

1 *Research Article*

2

3 **Women with fibromyalgia: Insights into behavioral and brain imaging**

4

5 Odelia Elkana<sup>1#</sup>, Iman Beheshti<sup>2,3#</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Behavioral Sciences, Academic College of Tel Aviv-Yaffo, Tel Aviv, Israel.

8 <sup>2</sup>Department of Human Anatomy and Cell Science, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB,

9 Canada

10 <sup>3</sup>Graduate Program in Biomedical Engineering, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

11 #These authors contributed equally to this study.

12

13 \*Corresponding Author:

14 Dr. Iman Beheshti

15 Address: 745 Bannatyne Ave., Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3E 0J9, Canada

16 Email : [Iman.beheshti@umanitoba.ca](mailto:Iman.beheshti@umanitoba.ca)

17

18 Odelia Elkana: The Academic College of Tel Aviv-Yafo (MTA), Israel. P.O.B 8401; Tel-Aviv-

19 Jaffa, 61083, Israel. Telephone: (+972-3) 6802525, Fax +97236802526. Email:

20 [odelia.elkana@gmail.com](mailto:odelia.elkana@gmail.com) ; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1862-4930>

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## **ABSTRACT**

Fibromyalgia (FM) is a chronic condition marked by widespread pain, fatigue, sleep problems, cognitive decline, and other symptoms. Despite extensive research, the pathophysiology of FM remains poorly understood, complicating diagnosis and treatment, which often relies on self-report questionnaires. This study explored structural and functional brain changes in women with FM, identified potential biomarkers, and examined their relationship with FM severity. MRI data from 33 female FM patients and 33 matched healthy controls were utilized, focusing on T1-weighted MRI and resting-state fMRI scans. Functional connectivity (FC) analysis was performed using a machine learning framework to differentiate FM patients from healthy controls and predict FM symptom severity. No significant differences were found in brain structural features, such as gray matter volume, white matter volume, deformation-based morphometry, and cortical thickness. However, significant differences in FC were observed between FM patients and healthy controls, particularly in the default mode network (DMN), somatomotor network (SMN), visual network (VIS), and dorsal attention network (DAN). The FC metrics were significantly associated with FM severity. Our prediction model differentiated FM patients from healthy controls with an area under the curve of 0.65. FC measures accurately estimated FM symptom severities with a significant correlation ( $r = 0.45$ ,  $p = 0.007$ ). Functional connections in the DMN, VIS, and DAN were crucial in determining FM severity. These findings suggest that integrating brain FC measurements could serve as valuable biomarkers for early detection of FM and predicting FM symptom severity, improving diagnostic accuracy and facilitating the development of targeted therapeutic strategies.

1 **Keywords:** functional connectivity, Fibromyalgia, Depression, Anxiety, Biomarkers, Chronic  
2 pain, Machine learning, MRI, Pain, SHAP

3

#### 4 **1- Introduction**

5 Fibromyalgia (FM) is a multifaceted, chronic condition characterized by widespread  
6 musculoskeletal pain, fatigue, sleep disturbances, cognitive impairments, and a variety of other  
7 somatic symptoms. While the exact cause of FM remains unknown, certain factors have been  
8 proposed to be associated with its development. These factors include genetic predisposition,  
9 emotional-cognitive factors, personal experiences, the mind-body connection, and a  
10 biopsychological capacity to manage stress <sup>1</sup>. FM affects approximately 2-4% of the general  
11 population, with women accounting for an estimated 70% to 90% of diagnosed cases, indicating a  
12 pronounced gender disproportionality in its prevalence <sup>2,3</sup>. It has been documented that males and  
13 females with fibromyalgia exhibit distinct clinical patterns <sup>4</sup>. In female FM patients, the age at  
14 diagnosis is typically lower compared to males (by nearly 9 years) <sup>4</sup>. Furthermore, females tend to  
15 experience more frequent headaches, connective tissue diseases (CTD), and concurrent psychiatric  
16 disorders, while male patients often have a higher prevalence of concurrent medical conditions <sup>4</sup>.

17 Despite its high prevalence in women, the pathophysiology of FM remains poorly  
18 understood, posing challenges for effective diagnosis and treatment <sup>5</sup>. The etiology of FM is  
19 considered to be multifactorial, involving genetic, neurobiological, and environmental factors.  
20 Central sensitization, a condition where the central nervous system becomes hypersensitive to pain  
21 stimuli, is thought to play a key role in FM. Patients with FM often exhibit abnormal pain  
22 processing and amplification, leading to the characteristic widespread pain and heightened  
23 sensitivity to non-painful stimuli (allodynia) and painful stimuli (hyperalgesia) <sup>3</sup>. Advancements

1 in neuroimaging techniques, particularly Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), have opened new  
2 avenues for exploring the neural mechanisms underlying FM. Structural MRI studies have reported  
3 alterations in brain regions involved in pain processing and modulation, such as the insula, anterior  
4 cingulate cortex (ACC), and prefrontal cortex <sup>6 7</sup>. Functional MRI (fMRI) studies have revealed  
5 disrupted functional connectivity (FC) within the default mode network (DMN), salience network  
6 (SN), and central executive network (CEN), which are crucial for pain perception, emotional  
7 regulation, and cognitive functions <sup>8,9</sup>.

8         Despite extensive research, the pathophysiology of FM remains poorly understood,  
9 complicating diagnosis and treatment, which often relies on self-report questionnaires, such as the  
10 American College of Rheumatology (ACR) criteria [11]. This reliance on self-reports underscores  
11 the critical need for objective diagnostic tools, such as brain imaging and machine learning (ML)  
12 methods, to enhance diagnostic accuracy and treatment efficacy.

13         Existing literature predominantly emphasizes single brain modalities, limiting our  
14 comprehension of the relationship between structural and functional brain abnormalities in FM.  
15 Additionally, there is a lack of neuroimaging studies specifically targeting women with FM,  
16 despite their higher prevalence and potentially different disease manifestations compared to men.  
17 Furthermore, the absence of validated biomarkers capable of detecting FM-related brain changes  
18 poses a significant challenge both in understanding the underlying mechanisms of FM and in  
19 clinical settings. This study aims to fill these gaps by integrating both structural and functional  
20 brain imaging to provide a more comprehensive understanding of FM, particularly in women.

21         Our research pursued three main objectives. Initially, our focus was on examining how  
22 clinical and psychological distress (e.g., anxiety and depression) are linked to the severity of FM  
23 in women. Secondly, we investigated how FM affects both the structural and functional aspects of

1 the brain and examined the correlation between the severity of FM symptoms and resultant brain  
2 changes. Lastly, we aimed to propose a robust brain imaging biomarker sensitive to changes  
3 caused by FM. Using machine learning frameworks, we assessed the reliability of this biomarker  
4 for potential clinical applications. Additionally, we sought to decipher the impact of FM on brain  
5 networks using advanced machine learning algorithms.

6

## 7 **2- Material and methods**

### 8 **2-1 Participants and MRI Acquisition**

9 We obtained the demographic, clinical, and behavioral data  
10 (<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6554870>; accessed on December 25, 2023), as well as the raw MRI  
11 data (<https://openneuro.org/datasets/ds004144/versions/1.0.2>, accessed on December 25, 2023) of  
12 33 female patients diagnosed with FM and 33 matched healthy female controls from a Mexican  
13 population. The MRI data included both T1-weighted and resting state-fMRI (rs-fMRI) sequences.  
14 The demographic characteristics that were considered include age at the time of the study, age of  
15 diagnosis, age at FM symptom onset, time to diagnosis, level of education, highest degree obtained,  
16 marital status, monthly income, duration of symptoms, duration of the disease, as well as the  
17 number of medications currently taken daily and during a crisis. Clinical and psychological  
18 assessments were conducted by a psychiatrist or psychologist in a calm office setting within two  
19 weeks prior to the scanning session. The following clinical and psychological assessments were  
20 collected from FM participants: (1) Widespread Pain Index and Symptom Severity Scale, (2)  
21 Fibromyalgia General Questionnaire, (3) Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire, (4) Mini  
22 International Neuropsychiatric Interview-Plus (MINI-Plus), (5) Hamilton Depression Rating Scale,

1 (6) Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale, (7) Toronto Alexithymia Scale, (8) Emotional Regulation  
2 Questionnaire, (9) Positive and Negative Affect Schedule, and (10) McGill Pain Questionnaire  
3 (*Supplementary Information*, Table S1). The clinical and psychological assessment details of the  
4 individuals involved in this study are accessible in <sup>10</sup>. The severity of FM was determined by the  
5 "Symptom Severity Scale" (SSS) <sup>11</sup> The SSS scale measures the severity of fatigue, waking  
6 unrefreshed, and cognitive symptoms on a scale from 0 to 3, plus one point each for the presence  
7 of headaches, lower abdominal pain, and depression. The SSS scale ranges from 0 to 12.

## 8 **2.2 Image Processing**

9 The structural MRI scans underwent processing using the CAT12 toolbox  
10 (<http://www.neuro.uni-jena.de/cat/>), an extension of the Statistical Parametric Mapping (SPM12)  
11 software package (<https://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/software/spm12/>). Gray matter (GM), white  
12 matter (WM) and Jacobian determinant (JD) images were generated for voxel-based morphometry  
13 (VBM) analysis, along with cortical thickness (CT) measurements from the Desikan-Killiany-  
14 Tourville (DKT) atlas <sup>12</sup>.

15 Preprocessing of rs-fMRI scans resulted in the creation of images representing the  
16 amplitude of time series (AM), amplitude of low-frequency fluctuations (ALFF), and regional  
17 homogeneity (ReHo) for each participant. Subsequently, Fisher-z transformation was applied to  
18 obtain FC values <sup>13</sup>. The technical details of the pre-processing steps are provided in the  
19 *Supplementary Information*.

## 20 **2.3 Identifying FM patients and predicting individual symptoms**

21  
22 In order to differentiate between FM patients and healthy controls, we used FCs between regions  
23 of interest (ROIs) and a logistic binary classification algorithm in MATLAB R2023a (Function:

1 'fitlinear', 'learner': 'logistic', 'Regularization': 'Lasso'). Classification performance was evaluated  
2 using leave-one-out cross-validation (LOOCV), where data from N-1 samples were used for  
3 training the model, and then applied to the remaining participant's data. This procedure was  
4 repeated N times for all samples utilized during testing.

5 Each FC brain network was represented as a symmetric  $273 \times 273$  matrix, resulting in  
6 74529 connection features. To mitigate overfitting and remove redundant information, we utilized  
7 the upper-triangular block of the FC matrix to form a high-dimensional raw-feature vector of  
8 37128 elements. To further refine the feature set and avoid redundancy, feature selection was  
9 performed within each LOOCV iteration, incorporating only the most informative FC values after  
10 regressing out age from the features. During feature selection, a two-sample two-sided t-test was  
11 applied on the training data, selecting FC features with a significance level of  $P < 0.05$ . The  
12 selected feature indices were then applied to the test sample in each LOOCV iteration.  
13 Classification performance was evaluated based on accuracy, specificity, sensitivity, and area  
14 under the curve (AUC).

15 The same machine learning pipeline was adapted to predict symptom severity ratings for  
16 each participant in the FM group based on FC values, except for using a support vector regression  
17 (SVR) algorithm and feature selection conducted through correlation testing. Prediction  
18 performance for each participant's FM symptom severity was assessed correlation metrics.

## 19 **2.4 Assessing the Contribution of Each ROI and Functional Brain Network in Prediction** 20 **Tasks**

21 To evaluate the contribution of each ROI and functional brain network in both FM identification  
22 and symptom estimation, we analyzed the weight of each connection within our prediction models

1 by Shapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) scores <sup>14</sup>. Specifically, we computed the feature  
2 coefficients of each connection for every fold in the LOOCV process. These connection weights  
3 were then averaged across all folds to quantify the importance of each FC feature in the machine  
4 learning models. If a connection was not selected as a feature in a particular fold, its contribution  
5 was set to zero. The contribution of a specific ROI was determined by aggregating the  
6 contributions of all connections associated with that ROI. In this study, we considered brain  
7 connections whose absolute weights fell above the 85th percentile in each prediction task as the  
8 most influential and reliable connections. Additionally, we assessed the importance of each  
9 network in the prediction models by summing the weights of all connections predicted within that  
10 network. The analysis was based on the Yeo 7 Network parcellation scheme, which categorizes  
11 the cerebral cortex into seven distinct networks derived from resting-state functional MRI data:  
12 Visual Network, Somatomotor Network, Dorsal Attention Network, Ventral Attention Network,  
13 Limbic Network, Frontoparietal Network, and DMN <sup>15</sup>.

## 14 **2.5 Statistical analysis**

15 To identify any morphological or functional differences between the FM and HC groups at the  
16 voxel-level, we employed VBM techniques implemented through independent t-tests in SPM12  
17 on processed GM, WM, JD, AM, and ReHo images. Age and TIV of the subjects were included  
18 as covariates in all VBM analyses. The peak-level p-value threshold was adjusted to <0.001  
19 (uncorrected). Cortical thickness measurements were compared between two groups in each brain  
20 region using two-tailed general linear models (GLMs), with age included as covariate. All  
21 statistical analyses were performed in MATLAB, with FDR correction applied to correct for  
22 multiple comparisons.



1 For FC analyses, t-tests were performed using the BRANT fMRI Toolkit while controlling  
2 for age. The peak-level p-value threshold was adjusted to  $<0.0001$  (uncorrected) to minimize the  
3 risk of false positives. The correlation between continuous variables was assessed using the  
4 Pearson correlation test, with partial correlation used when adjusting for covariates. A significance  
5 threshold of  $p < 0.05$  was applied to all correlation tests.

6

### 7 **3. Results**

#### 8 **3.1 Clinical demographics**

9 The individuals' demographics and clinical characteristics in this study were sourced from the  
10 database file (*Clinical\_fm\_66\_.xlsx*) accessible on Zenodo (<https://zenodo.org/records/7032997>).  
11 There were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of age, level of education  
12 and marital status ( $p > 0.05$ ). Individuals suffering from FM tend to have notably higher scores in  
13 terms of pain characteristics, psychological distress (depression symptoms, anxiety symptoms, and  
14 positive and negative affect) and alexithymia (Table 1). No significant difference was found  
15 between the groups in emotion regulation scores. However, the patient group exhibited a slightly  
16 higher BMI than the healthy controls, with a significant difference ( $p = 0.03$ , after FDR correction).

17

18

19 Table 1: Demographics and clinical features of 33 women with FM and 33 matched healthy  
20 controls included in this study.

	<b>FM (N=33)</b>	<b>HC (N=33)</b>
<b>Demographics</b>		
Age, years (SD)	41.73 (6.09)	41.52 (6.04)
Time to diagnosis	3.84 (7.14)	Na
Education, years (SD)	15.52 (3.96)	16.50 (3.95)
Disease duration, years (SD)	4.31 (4.95)	Na
Symptom duration, years (SD)	8.14 (9.95)	Na
<b>Marital status, n (%)</b>		
Single	9 (27.3)	7 (21.2)
Married/cohabitating	17 (51.5)	21 (63.6)
Divorced/separated	5 (15.1)	4 (12.1)


Widow	2 (6.1)	1 (3.0)
BMI (SD)	26.87 (4.08)	24.83 (3.16)*
Pain intensity during interview (range 0-100)	47.70(20.04)	1.18 (3.41)***
<b>Pain and Symptom Severity</b>		
Total widespread index (WPI), (range 0-19)	12.30 (4.26)	0.88 (1.39)***
FM Severity score (SSS), (range 0-12)	8.39 (2.42)	1.42 (1.41) ***
Fatigue	2.18 (0.81)	0.39 (0.56) ***
Waking unrefreshed	2.15 (0.80)	0.24 (0.56) ***
Cognitive symptoms	1.79 (0.82)	0.15 (0.44) ***
<b>Pain Characteristics and Intensity</b>		
Sensory dimension, (range 0-42)	39.12 (14.57)	0.00 (0.00) ***
Affective dimension, (range 0-14)	7.31 (3.24)	0.00 (0.00) ***
Evaluative dimension, (range 0-5)	3.31 (1.80)	0.00 (0.00) ***
Miscellaneous total, (range 0-17)	8.88 (4.13)	Nan
Total score, (range 0-78)	44.12 (12.47)	0.00 (0.00) ***
<b>Fibromyalgia impact on daily life</b>		
FIQ total score, (range 0-100)	33.45 (9.79)	Nan
<b>Psychological distress and emotional measures</b>		
<b>Depression symptoms</b>		
HAM-D total score, (range 0-51)	15.58 (6.37)	1.21 (1.93) ***
HAM-D score without physical symptoms, (range 0-24)	5.82 (3.51)	0.55 (1.33) ***
<b>Anxiety symptoms</b>		
HAM-A total score, (range 0-56)	21.54 (6.32)	2.18 (2.43) ***
HAM-A score without physical symptoms, (range 0-32)	11.70 (4.54)	1.36 (1.69) ***
<b>Positive and Negative Affect</b>		
General positive affect, (range 10-50)	28.61 (8.00)	34.55 (6.55)**
General negative affect, (range 10-50)	25.27 (8.72)	14.61 (4.47)***
<b>Alexithymia (TAS)</b>		
Difficulty identifying feelings, (range 7-35)	23.61 (9.93)	11.70 (6.06) ***
Difficulty describing feelings, (range 5-25)	15.15 (6.39)	10.64 (4.64) **
Externally oriented thinking, (range 8-40)	20.91 (8.23)	16.58 (5.50) **
TAS total score, (range 20-100)	59.67 (21.56)	38.91 (11.91) ***
<b>Emotion regulation</b>		
Reappraisal score, (range 6-42)	31.57 (6.33)	32.42 (6.34)
Suppression score, (range 4-28)	14.54(6.80)	11.76 (4.92)

1 Note: The significance values were presented following FDR correction for multiple comparisons, derived from a t-  
 2 test for continuous variables and a Chi-2 test for categorical variables, comparing the two groups (\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p <$   
 3  $0.001$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.0001$ ). Fatigue and waking unrefreshed and cognitive symptoms scores were collected on scale from  
 4 0-3 where 0-1 denoted mild, 2 moderate and 3 severe. BMI = Body Mass Index; FIQ = Fibromyalgia Impact  
 5 Questionnaire; HAM-A = Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale; HAM-D = Hamilton Depression Rating Scale; SD =  
 6 Standard Deviation; TAS = Alexithymia Toronto Scale. Clinical measurements details can be found at:  
 7 <https://zenodo.org/records/7032997>.

### 8 3.2 Association between clinical features and FM severity

9 A positive significant association was found between age and FM severity ( $r = 0.44$ ,  $p = 0.0097$ ;  
 10 Pearson correlation) (Fig. 1a).

11  
 12



**Fig. 1:** (A) Scatter plot showing the relationship between FM severity score (SSS) and age, (B) Partial correlation coefficients (r) between FM severity (SSS) and demographics and clinical parameters of FM patients, adjusted for age (n = 33). BMI = Body Mass Index; FIQ = Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire; HAM-A = Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale; HAM-D = Hamilton Depression Rating Scale; TAS = Alexithymia Toronto Scale. \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.001$ .

13  
 14 However, no significant associations were found between FM severity score and several other  
 15 variables, including years of education, disease duration, symptom duration, BMI, and pain  
 16 intensity during the interview (Fig. 1b). Significant correlations were found between FM severity  
 17 and various categories of anxiety and depression symptoms. There was no correlation between FM

1 severity and general positive affect ( $r = -0.12$ ,  $p = 0.52$ ), but there was a significant correlation with  
2 general negative affect ( $r = 0.40$ ,  $p = 0.021$ ).

3  
4  
5

### 6 **3.3 Association between fibromyalgia and neuroimaging data**


#### 7 **3.3.1 Brain Structural Analysis: VBM, DBM, and CT**

8 There were no significant differences observed between the two groups in terms of various  
9 brain structural features, including VBM on GM and WM images, DBM, and cortical thickness.

#### 10 **3.3.2 Brain Functional Analysis: ReHo, AM, FC**

11 No significant differences were found between the two groups in ReHo and AM features  
12 using t-test analysis in SPM12. However, t-test analysis on FC measurements identified six  
13 substantial connections that exhibited significant differences between the two groups (Fig. 2a).

14



**Fig. 2:** (A) Significant differences in functional connectivity between HC and FM groups obtained from t-test analysis while controlling for age. Connections represented in warm colors indicate increased FC in FM compared to HC, while those in cool colors indicate increased FC in HC compared to FM. (B) Significant functional connectivity associated with FM severity scores in the FM group, obtained from partial correlation controlling for age. Warm-colored connections indicate increasing functional connectivity values with FM severity scores, while cool-colored connections indicate the opposite trend.


1  
2 To examine whether FC measurements are associated with FM severity scores, we conducted a  
3 partial correlation analysis on 33 FM patients, controlling for age as a covariate. Through this  
4 analysis, we found six significant FCs significantly associated with FM severity (Fig. 2b). Our  
5 results revealed a large effect size and statistically significant correlation values ( $|r| > 0.64$ ,  $p <$   
6  $0.0001$ ) between FC values and FM severity scores at the identified connections. This indicates a  
7 genuine relationship between these variables in these specific brain connections rather than a  
8 chance occurrence.

9  
10

### 11 **3.3.2 Functional connectivity biomarker for ML-based purposes**

12 To investigate whether individual FC measurements can serve as an informative biomarker for  
13 distinguishing FM patients from healthy controls, we developed classifiers that predict subject  
14 status based on these measurements. Our prediction model, which employed leave-one-out cross-  
15 validation, successfully differentiated FM patients from healthy controls with an AUC of 0.65  
16 (accuracy = 65.15%, sensitivity = 66.67%, specificity = 63.64%) (Fig. 3a). Figures 3b and 4a  
17 illustrate the most significant FC patterns and the contributions of functional brain networks in  
18 distinguishing FM patients from HCs, respectively. Interestingly, all functional brain networks  
19 were identified through a ML-based model aimed at distinguishing FM patients from HCs,  
20 indicating the complexity of FM among women. The brain regions predominantly associated with  
21 distinguishing FM were located within the DMN, SMN, VIS, and dorsal attention network (DAN),  
22 as delineated in Yeo's group-level atlas.


1



**Fig 3:** (A) Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves for identifying FM patients from healthy controls using FC measurements with LOOCV approach. (B) Significant functional connectivity associated with FM identification identified through SHAP analysis using the Brainnetome Atlas.

2

3



**Fig. 4:** The functional connections associated with prediction models. (A) Weights in identifying FM patients from HCs, (B) Prediction FM severity scores. The weights have been computed based on SHAP analysis and respective results are presented on the 7 canonical networks. VIS: Visual Network, SMN: Somatomotor Network, DAN: Dorsal Attention Network, VAN: Ventral Attention Network, LIM: Limbic Network, FPN: Frontoparietal Network, DMN: Default Mode Network.

4


5

6 To assess whether individual-specific FC could track FM symptom severity, an SVR model was

7 trained to estimate symptom scores for each participant. The estimated and observed FM symptom

1 severities demonstrated a statistically significant correlation ( $r = 0.45, p = 0.007$ , Fig.5a). Through  
 2 SHAP analysis, we identified a set of FCs linked to predicting FM symptom severity scores (Fig.  
 3 5b). Interestingly, the significant FCs showed a negative association with FM severity scores.  
 4 Similarly, all functional brain networks contributed to predicting FM symptom severity. The brain  
 5 regions that exerted the greatest influence on predicting FM symptom severity predominantly  
 6 included the DMN, VIS, and DAN, as outlined in Yeo's group-level atlas (Fig. 4b).

7



**Fig 5:** (A) association between predicted FM severity scores versus actual scores using FC measurements and SVR with LOOCV approach. (B) Significant functional connectivities associated with FM severity scores through SHAP analysis using the Brainnetome Atlas.

8

#### 9 **4. Discussion**

10 In this study, we investigated the impact of FM on clinical, brain structural, and functional  
 11 measurements in female patients. It is essential to focus on women because they experience distinct  
 12 reactions to FM, with significant gender disparities in both prevalence and symptomatology. These  
 13 differences may be attributed to heightened pain severity and distinct symptom profiles in females  
 14 <sup>16</sup>, hormonal influences (e.g., estrogen and progesterone), genotype differences <sup>17</sup> and higher  
 15 prevalence of anxiety and depression among women. Additionally, structural and functional brain  
 16 variations further highlight the need to specifically study FM in women. The principal objectives

1 of this investigation were threefold. First, we aimed to identify which clinical and demographic  
2 factors correlate with FM severity among women. Our findings indicated that demographic factors  
3 and clinical parameters significantly associated with FM severity. Second, we examined how FM  
4 could lead to alterations in brain structure and function. Our results demonstrated that functional  
5 changes might precede structural abnormalities in females with FM. Third, we investigated  
6 whether neuroimaging data could serve as a robust biomarker sensitive to FM severity. Our study  
7 showed that ML models not only could be applied in this context but also helped in decoding the  
8 impact of FM on brain FC. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to explore the  
9 effects of FM on both brain structure and function, while also proposing a neuroimaging-based  
10 biomarker for potential clinical applications.

11

### 12 **Linking demographic and clinical features to fibromyalgia severity**

13 Although we did not observe any association between symptom onset age, diagnosis age, and  
14 disease duration with FM severity in our dataset, age exhibited a significant correlation with FM  
15 severity ( $r = 0.44$ ,  $p = 0.0097$ ). This finding is in consistent with previous studies that report  
16 increasing age as a risk factor for developing FM<sup>18</sup>. The correlation between advancing age and  
17 increased FM severity can be attributed to several physiological and lifestyle factors. Fluctuations  
18 in hormone levels, particularly estrogen, are known to affect pain sensitivity and inflammatory  
19 responses. Studies have shown that decreased estrogen levels in postmenopausal women are  
20 associated with heightened pain sensitivity and may contribute to the worsening of FM symptoms.  
21 Additionally, aging is often accompanied by a decline in physical activity levels. Reduced physical  
22 activity can lead to decreased muscle strength, increased stiffness, and higher levels of fatigue, all  
23 of which can exacerbate FM symptoms. Physical inactivity is also linked to poorer overall health



1 and can influence the severity of chronic conditions, including FM. Cognitive decline is another  
2 critical factor related to age. Aging affects cognitive processes such as memory, attention, and  
3 executive function. Cognitive impairments can exacerbate the perception of pain and make coping  
4 with chronic conditions like FM more challenging. Studies suggest that cognitive decline may  
5 impair the ability to manage stress and pain effectively, leading to increased FM severity. Thus,  
6 the relationship between age and FM severity is likely multifaceted, involving hormonal, physical,  
7 and cognitive dimensions. Understanding these underlying mechanisms can help in developing  
8 age-specific interventions to manage FM more effectively<sup>19</sup> .

9 Our study underscores the critical importance of considering anxiety and depression when  
10 evaluating the severity of FM. Anxiety and depression interact bidirectionally with pain in FM,  
11 creating a complex interplay that exacerbates symptom severity. Anxiety can lower pain thresholds  
12 and worsen pain, leading to a vicious cycle where increased pain heightens anxiety. This  
13 bidirectional relationship means that anxiety not only exacerbates pain, but pain also increases  
14 anxiety levels. Mechanistically, anxiety enhances the perception of pain through hypervigilance  
15 and increased attention to pain stimuli. Neuroimaging studies have shown that anxiety amplifies  
16 pain processing in brain regions such as the prefrontal cortex, amygdala, and anterior cingulate  
17 cortex (ACC). Similarly, depression can amplify pain perception and contribute to FM severity.  
18 Depressive symptoms often include a heightened focus on negative stimuli and a diminished  
19 capacity for experiencing pleasure (anhedonia), which can intensify the perception of pain. This  
20 relationship is also reciprocal: chronic pain can lead to depression, and depression can intensify  
21 pain perception. The shared biological pathways between pain and depression involve key brain  
22 regions, including the prefrontal cortex, ACC, amygdala, and hypothalamus. These mental health  
23 conditions share biological pathways and neural circuits, indicating that similar mechanisms

1 underlie both pain perception and mood regulation. For instance, the prefrontal cortex and ACC  
2 are involved in the cognitive and emotional processing of pain, while the amygdala and  
3 hypothalamus regulate emotional responses and stress. Neurotransmitters such as serotonin,  
4 norepinephrine, and dopamine, which are crucial for mood regulation, also play significant roles  
5 in pain modulation. Low levels of these neurotransmitters have been consistently observed in FM  
6 patients, contributing to both heightened pain sensitivity and mood disturbances.

7 Our findings also revealed that FM patients had significantly lower general positive affect  
8 and higher general negative affect compared to controls. Additionally, FM patients exhibited  
9 higher symptoms of alexithymia, particularly in terms of difficulty identifying feelings, difficulty  
10 describing feelings, and externally oriented thinking. These emotional and cognitive difficulties  
11 further compound the challenges faced by FM patients.

12 Overall, these findings highlight the importance of addressing these difficulties in FM  
13 patients through comprehensive treatment approaches that may include medication, cognitive-  
14 behavioral therapy (CBT), and other behavioral therapies. Medications such as selective serotonin  
15 reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) and serotonin-norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRIs) can help  
16 manage both pain and mood symptoms by increasing the levels of key neurotransmitters.  
17 Behavioral therapies, including CBT, can help patients develop coping strategies to manage pain  
18 and reduce anxiety and depression.

19 As FM severity increases, symptoms such as fatigue and walking unrefreshed may  
20 significantly worsen, while cognitive performance among FM patients may decrease <sup>20</sup>. The  
21 observed pattern of cognitive decline among FM patients in this study may differ significantly  
22 from age-related cognitive decline, given our sample's middle age (mean 41 years). Cognitive  
23 impairments in FM patients, often referred to as "fibro fog," include difficulties with memory,

1 attention, and executive function<sup>20,21</sup>. Consequently, factors like aging might exacerbate cognitive  
2 deterioration in FM patients emphasizing critical need for early management of cognitive function  
3<sup>22</sup>. Interventions such as cognitive training and physical exercise have been shown to improve  
4 cognitive function and overall quality of life in FM patients<sup>23</sup>.

## 6 **The relationship between fibromyalgia and neuroimaging data**

7 When examining brain structure differences between FM patients and matched healthy controls,  
8 we did not observe any significant differences in terms of GM, WM, DBM, and CT. This finding  
9 suggests that both groups experience a similar rate of brain degeneration, and that brain structure  
10 may not be a significant factor in the development or manifestation of FM.

11 However, our findings contrast with several other studies that have identified specific structural  
12 changes in the brains of individuals with FM, particularly in regions associated with pain and  
13 emotion processing, such as the thalamus, putamen, and insula<sup>24</sup>. For example, studies using VBM  
14 analysis have reported reduced gray matter volume in these areas in FM patients compared to  
15 healthy controls<sup>25,26</sup>.

16 The discrepancy between our findings and those of other studies may be attributed to several  
17 factors. Variations in the clinical profiles of subjects, including differences in pain severity,  
18 duration of illness, and comorbid conditions, could influence brain structure and contribute to  
19 differing results. Additionally, differences in neuroimaging methodologies, such as the type of  
20 MRI sequences used, the resolution of images, and the analysis techniques applied, could lead to  
21 variations in findings. Further research with standardized protocols and larger, more diverse  
22 populations is needed to better understand the role of brain structure in FM and its potential  
23 implications for treatment and management of the condition. A similar pattern was observed

1 between the two groups in terms of ReHo and ALFF features, with no significant differences  
2 detected. ReHo measures the local synchronization of spontaneous brain activity, while ALFF  
3 reflects the amplitude of spontaneous fluctuations in the blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD)  
4 signal. The lack of significant differences in these measures suggests that spontaneous neural  
5 activity and local synchronization of brain activity may not significantly affected by FM.  
6 However, when examining FC between brain regions, we found notable differences between FM  
7 patients and healthy controls. FC refers to the temporal correlation between spatially remote  
8 neurophysiological events, often measured by rs-fMRI. Significant differences in FC between the  
9 two groups suggest that abnormalities in brain function, rather than structural changes alone, may  
10 play a central role in the development and manifestation of FM. The observed differences in FC  
11 indicate that FM patients exhibit altered connectivity in specific brain networks compared to  
12 healthy controls. These changes are particularly evident in networks involved in pain processing,  
13 emotional regulation, and cognitive functions, such as the default mode network (DMN), salience  
14 network (SN), and central executive network (CEN). For example, previous studies have shown  
15 that FM patients often have decreased connectivity within the DMN, which is associated with self-  
16 referential thinking and mind-wandering, and increased connectivity in pain-related regions like  
17 the insula and anterior cingulate cortex <sup>8</sup>.

18 Our analysis revealed that the FC metric is significantly associated with FM severity scores,  
19 indicating a potential relationship between symptom severity and altered brain functioning in FM.  
20 This prominent association suggests that the extent of connectivity abnormalities correlates with  
21 the clinical manifestation of FM, including pain intensity, fatigue, and cognitive impairments. For  
22 instance, increased connectivity in the insula and decreased connectivity in the prefrontal cortex  
23 have been linked to higher pain levels and greater cognitive dysfunction in FM patients <sup>27</sup>.

1 The significant differences in FC between FM patients and healthy controls, along with the  
2 association between FC metrics and FM symptom severity, highlight the potential of using FC as  
3 a biomarker for FM. Identifying reliable biomarkers is crucial for early diagnosis, monitoring  
4 disease progression, and evaluating treatment efficacy. FC metrics could potentially serve as an  
5 objective indicator to complement subjective reports of pain and other symptoms.

6 The findings underscore the importance of considering brain FC in understanding the underlying  
7 mechanisms of FM. Altered FC patterns may reflect disrupted communication between brain  
8 regions involved in pain modulation, emotional regulation, and cognitive processing. These  
9 disruptions could contribute to the chronic pain, mood disturbances, and cognitive impairments  
10 characteristic of FM. Further research is needed to elucidate the causal relationships between  
11 altered FC and FM symptoms.

12 Understanding the specific patterns of FC alterations in FM patients can also inform the  
13 development of targeted interventions. For example, neurofeedback and brain stimulation  
14 techniques, such as transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) and transcranial direct current  
15 stimulation (tDCS), could be tailored to modulate aberrant connectivity patterns and alleviate  
16 symptoms. Additionally, cognitive-behavioral therapies and mindfulness-based interventions may  
17 benefit from incorporating strategies to enhance FC in key brain networks.

18 In conclusion, the differences in FC between FM patients and healthy controls, along with the  
19 correlation between FC metrics and symptom severity, highlight the significance of brain function  
20 in FM. These findings suggest that FC could serve as a valuable biomarker for clinical applications  
21 and enhance our understanding of the neural mechanisms underlying FM. Further research with  
22 larger sample sizes and longitudinal designs is warranted to confirm these results and explore their  
23 clinical utility.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## **FC as biomarker in FM**

Our neuroimaging analysis led us to explore the potential of using FC as a biomarker for FM. We obtained a moderate prediction accuracy for distinguishing FM patients from healthy controls through FC patterns (AUC=0.65, p=0.04). This indicates that FC could potentially be used as a biomarker for early detection of FM, even prior to the development of structural brain abnormalities, allowing for early intervention and better outcomes for patients. A larger sample size, along with the use of more advanced ML models such as deep learning models, is anticipated to offer improved accuracy in identifying FM through FC features.

In this study, we developed an advanced pattern recognition technique using SHAP values to uncover the hidden FC pattern for FM identification through ML approach. Specifically, our pattern recognition method effectively assessed the influence of different FC networks within a prediction model. In our framework for identifying FM, the default mode network (DMN), somatomotor network (SMN), visual network (VIS), and dorsal attention network (DAN) exhibited the highest contributions than other networks. Patients with FM have displayed changes in connectivity within the DMN, specifically affecting the posterior cingulate cortex (PCC) and areas such as the right parahippocampal gyrus, the anterior midcingulate cortex (aMCC), and the left inferior temporal gyrus, the left superior parietal lobule<sup>28</sup>. Decreased connectivity between the DMN and the right parahippocampal gyrus has been noted, possibly associated with the long-term nature of pain and cognitive impairments in FM, while enhanced connectivity between the DMN and aMCC is related to widespread tenderness and depression<sup>28,29</sup>. Disrupted connectivity within the DMN and between the DMN and sensory regions, particularly in the theta frequency, suggests widespread sensory dysfunction in FM<sup>29</sup>. Changes in neural pathways connecting the SMN to

1 various brain regions, like the somatosensory cortex and insular cortex, play a significant role in  
2 influencing pain perception and sensitivity traits in patients with FM <sup>30</sup>. Changes in VIS in FM  
3 may be linked to damage in visual processing caused by chronic pain <sup>29</sup>, while alterations in the  
4 DAN are related to top-down attention control and the regulation of sensory input <sup>30</sup>. The  
5 individual FC metric demonstrated a strong ability to predict FM severity symptom ratings. The  
6 connections included in the FM severity estimate model were mainly found in the DMN, VIS, and  
7 DAN functional connectivity networks. These networks were crucial in determining the severity  
8 of FM symptoms.

### 9 **Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions**

10 In contrast to the majority of studies that focused on just one neuroimaging modality <sup>25,31–33</sup>, this  
11 study examined seven different MRI metrics in order to investigate the impact of FM on both  
12 structural and functional brain characteristics. Our study exclusively used MRI scans from one site  
13 and a single scanner, ensuring that our results are not influenced by biases related to differences in  
14 MRI scanners and protocols across multiple sites <sup>34</sup>. To the best of our knowledge, this is the initial  
15 research to suggest a neuroimaging-based biomarker paired with ML algorithms and pattern  
16 recognition techniques in FM for potential clinical uses and a deeper comprehension of the impacts  
17 of FM on the brain.

18 Our results and findings should be interpreted considering several limitations. The main  
19 limitation of our study was the relatively small sample size, which reduced the statistical power of  
20 our tests and increased the risk of overfitting in our ML models. We hypothesize that a larger  
21 sample size could improve the accuracy of predicting FM and estimating its severity. Another  
22 limitation is the reliance on psychological assessments based on questionnaires or self-reports,  
23 which may be subject to biases such as social desirability or recall bias. Additionally, our study

1 focused exclusively on a specific population (Mexicans), which may limit the generalizability of  
2 the results to other populations. Lastly, we did not account for the effects of medications on our  
3 results because the number of medication users in the FM groups was significantly lower than that  
4 of non-users. For instance, medications commonly prescribed for FM, such as antidepressants and  
5 anticonvulsants<sup>35</sup>, have been shown to modulate brain activity and connectivity<sup>36</sup>. Future studies  
6 should investigate how these medications may influence the neural mechanisms underlying FM,  
7 which could be critical for tailoring personalized treatment strategies. Additionally, longitudinal  
8 analysis could provide valuable insights into the progression of brain changes in FM and their  
9 relationship with symptom severity and treatment response.

## 10 **5. Conclusion:**

11 Our study shows that FC measurements can be valuable biomarkers for early FM detection and  
12 severity assessment, particularly in women. Although no significant structural differences were  
13 found, FC alterations emphasize the role of brain function in FM. Advanced machine learning  
14 models improved diagnostic accuracy and suggested the default mode network, somatomotor  
15 network, visual network, and dorsal attention network as key in distinguishing FM patients and  
16 predicting severity.

17 Addressing anxiety and depression is crucial as they exacerbate FM symptoms.  
18 Comprehensive treatments, including medication and cognitive-behavioral therapy, can improve  
19 patients' quality of life. Future research should focus on larger, diverse populations and  
20 longitudinal studies to validate these findings. Investigating medication effects and incorporating  
21 advanced machine learning models could further enhance FM management. This study highlights  
22 FC's potential as a reliable biomarker for early FM detection and personalized treatment.

23

## 24 **References**



- 1 1. Sarzi-Puttini, P., Giorgi, V., Marotto, D. & Atzeni, F. Fibromyalgia: an update on clinical  
2 characteristics, aetiopathogenesis and treatment. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* **16**, 645–660 (2020).
- 3 2. Wolfe, F. *et al.* The American College of Rheumatology preliminary diagnostic criteria  
4 for fibromyalgia and measurement of symptom severity. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* **62**,  
5 600–610 (2010).
- 6 3. Clauw, D. J. Fibromyalgia: a clinical review. *JAMA* **311**, 1547–1555 (2014).
- 7 4. Arout, C. A., Sofuoglu, M., Bastian, L. A. & Rosenheck, R. A. Gender differences in the  
8 prevalence of fibromyalgia and in concomitant medical and psychiatric disorders: a  
9 national veterans health administration study. *J Womens Health* **27**, 1035–1044 (2018).
- 10 5. Häuser, W. *et al.* Fibromyalgia. *Nat Rev Dis Primers* **1**, 1–16 (2015).
- 11 6. Schmidt-Wilcke, T. & Clauw, D. J. Fibromyalgia: from pathophysiology to therapy. *Nat*  
12 *Rev Rheumatol* **7**, 518–527 (2011).
- 13 7. Kim, D. J., Lim, M., Kim, J. S. & Chung, C. K. Structural and functional thalamocortical  
14 connectivity study in female fibromyalgia. *Sci Rep* **11**, 23323 (2021).
- 15 8. Napadow, V. *et al.* Intrinsic brain connectivity in fibromyalgia is associated with chronic  
16 pain intensity. *Arthritis Rheum* **62**, 2545–2555 (2010).
- 17 9. Cagnie, B. *et al.* Central sensitization in fibromyalgia? A systematic review on structural  
18 and functional brain MRI. in *Seminars in arthritis and rheumatism* vol. 44 68–75  
19 (Elsevier, 2014).
- 20 10. Balducci, T. *et al.* A behavioral and brain imaging dataset with focus on emotion  
21 regulation of women with fibromyalgia. *Sci Data* **9**, 581 (2022).
- 22 11. Wolfe, F. *et al.* The American College of Rheumatology preliminary diagnostic criteria  
23 for fibromyalgia and measurement of symptom severity. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* **62**,  
24 600–610 (2010).
- 25 12. Klein, A. & Tourville, J. 101 labeled brain images and a consistent human cortical  
26 labeling protocol. *Front Neurosci* **6**, 171 (2012).
- 27 13. Xu, K., Liu, Y., Zhan, Y., Ren, J. & Jiang, T. BRANT: a versatile and extendable resting-  
28 state fMRI toolkit. *Front Neuroinform* **12**, 52 (2018).
- 29 14. Lundberg, S. M. & Lee, S.-I. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Adv*  
30 *Neural Inf Process Syst* **30**, (2017).
- 31 15. Yeo, B. T. T. *et al.* The organization of the human cerebral cortex estimated by intrinsic  
32 functional connectivity. *J Neurophysiol* (2011).
- 33 16. Ruschak, I. *et al.* Fibromyalgia syndrome pain in men and women: a scoping review. in  
34 *Healthcare* vol. 11 223 (MDPI, 2023).
- 35 17. Fernández-de-Las-Peñas, C. *et al.* Association of OPRM1 rs1799971, HTR1B rs6296 and  
36 COMT rs4680 polymorphisms with clinical phenotype among women with fibromyalgia.  
37 *Sci Rep* **14**, 11273 (2024).
- 38 18. Alzabibi, M. A. *et al.* Fibromyalgia: Epidemiology and risk factors, a population-based  
39 case-control study in Damascus, Syria. *BMC Rheumatol* **6**, 62 (2022).
- 40 19. Minerbi, A. & Fitzcharles, M.-A. Fibromyalgia in older individuals. *Drugs Aging* **38**,  
41 735–749 (2021).
- 42 20. Elkana, O., Falcofsky, A. K., Shorer, R., Bar-On Kalfon, T. & Ablin, J. N. Does the  
43 cognitive index of the symptom severity scale evaluate cognition? Data from subjective  
44 and objective cognitive measures in fibromyalgia. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* **37**, S51-7 (2019).

- 1 21. Elkana, O. *et al.* A modified version of the 2016 ACR fibromyalgia criteria cognitive  
2 items results in stronger correlations between subjective and objective measures of  
3 cognitive impairment. *Clin. Exp. Rheumatol* **39**, S66–S71 (2021).
- 4 22. Bennett, R. & Nelson, D. Cognitive behavioral therapy for fibromyalgia. *Nat Clin Pract*  
5 *Rheumatol* **2**, 416–424 (2006).
- 6 23. Choi, B. K. L., Verbeek, J. H., Wai-San Tam, W. & Jiang, J. Y. Exercises for prevention  
7 of recurrences of low-back pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (2010).
- 8 24. Mosch, B., Hagen, V., Herpertz, S. & Diers, M. Brain morphometric changes in  
9 fibromyalgia and the impact of psychometric and clinical factors: a volumetric and  
10 diffusion-tensor imaging study. *Arthritis Res Ther* **25**, 81 (2023).
- 11 25. Kuchinad, A. *et al.* Accelerated brain gray matter loss in fibromyalgia patients: premature  
12 aging of the brain? *Journal of Neuroscience* **27**, 4004–4007 (2007).
- 13 26. Schmidt-Wilcke, T. *et al.* Gray matter decrease in patients with chronic tension type  
14 headache. *Neurology* **65**, 1483–1486 (2005).
- 15 27. Kim, D. J., Lim, M., Kim, J. S. & Chung, C. K. Structural and functional thalamocortical  
16 connectivity study in female fibromyalgia. *Sci Rep* **11**, 23323 (2021).
- 17 28. Fallon, N., Chiu, Y., Nurmikko, T. & Stancak, A. Functional connectivity with the default  
18 mode network is altered in fibromyalgia patients. *PLoS One* **11**, e0159198 (2016).
- 19 29. Choe, M. K., Lim, M., Kim, J. S., Lee, D. S. & Chung, C. K. Disrupted resting state  
20 network of fibromyalgia in theta frequency. *Sci Rep* **8**, 2064 (2018).
- 21 30. Aoe, T., Kawanaka, R., Ohson, F., Hara, A. & Yokokawa, T. Functional connectivity  
22 associated with attention networks differs among subgroups of fibromyalgia patients: an  
23 observational case–control study. *Sci Rep* **14**, 10197 (2024).
- 24 31. Sawaddiruk, P., Paiboonworachat, S., Chattipakorn, N. & Chattipakorn, S. C. Alterations  
25 of brain activity in fibromyalgia patients. *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience* **38**, 13–22  
26 (2017).
- 27 32. Kim, D. J. *et al.* Altered White matter integrity in the corpus callosum in fibromyalgia  
28 patients identified by tract-based spatial statistical analysis. *Arthritis & Rheumatology* **66**,  
29 3190–3199 (2014).
- 30 33. Lin, C., Lee, S.-H. & Weng, H.-H. Gray matter atrophy within the default mode network  
31 of fibromyalgia: a meta-analysis of voxel-based morphometry studies. *Biomed Res Int*  
32 **2016**, 7296125 (2016).
- 33 34. Torbati, M. E. *et al.* A multi-scanner neuroimaging data harmonization using RAVEL and  
34 ComBat. *Neuroimage* **245**, 118703 (2021).
- 35 35. Häuser, W., Bernardy, K., Üçeyler, N. & Sommer, C. Treatment of fibromyalgia  
36 syndrome with antidepressants: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* **301**, 198–209 (2009).
- 37 36. Schmidt-Wilcke, T. *et al.* Resting state connectivity correlates with drug and placebo  
38 response in fibromyalgia patients. *Neuroimage Clin* **6**, 252–261 (2014).

40

#### 41 **Data Availability**

42 The clinical data for this article were sourced from (<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6554870>;  
43 accessed on December 25, 2023), while the raw MRI data came from

1 (<https://openneuro.org/datasets/ds004144/versions/1.0.2>, accessed on December 25, 2023) in a  
2 Mexican population. More details about the individuals' attributes can be found in <sup>10</sup>.

3

#### 4 **Acknowledgments**

5 The data for this study were obtained from a dataset of Mexican women diagnosed with  
6 fibromyalgia <sup>10</sup>. We sincerely thank the principal investigators for collecting and sharing this  
7 dataset and appreciate the participants whose cooperation was vital to advancing our understanding  
8 in this field.

9

#### 10 **Author Contributions**

11 **OE:** Study design, interpretation of results, writing and editing, conception of the project.  
12 **IB:** Data sorting and MRI preprocessing, statistical analysis, data visualization, writing and  
13 editing.

14

#### 15 **Code Availability**

16

17 Statistical analyses were conducted using MATLAB 2023a. Brain network visualization was  
18 performed with the BRANT fMRI Toolkit. The Statistics and Machine Learning Toolbox in  
19 MATLAB was employed for the development of machine learning models.

#### 20 **Conflicts of Interest**

21 All authors declare that there is no conflict of interest on their part.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30