Prediction of chronological age from recting state	
Frediction of chronological age from resting-state	
EEG power in the first three years of life	
Elle power in the mot time yours of me	
Winko W. An <sup>1,2,3</sup> , Aprotim C. Bhowmik <sup>1</sup> , Charles A. Nelson <sup>1,3,4</sup> ,	
Carol L. Wilkinson <sup><math>1,3^*</math></sup>	
<sup>1</sup> Developmental Medicine, Boston Children's Hospital, 300 Longwood	
Avenue, Boston, 02115, MA, USA.	
<sup>2</sup> Rosamund Stone Zander Translational Neuroscience Center, Boston	
Children's Hospital, 300 Longwood Avenue, Boston, 02115, MA, USA.	
<sup>3</sup> Harvard Medical School, 25 Shattuck St, Boston, 02115, MA, USA.	
<sup>4</sup> Harvard Graduate School of Education, 13 Appian Way, Cambridge, 02138,	
MA, USA.	
Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): carol.wilkinson@childrens.harvard.edu;	
Contributing authors: wenkang.an@childrens.harvard.edu;	
corybhowmik@gmail.com; charles.nelson@childrens.harvard.edu;	
Abstract	
The infant brain undergoes rapid and significant developmental changes in the first three years of life. Understanding these changes through the prediction of chronological	
age using neuroimaging data can provide insights into typical and atypical brain devel-	
opment. We utilized longitudinal resting-state EEG data from 457 typically developing	
infants, comprising 938 recordings, to develop age prediction models. The multilayer	
perceptron model demonstrated the highest accuracy with an $R^2$ of 0.82 and a mean	
absolute error of 92.4 days. Aperiodic offset and periodic theta, alpha, and beta power	
EEC data from infants later diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder or Down syn-	
drome revealed significant underestimations of chronological age. This study establishes	
the feasibility of using EEG to assess brain maturation in early childhood and supports	
its potential as a clinical tool for early identification of alterations in brain development.	
Keywords: brain age EEC neurodevelopment autism Down syndrome	
re, weres, brain age, EEG, neurogevelopment, autism, Down syndrome	
Introduction	
Introduction	
Introduction ver the first three years of life, the infant brain undergoes dramatic changes across multiple	
<b>Introduction</b> ver the first three years of life, the infant brain undergoes dramatic changes across multiple rales. These developmental processes include structural increases in both cortical volume [1]	
<b>Introduction</b> ver the first three years of life, the infant brain undergoes dramatic changes across multiple cales. These developmental processes include structural increases in both cortical volume [1] ad surface area [2], as well as changes occurring at the level of synaptogenesis [3, 4],	
<b>Introduction</b> ver the first three years of life, the infant brain undergoes dramatic changes across multiple cales. These developmental processes include structural increases in both cortical volume [1] and surface area [2], as well as changes occurring at the level of synaptogenesis [3, 4], hibitory neuron migration and maturation, and network formation [5]. It is presumed	
<b>Introduction</b> wer the first three years of life, the infant brain undergoes dramatic changes across multiple cales. These developmental processes include structural increases in both cortical volume [1] and surface area [2], as well as changes occurring at the level of synaptogenesis [3, 4], hibitory neuron migration and maturation, and network formation [5]. It is presumed nat the coordinated timing of these foundational neurodevelopmental processes is generally	
<b>Introduction</b> Were the first three years of life, the infant brain undergoes dramatic changes across multiple cales. These developmental processes include structural increases in both cortical volume [1] and surface area [2], as well as changes occurring at the level of synaptogenesis [3, 4], hibitory neuron migration and maturation, and network formation [5]. It is presumed nat the coordinated timing of these foundational neurodevelopmental processes is generally milar across infants, and that significant alterations in these processes would impact later main functioning and in turn cognition and behavior.	
• <b>Introduction</b> • Ver the first three years of life, the infant brain undergoes dramatic changes across multiple cales. These developmental processes include structural increases in both cortical volume [1] and surface area [2], as well as changes occurring at the level of synaptogenesis [3, 4], hibitory neuron migration and maturation, and network formation [5]. It is presumed hat the coordinated timing of these foundational neurodevelopmental processes is generally milar across infants, and that significant alterations in these processes would impact later rain functioning and in turn cognition and behavior.	

058the area of aging research, with the goal of better understanding differences between healthy 059 brain aging versus advanced brain aging associated with neurodegenerative disorders [7, 060 8]. However, there is growing interest in similarly understanding the developing brain and 061how differences in predicted versus chronological brain age (termed the 'brain age gap') 062relate to various neurodevelopmental conditions such as autism spectrum disorder, attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder, and intellectual disability [9–11]. It is hypothesized that, if 063064 a child has altered early brain development, their estimated brain age will be substantially 065different from their chronological age (i.e., a more negative brain age gap). Thus far, the 066 majority of brain age studies have focused on predicting across a broad age range, from 067 infancy to adulthood, with a very limited number of samples in infants and toddlers [12, 068 13]. This limited study of early development prevents a fine-grained evaluation of brain 069 milestones critical for developmental processes and reduces opportunities to develop clinical 070 tools effective for early screening. In addition, no published studies have utilized EEG to 071 predict age specifically in infants and toddlers, and only a handful have been published 072utilizing structural MRI and diffusion tensor imaging [14-16]. Finally, predictive brain age 073studies often do not include investigation of feature importance within machine learning 074models, preventing identification and characterization of features relevant to developmental 075brain maturation.

076Using resting state longitudinal EEG data collected from 457 typically developing infants 077 (938 EEG recordings) we first demonstrate the accuracy of four different linear or nonlinear 078 machine learning models in predicting chronological age using resting state EEG features. 079 Then, using an innovative approach that combines Shapley values and hierarchical clustering 080 we identified clusters of features (aperiodic offset and periodic alpha and beta band power) contributing most to age prediction models. Finally, to explore whether developmental, EEG-081 082 based, brain age predictive models could be used as a marker of altered brain development 083 we applied our model to EEG data collected from either infants and toddlers later diagnosed 084 with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) or infants and toddlers with Down syndrome (DS). In the ASD group, our model significantly underestimated chronological age at the oldest 085age bin (1000 - 1150 days), but not at younger bins; in the DS group, this underestimation 086 087 of age was significant across the full range of age prediction.

## <sup>089</sup> 2 Results

090

088

#### <sup>091</sup> 2.1 Prediction of chronological age from EEG power

Resting-state EEG data collected in the same laboratory from typically developing infants
and toddlers aged 2 – 38 months were used to create predictive models. A set of 18 features
from each of 4 regions of interest (frontal, temporal, central, posterior) were calculated from
aperiodic and periodic power spectra using an automated pipeline to enhance reproducibility.
Absolute, aperiodic, and periodic power spectra by age bins are shown in Figure 1. Features
included measures characterizing aperiodic and periodic activity and principal components
in pre-defined frequency bands (See Methods for more details).

With these 72 features we trained and tested four distinct regression models: Lasso, Ran-100dom Forest, XGBoost, and Multilaver Perceptron (MLP). Detailed model specifications are 101 provided in Methods, and the architecture of the MLP is shown in Figure 2B. Chronological 102age was reliably predicted from EEG in all four models (Figure 2C). The MLP yielded the 103best results among all models with an  $R^2$  of 0.82 and a mean absolute error (MAE) of 92.9 104days. Notably, this MAE accounts for a mere 8.5% of the age range covered in our dataset, 105which spans from 59 days to 1150 days. The other three models had MAE ranging from 113.4 106-131.6 days, with  $\mathbb{R}^2$  between 0.69 and 0.76 (Figure 2C). In all four models, the variance 107 in prediction errors increased with age, suggesting the presence of heteroskedasticity in the 108regression analysis (Figure 2D), which was confirmed by a Breusch-Pagan Lagrange Multi-109plier test (p < 0.001 in all models). This observation justified (and originally motivated) the 110 application of the Yeo-Johnson transformation to chronological age prior to model training 111 (for details, see Section 5.4). Additionally, the absolute prediction error significantly corre-112lated with age, in which a positive error (i.e., predicted age > actual age) was associated 113with a younger age (Pearson's r > 0.034, p < 0.001 in all models). Similar observations have 114

been reported in previous brain age prediction studies, and is commonly referred to as "age 115 bias" in prediction error [17–19]. 116

117

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

 $\begin{array}{c} 161 \\ 162 \\ 163 \end{array}$ 

 $164 \\ 165$ 

166

167

168

169

170

171

118119Raw EEG Processed EEG BEAPP/ HAPPE 120Averaged across 4 regions of interest (ROIs) FFT 121[Frontal, Temporal, Central, Posterior] 12218 Features in each ROI 1230.0 Frontal PSD (log 10) 1241: aperiodic total power 2: aperiodic exponent 125FOOOF: -1.0 aperiodic 1261279 12 9 12 20 30 Frequency (Hz) 20 30 Frequency (Hz) FOOOF: periodic 128129Age bin (days) 3: theta power 4: low alpha power 130(700, 1000] (500, 700] 0.2 5: high alpha power DOWO (350, 500] (250, 350] 1310. 6: low beta power oeriodic (165, 250] (140, 165] (0, 140] 7: high beta 132ate c 8: gamma Ę ž 133134135Broad alpha band Broad beta band 1361379: broad alpha kurtosis 13810: broad alpha skewness 11: broad beta kurtosis 13912: broad beta skewness 140 14130 -ncγ (Hz) 25 Frec 8 Frequency (Hz) 35 142PCA PCA 1430.1 1440. 1450.0 niit 13 - 15: broad alpha PCs (x3) arbitrary unit 0.0 16 - 18: broad beta PCs (x3) arbitrary 1460.0 147 0.1 -0.05 148-0.2 30 35 ency (Hz) 40 8 Frequency (Hz) 149150

**Fig. 1** Feature extraction steps in this study. Raw EEG signals were cleaned using an automated processing pipeline: BEAPP [20] and HAPPE [21]. Power spectral density (PSD) was calculated from each electrode in processed EEG via Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) and averaged across four regions of interest (ROIs): frontal, temporal, central, and posterior. Then, the PSD was parametrized into aperiodic and periodic components using SpecParam [22]. From the aperiodic component, we extract two features in each ROI: total power and exponent. From the periodic component, first, we extracted six features of power, one for each canonical frequency band: theta (4 - 6 Hz), low alpha (6 - 9 Hz), high alpha (9 - 12 Hz), low beta (12 - 20 Hz), high beta (20 - 30 Hz), and gamma (30 - 45 Hz). Second, we analyzed the periodic component within the broad alpha (4 - 12) and broad beta (14 - 45) bands, as we observed a strong age effect on the shape of PSD in these bands. From each band, we extracted two features of power distribution: kurtosis and skewness. Additionally, we applied a principal component analysis (PCA) and extracted three features (PC1 - 3) in each band — together, they accounted for >90% of total variance in each band. In total, we extracted 72 features from each EEG sample — 18 features in each of the 4 ROIs.

#### 2.2 Importance of EEG features in age prediction

Next, we analyzed feature importance to identify EEG features that drive model prediction and thus are tightly associated with early brain development. We employed the Shapley Additive Explanations (SHAP), a game theoretic approach to explain the output of machine learning models [23]. This algorithm assigns a value to *each feature* within every EEG sample (each recording), quantifying how much one feature shifts a model prediction from a baseline output (the average of all training samples). Feature importance can then be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.31.24308275; this version posted June 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.



Fig. 2 A: The schematic diagram of training and test steps. B: The architecture of the multi-layer perceptron (MLP) model in this analysis. C: Prediction results for each of the four regression models. The mean absolute error (MAE) and R<sup>2</sup> of each model are shown in the headings. The diagonal represents perfect prediction (i.e., y = x). D: Prediction error for each of the four models.

207inferred from the absolute value of SHAP. Multicolinearity is a common challenge in EEG 208data that can cause misleading interpretations of feature importance [24]. To solve this 209problem, we leveraged the additive property of SHAP [25], where the joint importance of 210two features can be estimated by the sum of their SHAP values; we split the 72 features 211into 11 clusters (Figure 3C) using hierarchical clustering and summed SHAP values within 212each feature cluster (Cluster-SHAP). Cluster importance was then evaluated from the mean 213absolute value of Cluster-SHAP across samples (mean |Cluster-SHAP|) and the correlation 214between Cluster-SHAP and actual age. In both metrics, a higher value indicates greater 215cluster importance [26].

216Using the above approach, we identified two clusters of features with the highest mean 217|Cluster-SHAP| - C2, consisting of features in the periodic alpha band (low/high alpha) 218power and PC1 in broad alpha band), and C1, consisting of features in the periodic beta 219band (low beta power and PC2 in broad beta band) (Figure 3D; Table 1). They were followed 220by C7 and C8, consisting of features in the theta band and aperiodic offset, respectively. The 221Cluster-SHAP values in these feature clusters, especially in C1, C2, and C8, also significantly 222correlated with age (Pearsons's  $r \ge 0.23$ , p < 0.001; Figure 3E; Table 1). This further validates 223the importance of these features as they associated a more positive shift in model output with 224older chronological age, facilitating more accurate predictions. In summary, we identified 225features in aperiodic offset and periodic theta, alpha, and low beta band as important drivers 226of age prediction.

227



**Fig. 3** A: Schematic diagram for the feature importance analysis. B: Correlation between each pair of EEG features (left) and the hierarchical clustering (right) based on feature correlation. Each cluster contains different types of features and is labelled with a color; the same labelling scheme applies to all figures in this paper. C: SHAP values in each feature cluster. SHAP value was calculated for each feature in each sample (i.e., EEG recording). Every point in this figure represents the SHAP value summed across all features in a cluster in one sample; the darkness of color represents the age of this sample. D: The average absolute SHAP values across all samples in each feature cluster. Error bars indicate standard error. E: Relationship between SHAP values and age in four selected feature clusters. Black line represents the best linear fit. Correlation was calculated using Pearson's r.

264

265

266

267

268

269

 $270 \\ 271$ 

272

#### 2.3 Prediction of age in children with autism or Down syndrome

273To assess whether an EEG-based brain-age prediction model in early development could be 274useful in early identification of children with neurodevelopmental disorders, we applied our 275model on EEG data from infants later diagnosed with ASD or with Down syndrome (DS) 276and compared its prediction with that of the TD group. To assess prediction accuracy within 277the ASD cohort, we first created a test set with data from children with ASD and age-278matched TD peers (n = 246 EEGs in each group). We divided the remaining 692 TD samples 279into 10 folds with equal sizes and trained our best-performing MLP model (Figure 2B) on 9 280random folds. We repeated this process 10 times, each time with a different fold left-out for 281testing, and the outputs from these 10 models were averaged as the final prediction for each 282test sample. As expected, age of the TD children was accurately predicted by this model 283(MAE = 100.2 days); the fitted prediction line for the TD group almost overlapped with the 284line of perfect prediction (Figure 4A). For ASD infants, prediction was comparatively less 285

	Cluster Features		Cluster-SHAP	Correlation with age	
	Juster	reatures	mean (std)	r	р
	C2	low/high alpha power,	120 22 (94 07)	0.69	<0.001
	02	broad alpha PC1	120.22 (34.07)		<0.001
	C1	low beta power,	110.66 (87.06)	0.63	<0.001
	01	broad beta PC2	110.00 (87.00)		<0.001
	C7	theta power,	54 10 (50 40)	0.03	<0.001
	01	broad alpha PC2	34.10 (30.40)	0.23	<0.001
	C8	aperiodic offset	50.29 (42.80)	0.58	< 0.001
	C10	broad alpha PC3	46.69 (46.54)	0.02	0.517
	Ca	broad beta PC1,	49.42 (49.07)	0.07	0.021
	05	high beta/gamma power	42.43 (42.07)	0.07	0.031
	C11	broad alpha kurtosis	36 87 (35 77)	0.91	<0.001
	011	and skewness	30.87 (33.17)	0.21	<0.001
	C5	broad beta PC3	35.25 (29.99)	0.25	< 0.001
	C6	broad beta skewness	20.28 (20.87)	0.12	< 0.001
	C4	broad beta kurtosis	19.56(22.07)	0.10	0.002
	C9	aperiodic exponent	18.87 (18.64)	0.16	< 0.001
Ta	Table 1 The absolute values of Cluster-SHAP and their correlation with age				ion with age in

Table 1 The absolute values of Cluster-SHAP and their correlation with age in each feature cluster. Rows are sorted from the highest |Cluster-SHAP| to the lowest.

accurate (MAE = 107.2 days) with age being underestimated, especially at older ages. A series of two-sample t-tests were conducted to compare the prediction errors between groups at pre-defined age bins (Table 3). A significant difference was only observed at the oldest age bin (1000 - 1150 days; p = 0.007, Cohen's d = 0.87; Figure 4B). We then conducted an exploratory analysis to compare the EEG features between groups within this oldest age bin via two-sample t-tests. In the frontal ROI, for example, significant group differences were observed in broad beta band skewness (p = 0.003), broad alpha band skewness (p = 0.022), and aperiodic exponent (p = 0.017). Four other features (theta power, aperiodic offset, broad alpha band PC3, and broad beta band PC3) showed trending significance in their difference between the two groups (0.05 .

A similar set of analyses were conducted to compare age prediction between TD and DS groups, where DS (n = 23) and age-matched TD samples were reserved for testing, and the remaining TD samples were used to train the MLP model. Prediction for the TD group (MAE = 107.0 days) was more accurate than that for the DS group (MAE = 331.9 days), in which the model substantially underestimated the age of children with DS (Figure 4C & 4D); brain age gap was significantly more negative in the DS than in the TD group (p < 0.001, Cohen's d = 1.32). Different from the comparisons between TD and ASD, more features with high importance showed significant difference between TD and DS (Figure 4F). 

#### Discussion

Here we demonstrate that resting-state EEG features, extracted from aperiodic and periodic power spectra, can reasonably predict chronological age early in child development via a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) model. With an innovative approach combining Shapley val-ues and hierarchical clustering, we identified two important clusters of features, namely the periodic alpha and beta band power, that contributed most to age prediction. In addition, as a proof of concept, we tested this MLP model's ability to capture early signs of neurode-velopmental conditions by applying this model to EEG collected from children who later received an ASD diagnosis or children with DS. The model significantly underestimated 



**Fig. 4** Comparing brain age prediction between children with typical development (TD) and neurodevelopmental disorders. A: Age prediction in TD and ASD using a MLP model depicted in Figure 2B. B: Brain age gap comparison between ASD and TD in 1000 – 1150 days. C: Age prediction in TD and DS using the same MLP model. D: Brain age gap comparison between DS and TD. E: Aperiodic and periodic power in the frontal ROI in TD vs ASD in 1000 – 1150 days (upper) and TD vs DS (lower). F: Exploratory feature comparisons, TD vs ASD in 1000 – 1150 days (upper) and TD vs DS (lower), in the frontal ROI as an example. Each feature was denoted as a Z score after being normalized by the mean and standard deviation across two groups. +, p<0.05; \*\*, p<0.01; \*\*\*, p<0.001

chronological age in toddlers with ASD and in infants and toddlers with DS, supporting the brain age gap as a potential tool for early identification of delays or alteration in early brain development.

Our work is one of the first studies investigating EEG-based age prediction across the first three years of life; only a handful of published neuroimaging-based age-prediction studies overlap with our age range (Table 2), and our MLP model yielded comparable results. Built upon one of the most extensive neuroimaging samples of infants and toddlers to date, our study exclusively focuses on early brain development. A model dedicated to the infant-toddler period facilitates the detection of the rapid developmental changes occurring both structurally and functionally during this period [27]. In doing so, it also improves the model's potential in identifying early indicators of alterations in brain development. While surprisingly few studies have used EEG in brain-age prediction, EEG may be an ideal candidate for models focused on infant and toddler years. Unlike MRI, EEG is low-cost and can be collected in awake and moving children, allowing for frequent data collection without sedation. In addition, EEG is a direct measurement of neuronal activity reflective of underlying network circuitry and therefore can capture the development and maturation of functional networks.

There are two notable findings related to our prediction error. First, we observed significant heteroskedasticity with increasing variance in predicted error with age. Brain volume dramatically increases in the first two years of life and then gradually slows down [27]; maximum synaptic density in middle frontal gyrus is reached at age 15 months, followed by synaptic pruning [3]. The fast changes in power spectra observed in infants match with these 

Study	Modality	Age range (years)	Sample size	$\mathbb{R}^2$	MAE (age range)
Here	Resting EEG	0 - 3	938	0.82	$0.19 (0-2 { m years})$
					$0.25 (0-3{ m years})$
[14]	sMRI	0 - 2	76	0.79	$0.15~(0-2~{ m years})$
[15]	sMRI	0 - 5	220	0.97	$0.19 (0-5 { m years})$
[16]	sMRI	0 - 3	658	0.85	$0.19 (0-3 { m years})$
[12]	Resting $M/EEG$	0 - 95	2540	0.74	> 6.48 (0 - 95  years)
[11]	Sleep EEG	0 - 18	1056	0.96	$\sim 0.25~(0-2~{ m years})$

 $408 \\ 409$ 

 Table 2 Model performance comparison with literature

412early, dynamic changes in the brain; once brain networks are more established in the sec-413ond and third year, the power spectra becomes relatively stable [28]. This may explain the 414increased error variance at older ages. Second, as is commonly reported in brain age studies 415based on MRI data [17, 29, 30], we observed an "age bias", characterized by the overestima-416tion of age in younger children and underestimation in older children (Figure 2D). Age bias in predictive models is thought to be the direct result of fitting a regression model by minimiz-417ing the sum of the squares [31] and some studies have attempted to account for this through 418419several bias correction methods performed after model estimation [17, 29, 30]. However, 420there are concerns that such correction may artificially inflate certain performance metrics such as the  $\mathbb{R}^2$  values [31]. Thus, we have chosen to present uncorrected data, ensuring our 421findings are directly comparable to existing literature. 422

423 In this study, we also demonstrated a computational framework to estimate joint feature 424 importance within clusters across highly correlated features. Analyzing feature importance 425 quantifies the contribution of specific power measures on brain age prediction and may help 426 understand the developmental trajectory of brain functions.

427 Using this method, important contributors to age prediction were identified including 428 aperiodic offset and periodic power features in the low/high alpha, low beta, and theta band 429(Figure 3D and 3E). Developmentally, these features exhibit an approximately linear or 430monotonic relationship with age, which may have facilitated their feature importance in pre-431diction models. Specifically, longitudinal modeling using generalized additive mixed models 432(GAMMs) of an overlapping data set recently demonstrated that aperiodic offset increases 433in the first year and then stays relatively stable between 1 - 3 years of age [28]. Aperi-434odic activity is hypothesized to be associated with strong broad band neural firing and the 435early increase is consistent with dramatic increases in gray matter volume and synaptoge-436nesis observed in the first year [27, 32]. Theta and alpha oscillations have been implicated 437in thalamocortical circuitry development, and theta and alpha power also have more linear 438relationships with age [28, 33]. Alpha peak frequency shows age-dependent changes with peak frequency in the theta range in infancy, increasing to the alpha range by toddlerhood. 439This leads to a linear decrease in theta power from 1-3 years and a steady increase in 440 441 high alpha power across the infant/toddler period. Linear increases are also observed in low 442 beta band power across the first 3 years. In addition, a peak in the low beta range begins to emerge after the first year and is captured in the PC2 beta component included in the C1 443444cluster. These changes in beta power may represent the emergence of network connections between thalamic nuclei and cortical layers [33]. In summary, the identified importance of 445aperiodic offset and periodic power in theta, alpha, and beta bands may reflect their critical 446 447role in early brain development.

448Our findings also support the use of EEG age prediction in early identification of neu-449rodevelopmental delays. Age-predictions were significantly lower for two neurodevelopmental 450disorders associated with brain alterations and neurodevelopmental delay. The concept of a brain age gap — the difference between predicted and actual age — has been most thoroughly 451452studied in brain degeneration [7, 13, 34, 35], brain injuries [36, 37], and mental disorders [38-40]. To date, we identified only three studies assessing individuals with neurodevelopmental 453454disorders related to brain age gaps. Wang et al. [9] developed a prediction model using both 455structural and functional MRI data and reported significantly lower brain age gap in an 456

MAE: mean absolute error; sMRI: structural MRI

 $<sup>\</sup>begin{array}{c} 410\\ 411 \end{array}$ 

ASD group (5 - 23 years) compared to a non-autistic group. They also observed associations between lower brain age gaps with lower ADOS scores within the ASD group. Tunc et al. [10] predicted brain age in individuals with ASD (6 - 25 years) using anatomical and diffusion metrics computed from MRI data and similarly observed that lower brain age was associated with higher ADOS severity scores. Iyer et al. [11] predicted age from sleep EEG and observed significantly lower brain age gap in children with DS (1 - 9 years) compared to the TD group. 457

464 Aligned with findings in prior literature, our EEG-based model was capable of generating distinguishable age predictions between ASD and TD groups at 3 years of age, and between 465466 DS and TD groups as early as 2 years of age (Figure 4A and C). We observed a negative and significantly lower brain-age gap for children with ASD (in the 1000 – 1150 days age bin) 467 and DS compared to TD peers (Figure 4B and D). This preliminary data suggests that EEG 468brain gap measures could be clinically useful in identifying children with neurodevelopmental 469delays. Ideally such a measure would identify children before delays are present to facilitate 470earlier intervention. This will benefit children with disorders such as Fragile X syndrome 471 and Tuberous Sclerosis Complex, where there are no obvious dysmorphisms at birth and 472diagnoses are often delayed. Future research with larger, diversified samples of both typically 473developing infants and infants with later identified delays are needed to build such clinical 474 tools with sufficient accuracy. 475

It is important to clarify that the MLP model in this study was specifically developed to predict chronological age, not to identify individuals who might later be diagnosed with ASD or have DS. This distinction is crucial for interpreting our findings, particularly the grouplevel differences in brain age gap. While we observed significant negative brain age gaps in ASD and DS groups, this does not mean that a negative brain age gap is exclusively linked to ASD/DS, and it is not intended for diagnosing or screening for any neurodevelopmental disorder in particular. 482

The contribution of this study is subject to two major limitations. First, though we built 483our models using one of the largest developmental EEG data for our age range of interest, 484it is still not as large as the samples used in MRI-based age predictions [6, 13, 16, 41], and 485 may even be considered small in the field of machine learning. Additionally, the majority of 486our data was collected from children who are disproportionately White and from families 487 with a high socioeconomic status, lacking the diversity necessary to represent children of all 488 backgrounds. Second, we acknowledge that more than one processing pipeline is available 489for developmental EEG [42-44], and the choice of pipeline and parameters may likely affect 490the output EEG, and thus the brain age prediction. Given it is impractical to evaluate 491our models across every processing configuration, we opted for one that we consider to be 492broadly reasonable. We are making our processing scripts, the parameters used, and the 493model training and testing scripts publicly available online, and welcome other researchers 494to test our method with their own data. 495

## 4 Conclusion

This study demonstrates the feasibility and accuracy of predicting chronological age from resting-state EEG features in infants and toddlers using a computational model. By analyzing data from a large cohort of typically developing children 2 to 38 months old, we identified significant EEG feature clusters that contribute most to age prediction. Moreover, the model's ability to identify negative brain age gaps in children with autism spectrum disorder and Down syndrome suggests its potential as a tool for early detection of neurodevelopmental disorders. These findings support the clinical utility of EEG-based brain age prediction in monitoring and identifying early signs of developmental delays, enabling timely interventions.

496 497 498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508 509 510

511

512 513

514 5 Methods

### 515

### 516 5.1 Studies and Participants

EEGs for this paper were collected in a single lab at Boston Children's Hospital as part of four different longitudinal studies. Sample numbers and demographics are shown in Table 3.
Each study is described below.

Emotion Project (IRB-P00002876) was a cohort/longitudinal study with infants enrolled at either 5, 7, or 12 months of age and then followed through school age. EEG for enrolled infants was collected at age of enrollment and again at 3 years of age. While no developmental assessments were performed for this study, parents completed questionnaires regarding child development, interventions received, and diagnoses, including ASD diagnoses.

Healthy Baby (IRB-P00019083) was a longitudinal study enrolling infants at 2 months
of age with developmental assessments (Mullen Scales of Early Learning – MSEL [45]) and
EEG collected at 2, 6, 9, 12, 24, and 36 months.

528Infant Sibling Project and Infant Screening Project (IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P00018377) 529enrolled infants with and without a first degree family history of ASD (most often a full-530 sibling with autism) as early as 3-months of age. The Infant Screening Project also included 531infants with elevated social communication concerns at 12 months of age, and were excluded 532from this analysis. EEG and MSEL were administered at 3, 12, 18, 24, and 36 months across 533 both studies, as well as 6 and 9 months of the Infant Sibling Project. Infants were assessed 534for ASD using the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule [46] or during the COVID pan-535demic some participants completed remote evaluations that included the Brief Observation 536of Symptoms of Autism [47], parent-child interaction, the Autism Screening Interview [48] 537and Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales-Third Edition [49]. For toddlers meeting criteria on 538 the ADOS or BOSA, a licensed clinical psychologist reviewed assessments and provided their 539best clinical judgement for ASD diagnosis based on criteria from the Diagnostic Statistical 540Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition [50].

541All infants in the typically developing (TD) group were born with a minimal gestational 542age of 36 weeks, had no history of prenatal or postnatal medical or neurological disorders, 543and no known genetic disorders. Our age prediction model development was limited to par-544ticipants without first degree family history of autism or known developmental delay or 545autism diagnosis. Exclusion based on developmental delays was determined as follows. Chil-546dren with MSEL T-scores <40 on expressive language, receptive language, visual reception, 547or fine motor subscales at either 24 or 36 months were excluded. For children in the Emotion 548 project where MSEL was not performed, children were excluded if parents reported a com-549munity diagnoses of speech or motor delay or if children were receiving Early Intervention 550services, or speech, occupational, or physical therapy services. 551

The Down syndrome (DS) cohort (n = 21, 12 females; 21 EEG recordings, average age 26.4  $\pm$  6.0 months, range 13.9 – 36.8 months) included in this study was recruited as part of two separate studies collected in the same lab from 2019 – 2022 (IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). DS participants all had Trisomy 21, a minimum gestational age of 36 weeks, and their families spoke primarily English at home (>50%). Children with known neurological disorders (e.g. intraventricular hemorrhage, seizure disorder) were excluded.

 $562 \\ 563$ 

## $\frac{505}{564}$ 5.2 EEG collection and processing

565 Resting-state (non-task related) EEG data was collected using similar protocols across stud-566 ies. The infant was seated with their caregiver in a dimly lit, sound attenuated room with 567 a faraday cage to reduce noise. For the Emotion, Healthy Baby, Infant Screening Project 568 studies a video of either infant toys or abstract moving objects were shown. For the Infant 569 Sibling Project, a research assistant presented bubbles or showed toys to the infant in order 570

	Combined	Healthy	Infant	Emotion	Infant
	Studies $N = 467$	Baby $N = 13$	N = 53	Project N — 317	Screening $N = 84$
Sex, % Female (n)	49.0(229)	69.2(9)	$\frac{11 - 33}{52.8 (28)}$	$\frac{11}{48.3}$ (153)	46.4(39)
Ethnicity, % (n)		(-)	( - )	( )	- ()
Hispanic	8.8 (41)	23.1(3)	1.9(1)	11.0(35)	2.4(2)
Non-Hispanic	89.9 (420)	76.9 (10)	96.2 (51)	87.7 (278)	96.4 (81)
Not answered	1.3 (6)	0.0 (0)	1.9(1)	1.3 (4)	1.2(1)
Race, % (n)		( )	( )		,
White	77.9 (364)	15.4(2)	83.0 (44)	79.5 (252)	78.6(66)
Black/	2 9 (15)	16 2 (6)	0.0.(0)	22(7)	24(2)
African-American	J.2 (10)	40.2 (0)	0.0 (0)	2.2 (1)	2.4 (2)
Asian	4.1(19)	0.0~(0)	3.8(2)	3.8(12)	6.0(5)
More than one race	12.8(60)	23.1(3)	11.3~(6)	12.9(41)	11.9(10)
Other	0.6(3)	7.7(1)	0.0~(0)	0.6(2)	0.0~(0)
Not answered	1.3~(6)	7.7(1)	1.9(1)	0.9(3)	1.2(1)
Family Income, % (	n)				
<\$35,000	3.6(17)	23.1(3)	5.7(3)	2.2(7)	4.8(4)
\$35,000 - \$75,000	10.7(50)	15.4(2)	7.5(4)	13.2(42)	2.4(2)
>\$75,000	76.7(358)	38.5(5)	69.8(37)	76.0(241)	89.3(75)
Not answered/	9.0(42)	23.1 (3)	170(9)	8 5 (27)	36(3)
Don't know	5.0 (42)	20.1 (0)	11.0 (3)	0.0 (21)	5.0 (5)
Participant EEG da	ta included	in analysis	5,		
n (% with longitudi	nal data)				
50-140 days	52(92)	13(100)	8 (100)	-	31 (87)
140-165 days	101 (29)	-	-	101 (29)	-
165-250  days	161 (49)	12(100)	36(100)	113 (27)	-
250-350 days	52(100)	10(100)	42(100)	-	-
350-500 days	224~(67)	10(100)	46(100)	93(22)	75 (97)
500-700 days	86 (99)	-	28(100)	-	58 (98)
700-1000 days	94(99)	10(100)	38(100)	-	46(98)
1000-1150  days	168 (93)	6(100)	38 (97)	90(89)	34(97)
By participant, mean $\#$ EEGs (SD)	2.0 (1.4)	4.7 (1.2)	4.5 (1.5)	1.3 (0.4)	2.9 (1.0)

 Table 3
 Sample Characteristics

to help the infant remain calm. Emotion, Healthy Baby, and Infant Screening Project studies used a 128-channel Hydrocel Geodesic Sensor Nets (Electrical Geodesics, Inc., Eugene, OR) connected to a NetAmps 300 amplifier (Electrical Geodesic Inc.) to collect continues EEG recordings with a 500Hz sampling rate. The Infant Sibling Project included recordings from either 64-channel Geodesic Sensor (< 10% of data) or a 128-channel Hydrocel Geodesic Sensor Nets (Electrical Geodesics, Inc., Eugene, OR), connected to either a NetAmps 200 or 300 amplifier (Electrical Geodesic Inc.) and sampled at either 250 or 500Hz. Data was referenced to the single vertex electrode, Cz, and electrooculographic electrodes were removed to improve infant comfort.

615EEG raw files were collected in Netstation (Electrical Geodesics, Inc) and exported to 616 MATLAB for preprocessing with the Batch Automated Processing Platform (BEAPP [51]) 617 using the integrated Harvard Automated Preprocessing Pipeline for EEG (HAPPE [52]). A 6181Hz high-pass and 100Hz low-pass filter were applied, and EEG data sampled at 500Hz were 619 resampled to 250Hz. HAPPE artifact removal included 60Hz line noise removal, bad channel 620 rejection, and artifact removal using first wavelet thresholding, followed by independent 621 component analysis and Multiple Artifact Rejection Algorithm (MARA 53). The following 622 channels, in addition to the 10-20 electrodes, were used for MARA: 64-channel net -16, 9,623 624 13, 112, 41, 47, 37, 55, 87, 103, 98, 65, 67, 77, 90, 75, evenly covering all brain regions of 625 interest. Next channels removed during bad channel rejection were interpolated, data were 626

627

604 605 606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

re-referenced to the average reference, detrended to the signal mean and segmented into 2second segments. Segments were then further evaluated for and rejected for retained artifact
using HAPPE's amplitude and joint probability criteria.

 $\begin{array}{ll} 631 & \mbox{EEG rejection criteria: HAPPE quality metrics were used to reject EEG recordings from} \\ 632 & \mbox{subsequent analysis. EEG were rejected if they had fewer than 20 segments (40 seconds of total EEG), < 80\% good channels, > 80\% of independent components rejected, > 0.3 mean artifact probability of components kept, and < 25\% percent variance retained. \end{array}$ 

### 635

## 636 5.3 Feature extraction637

#### 638 5.3.1 Spectral parameterization

Using the BEAPP Power Spectral Density (PSD) module, the PSD at each electrode, for each
2-second segment, was calculated using a multitaper spectral analysis with three orthogonal
tapers. For each electrode the PSD was then averaged across 2-second segments, and then
averaged across electrodes in defined left frontal, right frontal, central, left temporal right
temporal, and posterior regions of interest (Supplementary Figure 2).

The resulting PSD was then parametrized into aperiodic and periodic components using SpecParam v1.0.0 (ref; https://github.com/fooof-tools/fooof; in Python v3.6.8). SpecParam was modified for use in this age range — reason for and detailed description of modifications, along with modified code are discussed in [28]. SpecParam model parameters were: fixed mode, peak\_width\_limits set to [0.5, 18.0], max\_n\_peaks = 7, and peak\_threshold = 2. Detail evaluation of model fit across age ranges are also presented in [28].

650 Features extracted for age prediction include aperiodic parameters (offset and slope), 651periodic power across canonical frequency bands, and peak/amplitude characteristics of peri-652odic peaks. Periodic power across canonical frequency bands [theta (4 - 6Hz), low alpha (6653-9Hz), high alpha (9 -12Hz), low beta (12 -20Hz), high beta (20 -30Hz), and gamma (30 654- 45Hz)] was calculated. Peak characteristics were determined after the periodic spectrum 655was smoothed using a savgol filter (scipy.signal.savgoal\_filter, window length = 101, poly-656order = 8). Kurtosis and skewness, characterizing the shape of power distributions, were 657 calculated from the broad alpha range (4 - 12 Hz) and broad beta range (14 - 45 Hz) using 658 scipy functions. 659

## ${}^{660}_{661}$ 5.3.2 Principal component analysis

We observed multiple shifts in periodic peaks with respect to age within the broad alpha 662 range (4 - 12 Hz) and broad beta range (14 - 45 Hz) (Figure 1). Detailed characterization of 663 these peak shifts utilizing an overlapping dataset are described in [28]. To capture this change 664 across canonical frequency bands, we performed a principal component analysis (PCA) on 665 the periodic power spectrum within each of these two broad ranges, identifying intrinsic 666 functions that make up the spectrum. The top three PCs in each frequency range explain 667 over 90% of the variance in the data and have distinctive peaks (Figure 1). The weight 668 of each PC, quantifying the representation of each intrinsic function in data, was used as 669 features in our age prediction models. This PCA step added six features (i.e., the weights 670 of three PCs in each of the two frequency ranges) for each ROI, resulting in a total feature 671 vector length of 72 (48 from spectral parameterization and 24 from PCA). 672

673

#### 674 5.4 Regression models

675We used Scikit-learn [54] to train and test four regression models for predicting chronological 676 age using the extracted features. Prior to training, we preprocessed and transformed the data 677 to enhance model performance. Each EEG feature was individually scaled to [0, 1] using a 678 min-max scaler to avoid potential bias toward features with higher magnitude values and 679 improve gradient descent optimization. This could also improve the optimization process 680 by making the flow of gradient descent smoother. We then conducted recursive feature 681 elimination (RFE) with a linear support vector regression kernel to remove features with 682low importance, resulting in approximately 60 retained features in each training iteration. 683 For the dependent variable, we applied the Yeo-Johnson transformation to the chronological 684

age to achieve a more Gaussian-like distribution, which is particularly important since we observed heteroscedasticity in the model prediction, as shown in Figure 2D.

#### 5.4.1 Lasso regression

We conducted experiments with elastic-net linear regression using varying ratios (0 to 1) of lasso and ridge regression. Our highest prediction accuracy was achieved with pure lasso. For L1 regularization, we set  $\alpha$  to 0.001.

#### 5.4.2 Random Forest

We used 100 estimators (trees) with a maximum depth of 10. The maximum number of features in searching for the best split was set as the square root of feature length. Bootstrap was implemented when trees are being formed.

#### 5.4.3 XGBoost

XGBoost (Extreme Gradient Boosting,) is a gradient boosting decision tree framework. To prevent overfitting and ensure the generalizability of the learned model to new data, we employed a conservative parameter set for this algorithm. Specifically, we set a moderate maximum tree depth of 4, a low learning rate of 0.1, and a high  $\alpha$  value of 0.1 for L1 regularization.

#### 5.4.4 Multilayer perceptron

A multilayer perceptron (MLP) is a type of feed-forward artificial neural network where all layers of neurons are fully connected and each neuron has an activation function to introduce nonlinearity to the model. In our experimentation with MLP models, we explored various architectures and hyperparameters, including the number of layers, the number of neurons in each layer, and levels of regularization. Our best performing model consisted of five hidden layers with 120, 120, 80, 60, and 40 neurons, respectively, with the rectified linear unit function serving as the activation function 2B. We set the  $\alpha$  value for L2 regularization to 0.01, the batch size to 20, and gradually decreased the learning rate as a function of iteration number. Our findings indicate that MLP models with similar layer and neuron configurations to our best model typically yield comparable results.

#### 5.5 Repeated cross-validation

We employed a 5-fold cross-validation to assess the performance of our models. To ensure 721that each fold had an equal number of samples across different age ranges, we divided the 722data into eight age bins, namely 0–140 days, 140–165 days, 165–250 days, 250–350 days, 350– 723 500 days, 500-700 days, 700-1000 days, and 1000-1150 days, based on the sample distribution724 (Table 3). For each iteration, we pseudo-randomly assigned samples into five equal folds 725and ensured that the distribution of samples in each age range was balanced across folds. 726We then trained the model on four folds and tested it on the left-out fold. We prevented 727 information leakage by conducting PCA and all data preprocessing steps, including scaling, 728recursive feature elimination (RFE), and Yeo-Johnson transformation, only on the training 729set. We then applied the fitted transformers on both the training and test sets. The model's 730 performance was evaluated using the coefficient of determination  $(\mathbf{R}^2)$  value and the mean 731absolute error (MAE) of the test samples across all five iterations within the same train-test 732 split. To reduce the influence of random data splits, we repeated this process ten times, each 733time with a different train-test split. We calculated the mean and standard deviation of the 734 $R^2$  and MAE values across the repetitions to verify the performance stability of our model. 735

#### 5.6 Bagging cross-validated models

To further reduce the variance in predictions caused by the randomness in data splitting and improve model performance, we implemented the *bagging* technique, also known as *bootstrap aggregating*. We aggregated the models trained over ten repetitions of the train-test

686 687 688

685

689 690 691

692 693 694

695

696

697

 $\begin{array}{c} 698 \\ 699 \end{array}$ 

700

701

702

703

704

 $\begin{array}{c} 705 \\ 706 \end{array}$ 

707 708

709

710711712

713

714

715 716 717

718 719

720

736 737

738

739

740

742 split. Following the repeated cross-validation described above, each sample in the dataset 743 was tested ten times, each time using a slightly different model that was trained on a 744 randomly drawn 80% of the total data (bootstrapping). However, it is possible that some 745 of these models were suboptimal due to overfitting or underfitting, particularly with small 746 sample sizes and excessive noise in data. Averaging the prediction results for a sample over 747 multiple models (aggregating) can theoretically mitigate this problem, as such averaging can 748 potentially remove undesirable characteristics of each model while synergizing their positive 749 attributes [55]. We used the mean of ten predictions as the bagged prediction for a sample 750 and calculated  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and MAE using these bagged predictions.

751

## 752 5.7 Feature importance

753In this study, a crucial question we aimed to address is which features in resting-state EEG 754drive age prediction. Though not detrimental to the overall prediction accuracy [56, 57], 755including highly correlated features in a regression model — especially features extracted 756from neighbouring electrodes or ROIs — would negatively impact the ability to accurately 757interpret the statistical importance of each independent variable (feature) [58, 59]. Here, 758we proposed a viable approach to circumvent this multicollinearity problem by evaluating 759feature importance at a cluster level using hierarchical clustering and Shapley Additive 760Explanations (SHAP) values (Figure 3A). 761

762

## 763 5.7.1 Shapley values

764The Shapley value employs concepts in game theory and fairly distributes both gains and 765 costs to features working in coalition. Specifically, each feature of an observation is assigned 766with a Shapley value, which equals the amount that this feature steers the model away from 767a baseline prediction (the sample mean). Using the SHAP python package [60], we calculated 768SHAP values from each sample in the TD group via a 5-fold cross-validation, in which an 769 MLP model was trained with 4 folds of data, and feature importance was calculated for the 770left-out fold (test fold). This process was repeated five times, each with a different test fold, 771so that each sample was tested once, and hence had one set of SHAP values.

772

# $\frac{773}{774}$ 5.7.2 Feature clustering

We grouped all EEG features into clusters based on the Pearson's correlation between each pair of EEG features and used one minus the absolute value of this correlation as a measure of distance between features. Then we applied the Ward hierarchical clustering to group features into clusters. By setting a reasonable distance threshold, we divided the 72 features into 11 clusters (Figure 3B).

780

### 781 5.7.3 Cluster-SHAP

Employing its additivity property, we summed SHAP across features in each cluster for
their joint SHAP score (Cluster-SHAP). We then compared Cluster-SHAP among feature
clusters to evaluate their relative importance. Cluster importance can then be evaluated
from the mean absolute value of Cluster-SHAP across samples and the correlation between
Cluster-SHAP and actual age. In both metrics, a higher value indicates greater cluster
importance [26].

788

## $\frac{789}{790}$ 5.8 Prediction on children with autism or Down syndrome

We further examined our MLP model's sensitivity in identifying potential neurodevelopmental delays by testing it on data from the ASD and the DS groups. For the ASD group, we first age-matched each sample (n = 85, 246 EEG recordings) with one from the TD group (test set). Then, we retrained the MLP model with the remaining TD samples and applied this new model on the test set. Similarly, for the DS group, we age-matched each sample (n = 21, 21 EEG recordings) with one from the TD group, retrained the MLP model with the remaining TD samples, and compared prediction errors between groups.

111	
The o	correlation between predicted age and actual age and between Cluster-SHAP and actual
ige v pred <sup>:</sup>	action error and EEG features was examined by a two-sample t-test
~	
5up]	plementary information. Supplementary information for this paper includes two
igur	es.
Ack	nowledgements. We thank all the children and families who generously participated
n th	is research. We thank all the research staff involved in participant recruitment, data
olle Doge	ction, and database administration. We thank Dr. Helen Tager-Flusberg, Dr. Michelle
50sq •hat	contributed data to this study
Fune	ding. This research was supported by the National Institutes of Health (R01-
JC0	10290 and MH078829 to CAN, and K23DC07983 and T32MH112510 to CLW). Research
vas a	also supported by the the Rosamund Stone Zander Translational Neuroscience Center
	soon charten's nospital and the rapicy railing rund.
Aut	hor contribution. Winko W. An: Methodology, Software, Formal analysis, Writing
Jrigi Pe	inal Draft, Visualization. Aprotim C. Bhowmik: Portions of Formal Analysis, Writing
- Ke Editi	view and Editing. Unaries A. Nelson: investigation, Resources, Writing – Keview and ng Supervision Project administration Funding acquisition Carol I. Wilkinson: Con-
enti	alization, Investigation, Resources Data Collection Data Curation Writing – Portions
of Or	riginal Draft, Review and Editing, Supervision, Project administration.
	a availability Concents obtained from human neutricinents prohibit sharing of doiden
Jata	individual data without data use agreement in place. Please contact the corresponding
auth	or with reasonable data requests.
a 1	
Joa	<b>e availability.</b> Code used for EEG processing and analyses used in this paper can be d on the Open Science Framework (https://osfie/u3gp4)
ound	f on the Open Science Framework (https://osi.io/u3gp4).
Con	apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.
Con Ethi work IRB- en c	<ul> <li>appeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> </ul>
Con Ethi vork RB- en c Re:	<ul> <li>appeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work IRB- cen c Re: [1]	<ul> <li>appeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work RB- en c Re: [1]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work RB- cen c (1) [2]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. <i>Nature Reviews. Neuroscience</i> 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism mastering disorder.</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work RB- cen c Re: [1]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work RB- gen c [1] [2]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. <i>Nature Reviews. Neuroscience</i> 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. <i>NeuroImage : Clinical</i> 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work (RB- cen c [1] [2] [3]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work (RB- cen c [1] [2] [3]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. The Journal of Comparative Neurology 387, 167–178 (1997).</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work (RB- cen c [1] [2] [3]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. The Journal of Comparative Neurology 387, 167–178 (1997).</li> </ul>
Con Ethi Work RB- Jen c [1] [2] [3] [4]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. The Journal of Comparative Neurology 387, 167–178 (1997).</li> <li>Glantz, L. A., Gilmore, J. H., Hamer, R. M., Lieberman, J. A. &amp; Jarskog, L. F. Synaptophysin and postsymaptic density protein 05 in the human parfractal cortex form</li> </ul>
Con Ethi RB- en c [1] [2] [3] [4]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123-137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215-222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. The Journal of Comparative Neurology 387, 167-178 (1997).</li> <li>Glantz, L. A., Gilmore, J. H., Hamer, R. M., Lieberman, J. A. &amp; Jarskog, L. F. Synaptophysin and postsynaptic density protein 95 in the human prefrontal cortex from mid-gestation into early adulthood. Neuroscience 149, 582-591 (2007)</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work RB- en c [1] [2] [3] [4]	<ul> <li>appeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. The Journal of Comparative Neurology 387, 167–178 (1997).</li> <li>Glantz, L. A., Gilmore, J. H., Hamer, R. M., Lieberman, J. A. &amp; Jarskog, L. F. Synaptophysin and postsynaptic density protein 95 in the human prefrontal cortex from mid-gestation into early adulthood. Neuroscience 149, 582–591 (2007).</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work (RB- cen c [1] [2] [3] [4]	<ul> <li>appeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. The Journal of Comparative Neurology 387, 167–178 (1997).</li> <li>Glantz, L. A., Gilmore, J. H., Hamer, R. M., Lieberman, J. A. &amp; Jarskog, L. F. Synaptophysin and postsynaptic density protein 95 in the human prefrontal cortex from mid-gestation into early adulthood. Neuroscience 149, 582–591 (2007).</li> <li>Tau, G. Z. &amp; Peterson, B. S. Normal Development of Brain Circuits. Neuropsychophar-</li> </ul>
Con Ethi Work (RB- cen c [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	<ul> <li>appeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. The Journal of Comparative Neurology 387, 167–178 (1997).</li> <li>Glantz, L. A., Gilmore, J. H., Hamer, R. M., Lieberman, J. A. &amp; Jarskog, L. F. Synaptophysin and postsynaptic density protein 95 in the human prefrontal cortex from mid-gestation into early adulthood. Neuroscience 149, 582–591 (2007).</li> <li>Tau, G. Z. &amp; Peterson, B. S. Normal Development of Brain Circuits. Neuropsychopharmacology 35, 147–168 (2010). URL https://www.nature.com/articles/np2009115.</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work (RB- cen c [1] [2] [3] [4]	<ul> <li>appeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. The Journal of Comparative Neurology 387, 167–178 (1997).</li> <li>Glantz, L. A., Gilmore, J. H., Hamer, R. M., Lieberman, J. A. &amp; Jarskog, L. F. Synaptophysin and postsynaptic density protein 95 in the human prefrontal cortex from mid-gestation into early adulthood. Neuroscience 149, 582–591 (2007).</li> <li>Tau, G. Z. &amp; Peterson, B. S. Normal Development of Brain Circuits. Neuropsychopharmacology 35, 147–168 (2010). URL https://www.nature.com/articles/npp2009115. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work (RB- cen c [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. The Journal of Comparative Neurology 387, 167–178 (1997).</li> <li>Glantz, L. A., Gilmore, J. H., Hamer, R. M., Lieberman, J. A. &amp; Jarskog, L. F. Synaptophysin and postsynaptic density protein 95 in the human prefrontal cortex from mid-gestation into early adulthood. Neuroscience 149, 582–591 (2007).</li> <li>Tau, G. Z. &amp; Peterson, B. S. Normal Development of Brain Circuits. Neuropsychopharmacology 35, 147–168 (2010). URL https://www.nature.com/articles/npp2009115.</li> <li>Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.</li> </ul>
Con Ethi Work (RB- cen c [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P0000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. The Journal of Comparative Neurology 387, 167–178 (1997).</li> <li>Glantz, L. A., Gilmore, J. H., Hamer, R. M., Lieberman, J. A. &amp; Jarskog, L. F. Synaptophysin and postsynaptic density protein 95 in the human prefrontal cortex from mid-gestation into early adulthood. Neuroscience 149, 582–591 (2007).</li> <li>Tau, G. Z. &amp; Peterson, B. S. Normal Development of Brain Circuits. Neuropsychopharmacology 35, 147–168 (2010). URL https://www.nature.com/articles/npp2009115. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.</li> </ul>
Con Ethi work (RB- cen c [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	<ul> <li>apeting interests. The authors declare no competing interests.</li> <li>cs approval and consent to participate. All studies that contributed data to this were reviewed and approved by IRB at Boston Children's Hospital (IRB-P000287, P0001908, IRB-X06-08-0374, IRB-P0001837, IRB-P00018377, IRB-P00025806). Writtonsent was obtained prior to subject participation.</li> <li>ferences</li> <li>Gilmore, J. H., Knickmeyer, R. C. &amp; Gao, W. Imaging structural and functional brain development in early childhood. Nature Reviews. Neuroscience 19, 123–137 (2018).</li> <li>Mensen, V. T. et al. Development of cortical thickness and surface area in autism spectrum disorder. NeuroImage : Clinical 13, 215–222 (2016). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5157792/.</li> <li>Huttenlocher, P. R. &amp; Dabholkar, A. S. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. The Journal of Comparative Neurology 387, 167–178 (1997).</li> <li>Glantz, L. A., Gilmore, J. H., Hamer, R. M., Lieberman, J. A. &amp; Jarskog, L. F. Synaptophysin and postsynaptic density protein 95 in the human prefrontal cortex from mid-gestation into early adulthood. Neuroscience 149, 582–591 (2007).</li> <li>Tau, G. Z. &amp; Peterson, B. S. Normal Development of Brain Circuits. Neuropsychopharmacology 35, 147–168 (2010). URL https://www.nature.com/articles/npp2009115.</li> <li>Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.</li> </ul>

856 857 858	[6]	Cole, J. H. & Franke, K. Predicting Age Using Neuroimaging: Innovative Brain Age- ing Biomarkers. <i>Trends in Neurosciences</i> <b>40</b> , 681–690 (2017). URL https://www. sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016622361730187X.
859 860 861 862	[7]	Löwe, L. C., Gaser, C., Franke, K. & Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. The Effect of the APOE Genotype on Individual BrainAGE in Normal Aging, Mild Cognitive Impairment, and Alzheimer's Disease. <i>PloS One</i> <b>11</b> , e0157514 (2016).
863 864 865 866	[8]	Charissé, D. <i>et al.</i> Brain age and Alzheimer's-like atrophy are domain-specific predictors of cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. <i>Neurobiology of Aging</i> <b>109</b> , 31–42 (2022). URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0197458021002748.
867 868 869 870	[9]	Wang, Q. et al. Predicting brain age during typical and atypical development based on structural and functional neuroimaging. Human Brain Mapping 42, 5943 (2021). URL /pmc/articles/PMC8596985/. Publisher: Wiley-Blackwell.
871 872 873	[10]	Tunç, B. <i>et al.</i> Deviation from normative brain development is associated with symptom severity in autism spectrum disorder. <i>Molecular Autism</i> <b>10</b> , 46 (2019).
874 875 876 877	[11]	Iyer, K. K. <i>et al.</i> A growth chart of brain function from infancy to adolescence based on EEG. <i>eBioMedicine</i> <b>102</b> (2024). URL https://www.thelancet.com/journals/ebiom/article/PIIS2352-3964(24)00096-3/fulltext. Publisher: Elsevier.
878 879	[12]	Engemann, D. A. <i>et al.</i> A reusable benchmark of brain-age prediction from M/EEG resting-state signals. <i>NeuroImage</i> <b>262</b> , 119521 (2022). Publisher: Academic Press.
880 881 882 883	[13]	Franke, K., Ziegler, G., Klöppel, S. & Gaser, C. Estimating the age of healthy subjects from T1-weighted MRI scans using kernel methods: Exploring the influence of various parameters. <i>NeuroImage</i> <b>50</b> , 883–892 (2010). Publisher: Academic Press.
884 885 886 887	[14]	Cai, H., Li, A., Yu, G., Yang, X. & Liu, M. Brain Age Prediction in Developing Childhood with Multimodal Magnetic Resonance Images. <i>Neuroinformatics</i> <b>21</b> , 5–19 (2023). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s12021-022-09596-1. ISBN: 0123456789.
888 889 890 891	[15]	Hong, J. <i>et al.</i> Brain Age Prediction of Children Using Routine Brain MR Images via Deep Learning. <i>Frontiers in Neurology</i> <b>11</b> , 584682 (2020). Publisher: Frontiers Media S.A.
892 893 894 895	[16]	Hu, L. <i>et al.</i> MRI-based brain age prediction model for children under 3 years old using deep residual network. <i>Brain Structure and Function</i> <b>228</b> , 1771–1784 (2023). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-023-02686-z. ISBN: 0123456789.
896 897 808	[17]	Beheshti, I., Nugent, S., Potvin, O. & Duchesne, S. Bias-adjustment in neuroimaging- based brain age frameworks: A robust scheme. <i>NeuroImage. Clinical</i> <b>24</b> , 102063 (2019).
898 899 900 901	[18]	de Lange, AM. G. & Cole, J. H. Commentary: Correction procedures in brain-age prediction. <i>NeuroImage : Clinical</i> <b>26</b> , 102229 (2020). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih. gov/pmc/articles/PMC7049655/.
902 903 904 905	[19]	Liang, H., Zhang, F. & Niu, X. Investigating systematic bias in brain age estimation with application to post-traumatic stress disorders. <i>Human Brain Mapping</i> <b>40</b> , 3143–3152 (2019).
906 907 908 909 910 911 912	[20]	Levin, A. R., Leal, A. S. M., Gabard-Durnam, L. J. & O'Leary, H. M. Beapp: The batch electroencephalography automated processing platform. <i>Frontiers in Neuroscience</i> <b>0</b> , 513 (2018).

[21]	Gabard-Durnam, L. J., Leal, A. S. M., Wilkinson, C. L. & Levin, A. R. The harvard automated processing pipeline for electroencephalography (happe): Standardized processing software for developmental and high-artifact data. <i>Frontiers in Neuroscience</i> <b>12</b> , 97 (2018). URL http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnins.2018.00097/full.	913 914 915 916
[22]	Donoghue, T. <i>et al.</i> Parameterizing neural power spectra into periodic and aperiodic components. <i>Nature Neuroscience</i> <b>23</b> , 1655–1665 (2020).	917 918 919
[23]	Lundberg, S. M. & Lee, SI. in A unified approach to interpreting model pre- dictions (eds Guyon, I. et al.) Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30 4765–4774 (Curran Associates, Inc., 2017). URL http://papers.nips.cc/paper/ 7062-a-unified-approach-to-interpreting-model-predictions.pdf.	920 921 922 923 924
[24]	Cava, W. L., Bauer, C., Moore, J. H. & Pendergrass, S. A. Interpreta- tion of machine learning predictions for patient outcomes in electronic health records. <i>AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings</i> <b>2019</b> , 572 (2019). URL /pmc/articles/PMC7153071//pmc/articles/PMC7153071/?report=abstracthttps: //www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7153071/.	925 926 927 928 929 930
[25]	Molnar, C. Interpretable Machine Learning (Leanpub, 2020). URL https://books.google.com/books?id=jBm3DwAAQBAJ.	931 932 933
[26]	Lundberg, S. M. <i>et al.</i> From local explanations to global understanding with explainable AI for trees. <i>Nature Machine Intelligence</i> <b>2</b> , 56–67 (2020). URL https://www.nature. com/articles/s42256-019-0138-9. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.	934 935 936 937
[27]	Bethlehem, R. A. I. <i>et al.</i> Brain charts for the human lifespan. <i>Nature</i> (2022). URL https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-022-04554-y.	937 938 939
[28]	Wilkinson, C. L. <i>et al.</i> Developmental trajectories of EEG aperiodic and periodic power suggest timing of thalamocortical development during infancy. <i>bioRxiv</i> 2023.07.21.550114 (2023). URL https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.07.21. 550114v1. Publisher: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory.	940 941 942 943 944
[29]	Smith, S. M., Vidaurre, D., Alfaro-Almagro, F., Nichols, T. E. & Miller, K. L. Estimation of brain age delta from brain imaging. <i>NeuroImage</i> <b>200</b> , 528–539 (2019). Publisher: Academic Press Inc.	945 946 947 948
[30]	Peng, H., Gong, W., Beckmann, C. F., Vedaldi, A. & Smith, S. M. Accurate brain age prediction with lightweight deep neural networks. <i>Medical Image Analysis</i> <b>68</b> (2021). Publisher: Elsevier B.V.	949 950 951 952
[31]	de Lange, AM. G. <i>et al.</i> Mind the gap: Performance metric evalua- tion in brain-age prediction. <i>Human Brain Mapping</i> <b>43</b> , 3113–3129 (2022). URL https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/hbm.25837eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/hbm.25837.	953 954 955 956 957
[32]	Manning, J. R., Jacobs, J., Fried, I. & Kahana, M. J. Broadband Shifts in Local Field Potential Power Spectra Are Correlated with Single-Neuron Spiking in Humans. <i>Journal</i> of Neuroscience <b>29</b> , 13613–13620 (2009). URL https://www.jneurosci.org/content/29/ 43/13613. Publisher: Society for Neuroscience Section: Articles.	958 959 960 961 962
[33]	Spitzer, B. & Haegens, S. Beyond the Status Quo: A Role for Beta Oscillations in Endogenous Content (Re)Activation. <i>eNeuro</i> <b>4</b> , ENEURO.0170–17.2017 (2017). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5539431/.	963 964 965
[34]	Ly, M. <i>et al.</i> Improving brain age prediction models: incorporation of amyloid status in Alzheimer's disease. <i>Neurobiology of Aging</i> <b>87</b> , 44–48 (2020).	966 967 968 969

- [35] Franke, K. & Gaser, C. Longitudinal changes in individual BrainAGE in healthy aging,
  mild cognitive impairment, and Alzheimer's disease. *GeroPsych: The Journal of Geron-*topsychology and Geriatric Psychiatry 25, 235–245 (2012). Place: Germany Publisher:
  Hogrefe Publishing.
- 974
- [36] Cole, J. H., Leech, R., Sharp, D. J. & Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative.
  Prediction of brain age suggests accelerated atrophy after traumatic brain injury. Annals
  of Neurology 77, 571–581 (2015).
- [37] Savjani, R. R., Taylor, B. A., Acion, L., Wilde, E. A. & Jorge, R. E. Accelerated Changes in Cortical Thickness Measurements with Age in Military Service Members with Traumatic Brain Injury. *Journal of Neurotrauma* **34**, 3107–3116 (2017).
- [38] Chung, Y. et al. Use of Machine Learning to Determine Deviance in Neuroanatomical Maturity Associated With Future Psychosis in Youths at Clinically High Risk. JAMA psychiatry 75, 960–968 (2018).
- [39] Lee, W. H., Antoniades, M., Schnack, H. G., Kahn, R. S. & Frangou, S. Brain age prediction in schizophrenia: Does the choice of machine learning algorithm matter? *Psychiatry Research. Neuroimaging* **310**, 111270 (2021).
- [40] Kolenic, M. et al. Obesity, dyslipidemia and brain age in first-episode psychosis. Journal of Psychiatric Research 99, 151–158 (2018).
- 992
- [41] Valizadeh, S. A., Hänggi, J., Mérillat, S. & Jäncke, L. Age prediction on the basis of
  brain anatomical measures. *Human brain mapping* 38, 997–1008 (2017). URL https:
  //pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27807912/. Publisher: Hum Brain Mapp.
- [42] Monachino, A. D., Lopez, K. L., Pierce, L. J. & Gabard-Durnam, L. J. The HAPPE
  plus Event-Related (HAPPE+ER) software: A standardized preprocessing pipeline for
  event-related potential analyses. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience* 57, 101140
  (2022). Publisher: Elsevier.
- 1001
- [43] Debnath, R. et al. The Maryland analysis of developmental EEG (MADE) pipeline.
   Psychophysiology 57, e13580 (2020).
- 1004
  1005
  1006
  1006
  1006
  1007
  1007
  1004
  1007
  1004
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007
  1007</l
- 1008 [45] Mullen E. Infant Mullen Scales of Early Learning (Springer, New York, NY, 1989). URL http://www.pearsonclinical.com/childhood/products/100000306/ mullen-scales-of-early-learning.html#tab-details. Publication Title: TOTAL Child, Incorporated.
- 1012
- 1013 [46] Lord, C. et al. Autism diagnostic observation schedule: a standardized observation of communicative and social behavior. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders 1015 19, 185–212 (1989).
- 1016
- 1017 [47] Dow, D. et al. The Brief Observation of Symptoms of Autism (BOSA): Development of
  a New Adapted Assessment Measure for Remote Telehealth Administration Through
  COVID-19 and Beyond. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders 52, 5383–5394
  (2022). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8674519/.
- 1021
- 1022 [48] Lord, C., Rutter, M. & Le Couteur, A. Autism Diagnostic Interview—Revised: A revised
  1023 version of a diagnostic interview for caregivers of individuals with possible pervasive
  1024 developmental disorders. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders 24, 659–685
  1025 (1994). Place: US Publisher: Plenum Publishing Corp.
- 1026

[49]	Sparrow, S. S., Cicchetti, D. V. & Saulnier, C. A. Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales (Pearson Education, Inc;, London, 2018). URL https://www.pearsonassessments.com/store/usassessments/en/Store/Professional-Assessments/Behavior/Adaptive/Vineland-Adaptive-Behavior-Scales-%7C-Third-Edition/p/100001622.html.
[50]	Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. URL https://dsm. psychiatryonline.org/doi/book/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596.
[51]	Levin, A. R., Méndez Leal, A. S., Gabard-Durnam, L. J. & O'Leary, H. M. BEAPP: The Batch Electroencephalography Automated Processing Platform. <i>Frontiers in</i> <i>Neuroscience</i> <b>0</b> , 513 (2018). Publisher: Frontiers.
[52]	Gabard-Durnam, L. J., Mendez Leal, A. S., Wilkinson, C. L. & Levin, A. R. The Harvard Automated Processing Pipeline for Electroencephalography (HAPPE): Standardized Processing Software for Developmental and High-Artifact Data. <i>Frontiers in Neuroscience</i> <b>12</b> , 97 (2018). URL http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnins. 2018.00097/full. Publisher: Frontiers Media S.A.
[53]	<ul> <li>Winkler, I., Haufe, S. &amp; Tangermann, M. Automatic Classification of Artifactual ICA-Components for Artifact Removal in EEG Signals. <i>Behavioral and Brain Functions</i> 7, 30 (2011). URL http://www.behavioralandbrainfunctions.com/content/7/1/30.</li> <li>Publisher: BioMed Central Ltd ISBN: 1744-9081 (Electronic)\n1744-9081 (Linking).</li> </ul>
[54]	Pedregosa, F. et al. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. Journal of Machine Learning Research 12, 2825–2830 (2011).
[55]	Watt, J., Borhani, R., Katsaggelos, A. K. & Cambridge University Press. Machine learning refined : foundations, algorithms, and applications 574. ISBN: 1108480721.
[56]	Mundfrom, D., DePoy Smith, M. & Kay, L. The Effect of Multicollinearity on Prediction in Regression Models. <i>General Linear Model Journal</i> <b>44</b> , 24–28 (2018). URL https: //www.glmj.org/archives/articles/Mundfrom_v44n1.pdf.
[57]	Morris, J. & Lieberman, M. Multicollinearity's Effect on Regression Prediction Accuracy with Real Data Structures. <i>General Linear Model Journal</i> 44, 29–34 (2018). URL https://www.glmj.org/archives/articles/Morris_v44n1.pdf.
[58]	Farrar, D. E. & Glauber, R. R. Multicollinearity in Regression Analysis: The Problem Revisited. <i>The Review of Economics and Statistics</i> <b>49</b> , 92–107 (1967). URL https://www.jstor.org/stable/1937887. Publisher: The MIT Press.
[59]	Kim, J. H. Multicollinearity and misleading statistical results. <i>Korean Journal of Anesthesiology</i> <b>72</b> , 558–569 (2019). URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6900425/.
[60]	Lundberg, S. M. & Lee, SI. A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions, Vol. 30 (Curran Associates, Inc., 2017). URL https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/ 2017/hash/8a20a8621978632d76c43dfd28b67767-Abstract.html.
	19