

Diagnosis of Schizophrenia and its Subtypes Using MRI and Machine Learning

Hosna Tavakoli ¹, Reza Rostami ^{1,3}, Reza Shalhaf ¹, Mohammad-Reza Nazem-Zadeh ^{1,2,4*}

¹ Computational and Artificial Intelligence Department, Institute of Cognitive Science Studies, Tehran, Iran.

² Research Center for Molecular and Cellular Imaging, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

³ Department of Psychology, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.

⁴ Department of Neuroscience, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia.

* Corresponding author. E-mail: mohamad.nazem-zadeh@monash.edu;

Keywords: Schizophrenia, Psychiatric disorder diagnosis, Disease subtypes, Magnetic resonance imaging, Machine learning, Graph theory

Highlights

- The neurobiological heterogeneity present in schizophrenia remains poorly understood.
- This likely contributes to the limited success of existing treatments and the observed variability in treatment responses.
- Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and machine learning (ML) algorithms can improve the classification of schizophrenia and its subtypes.
- Structural and functional measures of MRI can discriminate Schizophrenia from healthy individuals with almost 80% accuracy.
- Paranoid is the most distinguishable subtype of schizophrenia.

26 **Abstract**

27 Purpose: The neurobiological heterogeneity present in schizophrenia remains poorly
28 understood. This likely contributes to the limited success of existing treatments and the
29 observed variability in treatment responses. Our objective was to employ magnetic resonance
30 imaging (MRI) and machine learning (ML) algorithms to improve the classification of
31 schizophrenia and its subtypes.

32 Method: We utilized a public dataset provided by the UCLA Consortium for
33 Neuropsychiatric Research, containing structural MRI and resting-state fMRI (rsfMRI) data.
34 We integrated all individuals within the dataset diagnosed with schizophrenia (N=50); along
35 with age- and gender-matched healthy individuals (N=50). We extracted volumetrics of 66
36 subcortical and thickness of 72 cortical regions. Additionally, we obtained four graph-based
37 measures for 116 intracranial regions from rsfMRI data including degree, betweenness
38 centrality, participation coefficient, and local efficiency. Employing conventional ML
39 methods, we sought to distinguish the patients with schizophrenia from healthy individuals.
40 Furthermore, we applied the methods for discriminating subtypes of schizophrenia. To
41 streamline the feature set, various feature selection techniques were applied. Furthermore, a
42 validation phase involved employing the model on a dataset domestically acquired using the
43 same imaging assessments (N=13). Finally, we explored the correlation between
44 neuroimaging features and behavioral assessments.

45 Finding: The classification accuracy reached as high as 79% in distinguishing
46 schizophrenia patients from healthy in the UCLA dataset. This result was achieved by the k-
47 nearest neighbor algorithm, utilizing 12 brain neuroimaging features, selected by the feature
48 selection method of Minimum Redundancy Maximum Relevance (MRMR). The model
49 demonstrated high effectiveness (85% accuracy) in estimating the disease vs. control label for
50 a new dataset acquired domestically. Using a linear SVM on 62 features obtained from
51 MRMR, patients with schizophrenic subtypes were classified with an accuracy of 64%. The
52 highest spearman correlation coefficient between the neuroimaging features and behavioral
53 assessments was observed between degree of the postcentral gyrus and mean reaction time in
54 the verbal capacity task ($r = 0.49$, $p = 0.001$).

55 Conclusion: The findings of this study underscore the utility of MRI and ML algorithms in
56 enhancing the diagnostic process for schizophrenia. Furthermore, these methods hold
57 promise for detecting both brain-related abnormalities and cognitive impairments associated
58 with this disorder.

59 **1 Introduction**

60 Schizophrenia is a serious mental health disorder that affects feelings, thoughts, and
61 behavior. There are complications and heterogeneities, which have made its treatment less

62 effective. The diagnosis for schizophrenia mostly relies on self-reports, behavioral
63 observations, and psychiatric history, which have led to an average response to the
64 antipsychotic medications as the mainstream treatment (de Araujo et al., 2012). In a
65 systematic review of 101 studies, the treatment-resistant patients exhibit malfunction in the
66 dopaminergic system and hypersensitivity to dopamine level in comparison with patients
67 responding to antipsychotic treatment (Iasevoli et al., 2023).

68 Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) as a neuroimaging tool has been a great help to explore
69 the neural basis of psychiatric disorders including schizophrenia. Introducing new
70 biomarkers based on MRI findings is so promising that it is suggested as an add-on diagnosis
71 method for schizophrenia (Galderisi et al., 2019). Another promising field in which MRI has
72 been helpful is personalized medicine. With the pieces of evidence MRI brought to the field,
73 adjusting the parameters of treatments such as brain stimulation based on individual features
74 draws some attention (Zangen et al., 2023, Klooster et al., 2022, Cole et al., 2022). Capturing
75 differences in structure of brain between healthy and schizophrenic patients using MRI (Zhao
76 et al., 2022, Li et al., 2022, Brenner et al., 2022) as well as the function (Zhu et al., 2022, Saris
77 et al., 2022, Scognamiglio and Houenou, 2014, Zeng et al., 2022), is prompted scientists to
78 invest more on this modality. The MRI modalities are capable to discriminate healthy from
79 schizophrenia patients, for instance a simple linear model on voxel-based morphometry
80 features can diagnose sufficiently, even on data from different sites and several scanners
81 (Nemoto et al., 2020). A review also highlights that neuroimaging studies in schizophrenia
82 revealed the significant role of drug abuse in the loss of brain volume of patients (Walter et
83 al., 2012). Employment of brain function and structure simultaneously as well as their
84 interaction can strongly examine schizophrenia patients from healthy individuals (Antonucci
85 et al., 2022).

86 MRI studies on brain structures revealed that the ventricular volume is associated with
87 poor treatment outcome in patients with schizophrenia (Lieberman et al., 2001). Moreover,
88 studying brain morphology in schizophrenia has proven that the treatment-resistance
89 patients are in more progressive stages of changes in brain morphology than treatment-
90 responsive cases (Sone et al., 2023). Decreased thickness of cortical regions such as the insula
91 and superior temporal gyrus has been also reported in first-episode drug-naïve schizophrenics
92 compared to healthy controls (Song et al., 2015). In a diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) study,
93 schizophrenia patients with severe hallucination showed disintegrated fiber integrity in the
94 connection between frontal and temporoparietal language area (de Weijer et al., 2011). In
95 another DTI study, white matter abnormalities in frontal, parietal and temporal regions were
96 found associated with a poor treatment outcome (Mitelman and Buchsbaum, 2007, Molina et
97 al., 2008). Enlargement of white matter volumes was also observed in treatment-resistance
98 patients compared to treatment-responsive patients (Molina et al., 2008, Anderson et al.,
99 2015).

100 Despite many efforts, there are investigation in the field to find prognostic biomarkers and
101 identify treatment-resistance cases with schizophrenia in order to offer a proper treatment at
102 early stages (Jiao et al., 2022, Vita et al., 2019). With the significant advancement of
103 technology, there is more optimism for introducing innovative and objective methodologies,
104 which may aid in a better understanding of the heterogeneity of schizophrenia and suggestion
105 of a potent individualized treatment.

106 Functional connectivity in brain as an identification of spontaneous interaction of regions
107 obtained during resting-state obtained abnormalities in favor of schizophrenia. By exploring
108 the resting-state fMRI (rsfMRI) of schizophrenic patients with auditory hallucinations, a
109 hypoconnectivity between the primary auditory cortex and secondary auditory cortical
110 regions was found (Gavrilescu et al., 2010). Various measures extracted from rsfMRI can
111 project different aspects of schizophrenia effects on the brain. For example, abnormal
112 functional connectivity in schizophrenia was shown in individual regional homogeneity
113 (ReHo), the amplitude of low-frequency fluctuations (ALFF), and the degree centrality values
114 extracted from rsfMRI (Li et al., 2023). There are benefits in applying graph analyses on
115 functional connectivity in order to characterize the brain networks (Rubinov and Sporns,
116 2010). There is also evidence for the ability of graph measures to capture significant lower
117 segregation and higher integration in structural connectome (Gao et al., 2023, Wang et al.,
118 2017).

119 Moreover, some studies point to MRI's ability to distinguish between subgroups of patients
120 with schizophrenia which can explain a portion of heterogeneities in this disorder. Structural
121 MRI has been used to distinct between schizophrenic subtypes, namely a morphometry study
122 suggesting a reduction in cortical folding in disorganized subtypes of schizophrenia relative
123 to healthy controls, predominantly manifested in the left hemisphere of the paranoid subtype
124 (Sallet et al., 2003). Patients over the course of schizophrenia revealed significant aberration
125 in cortical thickness (Zhao et al., 2022). In a multisite study, subgrouping schizophrenia using
126 clustering approaches on brain structures has resulted in three distinct groups with different
127 cognitive functions (Xiao et al., 2022). A valuable study supporting neurobiological
128 differences between paranoid and non-paranoid schizophrenia (Lutz et al., 2020), identified
129 larger bilateral hippocampi, right amygdala, and their subfield volumes in paranoids
130 compared to non-paranoid cases. It supports that structural MRI can play a major role
131 diagnosis of schizophrenic subtypes.

132 The combination of MRI with machine learning (ML) offers a new tool to exploit novel
133 biomarkers, diagnose illnesses, and forecast the response to a particular treatment in a more
134 accurate manner as a result of the development of new mathematical algorithms and data
135 collecting technologies. To find patterns and traits connected to schizophrenia, ML
136 algorithms can be trained to examine huge volumes of MRI data from numerous patients. This
137 will facilitate the development of tailored treatment programs and more precise diagnostic

138 decision-making by clinicians. By applying several ML models, the researchers identified
139 some pre-treatment clinical measures to predict the treatment outcome in depression (Webb
140 et al., 2020). The outcome of antipsychotic medications is variable across the patients with
141 schizophrenia. ML algorithms have been shown capable to predict the treatment outcome for
142 the first-episode drug-naïve schizophrenia patients from the functional connection in
143 superior temporal cortex with an accuracy of 82.5% (Cao et al., 2020). Furthermore, resting-
144 state EEG has shown potential in classifying responders vs. non-responders to the brain
145 stimulation treatment (Ebrahimzadeh et al., 2024).

146 Modalities neuroimaging with ML models works has elevated the accuracy of diagnosis for
147 mental health disorders (Quak et al., 2021, Wang et al., 2017). However, the number of
148 studies with utilizing ML for subtyping the patients is limited.

149 The primary objective of this study is to apply ML and MRI to classify patients with
150 schizophrenia and its subtypes. We also seek to reach more accurate discrimination of patients
151 from healthy controls as well as schizophrenia subtypes by utilizing the structural and
152 functional features of the brain. To reach the goals, we first extracted structural features and
153 graph measures from T1-weighted image and rsfMRI respectively. Then, using the
154 conventional ML models, we classified patients to schizophrenia and healthy. Different
155 combinations of features were tested on all models to obtain the best model with the best
156 combination of features. We evaluated the performance of the best model in classification of
157 schizophrenia subgroups from healthy controls. As an extra validation, we acquired a new
158 domestic dataset from the patients diagnosed with schizophrenia to assess the selected models
159 on an unseen test data. We used the same procedure on subtypes label to test whether the
160 conventional models and MRI measures are capable of differentiating between subtypes of
161 schizophrenia. For the final step, the correlation of the extracted features with behavior
162 assessments was inspected to uncover some of associations between the brain and behaviors
163 in the patients with schizophrenia.

164 **2 Material and method**

165 **2.1 Main dataset**

166 We used the dataset from UCLA Consortium for Neuropsychiatric Phenomics
167 (<https://openneuro.org/datasets/ds000030/versions/1.0.0>) consisting neuroimaging and
168 neuropsychological data from healthy individuals and patients with schizophrenia (Poldrack
169 et al., 2016). Neuroimaging data were acquired at the Ahmanson-Lovelace Brain Mapping
170 Center (Siemens version syngo MR B15) and the Staglin Center for Cognitive Neuroscience
171 (Siemens version syngo MR B17) at the University of California, Los Angeles, USA. The
172 parameters for the high-resolution scan were: 4mm slices, TR/TE=5000/34 ms, 4 averages,
173 Matrix=128 × 128. The parameters for MPRAGE were the following: TR=1.9 s, TE=2.26 ms,

174 FOV =250 mm, Matrix =256 × 256, sagittal plane, slice thickness=1 mm, 176 slices. The resting
175 fMRI scan lasted 304 s. Participants were asked to remain relaxed and keep their eyes open;
176 they were not presented any stimuli or asked to respond during the scan.

177 First, we gathered the information of all 50 schizophrenia patients and then matched them
178 to 50 out of 130 healthy controls by the age and gender. The age- and gender matched groups
179 are shown in **Table 1**. We extracted demographics, structural MRI, and resting-state fMRI
180 (rsfMRI) data of both groups. We also used behavioral assessments to investigate their
181 relationships with imaging data. The list of three domains of behavioral tests performed on
182 the subjects is presented in **Table 2** (Poldrack et al., 2016).

183 We also utilized the Scale for the Assessment of Negative Symptoms (SANS) and Scale for
184 the Assessment of Positive Symptoms (SAPS) to divide patients into Negative and Positive
185 groups. The individuals with negative scores greater than positive ones were put in the
186 Negative; and the ones with positive scores more than negative comprised the Positive group.
187 There were two subjects with equal scores of positive and negative symptoms which were
188 eventually put in the Positive group for the sake of maintaining the balance between the two
189 groups. A further grouping was made based on patients' subtypes defined by the Structured
190 Clinical Interview for DSM-5 (SCID-5).

191 **2.2 Extra validation dataset**

192 For extra validation of ML models to explore how these models would perform on an
193 unseen dataset, 13 patients with schizophrenia along with 20 healthy subjects were recruited
194 with the same imaging and behavioral measurements as the UCLA dataset. The patients were
195 diagnosed by DSM-5 and an MRI session conducted on a 3T MRI system with a 64-channel
196 head coil (Prisma, Siemens, Erlangen, Germany) at the National Brain Mapping Laboratory
197 located at Tehran University, Iran, while attending a neurologist (N. T.) throughout the scans.
198 Each session included a T1-weighted image with following protocol: TR=1.9 s, TE=2.26 ms,
199 FOV = 250 mm, Matrix =256 × 256, Sagittal plane, Slice thickness=1 mm, Resolution= 1 x 1 x
200 1 mm, 176 slices. The resting-state scan lasted 396 s using the following parameters: TR=1.2
201 s, TE=30 ms, FOV=192 mm, Matrix = 64 × 64, Sagittal plane, Slice thickness=3 mm,
202 Resolution= 3 x 3 x 3 mm, 42 slices.

203 **2.3 Data Harmonization**

204 To reduce the impact of using different scanners, we harmonized the data using ComBat
205 method (Johnson et al., 2006). Empirical Bayesian was used as the Bayesian inference in this
206 method using which, the distribution of latent variables was inferred. We applied the ComBat
207 for both main and extra validation datasets.

208 2.4 Feature extraction

209 Details of the acquisition parameter and assessments of the UCLA dataset are available in
210 the data descriptor (Poldrack et al., 2016). The data was preprocessed by FMRIPREP version
211 0.4.4 (<http://fmriprep.readthedocs.io>). Cortical thickness and subcortical volume were
212 calculated by FreeSurfer v6.0.0 (<http://surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu>). The structural measures
213 were extracted after motion correction, intensity correction, Talairach registration,
214 normalization, skull stripping, and segmentation. The cortical surface and subcortical
215 volumes were segmented and labeled into 68 and 45 regions (34 for each hemisphere),
216 respectively (Gorgolewski et al., 2017).

217 The preprocessing of the rsfMRI was performed using a toolbox for Data Processing and
218 Analysis of Brain Imaging (DPABI), which evolved from the Data Processing Assistant for
219 Resting-State fMRI (DPARSF) (Yan et al., 2016). We removed the first 10 slices and then slice
220 timing correction, realignment, brain extraction, and co-registration of the functional image
221 on T1 were done as preprocessing. Then the time series of 116 regions of the AAL atlas
222 (Tzourio-Mazoyer et al., 2002) was calculated for both healthy and patient subjects, for each
223 a matrix with a dimension of 320×116 was generated. We then calculated a 116×116
224 functional connectivity matrix (an undirected brain network) using Pearson's correlation
225 coefficient between each pair of time series, and extracted these values as imaging features.

226 Among the vast measures of brain networks, the centrality graph measures including the
227 degree, betweenness centrality, and participation coefficient were extracted to Local
228 efficiency was also calculated to measure the segregation and the presence of densely
229 interconnected brain networks.

230 These measures were calculated as follows (Rubinov and Sporns, 2010):

- 231 - **Degree** is the number of links connected to a node. Degree of a node i is defined as:

$$232 \quad k_i = \sum_{j \in N} a_{ij}$$

233 where N is the set of all nodes in the network and a_{ij} is the connection status between
234 nodes i and j .

- 235 - **Betweenness centrality** of node i is:

$$237 \quad b_i = \frac{1}{(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{\substack{h, j \in N \\ h \neq j, h \neq i, j \neq i}} \frac{\rho_{hj}(i)}{\rho_{hj}}$$

238 where ρ_{hj} is the number of shortest paths between h and j , and $\rho_{hj}(i)$ is the number
239 of shortest paths between h and j that pass through i .

240

- 241 - **Participation coefficient** of node i is:

242
$$y_i = 1 - \sum_{m \in M} \left(\frac{k_i(m)}{k_i} \right)^2$$

243 where M is the set of modules, and $k_i(m)$ is the number of links between i and all
244 nodes in module m . Modularity of a network is $Q = \sum_{u \in M} [e_{uu} - (\sum_{v \in M} e_{uv})^2]$, where
245 the network is fully subdivided into a set of nonoverlapping modules M , and e_{uv} is the
246 proportion of all links that connect nodes in module u with nodes in module v .

247

248

249 - **Local efficiency** of the network is defined as:

250
$$E_{loc} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in N} E_{loc,i} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in N} \frac{\sum_{j,h \in N, j \neq i} a_{ij} a_{ih} [d_{jh}(N_i)]^{-1}}{k_i(k_i - 1)}$$

251 where $E_{loc,i}$ is the local efficiency of node i , and $d_{jh}(N_i)$ is the length of the shortest
252 path between j and h , which contains only neighbors of i .

253 We extracted these features for both the datasets in this study.

254 .

255 2.5 Statistical analyses

256 We ran 2-sample t-test to explore differences in MRI measures between the healthy
257 controls and schizophrenia subjects. The Bonferroni correction was used to address the
258 multiple hypothesis testing issues. Since the independent variables (MRI measures)
259 outnumbered the observations, the repeated measure analyses of variance (ANOVA) were
260 conducted to indicate whether or not there are any significant differences between healthy
261 controls, Negative, and Positive groups in the extracted features. We considered the brain
262 region as a repeated factor. There was also another repeated measure ANOVA test to answer
263 the same question about the subtypes of schizophrenia and healthy subjects. The subtypes are
264 Disorganized, Paranoid, Undifferentiated, Residual, and Schizoaffective.

265 2.6 Classification and feature selection

266 All the procedures of classification and feature selection were operated in MATLAB ver.
267 2020b. The Conventional ML model including Support vector machine (SVM) with
268 polynomial and linear kernel, k-nearest neighborhood (kNN), Linear Discriminant Analyses
269 (LDA), Linear Regression (LR), Random Forest (RF), and Naïve Bayes (NB) were applied to
270 classify the defined groups. The 10-fold cross-validation approach was executed with 10-time
271 repeats and the performance of the model was measured by calculating the average of mean
272 accuracy of folds among the repeats. Furthermore, three feature selection methods were
273 implemented to reduce the feature dimensions as well as to improve the model's accuracy.
274 The feature selection methods were:

- 275 - **Sequential Forward Selection (SFS)** in which features are sequentially added to an
276 empty candidate set until the addition of further features does not decrease the
277 criterion.
- 278 - **Minimum Redundancy Maximum Relevance (MRMR)** is an approach to select features
279 with a high correlation with output (class) and a low correlation with other features in
280 the dataset.
- 281 - **Neighborhood Component Analysis (NCA)** is a method for selecting features with the
282 goal of maximizing the prediction accuracy of regression and classification algorithms.
283 It learns the feature weights using a diagonal adaptation of NCA with a regularization
284 term.

285 SFS is sensitive to the feature sequence so that different arrangement of features results in
286 different sets of final selected features. To address this issue, we implemented SFS 5 times and
287 each time we shuffled the MRI measures before using SFS. The reported accuracy for SFS is
288 the average of 5 repeats.

289 For MRMR and NCA these steps were performed: 1) apply the method on the feature set,
290 2) train the ML model with the best feature, 3) add features one by one and replicate the
291 training, 4) determine the features with the highest accuracy. This process was run to find
292 the best model with the lowest feature dimension by using MRMR and NCA.

293 We performed these steps for classifying the schizophrenia from healthy and also on
294 schizophrenia subtypes. For evaluation, we applied the best model on Negative and Positive
295 groups as well as new unseen dataset including new healthy and patient subjects.

296

297 **2.7 Behavioral and imaging correlation**

298 We inspected the relationship between the imaging features and behavioral assessments.
299 First, we obtained differences between healthy subjects and schizophrenic patients in both
300 imaging and behavioral data. Then, we investigated whether there is any association of MRI
301 measures with behavioral scales. To reduce the sensitivity to the outliers, we utilized the
302 Spearman coefficient method.

303 **3 Results**

304 **3.1 Data drop-out**

305 We dropped out a patient from the Negative and Positive grouping due to the missing
306 SANS and SAPS scores. Furthermore, we dropped the Disorganized subtype for insufficient
307 sample size (N=1).

308 3.2 Statistical results

309 There were no significant differences in age between any comparative groups based on
310 either the t-test (for two groups) or one-way ANOVA (for more than two groups) (**Table 1**).
311 A two-sample t-test with Bonferroni correction suggested no significant difference in any of
312 structural and graph measures between healthy controls and schizophrenic patients.

313 There was a significant interaction between group and MRI measures after the
314 Greenhouse–Geisser corrected ANOVA in healthy, Negative, and Positive groups,
315 ($F(601,1202) = 2.96, p = 0.025$). Post-hoc analyses using multiple comparison tests
316 revealed significant differences between healthy and Positive groups ($p = 0.011$). Two-
317 sample t-test also identified the significant features as the volume of the right hemisphere,
318 left hemisphere, and the whole cortex.

319 Another repeated measure ANOVA on healthy controls and subtypes of schizophrenia
320 obtains a significant effect of group on MRI measures after the Greenhouse–Geisser correction
321 ($F(601,2404) = 2.51, p = 0.015$). The post hoc results suggested that the differences
322 between residual and healthy groups were the most significant ($p = 0.007$).

323 3.3 Classification results

324 3.3.1 Healthy and Schizophrenia groups

325 MRI preprocessing and feature extraction provided a vector with 602 features for each
326 subject including sixty-six subcortical volumes (of 45 subcortical regions plus 21 whole-brain,
327 white matter, and right and left hemisphere cortex), 72 cortical measurements (68 left and
328 right regions plus 4 whole-brain cortical thickness) and 4 graph measures of 116 brain regions
329 ($602 = 66 + 72 + 4 \times 116$). The accuracy of models is shown in **Figure 1**. The combination of all
330 three sets of imaging measures suggested the best accuracy of 67% using RF classifier. As it is
331 observed, there is an improvement after applying feature selection methods, with the best
332 accuracy of 79% achieved by kNN when applied on the 12 features selected by MRMR. The
333 most important features obtained from MRMR were: thickness of middle temporal and
334 middle frontal gyrus in left hemisphere and insula in right hemisphere, degree of right
335 superior frontal gyrus, the volumes of right hippocampus, right postcentral gyrus, and midline
336 of vermis, participation coefficient of left cuneus and right palladium, betweenness centrality
337 of left postcentral gyrus and left superior frontal gyrus and local efficiency of middle frontal
338 gyrus. Confusion matrix, sensitivity, and specificity of the kNN model with selected features
339 to evaluate the model are in **Table 3**. A high sensitivity reported for schizophrenia group
340 means that the classifier has the ability to designate the individual with disease as positive.
341 The specificity is showing an acceptable false positive result for healthy and schizophrenia
342 groups. The details on other performances and accuracies are available in Table S1 in
343 supplementary.

344 3.3.2 Performance of selected model on other groups

345 The validation of the selected model on other group classifications is assessed in this
346 section. **Table 4** are showing the accuracy of the kNN model in classifying each group. The 12
347 features used in this classification are the same as those extracted from MRMR mentioned in
348 the previous section. The worth performance on the UCLA dataset belongs to healthy,
349 Negative, and Positive groups classification with 51% accuracy. On the other hand, the kNN
350 model with 12 features was able to discriminate healthy subjects from the Positive group with
351 an acceptable accuracy of 74%. After harmonization of the extra validation dataset, although
352 predicting labels of the patients seems a great success with an accuracy of 72%, the standard
353 deviation is high (35%). Prediction of new healthy and patient subjects after harmonization
354 was not noteworthy (58%).

355 3.3.3 Schizophrenia subtypes

356 There was a drastic inequality between the numbers of samples for each subtype, as shown
357 in **Table 1**~~Error! Reference source not found.~~. Four subtypes: Paranoid, Undifferentiated,
358 Residual, and Schizoaffective were considered. The same procedure was adopted as the
359 classification of patients vs. healthy controls. **Figure 2** shows the performance of 7 ML models
360 and 9 sets of features on classifying the subtypes. The highest accuracy of 64% derived from
361 SVM with linear kernel on 62 features obtained from MRMR. The performance of subtype
362 classifier was found inferior compared to the patient vs. control classifier (See Table S2 of
363 supplementary for more details). **Table 5** compares the selected model performance for each
364 group in a confusion matrix form with sensitivity and specificity values. By identifying 14 out
365 of 21, this classifier was the most accurate in differentiating Paranoid subtype with an
366 accuracy of 67%, followed by the Schizoaffective subtype with an accuracy of 64%. The
367 highest sensitivity and specificity in diagnosis of Schizoaffective confirms the great
368 differences of this subgroup with schizophrenia subtypes, with a support towards the most
369 distinguished subtype which is Paranoid.

370 3.4 Behavioral Results

371 **Table 6** lists the behavioral measures with the strongest correlations to each of the 12
372 imaging features with a significant difference ($p < 0.05$). The degree of right postcentral and
373 the verbal capacity task showed the highest correlation ($r = 0.49$, $p = 0.001$). The thickness of
374 left middle temporal and mean accuracy of manipulation trials in VMNM task showed the
375 second highest positive connection ($r = 0.45$, $p = 0.002$). Both the participation coefficient of
376 the left cuneus and the degree of vermis were negatively correlated with the reaction times
377 of two cognitive tasks ($r = -0.44$, -0.47 , $p = 0.003$, 0.002). The remaining negative correlations
378 ($r = -0.42$, -0.46 , $p = 0.005$, 0.002) were seen between two MRI measures and the recollection
379 process of two tasks. **Figure 3** shows the most positive and negative correlated imaging features
380 and behavioral scales.

381 4 Discussion

382 Schizophrenia diagnosis is not merely reliant on a singular method; rather, a combination
383 of physical and psychological assessments aids clinicians to achieve accurate diagnoses and
384 treatments. MRI serves as a diagnostic tool, revealing structural and functional brain
385 abnormalities that may distinguish the patients with schizophrenia from healthy individuals.
386 Moreover, recent strides in ML exhibit potential in leveraging MRI data to identify and
387 forecast outcomes in schizophrenia (Rozycki et al., 2017, Yassin et al., 2020). This study offers
388 substantial evidence of ML's significance in diagnosing and understanding schizophrenia
389 through both structural and functional imaging data. Achieving an accuracy of approximately
390 80%, the utilized MRI measures including cortical thickness and graph metrics, effectively
391 differentiate between healthy individuals and the patients. This performance on the specific
392 dataset stands as one of the notable accomplishments to date (Quaak et al., 2021, Matsubara
393 et al., 2019). In order to diagnose patients, the suggested strategy by this study needs to extract
394 only 12 features from MRI images. This may be advantageous in reducing the computation
395 cost and model's complexity. Clinical subtypes of schizophrenia are less noted in the context
396 of classification. According to the results of this study, Paranoid subtype can be discriminated
397 from normal with a decent accuracy (67%). This may be a valuable point to obtain the neural
398 differences of schizophrenia subtypes.

399 The most pertinent features chosen as significant for classification were graph measures
400 derived from rsfMRI data. The application of graph theory has offered novel insights into the
401 functional connections and the collaborative behaviors of brain regions in the context of
402 human cognitive functions and behaviors (Farahani et al., 2019). Degree, local efficiency,
403 betweenness centrality, and participation coefficient represent graph measures computed
404 from rsfMRI data can provide insights into various facets of brain functional connectivity.
405 Research has demonstrated that the organization of brain networks in individuals with
406 schizophrenia, as identified through graph theoretical analysis, deviates from the typical
407 patterns found in healthy controls (Gao et al., 2023).

408 Five of the twelve selected features are associated with the attention network including
409 the thickness of the middle frontal gyrus in the left hemisphere and the insula in the right
410 hemisphere, the degree of the right superior frontal gyrus, the betweenness centrality of the
411 left superior frontal gyrus, and the local efficiency of the middle frontal gyrus. These findings
412 are in agreement with existing literature. Conclusions drawn from both imaging data and
413 behavioral observations suggest that attentional deficits in patients manifest in performance
414 on attention-related tasks and are reflected in the brain's activity and connectivity within the
415 attention network (Jimenez et al., 2016, Roiser et al., 2013, Ioakeimidis et al., 2020).

416 The presence of nine functional-related measures highlights that distinctions in brain
417 function between patients and healthy individuals were more evident. Conversely,
418 subcortical volume values played a negligible role in discerning patients from healthy

419 subjects. Given that the disorder tends to preserve brain structure, particularly in its early
420 stages, this outcome was foreseeable. Consequently, it can be inferred that MRI measures
421 associated with brain networks might hold the potential to enhance the accuracy of diagnostic
422 procedures.

423 Another noteworthy finding of this study was that the chosen model exhibited superior
424 performance in distinguishing Positive group from healthy individuals compared to Negative
425 group. This suggests that individuals with positive symptoms show greater deviations from
426 the normal state in terms of brain function and structure, compared to patients with negative
427 symptoms. Substantiating this interpretation, statistical analyses confirmed that alterations in
428 the Positive group significantly impact the overall cortical thickness of the brain. This aligns
429 with prior research indicating distinct neural underpinnings for negative and positive
430 symptoms (Vanes et al., 2019).

431 In an additional validation step, the selected model displayed robust performance when
432 applied to a new dataset, achieving an accuracy rate of nearly 85%. However, the presence of
433 a high standard deviation suggests that the model's reliability on previously unseen data might
434 be somewhat compromised.

435 A multi-class classification task in general faces more challenges than a two-class
436 classification, which is the case for the conventional classification methods used in this study.
437 There is more concentration on clustering strategies as opposed to the classification, for
438 subtyping the schizophrenia using behavioral (Lefort-Besnard et al., 2018, Chen et al., 2020)
439 or anatomical data (Chand et al., 2020). We managed to solve this problem in a certain way
440 through adjustments, supported by the validated performance on the local data acquired in
441 this study. From the results, we observed that all models performed poorly on classifying the
442 subtypes. In addition, the small number of data and the unbalanced distribution of patients
443 in subtype groups has intensified the classification difficulty. This seems to be the reason why
444 studies on subtyping patients are quite limited. However, these issues can be dealt with to a
445 certain degree by using data augmentation approach along with developed ML models.

446 A significant contribution of neuroimaging data and ML approaches lies within the
447 capacity to unveil associations between brain characteristics and behavioral patterns in
448 psychiatric disorders (Drysdale et al., 2017). Although there are only a few studies
449 investigating that, the results are promising. Schizophrenia patients with low and high social
450 anhedonia were classified based on temporal and spatial networks extracted from fMRI task
451 (Krohne et al., 2019). Deep learning methods on task -based fMRI features suggested the
452 inferior and middle temporal lobe to be sufficiently informative to classify schizophrenia
453 versus healthy subjects (Oh et al., 2019). Another successful deep learning application in
454 diagnosis of schizophrenia has used the structural MRI features and a 3D convolutional neural
455 network architecture (Zhang et al., 2022). The most distinguished regions between control
456 and patients were subcortical cortex and ventricles, pivotal regions in cognitive, affective and

457 social functions. Our results support that the most robust connection pertains to the degree
458 of the postcentral gyrus and the Variable Central Attentional Performance (VCAP) task
459 ($r=0.49$). A positive association indicates that as the degree of aberration from the norm in the
460 postcentral node increases, the difference in reaction time during the VCAP task between
461 patients and healthy individuals becomes more pronounced. The postcentral gyrus, situated
462 in the parietal lobe, serves as the primary sensory receptive area in the human brain.

463 Existing literature suggests that working memory deficits are prevalent in numerous
464 psychiatric disorders. A meta-analysis has revealed that the dysfunction of working memory
465 in individuals with schizophrenia may stem from activation abnormalities in regions within
466 the parietal lobe and supplementary motor area—areas closely linked to, though not identical
467 to, the postcentral gyrus (Wu and Jiang, 2020).

468 We observed a robust negative correlation between the participation coefficient of the
469 right cuneus and reaction time during the switch task underscores the cuneus's integral role
470 in executive function, and its impairment is discernible in individuals with schizophrenia
471 (Huang et al., 2022, Nyatega et al., 2021). Moreover, the association between the superior
472 frontal gyrus and recall performance in the remember-know task can also be highlighted
473 (Huang et al., 2022).

474 CVLT test measures episodic verbal learning and memory, particularly in the recall
475 segment. The findings also indicate that performance on the CVLT test declines in
476 schizophrenia patients as insula thickness decreases. There is ample evidence to support the
477 insula's participation in episodic memory (Vatansever et al., 2021, Dahlgren et al., 2020), and
478 as we have demonstrated, structural alteration in the insula is among the factors that may
479 contribute to cognitive dysfunction in schizophrenia.

480 Furthermore, we found that alterations in brain structure, specifically cortical thickness,
481 attributed to the mental condition may cause changes in behavior (Ehrlich et al., 2011, Zhao
482 et al., 2022, Fan et al., 2023). Notably, a majority of the behavioral measures linked to imaging
483 metrics fall within the neurocognitive domain, with the exception of the Barratt
484 Impulsiveness Scale (BIS) and the Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI), which
485 belong to the traits domain.

486 One notable limitation of this study was the relatively small size of the training dataset
487 utilized for the ML model. It's important to note that employing larger datasets can yield more
488 robust model performance. At present, the availability of a comparable dataset with a
489 substantial volume of MRI data, encompassing both structural and functional aspects of the
490 brain, alongside comprehensive behavioral and cognitive assessments of psychiatric
491 patients—particularly individuals with schizophrenia—is limited. Addressing this challenge
492 might necessitate a collaborative effort across multiple research centers to generate a dataset
493 of sufficient size and diversity, thereby providing more reliable insights to the field.

494 In cases where such comprehensive datasets do become available, the application of deep
495 learning techniques and neural networks could be explored to more effectively harness the
496 features and achieve enhanced understanding, yielding more refined outcomes.

497 **Clinical implications:** It is a proven state that MRI and fMRI can distinguish the differences
498 in structure and function of the brain between schizophrenia patients and normal individuals.
499 The neuroimaging features along with clinical and behavioral characteristics can determine
500 subtypes of schizophrenia. On the other hand, MRI measures and clinical and behavioral data
501 can be used as features of the input data to be fed into an ML algorithm to learn the subtypes
502 from all types of features together. Then the subtype of a new neuroimaging and behavioral
503 data recorded from an individual can be predicted by this trained ML model which can be
504 negative, positive, or one of the cognitive subtypes (**Figure 4**). This application obtained from
505 our study can pave the way to a new individualized medicine and help the therapeutic
506 approach that targets either positive or negative symptoms, such as add-on TMS or other
507 medicine to regulate symptoms linked to distinct subtypes. The findings of this work can also
508 help in understanding the underlying neural basis of the negative and positive symptoms.
509 To estimate the subtypes, this model could be employed in place of neuropsychological tests
510 with subjective and other patient-related variability. (Carruthers et al., 2019, Gurvich et al.,
511 2023, Dean et al., 2022).

512 **5 Conclusion**

513 This study has effectively classified individuals with schizophrenia and healthy subjects
514 with a commendable level of accuracy, leveraging the structural and functional attributes of
515 MRI data alongside conventional machine learning models. The utilization of graph theory
516 has emerged as a powerful approach in the analysis of functional brain data, offering a
517 comprehensive depiction of various aspects of brain connectivity. Notably, the feature
518 selection process predominantly prioritized graph measures extracted from rsfMRI data,
519 signifying their relevance in the context of this study.

520 Furthermore, the identification of meaningful correlations between brain characteristics
521 and behavioral manifestations related to schizophrenia aligns harmoniously with existing
522 literature. These outcomes reinforce the notion that the fusion of machine learning
523 methodologies with feature selection techniques holds the potential to unearth novel
524 biomarkers, consequently contributing to the enhancement of diagnosis and treatment
525 strategies for psychiatric disorders.

526 **Supplementary information.** The supplementary material can be found in a separate file titled
527 “Supplementary_Material”.

528 **Acknowledgements.** Authors must recognize and show gratitude towards the prodigious
529 contribution of Iranian National Brain Mapping Laboratory (NBML), Tehran, Iran, for data acquisition
530 service.

531 Declaration

532 **Ethics approval and consent to participate.** All participants provided informed consent according to the
533 study protocol approved by the ethics committee of research, Iran University of Medical Sciences.

534 **Consent for publication.** Not applicable.

535 **Availability of data and materials.** All data can be available by making a proper request to the
536 corresponding author.

537 **Competing interests.** The authors have no competing interests that might be perceived to influence
538 the results and/or discussion reported in this paper.

539 **Funding.** This work was supported by Strategic Technologies Development of National Elite
540 Foundation.

541 **Authors' contributions.** The authors confirm contribution to the paper as follows: study conception
542 and design, analysis and interpretation of results, draft manuscript preparation: Hosna Tavakoli,
543 Mohammad-Reza Nazem-Zadeh, data collection: Hosna Tavakoli, Mohammad-Reza Nazem-Zadeh, Reza
544 Rostami, review and editing: Mohammad-Reza Nazem-Zadeh, Reza Shalbah, supervision: Mohammad-
545 Reza Nazem-Zadeh. All authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript.

546 References

- 547 ANDERSON, V. M., GOLDSTEIN, M. E., KYDD, R. R. & RUSSELL, B. R. 2015. Extensive gray matter volume
548 reduction in treatment-resistant schizophrenia. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol*, 18, pyv016.
- 549 ANTONUCCI, L. A., FAZIO, L., PERGOLA, G., BLASI, G., STOLFA, G., DI PALO, P., MUCCI, A., ROCCA, P.,
550 BRASSO, C. & DI GIANNANTONIO, M. 2022. Joint structural-functional magnetic resonance
551 imaging features are associated with diagnosis and real-world functioning in patients with
552 schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia research*, 240, 193-203.
- 553 BRENNER, A. M., CLAUDINO, F. C. D. A., BURIN, L. M., SCHEIBE, V. M., PADILHA, B. L., DE SOUZA, G. R.,
554 DUARTE, J. A. & DA ROCHA, N. S. 2022. Structural magnetic resonance imaging findings in severe
555 mental disorders adult inpatients: A systematic review. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging*, 326,
556 111529.
- 557 CAO, B., CHO, R. Y., CHEN, D., XIU, M., WANG, L., SOARES, J. C. & ZHANG, X. Y. 2020. Treatment response
558 prediction and individualized identification of first-episode drug-naïve schizophrenia using brain
559 functional connectivity. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 25, 906-913.
- 560 CARRUTHERS, S. P., VAN RHEENEN, T. E., GURVICH, C., SUMNER, P. J. & ROSSELL, S. L. 2019.
561 Characterising the structure of cognitive heterogeneity in schizophrenia spectrum disorders. A
562 systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 107, 252-278.
- 563 CHAND, G. B., DWYER, D. B., ERUS, G., SOTIRAS, A., VAROL, E., SRINIVASAN, D., DOSHI, J., POMPONIO,
564 R., PIGONI, A., DAZZAN, P., KAHN, R. S., SCHNACK, H. G., ZANETTI, M. V., MEISENZAHN, E.,
565 BUSATTO, G. F., CRESPO-FACORRO, B., PANTELIS, C., WOOD, S. J., ZHUO, C., SHINOHARA, R. T.,
566 SHOU, H., FAN, Y., GUR, R. C., GUR, R. E., SATTERTHWAITTE, T. D., KOUTSOULERIS, N., WOLF, D.

- 567 H. & DAVATZIKOS, C. 2020. Two distinct neuroanatomical subtypes of schizophrenia revealed
568 using machine learning. *Brain*, 143, 1027-1038.
- 569 CHEN, J., PATIL, K. R., WEIS, S., SIM, K., NICKL-JOCKSCHAT, T., ZHOU, J., ALEMAN, A., SOMMER, I. E.,
570 LIEMBURG, E. J., HOFFSTAEDTER, F., HABEL, U., DERNTL, B., LIU, X., FISCHER, J. M., KOGLER, L.,
571 REGENBOGEN, C., DIWADKAR, V. A., STANLEY, J. A., RIEDL, V., JARDRI, R., GRUBER, O., SOTIRAS,
572 A., DAVATZIKOS, C., EICKHOFF, S. B., PHARMACOTHERAPY, M. & OUTCOME SURVEY, I. 2020.
573 Neurobiological Divergence of the Positive and Negative Schizophrenia Subtypes Identified on a
574 New Factor Structure of Psychopathology Using Non-negative Factorization: An International
575 Machine Learning Study. *Biol Psychiatry*, 87, 282-293.
- 576 COLE, E. J., PHILLIPS, A. L., BENTZLEY, B. S., STIMPSON, K. H., NEJAD, R., BARMAK, F., VEERAPAL, C., KHAN,
577 N., CHERIAN, K., FELBER, E., BROWN, R., CHOI, E., KING, S., PANKOW, H., BISHOP, J. H., AZEEZ, A.,
578 COETZEE, J., RAPIER, R., ODENWALD, N., CARREON, D., HAWKINS, J., CHANG, M., KELLER, J., RAJ,
579 K., DEBATTISTA, C., JO, B., ESPIL, F. M., SCHATZBERG, A. F., SUDHEIMER, K. D. & WILLIAMS, N. R.
580 2022. Stanford Neuromodulation Therapy (SNT): A Double-Blind Randomized Controlled Trial.
581 *Am J Psychiatry*, 179, 132-141.
- 582 DAHLGREN, K., FERRIS, C. & HAMANN, S. 2020. Neural correlates of successful emotional episodic
583 encoding and retrieval: An SDM meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies. *Neuropsychologia*, 143,
584 107495.
- 585 DE ARAUJO, A. N., DE SENA, E. P., DE OLIVEIRA, I. R. & JURUENA, M. F. 2012. Antipsychotic agents: efficacy
586 and safety in schizophrenia. *Drug Healthc Patient Saf*, 4, 173-80.
- 587 DE WEIJER, A. D., MANDL, R. C. W., DIEDEREN, K. M. J., NEGGERS, S. F. W., KAHN, R. S., POL, H. E. H. &
588 SOMMER, I. E. C. 2011. Microstructural alterations of the arcuate fasciculus in schizophrenia
589 patients with frequent auditory verbal hallucinations. *Schizophrenia Research*, 130, 68-77.
- 590 DEAN, B., THOMAS, E. H., BOZAOGLU, K., TAN, E. J., VAN RHEENEN, T. E., NEILL, E., SUMNER, P. J.,
591 CARRUTHERS, S. P., SCARR, E. & ROSSELL, S. L. 2022. Evidence that a working memory cognitive
592 phenotype within schizophrenia has a unique underlying biology. *Psychiatry Research*, 317,
593 114873.
- 594 DRYSDALE, A. T., GROSENICK, L., DOWNAR, J., DUNLOP, K., MANSOURI, F., MENG, Y., FETCHO, R. N.,
595 ZEBLEY, B., OATHES, D. J. & ETKIN, A. 2017. Resting-state connectivity biomarkers define
596 neurophysiological subtypes of depression. *Nature medicine*, 23, 28-38.
- 597 EBRAHIMZADEH, E., DEGHANI, A., ASGARINEJAD, M. & SOLTANIAN-ZADEH, H. 2024. Non-linear
598 processing and reinforcement learning to predict rTMS treatment response in depression.
599 *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging*, 337, 111764.
- 600 EHRLICH, S., BRAUNS, S., YENDIKI, A., HO, B.-C., CALHOUN, V., SCHULZ, S. C., GOLLUB, R. L. & SPONHEIM,
601 S. R. 2011. Associations of Cortical Thickness and Cognition in Patients With Schizophrenia and
602 Healthy Controls. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 38, 1050-1062.
- 603 FAN, F., HUANG, J., TAN, S., WANG, Z., LI, Y., CHEN, S., LI, H., HARE, S., DU, X., YANG, F., TIAN, B.,
604 KOCHUNOV, P., TAN, Y. & HONG, L. E. 2023. Association of cortical thickness and cognition with
605 schizophrenia treatment resistance. *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 77, 12-19.
- 606 FARAHANI, F. V., KARWOWSKI, W. & LIGHTHALL, N. R. 2019. Application of Graph Theory for Identifying
607 Connectivity Patterns in Human Brain Networks: A Systematic Review. *Front Neurosci*, 13, 585.
- 608 GALDERISI, S., DELISI, L. E. & BORGWARDT, S. 2019. Neuroimaging of schizophrenia and other primary
609 psychotic disorders: achievements and perspectives.
- 610 GAO, Z., XIAO, Y., ZHU, F., TAO, B., YU, W. & LUI, S. 2023. The whole-brain connectome landscape in
611 patients with schizophrenia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of graph theoretical
612 characteristics. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 148, 105144.
- 613 GAVRILESCU, M., ROSSELL, S., STUART, G. W., SHEA, T. L., INNES-BROWN, H., HENSHALL, K., MCKAY, C.,
614 SERGEJEW, A. A., COPOLOV, D. & EGAN, G. F. 2010. Reduced connectivity of the auditory cortex
615 in patients with auditory hallucinations: a resting state functional magnetic resonance imaging
616 study. *Psychol Med*, 40, 1149-58.

- 617 GORGOLEWSKI, K. J., DURNEZ, J. & POLDRACK, R. A. 2017. Preprocessed Consortium for Neuropsychiatric
618 Phenomics dataset. *F1000Res*, 6, 1262.
- 619 GURVICH, C., THOMAS, N., HUDAIB, A.-R., VAN RHEENEN, T. E., THOMAS, E. H., TAN, E. J., NEILL, E.,
620 CARRUTHERS, S. P., SUMNER, P. J. & ROMANO-SILVA, M. 2023. The relationship between
621 cognitive clusters and telomere length in bipolar-schizophrenia spectrum disorders.
622 *Psychological Medicine*, 53, 5119-5126.
- 623 HUANG, Y., WANG, W., HEI, G., YANG, Y., LONG, Y., WANG, X., XIAO, J., XU, X., SONG, X., GAO, S., SHAO,
624 T., HUANG, J., WANG, Y., ZHAO, J. & WU, R. 2022. Altered regional homogeneity and cognitive
625 impairments in first-episode schizophrenia: A resting-state fMRI study. *Asian Journal of*
626 *Psychiatry*, 71, 103055.
- 627 IASEVOLI, F., AVAGLIANO, C., D'AMBROSIO, L., BARONE, A., CICCARELLI, M., DE SIMONE, G., MAZZA, B.,
628 VELLUCCI, L. & DE BARTOLOMEIS, A. 2023. Dopamine Dynamics and Neurobiology of Non-
629 Response to Antipsychotics, Relevance for Treatment Resistant Schizophrenia: A Systematic
630 Review and Critical Appraisal. *Biomedicines*, 11, 895.
- 631 IOAKEIMIDIS, V., HAENSCHL, C., YARROW, K., KYRIAKOPOULOS, M. & DIMA, D. 2020. A Meta-analysis
632 of Structural and Functional Brain Abnormalities in Early-Onset Schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia*
633 *Bulletin Open*, 1.
- 634 JIAO, S., CAO, T. & CAI, H. 2022. Peripheral biomarkers of treatment-resistant schizophrenia: Genetic,
635 inflammation and stress perspectives. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 13.
- 636 JIMENEZ, A. M., LEE, J., WYNN, J. K., COHEN, M. S., ENGEL, S. A., GLAHN, D. C., NUECHTERLEIN, K. H.,
637 REAVIS, E. A. & GREEN, M. F. 2016. Abnormal Ventral and Dorsal Attention Network Activity
638 during Single and Dual Target Detection in Schizophrenia. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7.
- 639 JOHNSON, W. E., LI, C. & RABINOVIC, A. 2006. Adjusting batch effects in microarray expression data using
640 empirical Bayes methods. *Biostatistics*, 8, 118-127.
- 641 KLOOSTER, D. C. W., FERGUSON, M. A., BOON, P. A. J. M. & BAEKEN, C. 2022. Personalizing Repetitive
642 Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Parameters for Depression Treatment Using Multimodal
643 Neuroimaging. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, 7, 536-545.
- 644 KROHNE, L. G., WANG, Y., HINRICH, J. L., MOERUP, M., CHAN, R. C. K. & MADSEN, K. H. 2019. Classification
645 of social anhedonia using temporal and spatial network features from a social cognition fMRI
646 task. *Hum Brain Mapp*, 40, 4965-4981.
- 647 LEFORT-BESNARD, J., VAROQUAUX, G., DERNTL, B., GRUBER, O., ALEMAN, A., JARDRI, R., SOMMER, I.,
648 THIRION, B. & BZDOK, D. 2018. Patterns of schizophrenia symptoms: hidden structure in the
649 PANSS questionnaire. *Translational Psychiatry*, 8, 237.
- 650 LI, X., LIU, N., YANG, C., ZHANG, W. & LUI, S. 2022. Cerebellar gray matter volume changes in patients
651 with schizophrenia: A voxel-based meta-analysis. *Front Psychiatry*, 13, 1083480.
- 652 LI, X., LIU, Q., CHEN, Z., LI, Y., YANG, Y., WANG, X., GUO, X., LUO, B., ZHANG, Y., SHI, H., ZHANG, L., SU, X.,
653 SHAO, M., SONG, M., GUO, S., FAN, L., YUE, W., LI, W., LV, L. & YANG, Y. 2023. Abnormalities of
654 Regional Brain Activity in Patients With Schizophrenia: A Longitudinal Resting-State fMRI Study.
655 *Schizophrenia Bulletin*.
- 656 LIEBERMAN, J., CHAKOS, M., WU, H., ALVIR, J., HOFFMAN, E., ROBINSON, D. & BILDER, R. 2001.
657 Longitudinal study of brain morphology in first episode schizophrenia. *Biological psychiatry*, 49,
658 487-499.
- 659 LUTZ, O., LIZANO, P., MOTHU, S. S., ZENG, V., HEGDE, R. R., HOANG, D. T., HENSON, P., BRADY, R.,
660 TAMMINGA, C. A., PEARLSON, G., CLEMENTZ, B. A., SWEENEY, J. A. & KESHAVAN, M. S. 2020. Do
661 neurobiological differences exist between paranoid and non-paranoid schizophrenia? Findings
662 from the bipolar schizophrenia network on intermediate phenotypes study. *Schizophr Res*, 223,
663 96-104.
- 664 MATSUBARA, T., TASHIRO, T. & UEHARA, K. 2019. Deep neural generative model of functional MRI
665 images for psychiatric disorder diagnosis. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 66, 2768-
666 2779.

- 667 MITELMAN, S. A. & BUCHSBAUM, M. S. 2007. Very poor outcome schizophrenia: clinical and
668 neuroimaging aspects. *Int Rev Psychiatry*, 19, 345-57.
- 669 MOLINA, V., REIG, S., SANZ, J., PALOMO, T., BENITO, C., SARRAMEA, F., PASCAU, J., SÁNCHEZ, J., MARTÍN-
670 LOECHES, M., MUÑOZ, F. & DESCO, M. 2008. Differential clinical, structural and P300 parameters
671 in schizophrenia patients resistant to conventional neuroleptics. *Progress in Neuro-*
672 *Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*, 32, 257-266.
- 673 NEMOTO, K., SHIMOKAWA, T., FUKUNAGA, M., YAMASHITA, F., TAMURA, M., YAMAMORI, H., YASUDA,
674 Y., AZECHI, H., KUDO, N. & WATANABE, Y. 2020. Differentiation of schizophrenia using structural
675 MRI with consideration of scanner differences: A real-world multisite study. *Psychiatry and*
676 *clinical neurosciences*, 74, 56-63.
- 677 NYATEGA, C. O., QIANG, L., ADAMU, M. J., YOUNIS, A. & KAWUWA, H. B. 2021. Altered Dynamic
678 Functional Connectivity of Cuneus in Schizophrenia Patients: A Resting-State fMRI Study. *Applied*
679 *Sciences*, 11, 11392.
- 680 OH, K., KIM, W., SHEN, G., PIAO, Y., KANG, N.-I., OH, I.-S. & CHUNG, Y. C. 2019. Classification of
681 schizophrenia and normal controls using 3D convolutional neural network and outcome
682 visualization. *Schizophrenia Research*, 212, 186-195.
- 683 POLDRACK, R. A., CONGDON, E., TRIPLETT, W., GORGOLEWSKI, K. J., KARLSGODT, K. H., MUMFORD, J. A.,
684 SABB, F. W., FREIMER, N. B., LONDON, E. D., CANNON, T. D. & BILDER, R. M. 2016. A phenome-
685 wide examination of neural and cognitive function. *Sci Data*, 3, 160110.
- 686 QUAACK, M., VAN DE MORTEL, L., THOMAS, R. M. & VAN WINGEN, G. 2021. Deep learning applications
687 for the classification of psychiatric disorders using neuroimaging data: Systematic review and
688 meta-analysis. *Neuroimage Clin*, 30, 102584.
- 689 ROISER, J. P., WIGTON, R., KILNER, J. M., MENDEZ, M. A., HON, N., FRISTON, K. J. & JOYCE, E. M. 2013.
690 Dysconnectivity in the Frontoparietal Attention Network in Schizophrenia. *Frontiers in*
691 *Psychiatry*, 4.
- 692 ROZYCKI, M., SATTERTHWAITTE, T. D., KOUTSOULERIS, N., ERUS, G., DOSHI, J., WOLF, D. H., FAN, Y., GUR,
693 R. E., GUR, R. C., MEISENZAHN, E. M., ZHUO, C., YIN, H., YAN, H., YUE, W., ZHANG, D. &
694 DAVATZIKOS, C. 2017. Multisite Machine Learning Analysis Provides a Robust Structural Imaging
695 Signature of Schizophrenia Detectable Across Diverse Patient Populations and Within Individuals.
696 *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 44, 1035-1044.
- 697 RUBINOV, M. & SPORNS, O. 2010. Complex network measures of brain connectivity: uses and
698 interpretations. *Neuroimage*, 52, 1059-69.
- 699 SALLET, P. C., ELKIS, H., ALVES, T. M., OLIVEIRA, J. R., SASSI, E., DE CASTRO, C. C., BUSATTO, G. F. &
700 GATTAZ, W. F. 2003. Reduced cortical folding in schizophrenia: an MRI morphometric study.
701 *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 160, 1606-1613.
- 702 SARIS, I. M. J., AGHAJANI, M., REUS, L. M., VISSER, P. J., PIJNENBURG, Y., VAN DER WEE, N. J. A.,
703 BILDERBECK, A. C., RASLESCU, A., MALIK, A., MENNES, M., KOOPS, S., ARRANGO, C., AYUSO-
704 MATEOS, J. L., DAWSON, G. R., MARSTON, H., KAS, M. J., PENNINX, B. & CONSORTIUM, P. 2022.
705 Social dysfunction is transdiagnostically associated with default mode network dysconnectivity
706 in schizophrenia and Alzheimer's disease. *World J Biol Psychiatry*, 23, 264-277.
- 707 SCOGNAMIGLIO, C. & HOUENOU, J. 2014. A meta-analysis of fMRI studies in healthy relatives of patients
708 with schizophrenia. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 48, 907-916.
- 709 SONE, D., YOUNG, A., SHINAGAWA, S., TSUGAWA, S., IWATA, Y., TARUMI, R., OGYU, K., HONDA, S., OCHI,
710 R., MATSUSHITA, K., UENO, F., HONDO, N., KOREKI, A., TORRES-CARMONA, E., MAR, W., CHAN,
711 N., KOIZUMI, T., KATO, H., KUSUDO, K., DE LUCA, V., GERRETSEN, P., REMINGTON, G., ONAYA,
712 M., NODA, Y., UCHIDA, H., MIMURA, M., SHIGETA, M., GRAFF-GUERRERO, A. & NAKAJIMA, S.
713 2023. Disease Progression Patterns of Brain Morphology in Schizophrenia: More Progressed
714 Stages in Treatment Resistance. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*.

- 715 SONG, X., QUAN, M., LV, L., LI, X., PANG, L., KENNEDY, D., HODGE, S., HARRINGTON, A., ZIEDONIS, D. &
716 FAN, X. 2015. Decreased cortical thickness in drug naïve first episode schizophrenia: In relation
717 to serum levels of BDNF. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 60, 22-28.
- 718 TZOURIO-MAZOYER, N., LANDEAU, B., PAPANATHANASSIOU, D., CRIVELLO, F., ETARD, O., DELCROIX, N.,
719 MAZOYER, B. & JOLIOT, M. 2002. Automated anatomical labeling of activations in SPM using a
720 macroscopic anatomical parcellation of the MNI MRI single-subject brain. *Neuroimage*, 15, 273-
721 89.
- 722 VANES, L. D., MOUCHLIANITIS, E., PATEL, K., BARRY, E., WONG, K., THOMAS, M., SZENTGYORGYI, T.,
723 JOYCE, D. & SHERGILL, S. 2019. Neural correlates of positive and negative symptoms through the
724 illness course: an fMRI study in early psychosis and chronic schizophrenia. *Scientific Reports*, 9,
725 14444.
- 726 VATANSEVER, D., SMALLWOOD, J. & JEFFERIES, E. 2021. Varying demands for cognitive control reveals
727 shared neural processes supporting semantic and episodic memory retrieval. *Nat Commun*, 12,
728 2134.
- 729 VITA, A., MINELLI, A., BARLATI, S., DESTE, G., GIACOPUZZI, E., VALSECCHI, P., TURRINA, C. & GENNARELLI,
730 M. 2019. Treatment-Resistant Schizophrenia: Genetic and Neuroimaging Correlates. *Front*
731 *Pharmacol*, 10, 402.
- 732 WALTER, M., DENIER, N., VOGEL, M. & LANG, U. 2012. Effects of psychoactive substances in
733 schizophrenia—findings of structural and functional neuroimaging. *Current topics in medicinal*
734 *chemistry*, 12, 2426-2433.
- 735 WANG, X., REN, Y. & ZHANG, W. 2017. Depression Disorder Classification of fMRI Data Using Sparse Low-
736 Rank Functional Brain Network and Graph-Based Features. *Comput Math Methods Med*, 2017,
737 3609821.
- 738 WEBB, C. A., COHEN, Z. D., BEARD, C., FORGEARD, M., PECKHAM, A. D. & BJORGVINSSON, T. 2020.
739 Personalized prognostic prediction of treatment outcome for depressed patients in a naturalistic
740 psychiatric hospital setting: A comparison of machine learning approaches. *J Consult Clin Psychol*,
741 88, 25-38.
- 742 WU, D. & JIANG, T. 2020. Schizophrenia-related abnormalities in the triple network: a meta-analysis of
743 working memory studies. *Brain Imaging Behav*, 14, 971-980.
- 744 XIAO, Y., LIAO, W., LONG, Z., TAO, B., ZHAO, Q., LUO, C., TAMMINGA, C. A., KESHAVAN, M. S., PEARLSON,
745 G. D. & CLEMENTZ, B. A. 2022. Subtyping schizophrenia patients based on patterns of structural
746 brain alterations. *Schizophrenia bulletin*, 48, 241-250.
- 747 YAN, C.-G., WANG, X.-D., ZUO, X.-N. & ZANG, Y.-F. 2016. DPABI: Data Processing & Analysis for (Resting-
748 State) Brain Imaging. *Neuroinformatics*, 14, 339-351.
- 749 YASSIN, W., NAKATANI, H., ZHU, Y., KOJIMA, M., OWADA, K., KUWABARA, H., GONOI, W., AOKI, Y.,
750 TAKAO, H., NATSUBORI, T., IWASHIRO, N., KASAI, K., KANO, Y., ABE, O., YAMASUE, H. & KOIKE, S.
751 2020. Machine-learning classification using neuroimaging data in schizophrenia, autism, ultra-
752 high risk and first-episode psychosis. *Translational Psychiatry*, 10, 278.
- 753 ZANGEN, A., ZIBMAN, S., TENDLER, A., BARNEA-YGAEL, N., ALYAGON, U., BLUMBERGER, D. M.,
754 GRAMMER, G., SHALEV, H., GULEVSKI, T., VAPNIK, T., BYSTRITSKY, A., FILIPCIC, I., FEIFEL, D.,
755 STEIN, A., DEUTSCH, F., ROTH, Y. & GEORGE, M. S. 2023. Pursuing personalized medicine for
756 depression by targeting the lateral or medial prefrontal cortex with Deep TMS. *JCI Insight*, 8.
- 757 ZENG, J., YAN, J., CAO, H., SU, Y., SONG, Y., LUO, Y. & YANG, X. 2022. Neural substrates of reward
758 anticipation and outcome in schizophrenia: a meta-analysis of fMRI findings in the monetary
759 incentive delay task. *Transl Psychiatry*, 12, 448.
- 760 ZHANG, J., RAO, V., TIAN, Y., YANG, Y., ACOSTA, N., WAN, Z., LEE, P.-Y., ZHANG, C., KEGELES, L. & SMALL,
761 S. A. 2022. Detecting Schizophrenia With 3D Structural Brain MRI Using Deep Learning.
- 762 ZHAO, Y., ZHANG, Q., SHAH, C., LI, Q., SWEENEY, J. A., LI, F. & GONG, Q. 2022. Cortical Thickness
763 Abnormalities at Different Stages of the Illness Course in Schizophrenia: A Systematic Review and
764 Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 79, 560-570.

765 ZHU, T., WANG, Z., ZHOU, C., FANG, X., HUANG, C., XIE, C., GE, H., YAN, Z., ZHANG, X. & CHEN, J. 2022.
766 Meta-analysis of structural and functional brain abnormalities in schizophrenia with persistent
767 negative symptoms using activation likelihood estimation. *Front Psychiatry*, 13, 957685.

768

769

770

771

Table 1 Demographic of healthy and patient groups

Group	Number	Age (mean \pm std)	Male/Female
Healthy	50	36.40 \pm 8.87	38/12
Schizophrenia	50	36.46 \pm 8.87	38/12
Negative	26	36.69 \pm 8.38	19/7
Positive	23	36 \pm 9.71	18/5
Paranoid	21	38.38 \pm 8.54	17/4
Undifferentiated	10	34.4 \pm 8.85	8/2
Residual	6	33.66 \pm 8.29	6/0
Schizoaffective	11	37 \pm 8.57	4/7
Local dataset (Healthy)	20	31.43 \pm 8.34	10/10
Local dataset (Patients)	13	33.84 \pm 11.58	11/2

772

773

774

775 **Table 2** Behavioral assessments in three domains: Traits, neurocognitive, and
 776 neuropsychological.

Domains	Measures
Traits	Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (BIS-11) Dickman Functional and Dysfunctional Impulsivity Scale Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (MPQ)—Control subscale Scale for Traits that Increase Risk for Bipolar II Disorder Golden & Meehl’s Seven MMPI Items Selected by Taxonomic Method Hypomanic Personality Scale (HPS) Chapman Scales (Perceptual Aberrations, Social Anhedonia, Physical Anhedonia) Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI) Munich Chronotype Questionnaire (MCTQ)
Neurocognitive Tasks	Task-switching Task (TS) Spatial Capacity Task (SCAP) Verbal Capacity Task (VCAP) Delay Discounting Task (DDT) Balloon Analog Risk Task (BART) Attention Network Task (ANT) Continuous Performance Go/NoGo Task (CPT) Stroop Color Word Task (SCWT) Stop Signal Task (SST) Scene Recognition Task Remember-Know Task (RK) Spatial Maintenance and Manipulation Task (SMNM) Verbal Maintenance and Manipulation Task (VMNM)
Neuropsychological Assessment	California Verbal Learning Test (CVLT-II) WMS-IV Symbol Span WMS-IV Visual Reproduction WAIS-IV Letter Number Sequencing WMS-IV Digit Span WAIS-IV Vocabulary WAIS-IV Matrix Reasoning Color Trails Test

777

778

779

780

Table 3 Confusion matrix of the best model on classifying healthy from schizophrenia with the sensitivity and specificity of the model.

		True value		Sensitivity	Specificity
		Healthy	Schizophrenia		
Prediction	Healthy	42	14	0.84	0.71
	Schizophrenia	8	35	0.81	0.75

781

782

783

784 **Table 4** Accuracy (mean±std) of kNN for classifying the different groups from
785 UCLA dataset and local dataset (13 patients) using 12 features extracted from
MRMR method.

Groups	Accuracy (kNN on 12 features from MRMR)
Healthy, Negative, Positive	0.51±0.02
Healthy, Negative	0.72±0.02
Healthy, Positive	0.74±0.02
Negative, Positive	0.52±0.04
Healthy, Schizophrenia (local dataset)	0.58±0.04

786

787

788

789

Table 5 Confusion matrix of the best model on classifying the subtypes of schizophrenia with the sensitivity and specificity of the model.

		True value				Sensitivity	Specificity
		Paranoid	Undifferentiated	Residual	Schizoaffective		
Prediction	Paranoid	14	3	2	1	0.67	0.77
	Undifferentiated	4	6	1	1	0.60	0.84
	Residual	1	1	3	0	0.50	0.95
	Schizoaffective	2	0	0	8	0.80	0.95

790

791

792

793


794 **Table 6** Spearman's correlation coefficients and p-values between MRI and behavioral measures.

Imaging measures	Behavioral items	r-value	p-value
Thickness-Left middle temporal	VMNM - Mean Accuracy of Manipulation trials	0.45	0.002
Degree-Right hippocampus	SCAP - Number of correct answers	0.41	0.005
Local efficiency-Left middle frontal	BIS - Brief	0.44	0.003
Participation coefficient -Right pallidum	TCI - Novelty	-0.33	0.024
Degree-Vermis	VCAP - Mean reaction time of true negatives	-0.44	0.003
Participation coefficient-Left cuneus	TS - Mean reaction time	-0.47	0.002
Degree-Right postcentral	VCAP - Mean reaction time of false negatives	0.49	0.001
Betweenness centrality-Left precentral	RK - Number of Know responses	0.38	0.010
Thickness-Left middle frontal	SST - Stop signal reaction time	0.39	0.008
Thickness-Right insula	CVLT - Number of correct recall answers	-0.42	0.005
Betweenness centrality-Left superior frontal	CVLT - Long delay cued recall	0.41	0.006
Degree-Right superior frontal	RK - Zero recalls	-0.46	0.002

795


796

797 Figure 1.



798

799 Figure 2.



800

801

802

803

804

805


806

807

808

809


810 Figure 3.



811

812

813 Figure 4.



814

815

816

817 **Figure 1.** Performance of machine learning models for differentiating schizophrenia vs. healthy with
818 different sets of features. There are six models with nine sets of features. The highest accuracy (79%)
819 belongs to kNN and MRMR, considered as the best model. Although the combination of RF and
820 MRMR resulted in the same accuracy as the combination of kNN and MRMR (79%), the latter
821 combination was chosen because of a lower number of features ($12 < 22$).

822 **Figure 2.** Accuracy of machine learning models and sets of features for differentiating schizophrenic
823 subtypes. SVM with linear kernel on 62 features extracted using MRMR method reached the highest
824 accuracy (64%) of classification.


825

826 **Figure 3.** Interaction of the differences observed in 6 extracted MRI measures between the
827 schizophrenia and healthy cohorts, in conjunction with the most closely associated behavioral
828 indicators. The red lines in the scatterplots represents the optimal linear regression correlating MRI
829 and behavioral metrics. Spearman correlation results are denoted as 'r' and the corresponding p-values
830 are presented above each scatterplot, offering insight into the strength and significance of the observed
831 relationships.


832 **Figure 4.** A suggestion for ML model to learn the subtypes of individuals from different types of
833 features.

834


Accuracy of machine learning models (Healthy vs. Patients)




Accuracy of machine learning models (Subtypes)




VCAP-MN-RT-FN




VMNM-MN-Manip




BIS-Brief




TS-MN-RT



RK-Zero




VCAP-MN-RT-TN



fMRI

Neuropsychological
assessments

Behavioural
scores



Determined
subtyping

Identification
of negative
and cognitive
subtypes