorry, P. *et al.* Biomarkers and clinical staging in psychiatry. *World Psychiatry* 13,
15 211–223 (2014).

16 15. Martínez-Cao, C. et al. Is it possible to stage schizophrenia? A systematic review.

17 Transl. Psychiatry 12, 197 (2022).

18 16. Yahata, N., Morimoto, J. & Hashimoto, R. A small number of abnormal brain

19 connections predicts adult autism spectrum disorder. Nat. Commun. 7, (2016).

20 17. Yoshihara, Y. *et al.* Overlapping but asymmetrical relationships between

21 schizophrenia and autism revealed by brain connectivity. *Schizophr. Bull.* 46, 1210–1218

22 (2020).

23 18. Ichikawa, N. et al. Primary functional brain connections associated with melancholic

- 24 major depressive disorder and modulation by antidepressants. Sci. Rep. 10, 3542 (2020).
- 25 19. Kay, S. R., Fiszbein, A. & Opler, L. A. The Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale

- 1 (PANSS) for schizophrenia. Schizophr. Bull. 13, 261–276 (1987).
- 2 20. Peters, E., Joseph, S., Day, S. & Garety, P. Measuring delusional ideation: The 21-item
- 3 Peters et al. Delusions Inventory (PDI). Schizophr. Bull. 30, 1005–1022 (2004).
- 4 21. Tanaka, S. C. et al. A multi-site, multi-disorder resting-state magnetic resonance
- 5 image database. *Sci. Data* **8**, 227 (2021).
- 6 22. Yamashita, A. et al. Generalizable brain network markers of major depressive
- 7 disorder across multiple imaging sites. *PLOS Biol.* 18, e3000966 (2020).
- 8 23. Esteban, O. et al. fMRIPrep: A robust preprocessing pipeline for functional MRI. Nat.
- 9 *Methods* **16**, 111–116 (2019).
- 10 24. Dickie, E. W. *et al.* Ciftify: A framework for surface-based analysis of legacy MR
- 11 acquisitions. *NeuroImage* **197**, 818–826 (2019).
- 12 25. Glasser, M. F. *et al.* A multi-modal parcellation of human cerebral cortex. *Nature* 536,
 13 171–178 (2016).
- 14 26. Ji, J. L. *et al.* Mapping the human brain's cortical-subcortical functional network
- 15 organization. *NeuroImage* **185**, 35–57 (2019).
- 16 27. Behzadi, Y., Restom, K., Liau, J. & Liu, T. T. A component based noise correction
- 17 method (CompCor) for BOLD and perfusion based fMRI. *NeuroImage* **37**, 90–101 (2007).
- 18 28. Satterthwaite, T. D. et al. An improved framework for confound regression and
- 19 filtering for control of motion artifact in the preprocessing of resting-state functional
- 20 connectivity data. *NeuroImage* **64**, 240–256 (2013).
- 21 29. Power, J. D. et al. Methods to detect, characterize, and remove motion artifact in
- 22 resting state fMRI. *NeuroImage* **84**, 320–341 (2014).
- 23 30. Fortin, J.-P. *et al.* Harmonization of multi-site diffusion tensor imaging data.
- 24 *NeuroImage* **161**, 149–170 (2017).
- 25 31. Fortin, J.-P. *et al.* Harmonization of cortical thickness measurements across scanners

- 1 and sites. *NeuroImage* **167**, 104–120 (2018).
- 2 32. Johnson, W. E., Li, C. & Rabinovic, A. Adjusting batch effects in microarray
- 3 expression data using empirical Bayes methods. *Biostatistics* **8**, 118–127 (2007).
- 4 33. Sherazi, S. W. A., Bae, J.-W. & Lee, J. Y. A soft voting ensemble classifier for early
- 5 prediction and diagnosis of occurrences of major adverse cardiovascular events for STEMI and
- 6 NSTEMI during 2-year follow-up in patients with acute coronary syndrome. PLOS ONE 16,
- 7 e0249338 (2021).
- 8 34. Boser, B. E., Guyon, I. M. & Vapnik, V. N. A training algorithm for optimal margin

9 classifiers. in Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Workshop on Computational Learning Theory.

- 10 Colt '92 144–152 (ACM Press, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, United States, 1992).
- 11 doi:10.1145/130385.130401.
- 12 35. Tin Kam Ho. Random decision forests. in *Proceedings of 3rd International*
- 13 Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition vol. 1 278–282 (IEEE Comput. Soc. Press,
- 14 Montreal, Que., Canada, 1995).
- 15 36. Ke, G. *et al.* LightGBM: A Highly Efficient Gradient Boosting Decision Tree. 9.
- 16 37. Rumelhart, D. E., Hinton, G. E. & Williams, R. J. Learning Internal Representations
- 17 by Error Propagation. in *Readings in Cognitive Science* 399–421 (Elsevier, 1988).
- 18 doi:10.1016/B978-1-4832-1446-7.50035-2.
- 19 38. Roldán-Nofuentes, J. A. Compbdt: an R program to compare two binary diagnostic
- 20 tests subject to a paired design. BMC Med. Res. Methodol. 20, 143 (2020).
- 21 39. Lincoln, T. M., Ziegler, M., Lüllmann, E., Müller, M. J. & Rief, W. Can delusions be
- 22 self-assessed? Concordance between self- and observer-rated delusions in schizophrenia.
- 23 Psychiatry Res. 178, 249–254 (2010).
- 24 40. Balzan, R. P., Delfabbro, P. H., Galletly, C. A. & Woodward, T. S. Metacognitive
- 25 training for patients with schizophrenia: Preliminary evidence for a targeted, single-module

1 programme. Aust. N. Z. J. Psychiatry 48, 1126–1136 (2014).

- 2 41. Wallwork, R. S., Fortgang, R., Hashimoto, R., Weinberger, D. R. & Dickinson, D.
- 3 Searching for a consensus five-factor model of the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale for
- 4 schizophrenia. Schizophr. Res. 137, 246–250 (2012).
- 5 42. McGorry, P. D., Killackey, E. & Yung, A. Early intervention in psychosis: Concepts,
- 6 evidence and future directions. *World Psychiatry* **7**, 148–156 (2008).
- 7 43. Newton, R. et al. Diverse definitions of the early course of schizophrenia—A targeted
- 8 literature review. *Npj Schizophr.* **4**, 21 (2018).
- 9 44. Leucht, S. et al. What does the PANSS mean? Schizophr. Res. 79, 231–238 (2005).
- 10 45. Okada, G. et al. Verification of the brain network marker of major depressive disorder:
- 11 Test-retest reliability and anterograde generalization performance for newly acquired data. J.
- 12 Affect. Disord. 326, 262–266 (2023).
- 13 46. Chan, R. C. K., Di, X., McAlonan, G. M. & Gong, Q. -y. Brain anatomical
- 14 abnormalities in high-risk individuals, first-episode, and chronic schizophrenia: An activation
- 15 likelihood estimation meta-analysis of illness progression. Schizophr. Bull. 37, 177–188
- 16 (2011).
- 17 47. Tu, P.-C., Hsieh, J.-C., Li, C.-T., Bai, Y.-M. & Su, T.-P. Cortico-striatal disconnection
- 18 within the cingulo-opercular network in schizophrenia revealed by intrinsic functional
- 19 connectivity analysis: A resting fMRI study. *NeuroImage* **59**, 238–247 (2012).
- 20 48. Li, S. et al. Dysconnectivity of multiple brain networks in schizophrenia: A
- 21 meta-analysis of resting-state functional connectivity. *Front. Psychiatry* **10**, 482 (2019).
- 22 49. Peters, S. K., Dunlop, K. & Downar, J. Cortico-striatal-thalamic loop circuits of the
- 23 salience network: A central pathway in psychiatric disease and treatment. Front. Syst. Neurosci.
- 24 **10**, (2016).
- 25 50. Cadena, E. J. *et al.* Cognitive control network dysconnectivity and response to

1 antipsychotic treatment in schizophrenia. Schizophr. Res. 204, 262–270 (2019).

- 2 51. Anticevic, A. et al. Characterizing thalamo-cortical disturbances in schizophrenia and
- 3 bipolar illness. *Cereb. Cortex* **24**, 3116–3130 (2014).
- 4 52. Andreasen, N. C. The role of the thalamus in schizophrenia. *Can. J. Psychiatry* 42,
- 5 27–33 (1997).
- 6 53. Wu, X. et al. Functional network connectivity alterations in schizophrenia and
- 7 depression. *Psychiatry Res. Neuroimaging* **263**, 113–120 (2017).
- 8 54. Koike, S. et al. Shared functional impairment in the prefrontal cortex affects symptom
- 9 severity across psychiatric disorders. *Psychol. Med.* **52**, 2661–70 (2020).
- 10 55. Jutla, A., Foss 🗆 Feig, J. & Veenstra 🗆 Vanderweele, J. Autism spectrum disorder and
- 11 schizophrenia: An updated conceptual review. Autism Res. 15, 384–412 (2021).
- 12 56. Writing Committee for the Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder *et al.* Virtual
- 13 Histology of Cortical Thickness and Shared Neurobiology in 6 Psychiatric Disorders. JAMA
- 14 Psychiatry 78, 47 (2021).
- 15 57. Goodkind, M. *et al.* Identification of a common neurobiological substrate for mental
- 16 illness. JAMA Psychiatry 72, 305 (2015).
- 17 58. Li, A. *et al.* A neuroimaging biomarker for striatal dysfunction in schizophrenia. *Nat.*18 *Med.* 26, 558–565 (2020).
- 19 59. Wang, D. et al. Individual-specific functional connectivity markers track dimensional
- and categorical features of psychotic illness. *Mol. Psychiatry* **25**, 2119–2129 (2020).
- 21 60. Ferri, J. et al. Resting-state thalamic dysconnectivity in schizophrenia and
- 22 relationships with symptoms. *Psychol. Med.* **48**, 2492–2499 (2018).
- 23 61. Hoptman, M. J. et al. Decreased interhemispheric coordination in schizophrenia: A
- 24 resting state fMRI study. *Schizophr. Res.* 141, 1–7 (2012).
- 25 62. Schröder, J., Wenz, F., Schad, L. R., Baudendistel, K. & Knopp, M. V. Sensorimotor

1	cortex and supplementary motor area changes in schizophrenia. A study with functional
2	magnetic resonance imaging. Br. J. Psychiatry 167, 197–201 (1995).
3	63. Fountoulakis, K. N., Panagiotidis, P., Gonda, X., Kimiskidis, V. & Nimatoudis, I.
4	Neurological soft signs significantly differentiate schizophrenia patients from healthy controls.
5	Acta Neuropsychiatr. 30, 97–105 (2018).
6	64. Leclerc, M. P., Regenbogen, C., Hamilton, R. H. & Habel, U. Some neuroanatomical
7	insights to impulsive aggression in schizophrenia. Schizophr. Res. 201, 27-34 (2018).
8	65. Wong, T. Y. <i>et al.</i> Neural networks of aggression: ALE meta-analyses on trait and
9	elicited aggression. Brain Struct. Funct. 224, 133-148 (2019).
10	66. Taylor, J. E. <i>et al.</i> Depressive symptoms reduce when dorsolateral prefrontal
11	cortex-precuneus connectivity normalizes after functional connectivity neurofeedback. Sci.
12	<i>Rep.</i> 12 , 2581 (2022).
13	67. Takamura, M. <i>et al.</i> Application of functional connectivity neurofeedback in patients
14	with treatment-resistant depression: A preliminary report. J. Affect. Disord. Rep. 14, 100644
15	(2023).
16	68. Crossley, N. A. <i>et al.</i> Superior temporal lobe dysfunction and frontotemporal
17	dysconnectivity in subjects at risk of psychosis and in first-episode psychosis. Hum. Brain
18	<i>Mapp.</i> 30 , 4129–4137 (2009).
19	69. Wen, K. <i>et al.</i> Cortical thickness abnormalities in patients with first episode psychosis:
20	a meta-analysis of psychoradiologic studies and replication in an independent sample.
21	<i>Psychoradiology</i> 1 , 185–198 (2021).
22	

1 FIGURE LEGENDS

2 Figure 1. Outline of the study

3 This study was composed of two parts. (I) Constructing SSD classifier: Using the discovery 4 dataset, we processed rs-fMRI images into an FC matrix for each participant, which was then 5 inputted into machine learning (LASSO) to build SSD classifiers. We obtained the 6 classification performance through 10-fold CV and examined its external generalisability using 7 the validation dataset. 'Important FCs' were those that made the highest contribution to the 8 classification. To assess classifier specificity for SSD, we also applied the classifiers to other 9 mental disorders. We performed further analyses on another machine learning method (voting 10 classifiers) and on classification performance by disease severity. (II) Exploring 11 trait/state/staging markers of SSD: We investigated the different types of biomarkers inherent 12 in important FCs. First, we attempted to predict clinical scale scores using aggregated FCs. 13 Second, we searched for individual FCs associated with the state and/or disease stage. CV, 14 cross-validation; SSD, schizophrenia spectrum disorder; LASSO, least absolute shrinkage and 15 selection operator; rs-fMRI, resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging; FC, 16 functional connectivity.

17

18 Figure 2. Probability density curves based on LASSO classifiers

(a) Results for all the sites combined in the discovery dataset. (b) Results for individual sites in
the discovery dataset. (c) Results for all the sites combined in the validation dataset. (d) Results
for individual sites in the validation dataset. As four sites in Hiroshima (COI, HKH, HRC, and
HUH) did not have any patients with SSD, these sites have a curve for HCs only. HC, healthy
control; SSD, schizophrenia spectrum disorder; AUC, area under the curve; MCC, Matthews'
correlation coefficient; LASSO, least absolute shrinkage and selection operator; COBRE,

1 Centre of Biomedical Research Excellence.

2

3 Figure 3. Important FCs (P<0.05) in diagnosis prediction by LASSO classifiers

4 (a) Each node on the inner circle corresponds to an ROI. The line width of the FC shows how
5 many times it was selected by the classifiers, and the line colour denotes the direction to which

6 it contributes to the logistic regression model (red means that the higher the FC value is, the

7 more likely the classifier's output is to be SSD; blue means a lower FC value for a higher

8 likelihood of SSD). (b) The 47 important FCs were projected onto glass brains. The colours of

9 the ROIs in relation to each intrinsic brain network and the red/blue line colours correspond to

10 those in (a). (c) The mean FC values (Z-score, on the ordinate) of the 47 important FCs for the

11 HC and SSD groups are shown as a bar plot for the discovery and validation datasets. Error

12 bars represent standard error. The FC numbers on the abscissa correspond to those in (a) and

13 Supplementary Table 4. FC, functional connectivity; HC, healthy control; SSD,

schizophrenia spectrum disorder; ROI, region of interest; LASSO, least absolute shrinkage and
selection operator.

16

17 Figure 4. Trait, state, and staging marker analyses

18 (a, b) Prediction results of PDI total and PANSS total scores. The relationship between the 19 predicted scores (on the ordinate) and actual scores (on the abscissa) for the validation dataset 20 is shown in a scatter plot. The grey translucent band represents the 95% confidence interval of 21 the regression line. (a) PDI total scores. (b) PANSS total score. (c) Individual FCs associated 22 with disease stage. This heat map shows the results of the bootstrap method, where the number 23 in the colour bar indicates the number of times the FC was sorted into a category out of 1,000 24 iterations. n.s., not significant ($P \ge 0.05$ for all three explanatory variables or any of the 25 coefficients' signs were inconsistent with the average weight in LASSO classifiers); MAE,

- 1 mean absolute error; PDI, Peters et al. Delusion Inventory; PANSS, Positive and Negative
- 2 Syndrome Scale; FC, functional connectivity; LASSO, least absolute shrinkage and selection
- 3 operator.

1 **TABLES**

2 Table 1. Demographics of the participants (HCs and patients with SSD)

		НС				SSD				Total (HC and SSD)			
Site	Abbr.	Number	M/F	Age (mean±SD)		Number	M/F	Age (mean±SD)		Number	M/F	Age (mean±SD)	
		ove	ry dataset										
Kyoto University (Tim Trio)	KUT	223	127/96	33.4±13.2		61	32/29	40.7±13.2		284	159/125	35.1±13.2	
Showa University	SWA	101	86/15	31.4±7.9		19	15/4	42.7±8.4		120	101/19	30.7±9.5	
Centre of Innovation, Hiroshima University	COI	124	46/78	51.9±13.4		_	_	_		124	46/78	51.9±13.4	
University of Tokyo	UTO	169	77/92	35.7±17.5		36	24/12	23.3±10.3		205	101/104	34.9±16.5	
Summary		617	336/281	36.9±16.0		116	71/45	38.5±11.4		733	407/326	37.2±15.3	
				Valid	lati	on dataset							
Kyoto University (Trio)	KTT	72	44/28	28.7±9.4		48	23/25	37.8±9.4		120	67/53	32.4±10.4	
Kyoto University (Prisma)	KUP	11	7/4	35.0±8.5		18	11/7	40.2±12.9		29	18/11	38.2±11.6	
Hiroshima University Hospital	HUH	66	29/37	34.6±13.0		-	_	-		66	29/37	34.6±13.0	

Hiroshima Kajikawa Hospital	НКН	29	12/17	45.4±9.5	_	_	-	29	12/17	45.4±9.5
Hiroshima Research Centre	HRC	49	13/36	41.7±11.7	_	_	_	49	13/36	41.7±11.7
Centre of Biomedical Research Excellence	COBRE	73	50/23	35.7±11.6	67	57/10	37.4±13.8	140	107/33	36.6±12.7
Taipei Medical University	TMU	29	26/3	31.4±5.0	32	23/9	35.3±6.1	61	49/12	33.4±5.9
Johns Hopkins University	JHU	75	37/38	24.4±4.1	33	23/10	22.5±4.7	108	60/48	23.8±4.4
Summary		404	218/186	32.3±11.6	198	137/61	34.9±11.9	602	355/247	33.8±11.7

1

2 The distributions of age and sex were not significantly different between the HC and SSD groups in the discovery dataset (P>0.05). In the

3 validation dataset, the age distribution was not significantly different (P>0.05); however, the sex distribution was significantly different (P<0.05).

4 Abbr., abbreviations; HC, healthy control; SSD, schizophrenia spectrum disorder; SD, standard deviation.

	Three-factor model		Five-factor model										
Score conversion	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Disorganised	Excited	Depressed						
1. Min–max	#41: R.6a and	#1: L.3b and L.1	#5: L.5L and			#17: L.MI and	#27: R.RSC						
transformation	R.PoI1		R.Cereb			R.Putamen	and R.SFL						
	#45: R.TPOJ1	#8: L.1 and R.3b	#42: R.i6-8 and			#18: L.FOP1	#28: R.POS2						
	and R.Thalamus		R.PeEc		and R.Putamen	and R.SFL							
			#45: R.TPOJ1 and			#41: R.6a and							
			R.Thalamus			R.PoI1							
						#43: R.FOP4							
						and R.Putamen							
2. Binarisation	#33: R.6ma and	#2: L.POS2 and	#3: L.PCV and	#8: L.1	and #8: L.1 and	#2: L.POS2 and	#27: R.RSC						
	R.Cereb		L.POS1	R.3b	R.3b	R.SFL	and R.SFL						

1 Table 2. Individual FCs significantly associated with PANSS factorial scores

#45:	R.TPOJ1	#8: L.1 and R.3b		#14: L.IFSa and	
and R.TI	halamus			R.AVI	
		#28: R.POS2 and		#18: L.FOP1	
		R.SFL		and R.Putamen	
				#38: R.p32pr	
				and R.Putamen	
				#41: R.6a and	
				R.PoI1	
				#43: R.FOP4	
				and R.Putamen	
				#44: R.FOP1	
				and R.Putamen	

2 Using multiple regression analyses, the FCs significantly associated with each PANSS factor were identified. When the coefficient for the

3 factor was positive, the FC is coloured red, and when it was negative, the FC is coloured blue. 'Pure state markers' (the case in which the

2 Glasser's parcellation. FC, functional connectivity; PANSS, Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale; ROI, region of interest.

I. Developing Clinically Applicable SSD Classifiers

II. Exploring Trait / State / Staging markers of SSD



Concerns about rsfMRI biomarkers

Results for LASSO Classifiers Discovery dataset

Validation dataset











