

1 TMS-induced modulation of brain networks and its associations to rTMS treatment for 2 depression: a concurrent fMRI-EEG-TMS study 3

4 Hengda He^{1,*}, Xiaoxiao Sun¹, Jayce Doose², Josef Faller¹, James R. McIntosh^{1,3}, Golbarg T. Saber^{2,5}, Sarah
5 Huffman⁶, Linbi Hong¹, Spiro P. Pantazatos⁷, Han Yuan⁸, Lisa M. McTeague^{6,10}, Robin I. Goldman⁹, Truman R.
6 Brown², Mark S. George^{6,10}, and Paul Sajda^{1,11,12,13,*}
7

8 ¹Department of Biomedical Engineering, Columbia University, New York, 10027, NY, USA.

9 ²Center for Biomedical Imaging, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, 29425, SC, USA.

10 ³Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York, 10032, NY, USA.

11 ⁴Department of Radiology and Radiological Science, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, 29425, SC, USA.

12 ⁵Department of Neurology, University of Chicago, Chicago, 60637, IL, USA.

13 ⁶Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, 29425, SC, USA.

14 ⁷Department of Psychiatry, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York, 10032, NY, USA.

15 ⁸Stephenson School of Biomedical Engineering, The University of Oklahoma, Norman, 73019, OK, USA.

16 ⁹Center for Healthy Minds, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, 53705, WI, USA.

17 ¹⁰Ralph H. Johnson VA Medical Center, Charleston, 29401, SC, USA.

18 ¹¹Department of Electrical Engineering, Columbia University, New York, 10027, NY, USA.

19 ¹²Department of Radiology, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York, 10032, NY, USA.

20 ¹³Data Science Institute, Columbia University, New York, 10027, NY, USA.

21 *Corresponding author(s): hengda.he@columbia.edu; psajda@columbia.edu
22

23 • Abstract 24

25 Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) over the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (L-DLPFC)
26 is an established intervention for treatment-resistant depression (TRD), yet the underlying
27 therapeutic mechanisms remain not fully understood. This study employs an integrative approach
28 that combines TMS with concurrent functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and
29 electroencephalography (EEG), aimed at assessing the acute/immediate effects of TMS on brain
30 network dynamics and their correlation with clinical outcomes. Our study demonstrates that
31 TMS acutely modulates connectivity within vital brain circuits, particularly the cognitive control
32 and default mode networks. We found that the baseline TMS-evoked responses in the cognitive
33 control and limbic networks significantly predicted clinical improvement in patients receiving a
34 novel EEG-synchronized repetitive TMS treatment. Furthermore, this study explored the brain-
35 state dependent effects of TMS, as the brain-state indexed by the phase of EEG prefrontal alpha
36 oscillation. We found that clinical outcomes in this novel treatment are linked to state-specific
37 TMS-modulated functional connectivity within a pivotal brain circuit of the L-DLPFC and the
38 posterior subgenual anterior cingulate cortex within the limbic system. These findings contribute
39 to our understanding of the therapeutic effects underlying TMS treatment in depression and
40 support the potential of assessing state-dependent TMS effects in TMS timing target selection.
41 This study emphasizes the importance of personalized timing of TMS for optimizing target
42 engagement of specific clinically relevant brain circuits. Our results are crucial for future
43 research into the development of personalized neuromodulation therapies for TRD patients.
44

45 • Introduction 46

47 Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) over the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (L-DLPFC)
48 is a Food and Drug Administration-approved treatment for depression. TMS therapy has
49 demonstrated efficacy and safety in the treatment of patients with treatment-resistant depression
50 (TRD)^{1,2}. However, the mechanism of action underlying the therapeutic effects of TMS is still
51 unclear. Substantial evidence has shown that TMS not only stimulates the superficial cortex site

52 right underneath the coil, but also has transsynaptic effects on deep brain circuits associated with
53 the stimulation site³⁻⁷. Assessing such TMS-induced effects on brain circuits allows the
54 quantification of network perturbation and identifies measures relevant to clinical improvement.
55 To investigate TMS-induced effects, the propagation pattern of induced activity from the L-
56 DLPFC to various downstream regions has been established in many studies⁸⁻¹⁰. However, such
57 effects appear to be highly heterogenous both at the stimulation site¹¹ and at the associated
58 networks distal to the stimulation site^{12,13}, with reports of such stimulation both increasing and
59 decreasing neuronal activity, depending on the region, network, and stimulation parameters. To
60 directly assess TMS-induced acute effects on the brain, recent studies combined TMS with
61 concurrent functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) acquisitions, which allows monitoring
62 of the acute/immediate subsequent effects of the TMS on brain dynamics. For example, Vink et
63 al. investigated the propagation pattern of TMS-induced activity from the L-DLPFC to the
64 subgenual anterior cingulate cortex (sgACC)¹³. Oathes et al. also assessed TMS-evoked response
65 in the sgACC and found its pre-treatment magnitude and the post-treatment changes are both
66 associated with depression improvement⁶. Despite these encouraging results, research on this
67 topic is relatively sparse, and more studies are warranted to examine and quantify the TMS-
68 induced acute effects on brain networks and characterize the variability between patients, which
69 might inform prognosis in depression treatment¹⁴.

70
71 In addition to assessing TMS-evoked response at a particular brain region, it is also important to
72 explore how the induced local activity can drive modulations throughout large-scale brain
73 network systems¹⁵. Numerous studies have explored the brain circuits affected by TMS
74 perturbation. These efforts include investigating the lasting after-effects on brain connectivity
75 minutes after a TMS session in offline setups, as well as assessing the immediate, acute effects
76 using concurrent TMS-fMRI in online setups¹⁶. For example, previous studies have shown that
77 TMS applied to the L-DLPFC attenuates hyper-connectivity between sgACC and the default
78 mode network (DMN) in depression patients¹⁷, and TMS might modulate the abnormal or
79 symptom-related network connectivity in depression¹⁸⁻²⁰. These studies provide evidence for the
80 mechanisms underlying its therapeutic effects. However, these TMS-induced effects on brain
81 connectivity were assessed in an offline fashion. It remains unclear whether these lasting after-
82 effects of TMS-induced modulation reflect direct engagement of targeted brain circuits or reflect
83 indirect compensatory effects, such as induced adaptive plasticity or short-term reorganization
84 across brain networks^{21,22}. Even though some studies have shown promising results on the
85 consistency of these acute and offline-lasting effects of TMS²³, more studies are needed to
86 confirm the relationship between online-acute and offline-lasting effects of TMS-induced
87 modulation. Currently, assessing the TMS-induced online-acute modulation with concurrent
88 TMS-fMRI still provides stronger evidence for the direct engagement of target brain circuits
89 compared to the offline setups²².

90
91 While great progress has been made to integrate TMS with structural and functional MRI on the
92 optimization of TMS spatial targets for depression treatment²⁴⁻³⁰, relatively little has been
93 explored on the optimization of TMS timing for target engagement³¹⁻³⁶. Based on the substantial
94 evidence of state-dependent effects of TMS on the brain and behavior^{22,37-41}, it is reasonable to
95 hypothesize that TMS timing relative to the state of the brain matters for the TMS treatment of
96 depression. However, the definition of brain state varies across subfields and contexts, and brain
97 state fluctuates at different timescales^{41,42}. In this study, we derive a brain state index varying at a

98 relatively short timeframe. Specifically, we proposed to use the phase of prefrontal alpha
99 oscillation in the electroencephalography (EEG) signal as an index of brain state. Many studies
100 have demonstrated that the alpha phase is associated with an active inhibitory mechanism, and
101 the timing of sensory stimulation relative to the alpha phase influences perception^{43–47}. These
102 studies indicate a gating mechanism of prefrontal alpha oscillation, with distinct phases
103 reflecting different neural excitability, thus gating the information flow across brain networks.
104 Thus, we hypothesized that prefrontal alpha oscillation might gate the propagation of TMS-
105 induced effects across brain networks, and by potentially targeting the TMS pulses to the
106 personalized phase in the alpha cycle, we can induce a stronger effect at the distal target. Here,
107 we integrated EEG with TMS to track brain state, which is used for personalized TMS pulse
108 timing optimization. In our previous studies, we have shown the benefit of EEG-synchronized
109 repetitive TMS (rTMS) treatment, where we observed progressive entrainment effects over the
110 sessions of rTMS treatment⁴⁸, which are related to better TMS antidepressant response³¹. In
111 another study, our group demonstrated that TMS-induced effects in the circuit between DLPFC
112 and sgACC depended on the EEG prefrontal alpha phase³⁵. However, TMS-induced modulation
113 of large-scale brain network systems across the whole brain was not assessed, and their
114 longitudinal changes over the pre- and post-treatment scans have not been explored.
115

116 Here, we aim to investigate and quantify the TMS-induced acute modulation on brain networks
117 and to test its associations with the clinical improvement in rTMS treatment for depression. As
118 shown in Fig. 1, in this study, the treatment was designed as follows: 1) At baseline, an
119 integrated fMRI-EEG-TMS (fET) instrument was developed and used as a pre-treatment scan to
120 select the personalized TMS timing target (optimum phase), which was defined as the prefrontal
121 alpha phase that produced the largest blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) signal increase in
122 the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC); 2) During the rTMS treatment, patients were
123 randomized into two groups with either rTMS pulses synchronized to the personalized optimal
124 phase as the timing target (SYNC group) or delivered at a random phase (UNSYNC group).
125 Patients were treated with 30 rTMS sessions over six weeks; 3) After the treatment, another fET
126 scan was acquired. In this study, we aimed to explore how TMS-induced acute effects propagate
127 through brain network systems. Specifically, we assessed TMS-evoked BOLD responses and
128 connectivity modulations, hypothesizing that TMS over the L-DLPFC would modulate not only
129 the local brain networks but also distal networks associated with depression, such as the
130 cognitive control network (CCN) and the DMN. Furthermore, we tested the state-dependent
131 effects of these modulations using fET scans, with prefrontal alpha oscillation phase indexing
132 brain state. Additionally, we investigated TMS-induced acute effects on brain networks before
133 and after a six-week rTMS treatment. We hypothesized that these TMS-induced effects, both at
134 baseline and post-treatment, would be associated with clinical response. By quantifying the
135 TMS-induced acute effects and state-dependent effects, this study is important for future efforts
136 to temporally optimize TMS targeting in the treatment of depression, with potential implications
137 for personalized treatment strategies in depression^{31,32,35,48}.
138




Fig. 1. Experimental procedure and data analyses. TMS-induced effects were assessed at both pre- and post-treatment fMRI-EEG-TMS (fET) scans. Both baseline TMS-induced effects and the longitudinal changes in TMS effects were related to the clinical outcome (HRSD percent change). HRSD, Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression.

139
140
141
142

• Results

143 Patients in the SYNC group (N = 15) have Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (HRSD) scores
144 of 30.50 ± 4.35 (mean \pm SD; SD, standard deviation) at baseline and HRSD scores of $14.50 \pm$
145 7.68 (mean \pm SD) post-treatment, with a percent improvement of $52.56\% \pm 25.37\%$ (mean \pm
146 SD). Patients in the UNSYNC group (N = 13) have HRSD scores of 28.40 ± 7.29 (mean \pm SD) at
147 baseline and HRSD scores of 13.70 ± 8.22 (mean \pm SD) post-treatment, with a percent
148 improvement of $55.31\% \pm 19.04\%$ (mean \pm SD). There is no significant difference in the HRSD
149 percent improvement between groups ($p > 0.78$). More details on participants recruitment and
150 demographic information are in the “Methods” section.

151

TMS-induced acute/immediate effects on whole-brain BOLD signal at baseline fET scan

152 The group-level TMS-induced BOLD activation map is shown in Fig. 2A (permutation test with
153 FSL Randomise⁴⁹; FWE-corrected $p < 0.05$). TMS significantly elevated BOLD signals in
154 various brain regions, including dACC, occipital areas, insula, and thalamus, which are
155 consistent with the literature⁵⁰. Next, we sought to computationally quantify these TMS-induced
156 acute effects on brain networks. Specifically, we quantified both the amplitude and spatial extent
157 of TMS-evoked responses across brain networks. These quantifications allow us to assess the
158 engagement of the neural circuits under neuromodulation. We hypothesized that specific neural
159 circuits engaged at the baseline acquisition could predict the following rTMS antidepressant
160 response, and any significant results might potentially provide evidence of their mechanistic
161 contribution to the rTMS therapeutic effects⁶. As shown in Fig. 2B, TMS evoked the strongest
162 response in the salience/ventral attention network (subnetwork A, right hemisphere (RH)) and
163 the smallest response in the limbic network (subnetwork B, left hemisphere (LH)), with the
164 highest inter-subject variability in the somatomotor network (subnetwork A, RH) and the lowest
165 inter-subject variability in the limbic network (subnetwork B, RH). Fig. 2C illustrates the spatial
166 coverage of brain networks under the propagation of TMS-induced effects, where the
167 somatomotor network (subnetwork B, RH) has the highest spatial extent evoked by TMS, and
168

169 limbic network (subnetwork B, RH) has the smallest spatial extent evoked. As for the spatial
 170 extent, we observed the largest and smallest inter-subject variabilities in the visual peripheral
 171 network (RH) and limbic network (subnetwork B, RH), respectively.
 172




Fig. 2. Quantification of baseline TMS-evoked responses on whole-brain BOLD signal. (A) group-level activation map (t-value; $p < 0.05$ FWE multiple comparison correction; mixed effect); (B) Amplitude of TMS-induced BOLD response in brain networks (Schaefer atlas brain parcellation); (C) The spatial extent of TMS induced-activity propagation coverage through the networks was computed (percentage coverage). The red line indicates the median across subjects. The blue lines indicate the lower and upper quartile across subjects. TMS evoked the strongest response in the SalVentAttn network (subnetwork A, RH), with the highest inter-subject variability in the SomMot network (subnetwork A, RH). We found that the SomMot network (subnetwork B, RH) had the highest extent of propagation coverage of TMS-induced activity, and the VisPeri network in the RH had the highest inter-subject variability in the propagation coverage. LH, left hemisphere; RH, right hemisphere; SomMot, somatomotor network; VisPeri, visual peripheral network; SalVentAttn, salience/ventral attention network. Default, default mode network; VisCent, visual central network; Cont, control network; TempPar, temporal parietal network; DorsAttn, dorsal attention network.

173
 174 **TMS-induced acute/immediate modulation on brain connectivity at baseline fET scan**
 175 To examine the TMS-induced acute/immediate modulation of functional connectivity (FC), we
 176 performed a whole-brain psychophysiological interaction (PPI) analysis⁵¹⁻⁵³. Significant TMS
 177 modulations between networks are shown in Fig. 3A (FDR-corrected $p < 0.05$), with the
 178 strongest negative effect on the connectivity between default mode network (subnetwork A) in
 179 the LH and default mode network (subnetwork B) in the RH. Of note is that these are all
 180 negative effects, and none of the connections showed significant positive effects after multiple
 181 comparison corrections. To identify brain regions that are important for potentially facilitating
 182 the propagation of TMS-induced effects over networks, we performed hub analysis, where
 183 positive and negative node strength was computed by summing across all positive or negative
 184 connections associated with each network node, respectively. As shown in Fig. 3B and 3C, the
 185 results showed that the positive hubs are mostly within the visual and somatomotor networks,
 186 and the negative hubs are regions in the default, control, and salience ventral attention networks.
 187 The summarized hub strength results showed that nodes in the somatomotor network

188 (subnetwork B, LH) and salience/ventral attention network (subnetwork A, RH) have the most
 189 positive and negative node strength, respectively.
 190




Fig. 3. Quantification of TMS-induced functional connectivity at baseline fMRI-EEG-TMS (fET) scan. (A) Group level whole-brain psychophysiological interaction analysis results. TMS induced significant negative effects on the connectivity between cortical networks (FDR multiple comparison corrected $p < 0.05$). No significant positive effect was observed after multiple comparison correction. (B) and (C) represent negative and positive node strength by computing the sum of all the negative and positive connection weights between one node and all other nodes, respectively. The positive hubs are mostly within the visual and somatomotor networks, and the negative hubs are regions in the default, control, and salience ventral attention networks. LH, left hemisphere; RH, right hemisphere; SalVentAttn, salience/ventral attention network. Default, default mode network; Cont, control network; TempPar, temporal parietal network.

191
 192 **State-dependency of TMS-induced acute effects and modulation at baseline fET scan**
 193 In this section, we investigated TMS state-dependent effects, where we grouped the TMS trials
 194 into four phase bins based on their timing relative to the phase of the prefrontal alpha oscillation,

195 resulting in four phase-bin conditions. Then, we identified two TMS trial conditions for each
196 subject: 1) high-load-phase (HLP) condition was defined as the condition where a high TMS
197 evoked response was introduced at the stimulation site (L-DLPFC); 2) low-load-phase (LLP)
198 condition was defined with a low evoked response at L-DLPFC. We assessed the contrast
199 between HLP and LLP conditions, where the whole-brain general linear modeling (GLM)
200 analysis identified regions in the lateral frontoparietal network⁵⁴ as significant clusters ($p <$
201 0.001), including bilateral DLPFC and inferior parietal lobule (Fig. 4A). Because HLP and LLP
202 conditions were defined on the BOLD signal only from the L-DLPFC region, activation pattern
203 of their contrast reflects brain areas associated with a higher load of TMS-induced effects on the
204 L-DLPFC, potentially suggesting the whole-brain spreading pattern of TMS-induced response.
205 Then, we hypothesized that this TMS-effects spreading pattern follows brain connectivity. To
206 test this, we compared the spatial pattern of this activation contrast to the seed-based functional
207 connectivity map of the L-DLPFC stimulation site. With different thresholds on the connectivity
208 map, it showed the highest overlap of 28.66% (Dice similarity coefficient (DSC)) with the TMS
209 response contrast map at the group level (Fig. 4B). We replicated these results using the Schaefer
210 atlas L-DLPFC regions of interest (ROIs) near the stimulation site, by also examining HLP and
211 LLP contrast map and seed-based functional connectivity map of each ROI. The results showed
212 a high overlap between the spatial spread of state-dependent effects from L-DLPFC and the
213 connectivity pattern of the L-DLPFC (L-DLPFC in the default mode subnetwork-A: DSC =
214 25.97%; L-DLPFC in the default mode subnetwork-B: DSC = 37.08%; L-DLPFC in the
215 salience/ventral attention subnetwork-B: DSC = 30.53%; see supplementary figures for details).

216 These results are consistent with the hypothesis that the spatial spread of TMS-induced
217 acute/immediate effects is related to the functional connectivity pattern of the stimulation site¹².
218




Fig. 4. State-dependency analysis of TMS-evoked BOLD response using baseline fMRI-EEG-TMS (fET) scan. (A) TMS response contrast between the conditions of TMS trials in the high-load-phase (HLP) bins and low-load-phase (LLP) bins. Regions in the lateral frontoparietal network were identified as significant clusters (t-value; $p < 0.001$). Because HLP and LLP conditions were defined solely on the BOLD signal from L-DLPFC region, the activation pattern resulting from their contrast highlight brain areas associated with greater TMS-induced effects on the L-DLPFC, indicating a whole-brain spreading pattern of the phase-dependent TMS-induced response. (B) Spatial overlap between the TMS response contrast and L-DLPFC seed-based functional connectivity. The TMS response contrast (green) and overlap (yellow) areas encompass the same regions shown in the panel (A). L-DLPFC functional connectivity map showed a network overlapped with the TMS response contrast map, suggesting the propagation of TMS-induced acute effects is related to the functional connectivity.

219
220 We also examined whether TMS modulates the connectivity between brain networks differently
221 when the pulses were delivered at different prefrontal alpha phases. Specifically, we used PPI
222 analysis to assess connectivity modulations of the TMS trials in the HLP and LLP bins of the L-
223 DLPFC stimulation site. Our results showed that only the TMS trials in the HLP bins induced
224 significant (FDR-corrected $p < 0.05$) negative functional connectivity modulations between 1)
225 default mode subnetwork-A in the RH and default mode subnetwork-B in the RH; 2) default
226 mode network (subnetwork A, RH) and subnetwork-A of the control network (RH); 3) default
227 mode network (subnetwork A, RH) and subnetwork-B of the control network (RH). Whereas, no

228 significant functional connectivity modulations were observed for the TMS trials in the LLP bins
229 of the stimulation site. These findings suggest state-specific TMS modulations on the
230 connectivity, rendering the importance of TMS timing optimization to induce stronger
231 modulations on the target brain circuits. We also examined these state-specific modulations for
232 the HLP bins of the Schaefer atlas L-DLPFC ROIs, where no significant modulations were found
233 after multiple comparison correction (see supplementary text for details).

234 235 **Associations of TMS-induced acute/immediate effects to the clinical response in rTMS** 236 **treatment for TRD patients**

237 In this section, we first tested the associations between the quantification of TMS-induced
238 acute/immediate effects at baseline and the clinical response during rTMS treatment. As for the
239 TMS-evoked BOLD response, we observed a significant correlation between the clinical
240 improvement (percent decrease/improvement in the HRSD) and the amplitude of evoked
241 response in the subnetwork B of the control network (LH: $r = 0.8591$, $p < 0.0007$; RH: $r =$
242 0.8601 , $p < 0.0007$), and limbic network (subnetwork B, RH) ($r = 0.8991$, $p < 0.0002$) for the
243 patients in the SYNC group. There is no significant association between the clinical
244 improvement and the amplitude of evoked response in any network for the patients in the
245 UNSYNC group (significance defined as $p < 0.05$ with Bonferroni correction). We also
246 examined whether the spatial extents of evoked response at baseline pre-treatment scan are
247 associated with clinical improvement, and no significant association was found.

248
249 Next, we assessed the longitudinal changes in the TMS-induced acute/immediate effects and
250 tested their associations with the clinical outcome during rTMS treatment. We did not observe
251 any significant longitudinal changes in the TMS-induced acute/immediate effects for each group.
252 However, by pooling the patients from both groups, we found that TMS-evoked BOLD
253 responses in the salience/ventral attention network (subnetwork A) significantly decreased from
254 pre-treatment to post-treatment scan (LH: $t = -4.0129$, $p < 0.0074$; RH: $t = -4.0403$, $p < 0.0070$).
255 But these longitudinal changes were not significantly associated with the clinical outcome (LH: $r =$
256 -0.2505 , $p > 0.4851$; RH: $r = -0.2662$, $p > 0.4571$).

257
258 Finally, we asked if any state-specific TMS modulations on the connectivity at baseline or its
259 longitudinal changes are associated with the clinical outcome during rTMS treatment. We
260 assessed the state-specific effects with the HLP condition. Here, as shown in Fig. 5B, we
261 examined four L-DLPFC ROIs, because the results in our state-dependency analyses suggest that
262 the state-specific effects are sensitive to the spatial specificity of the L-DLPFC ROIs (see
263 supplementary text for details). Specifically, we assessed the connectivity modulated by the TMS
264 trials that evoked the largest response (defined as the HLP condition) at 1) L-DLPFC of EEG F3;
265 2) L-DLPFC in the subnetwork A of the DMN; 3) L-DLPFC in the subnetwork B of the DMN;
266 4) L-DLPFC in the subnetwork B of the salience/ventral attention network. This analysis allows
267 us to explore how stronger induced local activities near the stimulation site can drive specific
268 modulations throughout brain networks. Any association between these state-specific
269 connectivity modulations and the clinical outcome might indicate these brain circuits'
270 involvement in treating TRD patients. We did not observe any significant association between
271 the clinical outcome and the baseline state-specific TMS modulations on the connectivity. Then,
272 we tested the associations between the clinical outcome and the longitudinal changes in the state-
273 specific TMS modulations on the connectivity. As for the state-specific effects associated with

274 the L-DLPFC of the default mode network (subnetwork A), we observed that the clinical
 275 outcome is significantly correlated to the changes in the connectivity between L-DLPFC in the
 276 default mode network (subnetwork B) and orbitofrontal-cortex in the limbic network
 277 (subnetwork B, RH) only in the SYNC group (SYNC group: $r = 0.9916$, $p < 1.4971e-6$, FDR-
 278 corrected $p < 0.01$; UNSYNC group: $r = -0.3841$, $p > 0.45$). This relationship is still significant
 279 after regressing out the baseline connectivity measurement from the longitudinal changes ($r =$
 280 0.7269 , $p < 0.0411$). However, when testing on the other L-DLPFC regions, we did not observe
 281 any significant relationship between the clinical outcome and the connectivity changes after
 282 multiple comparison correction. For the connectivity between L-DLPFC and RH orbitofrontal-
 283 cortex in the SYNC group, we did observe a trend for the state-specific effects associated with
 284 the L-DLPFC in the default mode network (subnetwork B; $p < 0.0023$), but not L-DLPFC of
 285 EEG F3 ($p > 0.4730$) and L-DLPFC in the salience/ventral attention network (subnetwork B; $p >$
 286 0.0903). Our results suggest EEG-synchronized rTMS treatment induces functional connectivity
 287 changes in specific neural circuits that are associated with the clinical outcome, i.e., state-
 288 dependent response in the L-DLPFC (default mode network (subnetwork A)) and the
 289 connectivity between L-DLPFC (default mode network (subnetwork B)) and orbitofrontal-cortex
 290 (RH, limbic network (subnetwork B)). These results provide insight into the therapeutic effect of
 291 rTMS and may inform the design of future rTMS interventions in depression.
 292




Fig. 5 Associations of TMS-induced acute/immediate effects to the clinical response in rTMS treatment for depression patients. (A) We observed a significant correlation between the clinical outcome (percent change in the HRSD) and the pre-treatment TMS evoked response in the bilateral ContB network and RH-LimbicB network only for the SYNC group. (B) State-specific TMS modulations on the connectivity were assessed for four L-DLPFC regions (EEG F3, L-DLPFC in DefaultA, L-DLPFC in

DefaultB, and L-DLPFC in SalVentAttnB). (C) As for the L-DLPFC in DefaultA, the pre- and post-treatment state-specific TMS-modulated connectivity changes (between L-DLPFC in the DefaultB network and RH orbitofrontal cortex in LimbicB network) are significantly associated with the clinical outcome only for the SYNC group. No significant result was found for the other three L-DLPFC regions after multiple comparison correction. Panel (A) includes the results of 23 patients (11 SYNC patients and 12 UNSYNC patients) with pre-treatment fET and HRSD available. Panel (C) includes the results of 14 patients (8 SYNC patients and 6 UNSYNC patients) with complete pre- and post-treatment data. HRSD: Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression; fET: integrated fMRI-EEG-TMS. LH, left hemisphere; RH, right hemisphere; SalVentAttnB, salience/ventral attention network (subnetwork B); DefaultA/B, default mode network (subnetwork A/B); ContB, control network (subnetwork B); LimbicB, limbic network (subnetwork B).

293

294

295

- **Discussion**

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

In this paper, we investigated the TMS-induced acute/immediate effects on brain networks. Firstly, we quantified its evoked BOLD response and modulated functional connectivity. Then, we tested associations between TMS-induced effects and the clinical outcome. Additionally, we examined whether these TMS-induced acute effects depend on the prefrontal alpha oscillation phase. Our results showed that the spatial spread of TMS-induced phase-dependent effects follows a similar pattern to the functional connectivity of the L-DLPFC stimulation site. When assessing the TMS modulated functional connectivity with trials in the HLP bins (i.e., TMS trials that evoked a higher response at the L-DLPFC stimulation site), we observed significant negative modulations on the control network (subnetwork A and B, RH) and default mode network (subnetwork A and B, RH). No significant modulation was found for trials where TMS was delivered at the LLP timing, and no significant modulation was observed for this state-specific effect associated with other L-DLPFC ROIs near the stimulation site. Finally, we tested the associations between the quantification of TMS-induced acute/immediate effects and the clinical outcome, where TRD patients received a randomized six-week rTMS treatment. We found that the baseline TMS-evoked responses in the bilateral control network (subnetwork B) and limbic network (subnetwork B, RH) significantly predict the following clinical improvement, but only in the group of patients receiving the EEG-synchronized rTMS treatment (SYNC group). Finally, our results showed that the longitudinal changes in the state-specific TMS modulations on the connectivity between L-DLPFC (part of the subnetwork B of the DMN) and right hemisphere orbitofrontal cortex (part of the subnetwork B of the limbic network) was significantly associated with the clinical improvement only for the patients in the SYNC group. The present study assessed TMS-induced acute/immediate effects on brain networks with concurrent TMS-fMRI and investigated the brain-state dependency of the induced effects with simultaneous EEG recordings. The results of its association with clinical outcomes have potential implications for developing efficient and personalized treatments for TRD patients.

The concurrent acquisition of fMRI data during single-pulse TMS enables the investigation of the immediate BOLD response to TMS. This TMS-evoked BOLD response, frequently characterized in recent concurrent TMS-fMRI studies, serves to demonstrate target engagement

325 or its associations with the clinical outcome. For example, Oathes et al. explored the TMS-
326 evoked response in subcortical brain areas and the associated networks, such as the amygdala
327 and sgACC⁵⁵, demonstrating engagements of these circuits underlying neuromodulation.
328 Similarly, Vink et al. assessed the spatial propagation of TMS-evoked responses in the sgACC
329 and across the whole brain¹³. In support of the findings in other literature, these studies
330 highlighted the substantial individual variability in TMS-evoked responses. The observed
331 variability may be attributable to neural activity at the stimulation site¹¹ and/or its functional
332 connectivity with specific brain networks, such as the salience network¹². These observations
333 underscore the importance of characterizing such individual variabilities. Thus, in this study, we
334 proposed to quantify both the amplitude and the spatial propagation extent of the immediate
335 acute TMS-evoked responses. Such quantifications potentially validate target engagement and
336 could have important clinical implications. For instance, a recent study linked the TMS-evoked
337 response in the sgACC to clinical outcomes following rTMS treatment⁶. Their results suggest
338 that a stronger evoked response in the sgACC during the pre-treatment TMS-fMRI session
339 demonstrated better target engagement and subsequently correlated with improved therapeutic
340 outcomes in the treatment. Our findings align with these studies, where we demonstrated that the
341 evoked response in the right orbitofrontal cortex (containing the posterior sgACC) within the
342 limbic network (subnetwork B) during the pre-treatment session is relevant to the clinical
343 outcomes of rTMS treatment. Additionally, we observed that baseline-evoked responses in the
344 bilateral control network (subnetwork B) were significantly associated with clinical outcomes.
345 However, these associations are only significant for the patients in the SYNC group. This
346 suggests that patients exhibiting the strongest evoked responses in the limbic network
347 (subnetwork B, RH) and bilateral control network (subnetwork B) networks at baseline,
348 rendering a better target engagement of these networks, benefit most from EEG-synchronized
349 rTMS treatment. Conversely, the nonsignificant results for patients in the UNSYNC group might
350 imply that the therapeutic effects of unsynchronized rTMS treatment might not be specific to
351 certain brain networks. Moreover, with the longitudinal data, we showed a significant decrease in
352 the evoked response within the salience network after rTMS treatment, which does not correlate
353 significantly with the clinical outcomes. These findings might suggest the potential impact of
354 rTMS on anxiety symptoms, given the established link between the salience network and anxiety
355 ^{56,57}. However, further research is warranted to validate this with a larger sample size.

356
357 Numerous studies have illustrated that TMS not only influences the stimulation site and its
358 directly connected network but also has effects that propagate to other brain networks⁵⁸.
359 Considering these distributed brain regions collectively within the framework of brain circuits
360 and networks, especially in relation to the impacts of TMS or the characterization of depression
361 patients^{59,60}, could enhance our understanding of the therapeutic effects of TMS in depression,
362 and also in the target selection. In support of this literature, we propose to characterize and
363 quantify such effects at the level of network connectivity. Recent studies have demonstrated that
364 rTMS may down-regulate and normalize hyperconnectivity of certain brain networks, such as the
365 DMN^{17,61} and the salience network⁶². Consistent with these findings, our study also reveals that
366 TMS induces significant negative modulations in the connectivity between brain networks,
367 including the DMN, control, and salience networks. These results are consistent with the
368 literature, where Chen et al. observed significant negative TMS modulations between the CCN
369 (lateral frontoparietal network⁵⁴ or central executive network) and the DMN when single-pulse
370 excitatory TMS delivered to the node of CCN⁷. Our results also are consistent with the findings

371 that TMS can normalize depression-related hyperconnectivity associated with DMN¹⁷. These
372 potentially suggest the engagement of these brain networks in the therapeutic mechanisms of
373 rTMS by normalizing the network hyperconnectivity in depression patients. However, unlike
374 these studies, our concurrent acquisition allows us to assess the acute modulatory effects of TMS
375 on network connectivity and potentially provides more causal insights into the interactions
376 between brain networks. Furthermore, our findings are in line with concurrent TMS-fMRI
377 research, showing that TMS application to the central executive network (CEN) node induces
378 causal negative downstream effects on the DMN⁷. We also found that the negative hubs in the
379 TMS-induced acute modulations on connectivity are located within the default, control, and
380 salience ventral attention networks, while positive hubs are primarily within the visual and
381 somatomotor networks. This reveals a differentiation in the top-down pathways involved in the
382 propagation of TMS-induced acute effects across brain networks, which aligns with the
383 categorized hub types hypothesis⁶³. Notably, some studies have reported that the TMS effects on
384 the connectivity of the visual networks contribute to therapeutic outcomes^{20,29}. In future studies,
385 it is worth further investigating TMS modulations on visual networks in comparison to its
386 negative modulations on the DMN and cognitive control networks. Thus, further exploration of
387 the excitatory and inhibitory effects of single-pulse TMS at the stimulation site¹¹, along with the
388 propagation of TMS effects through both positive and negative connections across distinct brain
389 hub regions, is warranted.

390
391 In this study, we utilized the phase of EEG prefrontal alpha oscillation as an indicator of brain
392 state and investigated the brain-state-dependent effects of TMS-induced brain activity. Our
393 results suggest that the propagation of TMS-induced BOLD activity from the L-DLPFC (EEG
394 F3 stimulation site) to regions within the L-FPN is dependent on the EEG prefrontal alpha phase.
395 Specifically, in conditions where TMS trials elicited a stronger response at the L-DLPFC (HLP
396 timing), areas within the L-FPN also exhibited a stronger response to these TMS pulses,
397 suggesting that the state-dependent spread patterns of TMS-induced activity closely follow the
398 functional connectivity of the L-DLPFC, with high spatial similarity. However, when examining
399 other ROIs proximate to the L-DLPFC F3 stimulation site, the results suggest distinct spread
400 patterns, underscoring the spatial specificity inherent to the localization or characterization of the
401 L-DLPFC ROIs. These findings align with existing literature, indicating that the spread of TMS-
402 induced activity from the L-DLPFC stimulation site follows the functional connectivity pattern
403 of the site¹². Nevertheless, Hawco et al. also reported that this relationship is mediated by the
404 characteristics of the L-DLPFC, particularly depending on its functional connectivity to the
405 salience network. Our results, along with the literature, highlight the critical role of leveraging
406 functional connectivity to guide TMS targeting²⁴. However, it should be noted that we assessed
407 the functional connectivity of the L-DLPFC with TMS-evoked responses regressed out to control
408 the confound of TMS-related activations. Future studies should explore the spread of TMS-
409 induced response and functional connectivity based on separate resting-state fMRI sessions to
410 completely rule out the possible interactions between spontaneous brain activity and TMS. In
411 this study, we used the prefrontal alpha oscillation phase as an index of brain state and assessed
412 state-dependent effects on both evoked response and modulated functional connectivity. This
413 choice was motivated by literature evidencing the gating mechanism of the alpha oscillation
414 phase. However, to further elucidate the state dependency of TMS-induced activity, future
415 research should consider other brain state indices, such as the power of alpha or the phase of
416 theta oscillation. In our previous investigations, we demonstrated that the TMS-evoked BOLD

417 response in the cingulate gyrus is dependent on the EEG prefrontal alpha phase³⁵. Additionally,
418 we have reported that alpha phase-synchronized rTMS treatment facilitates phase entrainment in
419 patients⁴⁸, with increased entrainment over time correlating with improved rTMS treatment
420 outcome³¹. Altogether, these findings contribute to the development of biomarkers for tracking
421 the efficacy of EEG-synchronized rTMS treatment⁶⁴. Following our previous findings, the
422 current study focused on quantifying the acute effects of TMS on fMRI signals and evaluating its
423 clinical relevance. These results add new perspectives to our understanding of TMS-induced
424 effects on brain networks and also shed light on the therapeutic effects of rTMS treatment in
425 depression.

426
427 The observed association between changes in state-specific connectivity modulation and clinical
428 outcomes suggested that patients who achieved a more increased modulated connectivity
429 between the left dorsal-prefrontal cortex and the right orbitofrontal cortex benefitted the most
430 from EEG-synchronized rTMS treatment. This brain circuit, which showed relevance to the
431 clinical outcome, is associated with the personalized prefrontal alpha phase (HLP condition) in
432 which TMS evoked the strongest response in the L-DPFC within the default mode (subnetwork
433 A). Furthermore, to examine spatial specificity, we assessed this relationship with other L-
434 DLPFC ROIs. Our results revealed that, when evaluating the phase-dependent response, the
435 strongest association to the clinical outcome was observed for the L-DLPFC within the
436 subnetwork A of the DMN, compared to the ROIs in the EEG F3 area, the subnetwork B of the
437 DMN and salience/ventral attention network (subnetwork B). However, caution should be taken
438 when evaluating the correlation coefficient results with a small sample size in this study. No such
439 association was observed when using patients in the UNSYNC group as a control group. These
440 findings highlight the potential systematic therapeutic effect of EEG-synchronized rTMS
441 treatment in engaging more specific brain circuits, which might be more directly related to the
442 clinical therapeutic effects in depression, as opposed to the possible widespread effects in the
443 unsynchronized rTMS treatment. The latter may induce effects across a wide range of brain
444 circuits, with TMS pulses during various brain states affecting distinct circuits. Randomly fired
445 TMS pulses at different prefrontal alpha phases could modulate different network connections,
446 with some pulses occurring at the right time actually having beneficial effects. Our findings align
447 with existing literature that the therapeutic mechanism of rTMS treatment is likely to involve the
448 circuit of the right orbitofrontal cortex (containing posterior sgACC) and L-DLPFC^{24,65}. Future
449 research with a larger cohort is necessary to validate these results.

450
451 This study is subject to several limitations that warrant consideration in the future. Firstly, while
452 our findings are promising, the current study is constrained by a relatively small sample size. Our
453 results demonstrated that quantified effects of TMS are correlated with clinical outcomes only in
454 the SYNC group, and results from the UNSYNC group served as a control. However, a direct
455 comparison of the UNSYNC group's results with those of conventional standard clinical TMS
456 treatments is challenging. This is attributed to the fact that, for the UNSYNC group, the patients
457 still received TMS pulses adjusted to their personalized prefrontal alpha frequency but with a
458 random phase. Another notable limitation is the absence of a sham intervention. The sensations
459 and auditory aspects associated with TMS may have influenced the quantified acute effects on
460 the fMRI signal. The study's double-blind design ensured that both groups experienced these
461 factors during the intervention similarly. However, future studies employing sham-controlled
462 interventions are needed to rule out any potential confounding effects caused by the sensory

463 stimulation during TMS. Furthermore, this study focused on optimizing the timing of TMS
464 targeting, but we did not employ a strategy for precise and individualized spatial targeting (EEG
465 F3 electrode was used as a target). Our findings suggest that varying responses across different
466 ROIs near the L-DLPFC may influence the propagation of the effects to distinct areas and,
467 consequently, the different extent of clinical outcome associations. The observed spread of TMS-
468 induced acute effects, potentially following functional connectivity patterns as suggested by our
469 results, underscores the need for future research to optimize spatial targeting of TMS based on
470 individualized functional connectivity and possible electric field modeling⁶⁶. In this EEG-
471 synchronized rTMS treatment, synchronization of TMS pulses with the personalized optimal
472 phase, which is associated with the largest evoked response in the cingulate, proves to be a novel
473 approach for TMS timing target selection. Building on the current study's results, future
474 investigations could explore optimizing timing selection based on the evoked responses in
475 specific brain networks, such as the cognitive control and limbic networks, or the modulated
476 connectivity between the L-DLPFC and the posterior sgACC in the limbic system. Additionally,
477 employing network neuroscience methodologies to select the best TMS timing could provide
478 novel intervention approaches that might lead to potentially optimized interaction, integration, or
479 segregation across brain networks, potentially leading towards optimized TMS effects on
480 behavior or TRD treatment.

481
482 In conclusion, the present study highlights the importance of quantifying TMS-induced acute
483 effects on brain network systems, including evoked response and modulated functional
484 connectivity. These quantifications demonstrate brain areas and circuits engaged in underlying
485 TMS perturbation and potentially their involvement in the therapeutic effects of rTMS treatment
486 in depression. Additionally, the state-dependent analyses established that, by conditioning on
487 different phases of the prefrontal alpha oscillation, the spread of TMS-induced activity follows
488 the functional connectivity of the stimulation site. Finally, in an exploration analysis with limited
489 sample size, longitudinal changes in the state-specific TMS-modulated connectivity in the brain
490 circuit of the stimulation site and sgACC are associated with the clinical outcome. These results
491 suggested that EEG-synchronized rTMS engages specific brain networks (right limbic and
492 bilateral cognitive control networks) and brain circuits (L-DLPFC and right posterior sgACC)
493 toward depression treatment. These results carry significant implications for the treatment of
494 TRD and the development of more precise and personalized TMS treatment protocols, with a
495 focus on both target selection and timing parameters.

496 497 • **Methods**

498 499 **Participants and procedure**

500 This randomized and double-blinded clinical trial study was conducted at the Medical University
501 of South Carolina (MUSC) Institute of Psychiatry (ClinicalTrials.gov ID: NCT032421808⁶⁷).
502 The experimental procedures of our study and the recruitment process were approved by the
503 MUSC institutional review board. All patients have provided informed consent to participate in
504 the study, and written consent was obtained from the participants.

505
506 Thirty-four TRD patients were enrolled in the study, and six subjects were excluded due to
507 voluntary withdrawal, claustrophobia, or inability to complete the pre-treatment MRI scan. Pre-
508 treatment fET data from the remaining twenty-eight patients (mean age \pm SD = 45 \pm 13 years,

509 female/male = 19/9) were collected. Then, these twenty-eight patients were randomized into the
510 SYNC or UNSYNC group before the treatment, with fifteen patients in the SYNC group and
511 thirteen patients in the UNSYNC group. Ten patients in the SYNC group completed the study,
512 with five patients excluded due to 1) life stress, 2) inability to adhere to the treatment schedule,
513 3) equipment unavailable, and 4) patients opting not to complete it. Ten patients in the UNSYNC
514 group completed the study, with three patients excluded due to 1) hospitalization, 2) equipment
515 unavailable, and 3) opting not to complete. All enrolled patients had a baseline HRSD (Ham-D
516 28-item) score greater than or equal to twenty at the time of enrollment. Details of patient
517 enrollment and inclusion/exclusion criteria were described elsewhere³¹.

518
519 After enrollment, we performed an integrated fET scan on the patients to determine an
520 individualized optimum phase ϕ_{opt} , which was defined as the phase that produced the largest
521 BOLD signal increase in the dACC. During the closed-loop EEG-rTMS treatment, patients in the
522 SYNC group received rTMS treatment with the target phase set as the individualized ϕ_{opt} , while
523 for the patients in the UNSYNC group, the target phase was randomly selected from a uniform
524 distribution between 0 to 2π . As the rTMS was delivered at the patients' daily individualized
525 alpha frequency (6-13 Hz), and the initial pulse was delivered at the pre-defined target phase,
526 patients in the SYNC group received rTMS pulses synchronized to the individualized optimum
527 phase, and patients in the UNSYNC group received rTMS pulses that were unrelated to the
528 patients' optimum phase (initial pulse was fired randomly). Each patient received one treatment
529 session each weekday for six weeks, with a total of thirty closed-loop EEG-rTMS treatment
530 sessions. During the treatment sessions, the TMS coil was placed at the L-DLPFC (F3 electrode)
531 with the dose of 120% motor threshold, 40 pulses per train, and 75 pulse train per session (3000
532 pulses in total per session). Details of the closed-loop EEG-rTMS treatment were described in
533 ^{31,48}. After the treatment, post-treatment fET scans were acquired from the remaining patients.
534 Each patient's HRSD was assessed during the pre- and post-treatment fET scans and before the
535 first treatment of each week. The experimental procedure and data analyses are illustrated in Fig.
536 1.

537 538 **Data acquisition and preprocessing**

539 An integrated fET instrument was developed and used in this study⁶⁸, where simultaneous EEG-
540 fMRI data were acquired from the patients while receiving single-pulse TMS at L-DLPFC. The
541 EEG data were acquired with a custom MR-compatible bipolar EEG cap (36 electrodes,
542 sampling rate = 488 Hz, Innovative Technologies, CA, USA). A Siemens 3T Prisma MRI
543 Scanner was used to acquire fMRI data with a custom 12-channel head coil (Rapid MR
544 International, LLC, Columbus, OH, USA). A modified MR-compatible TMS coil was used
545 (MagStim Rapid2) and configured to 100%-120% intensity of each subject's motor threshold.
546

547 Functional MRI data were collected with T2*-weighted multi-echo multiband pulse sequence
548 (CMRR, University of Minnesota) with parameters as follows: TR = 1750 ms with a 200 ms gap,
549 TE1 = 11.20 ms, TE2 = 32.36 ms, TE3 = 53.52 ms, flip angle 59 degrees, multiband acceleration
550 factor = 2, voxel size 3.2 x 3.2 x 3.2 mm, matrix size = 64 x 56 x 38, 233 volumes, six runs. T1-
551 weighted structural image was acquired with a 32-channel Siemens head coil (Multiecho
552 MPRAGE, TR = 2530 ms, TE = 1.55/3.26/5.12/6.98 ms, voxel size 1 x 1 x 1 mm, 176 slices).
553 Images with reversed phase encoding direction were acquired for geometric distortion correction.
554 Single-pulse TMS was delivered to the L-DLPFC (marked under the EEG F3 electrode, Beam

555 F3 locator) at the beginning of the TR gap, with inter-trial intervals drawn from a uniform
556 distribution (4-6 TRs). Details of data acquisition, EEG data preprocessing, and alpha phase
557 estimation were described in³⁵.

558
559 Functional MRI data were preprocessed with AFNI⁶⁹. Firstly, slice timing correction was
560 performed on each echo time series data. At the same time, susceptibility distortion correction
561 warping fields were estimated from echo-planar imaging (EPI) images with opposite phase
562 encoding direction. The co-registrations between functional and structural images were
563 performed using local Pearson correlation⁷⁰. Additionally, motion correction parameters were
564 estimated from the first echo time series data. Then, the estimated distortion correction warping
565 field, motion parameters, and co-registration transformations were concatenated and applied to
566 the slice timing corrected data of each echo time series. The transformed echoes were combined
567 into a single dataset with the optimally combined weights⁷¹. Lastly, the combined time series
568 dataset was spatially smoothed with a Gaussian kernel of full width at half maximum (FWHM) 5
569 mm and scaled to the percent of mean signal level with a mean of 100. Motion-related nuisance
570 signals (six standard head motion parameters and their temporal derivatives) were regressed out
571 from the preprocessed fMRI data before further analysis. No global signal regression was
572 applied. Spatial normalization was performed by using FLIRT⁷² and FNIRT⁷³ from the FSL
573 software package, where the structural T1-weighted MR image was initially affine transformed
574 and then non-linearly registered to the MNI152 (the nonlinear 6th generation atlas from FSL)
575 brain image.

576
577 Structural T1-weighted MR images were processed with the FreeSurfer pipeline⁷⁴, including
578 brain tissue segmentation and cerebral cortex surface reconstruction. Local-global Schaefer
579 cortical parcellation atlas⁷⁵ was used to define cortical ROI and network systems, which is an
580 fMRI-based parcellation approach integrating local gradient and global similarity approaches
581 based on resting state fMRI data from 1489 young adults. The Schaefer atlas was transformed to
582 each subject's cortical surface through surface-based registration using FreeSurfer. Then, the ROI
583 surface areas were projected into the volumetric space, where the cerebral cortex was parcellated
584 into 400 ROIs. The Schaefer atlas classified these 400 ROIs into 34 brain networks with 106
585 network nodes, with each node consisted of adjacent subregions of each node. The L-DLPFC
586 EEG F3 stimulation site ROI was defined in the MNI152 space with a 10 mm radius sphere
587 centered at the coordinate $MNI = [-37\ 26\ 49]$ ⁷⁶. For each subject, the L-DLPFC EEG F3 ROI
588 was warped into each subject's space with the estimated spatial normalization parameters and
589 intersected with the gray matter mask. To maintain consistency in brain parcellation, we also
590 assessed L-DLPFC ROIs near the EEG F3 stimulation site by selecting the ROIs from the
591 Schaefer atlas at the nearest distance to the EEG F3 coordinates. Specifically, we included L-
592 DLPFC ROIs near the stimulation site: 1) dorsal-PFC in the subnetwork A of the DMN; 2)
593 lateral-PFC in the subnetwork B of the DMN 3) lateral-PFC in the salience/ventral attention
594 network (subnetwork B).

595 596 **Whole-brain general linear model analysis**

597 To investigate the propagation patterns of TMS-induced effects on whole-brain BOLD signal,
598 we performed an event-related GLM analysis, where each TMS pulse was modeled as an
599 instantaneous event, convolved with a set of optimized basis functions known as FMRIB's linear
600 optimal basis set (FLOBS)⁷⁷. The use of FLOBS compared to the canonical hemodynamic

601 response function (HRF) allows more freedom in the variability of hemodynamic response, as
602 we expect the TMS-induced brain activity might be different from that evoked by conventional
603 fMRI task stimuli, and the FLOBS allows us to control the HRF variabilities across different
604 brain regions. The combined parameters from FLOBS were carried out for the group-level
605 analysis. Specifically, we computed the signed root mean square of the regression parameter
606 estimates from the subject-level⁷⁸. As the distribution of the combined statistic is non-Gaussian,
607 in the group-level analysis, we used FSL ‘Randomise tool’⁴⁹ for a nonparametric permutation
608 statistical testing (10000 permutations; $p < 0.05$ with multiple comparison correction across
609 space using voxel-wise family-wise error).

610

611 **Quantification of TMS-evoked BOLD response**

612 To assess subject-wise TMS-induced acute effects and quantify its inter-subject variability, we
613 quantified both the spatial extent and amplitude of TMS-evoked BOLD response across brain
614 networks. We defined the spatial extent of the induced response as the percent coverage of each
615 network by the propagation pattern of TMS-evoked BOLD response. Specifically, based on the
616 subject-wise whole-brain GLM analysis results, the spatial extent of each network activated by
617 the TMS was computed as the number of significantly activated voxels divided by the total
618 number of voxels within each network. Then, to quantify the amplitude of TMS-evoked BOLD
619 response for each brain network, we performed ROI analysis, where the mean BOLD signal of
620 each ROI was modeled by the TMS pulse timing regressor (TMS pulse timing boxcar function
621 convolved with the FLOBS basis set) with GLM. The signed root mean square of the regression
622 parameter estimates was summed across ROIs within each network to compute the amplitude of
623 the network's induced response.

624

625 **Functional connectivity and hub analysis**

626 To examine the TMS-induced acute modulation of FC, we performed a whole-brain PPI
627 analysis⁵¹⁻⁵³. Firstly, the BOLD signal from each parcellated cortical region was extracted with
628 SPM⁷⁹. Then, to compute the TMS-dependent functional connectivity, we used multiple
629 regression, where the BOLD signal of an ROI *A* was modeled as a linear combination of multiple
630 independent variables including 1) BOLD signal of ROI *B*; 2) TMS-induced BOLD response (a
631 boxcar function representing the timing of TMS pulses convolved with FLOBS); 3) PPI
632 interaction between the BOLD signal at ROI *B* and the timing of TMS pulses; 4) nuisance
633 variables (motion parameters, large motion volumes, BOLD signal in white matter, and BOLD
634 signal in lateral ventricle). The interaction between the BOLD signal from one ROI and the task
635 regressor was modeled by first deconvolving the BOLD signal from the canonical HRF and then
636 being multiplied by the task timing boxcar function, and lastly re-convolving with the HRF. As
637 the PPI analysis focuses on the second-order task modulation, controlling the first-order task
638 modulation (task-evoked mean activation) is necessary, as the task-evoked mean activation could
639 be a potential confounder and drives the false positive observed interaction between regions⁸⁰.
640 Specifically, FLOBS-based task regression was performed to account for the task-evoked mean
641 activation, which has been shown to achieve relatively low false positive results in controlling
642 the confounds⁸⁰. The TMS-modulated functional connectivity matrix (beta estimates of the
643 interaction term in the GLM model) between each pair of ROI *A* and *B* was extracted,
644 symmetrized (averaging the upper and lower triangles), and summarized within/between

645 parcellated brain networks. Finally, we assessed positive/negative node strength by computing
646 the sum of all positive/negative connection weights associated with each node.
647

648 In addition to the TMS-modulated connectivity, we also assessed correlation-based functional
649 connectivity. The seed-based functional connectivity analysis of the L-DLPFC was performed
650 with a mixed-effects model. The functional connectivity of each patient was computed based on
651 the Pearson correlation between the time series of each ROI and the time series of each voxel in
652 the brain. Before computing the Pearson correlation, the TMS-related variabilities (modeled with
653 FLOBS basis sets) were regressed out from the preprocessed fMRI time series. Then, each
654 subject's functional connectivity map was transformed into a z-score with Fisher's Z
655 transformation and threshold at $p < 0.01$. One sample student's t-test was performed at the group
656 level to obtain the seed-based functional connectivity t-value map of the ROI.
657

658 **Brain-state dependency analysis**

659 The aim of this analysis was to assess whether single-pulse TMS delivered at different timing
660 relative to the prefrontal alpha oscillation modulates brain network systems differently. To
661 examine the brain-state dependency effect of TMS delivery, we used the phase of prefrontal
662 alpha oscillation to index the brain state. Specifically, we extracted prefrontal alpha oscillation
663 from the EEG signals at channels FP1, F3, and F7, and the alpha phase at TMS onset was
664 estimated (details in³⁵). Based on the alpha phase, TMS trials were grouped into four bins (bin 1:
665 $-\pi$ to $-1/2 \pi$, bin 2: $-1/2 \pi$ to 0, bin 3: 0 to $1/2 \pi$, and bin 4: $1/2 \pi$ to π), and we investigated the
666 TMS effects on brain network systems for the trials in different phase bins.
667

668 Firstly, to examine the brain-state dependency of the TMS evoked response, we used GLM to
669 model the BOLD signal at L-DLPFC (EEG F3 stimulation site), with the trials in each phase bin
670 as a separate regressor (Fig. 6). This analysis aimed to identify two TMS trial conditions for each
671 subject: 1) HLP condition was defined as the condition where a high TMS evoked response was
672 introduced at the stimulation site (L-DLPFC); 2) LLP condition was defined with a low evoked
673 response at L-DLPFC. Because the phase bins groups differ in the number of trials and the
674 temporal spacing, this might potentially lead to biased estimation of BOLD response and the trial
675 conditions identification. To prevent such bias during HLP/LLP conditions identification, we
676 performed bootstrapping where same number of trials were randomly chosen for each phase bin
677 to construct the regressors. Here, we set the selected trial number as eighty percent of the trial
678 number in the phase bin with the smallest number of trials, and we repeated the bootstrapping
679 process with 500 iterations. For each subject, the phase bins that generated the highest and
680 lowest evoked response at L-DLPFC were identified as the subject-wise HLP and LLP bins,
681 respectively. Then, we assessed the contrast between the conditions of HLP and LLP bins.
682 Whole-brain GLM analysis was performed to identify other brain areas with a significantly
683 higher evoked response for the TMS trials in the HLP bins compared to that in the LLP bins
684 (correlates of the HLP-vs-LLP contrast). The beta-weight maps of the estimated contrast were
685 carried out to the group level, and a voxel-wise t-test against zero was performed with
686 uncorrected threshold of $p < 0.001$.
687

688 Additionally, we also examined the brain-state dependency of TMS-modulated functional
689 connectivity. Similar to the PPI analysis in the previous section, the same approach was adapted
690 to assess the modulated FC for the TMS trials in each phase bin. In this analysis, the PPI

691 interaction terms include four regressors, and each of them models the interaction between the
692 BOLD signal at ROI *B* and the timing of TMS pulses in each phase bin.
693




Fig. 6. Brain-state dependency analysis of TMS-induced acute effects using alpha phase from the prefrontal EEG signal. TMS trials were grouped into four categories with different prefrontal alpha phase bins (illustrated with different colors), where the prefrontal alpha oscillation was extracted from the concurrent EEG recordings at electrodes FP1, F3, and F7. Effects from the TMS trials in different phase bins were modeled with general linear modeling, where the BOLD signal at L-DLPFC (EEG F3 stimulation site) was modeled with the TMS trials in each phase bin as a separate regressor. The phase bins that generated the highest and lowest BOLD response at L-DLPFC were identified as the subject-wise high-load-phase (HLP) and low-load-phase (LLP) conditions, respectively.

694

695 **Associations between TMS effects and clinical response**

696 Pearson correlation coefficient was used to assess the relationship between neuroimaging
697 measurements of TMS effects and the clinical response. The clinical response was quantified as
698 the percent improvement of the HRSD score since the baseline, i.e. $100 \times (\text{pre-treatment score} -$
699 $\text{post-treatment score}) / \text{pre-treatment score}$. We also assessed whether the neuroimaging
700 measurements (TMS-induced response and TMS-modulated functional connectivity) at baseline
701 pre-treatment scan are predictive biomarkers of the clinical response. Additionally, to explore the
702 potential mechanisms of action underlying EEG-synchronized rTMS treatment, we also
703 examined the longitudinal changes in the neuroimaging measurements of TMS effects.
704 Specifically, we quantified the changes in the TMS-induced response, modulated functional

705 connectivity by all TMS trials, and modulated functional connectivity by TMS trials in the HLP
706 bin (state-specific modulation). Finally, we tested their associations with the clinical response as
707 well.

708

709 **Data and code availability**

710 The datasets analyzed in the current study are available from the corresponding author on
711 reasonable request. Custom codes used in this work are available at
712 https://github.com/hehengda/fMRI_EEG_TMS.git.

713

714

715 • **Reference**

716

- 717 1. Cole, E. J. *et al.* Stanford Neuromodulation Therapy (SNT): A Double-Blind Randomized
718 Controlled Trial. *Am J Psychiatry* **179**, 132–141 (2022).
- 719 2. Perera, T. *et al.* The Clinical TMS Society Consensus Review and Treatment
720 Recommendations for TMS Therapy for Major Depressive Disorder. *Brain Stimul* **9**, 336–
721 346 (2016).
- 722 3. Tik, M. *et al.* Towards understanding rTMS mechanism of action: Stimulation of the
723 DLPFC causes network-specific increase in functional connectivity. *Neuroimage* **162**,
724 289–296 (2017).
- 725 4. Anderson, R. J., Hoy, K. E., Daskalakis, Z. J. & Fitzgerald, P. B. Repetitive transcranial
726 magnetic stimulation for treatment resistant depression: Re-establishing connections.
727 *Clinical Neurophysiology* **127**, 3394–3405 (2016).
- 728 5. Sydnor, V. J. *et al.* Cortical-subcortical structural connections support transcranial
729 magnetic stimulation engagement of the amygdala. *Sci Adv* **8**, 5803 (2022).
- 730 6. Oathes, D. J. *et al.* Non-invasively targeting, probing and modulating a deep brain circuit
731 for depression alleviation. *Nature Mental Health* **2023 1:12 1**, 1033–1042 (2023).
- 732 7. Chen, A. C. *et al.* Causal interactions between fronto-parietal central executive and
733 default-mode networks in humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**,
734 19944–19949 (2013).
- 735 8. Hanlon, C. A., Dowdle, L. T., Moss, H., Canterberry, M. & George, M. S. Mobilization of
736 Medial and Lateral Frontal-Striatal Circuits in Cocaine Users and Controls: An
737 Interleaved TMS/BOLD Functional Connectivity Study. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **2016**
738 *41:13 41*, 3032–3041 (2016).
- 739 9. Hanlon, C. A. *et al.* Probing the Frontostriatal Loops Involved in Executive and Limbic
740 Processing via Interleaved TMS and Functional MRI at Two Prefrontal Locations: A Pilot
741 Study. *PLoS One* **8**, e67917 (2013).
- 742 10. Dowdle, L. T., Brown, T. R., George, M. S. & Hanlon, C. A. Single pulse TMS to the
743 DLPFC, compared to a matched sham control, induces a direct, causal increase in caudate,
744 cingulate, and thalamic BOLD signal. *Brain Stimul* **11**, 789–796 (2018).
- 745 11. Rafiei, F. & Rahnev, D. TMS Does Not Increase BOLD Activity at the Site of
746 Stimulation: A Review of All Concurrent TMS-fMRI Studies. *eNeuro* vol. 9 Preprint at
747 <https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0163-22.2022> (2022).

- 748 12. Hawco, C. *et al.* Spread of activity following TMS is related to intrinsic resting
749 connectivity to the salience network: A concurrent TMS-fMRI study. *Cortex* **108**, 160–
750 172 (2018).
- 751 13. Vink, J. J. T. *et al.* A novel concurrent TMS-fMRI method to reveal propagation patterns
752 of prefrontal magnetic brain stimulation. *Hum Brain Mapp* **39**, 4580–4592 (2018).
- 753 14. Eshel, N. *et al.* Global connectivity and local excitability changes underlie antidepressant
754 effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **2020**
755 *45:6* **45**, 1018–1025 (2020).
- 756 15. Cocchi, L. *et al.* Dissociable effects of local inhibitory and excitatory theta-burst
757 stimulation on large-scale brain dynamics. *J Neurophysiol* **113**, 3375–3385 (2015).
- 758 16. Tik, M. *et al.* Acute TMS/fMRI response explains offline TMS network effects-An
759 interleaved TMS-fMRI study. *Neuroimage* **267**, 119833 (2023).
- 760 17. Liston, C. *et al.* Default Mode Network Mechanisms of Transcranial Magnetic
761 Stimulation in Depression. *Biol Psychiatry* **76**, 517–526 (2014).
- 762 18. Siddiqi, S. H. *et al.* Distinct symptom-specific treatment targets for circuit-based
763 neuromodulation. *American Journal of Psychiatry* **177**, 435–446 (2020).
- 764 19. Philip, N. S. *et al.* Network Mechanisms of Clinical Response to Transcranial Magnetic
765 Stimulation in Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and Major Depressive Disorder. *Biol*
766 *Psychiatry* **83**, 263–272 (2018).
- 767 20. Ge, R., Downar, J., Blumberger, D. M., Daskalakis, Z. J. & Vila-Rodriguez, F. Functional
768 connectivity of the anterior cingulate cortex predicts treatment outcome for rTMS in
769 treatment-resistant depression at 3-month follow-up. *Brain Stimul* **13**, 206–214 (2020).
- 770 21. Hartwigsen, G. Flexible Redistribution in Cognitive Networks. *Trends Cogn Sci* **22**, 687–
771 698 (2018).
- 772 22. Bergmann, T. O. *et al.* Concurrent TMS-fMRI for causal network perturbation and proof
773 of target engagement. *Neuroimage* **237**, 118093 (2021).
- 774 23. Tik, M. *et al.* Acute TMS/fMRI response explains offline TMS network effects-An
775 interleaved TMS-fMRI study. *Neuroimage* **267**, 119833 (2023).
- 776 24. Fox, M. D., Buckner, R. L., White, M. P., Greicius, M. D. & Pascual-Leone, A. Efficacy
777 of Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Targets for Depression Is Related to Intrinsic
778 Functional Connectivity with the Subgenual Cingulate. *Biol Psychiatry* **72**, 595–603
779 (2012).
- 780 25. Fitzgerald, P. B. Targeting repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in depression: do
781 we really know what we are stimulating and how best to do it? *Brain Stimulation* vol. 14
782 730–736 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2021.04.018> (2021).
- 783 26. Luber, B. *et al.* Using diffusion tensor imaging to effectively target TMS to deep brain
784 structures. *Neuroimage* **249**, 118863 (2022).
- 785 27. Luber, B. M. *et al.* Using neuroimaging to individualize TMS treatment for depression:
786 Toward a new paradigm for imaging-guided intervention. *Neuroimage* **148**, 1–7 (2017).
- 787 28. Menardi, A. *et al.* Maximizing brain networks engagement via individualized
788 connectome-wide target search. *Brain Stimul* **15**, 1418–1431 (2022).
- 789 29. Moreno-Ortega, M. *et al.* Parcel-guided rTMS for depression. *Translational Psychiatry*
790 *2020 10:1* **10**, 1–6 (2020).
- 791 30. Kaur, M. *et al.* Investigating high- and low-frequency neuro-cardiac-guided TMS for
792 probing the frontal vagal pathway. *Brain Stimul* **13**, 931–938 (2020).

- 793 31. George, M. S. *et al.* EEG synchronized left prefrontal transcranial magnetic stimulation
794 (TMS) for treatment resistant depression is feasible and produces an entrainment
795 dependent clinical response: A randomized controlled double blind clinical trial. *Brain*
796 *Stimul* **16**, 1753–1763 (2023).
- 797 32. Sun, X. *et al.* Biomarkers predict the efficacy of closed-loop rTMS treatment for
798 refractory depression. *Res Sq* (2023) doi:10.21203/RS.3.RS-3496521/V1.
- 799 33. Jin, Y. & Phillips, B. A pilot study of the use of EEG-based synchronized Transcranial
800 Magnetic Stimulation (sTMS) for treatment of Major Depression. *BMC Psychiatry* **14**, 1–
801 6 (2014).
- 802 34. Leuchter, A. F. *et al.* Efficacy and Safety of Low-field Synchronized Transcranial
803 Magnetic Stimulation (sTMS) for Treatment of Major Depression. *Brain Stimul* **8**, 787–
804 794 (2015).
- 805 35. Pantazatos, S. P. *et al.* The timing of transcranial magnetic stimulation relative to the
806 phase of prefrontal alpha EEG modulates downstream target engagement. *Brain Stimul*
807 **16**, 830–839 (2023).
- 808 36. Zrenner, B. *et al.* Brain oscillation-synchronized stimulation of the left dorsolateral
809 prefrontal cortex in depression using real-time EEG-triggered TMS. *Brain Stimul* **13**, 197–
810 205 (2020).
- 811 37. Bestmann, S. *et al.* Dorsal Premotor Cortex Exerts State-Dependent Causal Influences on
812 Activity in Contralateral Primary Motor and Dorsal Premotor Cortex. *Cerebral Cortex* **18**,
813 1281–1291 (2008).
- 814 38. Luber, B. *et al.* Using Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation to Test a Network Model of
815 Perceptual Decision Making in the Human Brain. *Front Hum Neurosci* **14**, 450862 (2020).
- 816 39. Luber, B. *et al.* Facilitation of performance in a working memory task with rTMS
817 stimulation of the precuneus: Frequency- and time-dependent effects. *Brain Res* **1128**,
818 120–129 (2007).
- 819 40. Peters, J. C. *et al.* Concurrent human TMS-EEG-fMRI enables monitoring of oscillatory
820 brain state-dependent gating of cortico-subcortical network activity. *Communications*
821 *Biology* **2020 3:1 3**, 1–11 (2020).
- 822 41. Bradley, C., Nydam, A. S., Dux, P. E. & Mattingley, J. B. State-dependent effects of
823 neural stimulation on brain function and cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **2022**
824 **23:8 23**, 459–475 (2022).
- 825 42. Greene, A. S., Horien, C., Barson, D., Scheinost, D. & Constable, R. T. Why is everyone
826 talking about brain state? *Trends Neurosci* **0**, (2023).
- 827 43. Ronconi, L., Busch, N. A. & Melcher, D. Alpha-band sensory entrainment alters the
828 duration of temporal windows in visual perception. *Scientific Reports* **2018 8:1 8**, 1–10
829 (2018).
- 830 44. Milton, A. & Pleydell-Pearce, C. W. The phase of pre-stimulus alpha oscillations
831 influences the visual perception of stimulus timing. *Neuroimage* **133**, 53–61 (2016).
- 832 45. Klimesch, W. Alpha-band oscillations, attention, and controlled access to stored
833 information. *Trends Cogn Sci* **16**, 606–617 (2012).
- 834 46. Sadaghiani, S. *et al.* Alpha-Band Phase Synchrony Is Related to Activity in the Fronto-
835 Parietal Adaptive Control Network. *Journal of Neuroscience* **32**, 14305–14310 (2012).
- 836 47. Busch, N. A., Dubois, J. & VanRullen, R. The Phase of Ongoing EEG Oscillations
837 Predicts Visual Perception. *Journal of Neuroscience* **29**, 7869–7876 (2009).

- 838 48. Faller, J. *et al.* Daily prefrontal closed-loop repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation
839 (rTMS) produces progressive EEG quasi-alpha phase entrainment in depressed adults.
840 *Brain Stimul* **15**, 458–471 (2022).
- 841 49. Winkler, A. M., Ridgway, G. R., Webster, M. A., Smith, S. M. & Nichols, T. E.
842 Permutation inference for the general linear model. *Neuroimage* **92**, 381–397 (2014).
- 843 50. Dowdle, L. T., Brown, T. R., George, M. S. & Hanlon, C. A. Single pulse TMS to the
844 DLPFC, compared to a matched sham control, induces a direct, causal increase in caudate,
845 cingulate, and thalamic BOLD signal. *Brain Stimul* **11**, 789–796 (2018).
- 846 51. Gerchen, M. F., Bernal-Casas, D. & Kirsch, P. Analyzing task-dependent brain network
847 changes by whole-brain psychophysiological interactions: A comparison to conventional
848 analysis. *Hum Brain Mapp* **35**, 5071–5082 (2014).
- 849 52. Friston, K. J. *et al.* Psychophysiological and Modulatory Interactions in Neuroimaging.
850 *Neuroimage* **6**, 218–229 (1997).
- 851 53. Tompson, S. H., Kahn, A. E., Falk, E. B., Vettel, J. M. & Bassett, D. S. Functional brain
852 network architecture supporting the learning of social networks in humans. *Neuroimage*
853 **210**, 116498 (2020).
- 854 54. Uddin, L. Q., Yeo, B. T. T. & Spreng, R. N. Towards a Universal Taxonomy of Macro-
855 scale Functional Human Brain Networks. *Brain Topogr* **32**, 926–942 (2019).
- 856 55. Oathes, D. J. *et al.* Resting fMRI-guided TMS results in subcortical and brain network
857 modulation indexed by interleaved TMS/fMRI. *Exp Brain Res* **239**, 1165–1178 (2021).
- 858 56. Seeley, W. W. *et al.* Dissociable intrinsic connectivity networks for salience processing
859 and executive control. *Journal of Neuroscience* **27**, 2349–2356 (2007).
- 860 57. Stein, M. B., Simmons, A. N., Feinstein, J. S. & Paulus, M. P. Increased amygdala and
861 insula activation during emotion processing in anxiety-prone subjects. *American Journal*
862 *of Psychiatry* **164**, 318–327 (2007).
- 863 58. Beynel, L., Powers, J. P. & Appelbaum, L. G. Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic
864 stimulation on resting-state connectivity: A systematic review. *Neuroimage* **211**, 116596
865 (2020).
- 866 59. Iseger, T. A., Van Bueren, N. E. R., Kenemans, J. L., Gevirtz, R. & Arns, M. A frontal-
867 vagal network theory for Major Depressive Disorder: Implications for optimizing
868 neuromodulation techniques. (2019) doi:10.1016/j.brs.2019.10.006.
- 869 60. Siddiqi, S. H. *et al.* Brain stimulation and brain lesions converge on common causal
870 circuits in neuropsychiatric disease. *Nature Human Behaviour* **2021 5:12** **5**, 1707–1716
871 (2021).
- 872 61. Dichter, G. S., Gibbs, D. & Smoski, M. J. A systematic review of relations between
873 resting-state functional-MRI and treatment response in major depressive disorder. *J Affect*
874 *Disord* **172**, 8–17 (2015).
- 875 62. Godfrey, K. E. M., Muthukumaraswamy, S. D., Stinear, C. M. & Hoeh, N. Decreased
876 salience network fMRI functional connectivity following a course of rTMS for treatment-
877 resistant depression. *J Affect Disord* **300**, 235–242 (2022).
- 878 63. Gordon, E. M. *et al.* Three Distinct Sets of Connector Hubs Integrate Human Brain
879 Function. *Cell Rep* **24**, 1687-1695.e4 (2018).
- 880 64. Sun, X. *et al.* Biomarkers predict the efficacy of closed-loop rTMS treatment for
881 refractory depression. *Res Sq* (2023) doi:10.21203/RS.3.RS-3496521/V1.

- 882 65. Baeken, C. *et al.* Accelerated HF-rTMS in treatment-resistant unipolar depression:
883 Insights from subgenual anterior cingulate functional connectivity. *World J Biol*
884 *Psychiatry* **15**, 286–297 (2014).
- 885 66. Balderston, N. L. *et al.* A generalized workflow for conducting electric field-optimized,
886 fMRI-guided, transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Nature Protocols* **2020 15:11 15**, 3595–
887 3614 (2020).
- 888 67. ClinicalTrials.gov id: Nct03421808. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT03421808> (2018).
- 889 68. Faller, J. *et al.* An EEG-fMRI-TMS instrument to investigate BOLD response to EEG
890 guided stimulation. *International IEEE/EMBS Conference on Neural Engineering, NER*
891 **2019-March**, 1054–1057 (2019).
- 892 69. Cox, R. W. & Hyde, J. S. Software Tools for Analysis and Visualization of fMRI Data.
893 (1997) doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1492(199706/08)10:4/5.
- 894 70. Saad, Z. S. *et al.* A new method for improving functional-to-structural MRI alignment
895 using local Pearson correlation. *Neuroimage* **44**, 839–848 (2009).
- 896 71. Kundu, P., Inati, S. J., Evans, J. W., Luh, W. M. & Bandettini, P. A. Differentiating
897 BOLD and non-BOLD signals in fMRI time series using multi-echo EPI. *Neuroimage* **60**,
898 1759–1770 (2012).
- 899 72. Jenkinson, M., Bannister, P., Brady, M. & Smith, S. Improved optimization for the robust
900 and accurate linear registration and motion correction of brain images. *Neuroimage* **17**,
901 825–841 (2002).
- 902 73. Andersson, J. L. R., Jenkinson, M., Smith, S. & others. Non-linear registration, aka Spatial
903 normalisation FMRIB technical report TR07JA2. *FMRIB Analysis Group of the*
904 *University of Oxford* **2**, e21 (2007).
- 905 74. Fischl, B. *et al.* Automatically parcellating the human cerebral cortex. *Cerebral Cortex* **14**,
906 11–22 (2004).
- 907 75. Schaefer, A. *et al.* Local-Global Parcellation of the Human Cerebral Cortex from Intrinsic
908 Functional Connectivity MRI. *Cerebral Cortex* **28**, 3095–3114 (2018).
- 909 76. Herwig, U., Satrapi, P. & Schönfeldt-Lecuona, C. Using the International 10-20 EEG
910 System for Positioning of Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation. *Brain Topogr* **16**, 95–99
911 (2003).
- 912 77. Woolrich, M. W., Behrens, T. E. J. & Smith, S. M. Constrained linear basis sets for HRF
913 modelling using Variational Bayes. *Neuroimage* **21**, 1748–1761 (2004).
- 914 78. Calhoun, V. D., Stevens, M. C., Pearlson, G. D. & Kiehl, K. A. fMRI analysis with the
915 general linear model: Removal of latency-induced amplitude bias by incorporation of
916 hemodynamic derivative terms. *Neuroimage* **22**, 252–257 (2004).
- 917 79. Penny, W., Friston, K., Ashburner, J., Kiebel, S. & Nichols, T. *Statistical Parametric*
918 *Mapping: The Analysis of Functional Brain Images. Statistical Parametric Mapping: The*
919 *Analysis of Functional Brain Images* (Elsevier Ltd, 2007). doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-
920 372560-8.X5000-1.
- 921 80. Cole, M. W. *et al.* Task activations produce spurious but systematic inflation of task
922 functional connectivity estimates. *Neuroimage* **189**, 1–18 (2019).
- 923
924
925
926
927

928 **Acknowledgments**

929 This work was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health (MH106775), a Vannevar
930 Bush Faculty Fellowship from the US Department of Defense (N00014-20-1-2027) a Center of
931 Excellence grant from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (FA9550-22-1-0337) and by
932 DARPA (HR00112320032).

933

934 **Author contributions**

935 Design of research: H.H., T.R.B., M.S.G., and P.S.; Methodology: H.H., X.S., J.D., J.F., R.I.G.,
936 T.R.B., M.S.G., and P.S.; Formal analysis: H.H.; Data collection: J.D., J.F., G.T.S., S.H., R.I.G.,
937 T.R.B., M.S.G., and P.S.; Writing original draft: H.H.; Writing, review, and editing: H.H., X.S.,
938 J.D., J.F., J.R.M., G.T.S., S.H., L.H., S.P.P., H.Y., L.M.M., R.I.G., T.R.B., M.S.G., and P.S.;
939 Funding and supervision: L.M.M., R.I.G., T.R.B., M.S.G. and P.S.

940

941 **Competing interest statement**

942 P.S. is a scientific advisor to Optios Inc. and OpenBCI LLC.