Supplementary Materials

Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience

A Transdiagnostic Data-driven Study of Children's Behaviour and the Functional Connectome

Age Distributions



Figure S1. Age distributions in the whole sample (left) and the functional connectome sample (right).

MRI Sample Demographics

Table S1. MRI Sample Characteristics

	Struggling learners (*n*=175)	Comparison sample (*n*=63)
Age in years: *M* (*SD*)	10.36 (2.23)	10.79 (2.04)
Boys: *n*	115 (65.71%)	29 (46.03%)
Girls: *n*	60 (34.29%)	34 (53.97%)
No diagnosis: *n*	109 (62.29%)	60 (95.24%)
ADHD: *n*	35 (20%)	1 (1.59%)
Suspected ADHD: *n*	10 (5.71%)	0 (0%)
Autism: *n*	13 (7.43%)	0 (0%)
Dyslexia: *n*	17 (9.71%)	2 (3.17%)

Evaluation of rsfMRI denoising strategies

A number of pipelines were evaluated to denoise motion and physiological artefacts from the resting-state fMRI data using the fmridenoise package in Python (https://github.com/compneuro-ncu/fmridenoise). The pipelines included combinations of different methods and regressors:

- 24 Head Motion Parameters (24HMP) – Regression of the 6 rigid body realignment parameters, their squares, their first derivatives, and the squares of the first derivatives
- 8 Physiological regressors (8Phys) – Regression of the time series activity from the CSF and WM masks, their squares, their first derivatives, and the squares of the first derivatives
- 4 Global Signal Regressors (4GSR) – Regression of the whole-brain time series activity, its square, first derivative, and square of the first derivative
- Motion spike regression (SpikeReg) – Regression of volumes where framewise displacement (FD) was greater than 0.5mm or where the BOLD signal change (DVARS) was 3 standard deviations away from the mean (Power, Barnes, Snyder, Schlaggar, & Petersen, 2012)
- Anatomical component correction (aCompCor) – Regression of 10 principal components estimated from the CSF and WM matter masks (Behzadi, Restom, Liau, & Liu, 2007)
- ICA-AROMA – Estimation of independent components using MELODIC in FSL, automatic identification of noise components, and their subsequent regression from the data (Pruim et al., 2015)

24HMP_aCompCor_SpikeReg (coloured pink in the following figures) was selected because it was the best performing pipeline across a number of quality control measures. It is also widely implemented as the default denoising pipeline in Conn (Whitfield-Gabrieli & Nieto-Castanon, 2012). Although GSR pipelines performed well on various quality metrics, we did not implement it here because GSR is a highly controversial technique that may remove neural signal and introduce spurious anti-correlations (Murphy & Fox, 2017).



Figure S2. The density of edge weights across various denoising pipelines



Figure S3. The average correlation between average movement (FD) and functional connectivity at each edge.



Figure S4. The average correlation between functional connectivity at each edge and the Euclidean distance between nodes.



Figure S5. The functional degrees of freedom lost (fDOF) according to the number of confound regressors used.



Figure S6. The correlation matrix (Pearson's R) after the selected confound regression strategy including: 24 head movement parameters, 10 principal components from WM and CSF, and motion spikes (left). The corresponding correlation between average movement and functional connectivity at each edge (right). Note, the 200 region parcellation from Schaefer et al. (2018) was used here.

Supplementary Results

Table S2. Behavioural profiles in the full sample

	Controls		C1		C2		C3	
Conners scale:	Median	MAD	Median	MAD	Median	MAD	Median	MAD
Inattention	52.5	9.5	84	6	89	1	79	9.5
Hyperactivity/Impulsivity	53	8	88	2	81.5	8.5	59	11
Learning Problems	46	4	69	11	81	8	85	5
Executive Function (cool)	51	9	76	9	80.5	7.5	70	9
Aggression	46	2	84	6	52	7	54	9
Peer Relations	46	2	90	0	58	13	84	6

Note. Median scores and Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) on the Conners subscales for each group.

Table S3. Pairwise group differences on the Conners scales in the full sample

Conners scale:	Group 1	Group 2	Median Difference	*U*	*p*	Effect size
Inattention	Controls	C1	31.5	6672	<0.001	0.875
	Controls	C2	36.5	2742	<0.001	0.933
	Controls	C3	26.5	4704	<0.001	0.833
	C1	C2	5	31730	<0.001	0.64
	C1	C3	-5	23987	<0.001	0.602
	C2	C3	-10	12081	<0.001	0.739
Hyperactivity/Impulsivity	Controls	C1	35	7522	<0.001	0.86
	Controls	C2	28.5	6918	<0.001	0.832
	Controls	C3	6	10948	0.001	0.611
	C1	C2	-6.5	35883	<0.001	0.593
	C1	C3	-29	10676	<0.001	0.823
	C2	C3	-22.5	10529	<0.001	0.772
Learning Problems	Controls	C1	23	7424	<0.001	0.861
	Controls	C2	35	2020	<0.001	0.951
	Controls	C3	39	934	<0.001	0.967
	C1	C2	12	26260	<0.001	0.702
	C1	C3	16	13556	<0.001	0.775
	C2	C3	4	18416	<0.001	0.602
Executive Function (cool)	Controls	C1	25	8577	<0.001	0.84
	Controls	C2	29.5	3289	<0.001	0.92
	Controls	C3	19	5704	<0.001	0.797
	C1	C2	4.5	30395	<0.001	0.655
	C1	C3	-6	23790	<0.001	0.606
	C2	C3	-10.5	11082	<0.001	0.761
Aggression	Controls	C1	38	8880	<0.001	0.834
	Controls	C2	6	19366	0.961	0.529
	Controls	C3	8	10976	0.001	0.61
	C1	C2	-32	14856	<0.001	0.831
	C1	C3	-30	13620	<0.001	0.774
	C2	C3	2	19098	0.005	0.587
Peer Relations	Controls	C1	44	7768	<0.001	0.855
	Controls	C2	12	14327	<0.001	0.651
	Controls	C3	38	5310	<0.001	0.811
	C1	C2	-32	20302	<0.001	0.77
	C1	C3	-6	24754	<0.001	0.59
	C2	C3	26	13763	<0.001	0.703

Note. The table dispalys the pariwise median differences (Group2-Group1) between the groups on each subscale of the Conners. Mann-Whitney U-tests assess whether two samples come from different population distributions. The common language effect size is the probability that a randomly selected sample from one group has a higher score than a random sample from the other group. P-values are Bonferroni corrected for the total number of group comparisons.

Table S4. Behavioural profiles in the MRI sample

	Controls		C1		C2		C3	
Conners scale:	Median	MAD	Median	MAD	Median	MAD	Median	MAD
Inattention	50.5	10	84	6	90	0	81	9
Hyperactivity/Impulsivity	51	7	85.5	4.5	80	10	60	13
Learning Problems	46	4	67	11	81	9	88	2
Executive Function (cool)	46	6	73.5	9.5	80.5	6.5	72	8
Aggression	46	1	69.5	17.5	48.5	4.5	53	8
Peer Relations	46	1	69.5	17.5	48.5	4.5	53	8

Note. Median scores and Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) on the Conners subscales for each group.

Table S5. Pairwise group differences on the Conners scales in the MRI sample

Conners scale:	Group 1	Group 2	Median difference	*U*	*p*	Effect size
Inattention	Controls	C1	33.5	692	<0.001	0.84
	Controls	C2	39.5	270	<0.001	0.922
	Controls	C3	30.5	454	<0.001	0.844
	C1	C2	6	1096	<0.001	0.72
	C1	C3	-3	1544	1	0.531
	C2	C3	-9	704	<0.001	0.733
Hyperactivity/Impulsivity	Controls	C1	34.5	680	<0.001	0.843
	Controls	C2	29	599	<0.001	0.827
	Controls	C3	9	1061	0.046	0.636
	C1	C2	-5.5	1746	0.85	0.555
	C1	C3	-25.5	708	<0.001	0.785
	C2	C3	-20	660	<0.001	0.749
Learning Problems	Controls	C1	21	756	<0.001	0.826
	Controls	C2	35	232	<0.001	0.933
	Controls	C3	42	138	<0.001	0.952
	C1	C2	14	1012	<0.001	0.742
	C1	C3	21	500	<0.001	0.848
	C2	C3	7	896	0.014	0.66
Executive Function (cool)	Controls	C1	27.5	693	<0.001	0.84
	Controls	C2	34.5	265	<0.001	0.924
	Controls	C3	26	408	<0.001	0.86
	C1	C2	7	1104	<0.001	0.718
	C1	C3	-1.5	1614	1	0.509
	C2	C3	-8.5	760	<0.001	0.711
Aggression	Controls	C1	23.5	768	<0.001	0.823
	Controls	C2	2.5	1574	1	0.547
	Controls	C3	7	1056	0.04	0.638
	C1	C2	-21	818	<0.001	0.791
	C1	C3	-16.5	984	<0.001	0.701
	C2	C3	4.5	1069	0.297	0.594
Peer Relations	Controls	C1	43.5	594	<0.001	0.863
	Controls	C2	7	1384	1	0.601
	Controls	C3	40	564	<0.001	0.807
	C1	C2	-36.5	986	<0.001	0.749
	C1	C3	-3.5	1454	0.798	0.558
	C2	C3	33	810	0.002	0.692

Note. The table dispalys the pariwise median differences (Group2-Group1) between the groups on each subscale of the Conners. Mann-Whitney U-tests assess whether two samples come from different population distributions. The common language effect size is the probability that a randomly selected sample from one group has a higher score than a random sample from the other group. P-values are Bonferroni corrected for the total number of group comparisons.

Table S6. Pairwise chi-square tests of gender and diagnoses in the full sample

	Group 1	Group 2	Percent difference	X^2	*p*
Gender	Controls	C1	23.61	28.92	<0.001
	Controls	C2	3.29	0.31	1
	Controls	C3	5.47	0.82	1
	C1	C2	-20.33	28.61	<0.001
	C1	C3	-18.14	18.89	<0.001
	C2	C3	2.18	0.13	1
Diagnosis	Controls	C1	44.29	92.22	<0.001
	Controls	C2	28.13	44.73	<0.001
	Controls	C3	33.28	53.11	<0.001
	C1	C2	-16.16	15.22	0.001
	C1	C3	-11	5.29	0.129
	C2	C3	5.16	1.03	1
ADHD	Controls	C1	35.65	71.26	<0.001
	Controls	C2	17.06	26.98	<0.001
	Controls	C3	11.16	15.28	0.001
	C1	C2	-18.59	24.2	<0.001
	C1	C3	-24.49	33.61	<0.001
	C2	C3	-5.89	2.4	0.729
Dyslexia	Controls	C1	0.8	0.07	1
	Controls	C2	6.43	6.9	0.052
	Controls	C3	9.41	11.09	0.005
	C1	C2	5.63	9.56	0.012
	C1	C3	8.61	16.36	<0.001
	C2	C3	2.98	0.82	1
Autism	Controls	C1	10.62	16.54	<0.001
	Controls	C2	3.08	3.45	0.379
	Controls	C3	7.3	10.12	0.009
	C1	C2	-7.54	11.22	0.005
	C1	C3	-3.32	1.13	1
	C2	C3	4.23	3.26	0.426

Note. The table displays group differences in percentages of boys and diagnoses (Group2-Group1), and the chi square test of difference between expected and observed frequencies. P-values are Bonferroni corrected for the total number of group comparisons.

Table S7. Pairwise t-tests of age, IQ, maths and reading in the full sample

	Group 1	Group 2	Mean difference	*t*	*p*	Cohen's *d*
Age	Controls	C1	-0.42	0.96	1	0.18
	Controls	C2	-0.11	0.28	1	0.05
	Controls	C3	-1.03	2.31	0.137	0.48
	C1	C2	0.31	-0.79	1	-0.14
	C1	C3	-0.61	1.38	1	0.27
	C2	C3	-0.92	2.26	0.154	0.44
IQ	Controls	C1	-13.06	11.05	0.001	1.09
	Controls	C2	-16.26	13.85	0.001	1.41
	Controls	C3	-20.72	15.24	0.001	1.68
	C1	C2	-3.2	3.15	0.01	0.26
	C1	C3	-7.65	6.4	0.001	0.59
	C2	C3	-4.46	3.68	0.002	0.36
Reading	Controls	C1	-17.07	10.91	<0.001	1.12
	Controls	C2	-22.17	15.16	<0.001	1.57
	Controls	C3	-29.25	18.69	<0.001	2.07
	C1	C2	-5.1	3.69	0.001	0.31
	C1	C3	-12.18	7.79	<0.001	0.74
	C2	C3	-7.08	4.72	<0.001	0.46
Maths	Controls	C1	-25.85	14.76	<0.001	1.43
	Controls	C2	-32.79	20.54	<0.001	2.02
	Controls	C3	-35.94	20.18	<0.001	2.21
	C1	C2	-6.94	5.08	<0.001	0.43
	C1	C3	-10.09	6.4	<0.001	0.62
	C2	C3	-3.15	2.26	0.145	0.22
WIAT-II Maths	Controls	C1	-25.16	14.09	<0.001	1.38
	Controls	C2	-32.38	19.65	<0.001	1.98
	Controls	C3	-35.35	19.16	<0.001	2.17
	C1	C2	-7.22	4.99	<0.001	0.44
	C1	C3	-10.19	6.08	<0.001	0.62
	C2	C3	-2.98	2.01	0.271	0.21

Note. The table displays the pariwise mean differences (Group2-Group1) between the groups. Maths scores are reported for a subset of children who completed the Numeric Operations subtest of Wechsler Individual Achievement Test II (Maths WIAT-II) and for the whole sample using a combined normalized maths score (Maths), which combines z-scored Numeric Operations WIAT-II with z-scored Maths Fluency subtest of Woodcock Johnson III Test of Achievement (WJ-III). P-values are Bonferroni corrected for the total number of group comparisons.

Table S8. Pairwise chi-square tests of gender and diagnoses in the MRI sample

	Group 1	Group 2	Percent difference	Chi2	p
Gender	Controls	C1	33.41	14.32	0.001
	Controls	C2	13.77	1.72	1
	Controls	C3	10.16	0.73	1
	C1	C2	-19.64	4.8	0.17
	C1	C3	-23.25	6.09	0.082
	C2	C3	-3.61	0.03	1
Diagnosis	Controls	C1	36.59	22.02	<0.001
	Controls	C2	25.52	11.86	0.003
	Controls	C3	35.59	18.87	<0.001
	C1	C2	-11.07	1.2	1
	C1	C3	-1	0.01	1
	C2	C3	10.07	0.74	1
ADHD	Controls	C1	29.82	18.29	<0.001
	Controls	C2	12.67	5.03	0.15
	Controls	C3	6.9	1.54	1
	C1	C2	-17.14	4.14	0.251
	C1	C3	-22.92	7.27	0.042
	C2	C3	-5.78	0.36	1
Dyslexia	Controls	C1	1.06	0.02	1
	Controls	C2	11.06	3.32	0.41
	Controls	C3	9.54	2.31	0.77
	C1	C2	10	2.75	0.583
	C1	C3	8.48	1.78	1
	C2	C3	-1.52	0	1
Autism	Controls	C1	11.43	5.67	0.104
	Controls	C2	1.79	0	1
	Controls	C3	8.51	3.33	0.407
	C1	C2	-9.64	3.03	0.491
	C1	C3	-2.92	0.04	1
	C2	C3	6.72	1.26	1

Note. The table displays group differences in percentages of boys and diagnoses (Group2-Group1), and the chi square test of difference between expected and observed frequencies P-values are Bonferroni corrected for the total number of group comparisons.

Table S9. Pairwise t-tests of group differences in the MRI sample

	Group 1	Group 2	Mean difference	t	p	Cohen's *d*
Age	Controls	C1	-0.06	0.16	1	0.03
	Controls	C2	-0.72	2.02	0.275	0.37
	Controls	C3	-0.51	1.21	1	0.23
	C1	C2	-0.65	1.66	0.6	0.3
	C1	C3	-0.45	0.98	1	0.19
	C2	C3	0.21	-0.51	1	-0.1
IQ	Controls	C1	-9.96	4.86	<0.001	0.85
	Controls	C2	-15.9	7.94	<0.001	1.46
	Controls	C3	-20.92	7.78	<0.001	1.46
	C1	C2	-5.94	2.75	0.042	0.5
	C1	C3	-10.96	3.94	0.001	0.72
	C2	C3	-5.03	1.77	0.475	0.34
Reading	Controls	C1	-13.32	4.98	<0.001	0.89
	Controls	C2	-22.13	8.78	<0.001	1.62
	Controls	C3	-30.03	11.24	<0.001	2.15
	C1	C2	-8.81	2.92	0.025	0.53
	C1	C3	-16.71	5.14	<0.001	0.99
	C2	C3	-7.9	2.53	0.077	0.5
Maths	Controls	C1	-21.47	5.93	<0.001	1.04
	Controls	C2	-33.2	10.38	<0.001	1.93
	Controls	C3	-36.38	10.27	<0.001	2.04
	C1	C2	-11.72	3.63	0.002	0.67
	C1	C3	-14.91	4.18	<0.001	0.82
	C2	C3	-3.19	1.14	1	0.23
WIAT-II Maths	Controls	C1	-20.66	5.64	<0.001	1
	Controls	C2	-31.83	9.26	<0.001	1.84
	Controls	C3	-33.66	8.81	<0.001	1.9
	C1	C2	-11.17	3.19	0.011	0.63
	C1	C3	-13	3.34	0.007	0.72
	C2	C3	-1.83	0.59	1	0.13
Mean FC	Controls	C1	0	-0.48	1	-0.08
	Controls	C2	0.01	-2.26	0.154	-0.42
	Controls	C3	0	0.27	1	0.05
	C1	C2	0.01	-1.73	0.518	-0.31
	C1	C3	0	0.67	1	0.13
	C2	C3	-0.01	2.22	0.173	0.44
Framewise displacement	Controls	C1	0.06	-3.82	0.001	-0.67
	Controls	C2	0.04	-2.81	0.035	-0.52
	Controls	C3	0.04	-2.59	0.066	-0.49
	C1	C2	-0.02	0.99	1	0.18
	C1	C3	-0.02	1.04	1	0.2
	C2	C3	0	0.11	1	0.02

Note. The table displays the pariwise mean differences (Group2-Group1) between the groups. Maths scores are reported for a subset of children who completed the Numeric Operations subtest of Wechsler Individual Achievement Test II (Maths WIAT-II) and for the whole sample using a combined normalized maths score (Maths), which combines z-scored Numeric Operations WIAT-II with z-scored Maths Fluency subtest of Woodcock Johnson III Test of Achievement (WJ-III). P-values are Bonferroni corrected for the total number of group comparisons.

Table S10. Group effects on global graph metrics across all group thresholds

	F-ratio AUC	Permuted AUC: M (SD)	*p*
Strength	6.10	5.47 (8.53)	0.291
Modularity	9.65	5.31 (6.1)	0.167
Path length	8.53	5.23 (4.38)	0.171
Global efficiency	12.23	5.07 (6.93)	0.103
Local efficiency	3.79	5.32 (6.65)	0.429
Clustering	6.49	5.37 (7.02)	0.263
Small-worldness	4.97	5.19 (5.09)	0.367
Assortativity	0.4	4.87 (6.31)	0.903

Note. All graph metrics were normalised according to 100 random graphs except for strength and modularity.

Table S11. Group effects on global graph metrics across all individual thresholds

	F-ratio AUC	Permuted AUC: M (SD)	*p*
Strength	0.23	5.22 (7.71)	0.852
Modularity	9.72	5.55 (7.34)	0.172
Path length	0.65	5.11 (6.62)	0.815
Global efficiency	0.2	5.05 (6.77)	0.943
Local efficiency	2.44	4.81 (5.99)	0.534
Clustering	3.91	4.79 (5.68)	0.397
Small-worldness	3.59	4.75 (5.62)	0.42
Assortativity	0.99	4.74 (6)	0.682

Note. All graph metrics were normalised according to 100 random graphs except for strength and modularity.

Table S12. PLS of ICN Connectivity across connectome thresholds

		ICN Connectivity		Permutation Test	
Threshold (%)	PLS Components	RMSE (SEM)	Accuracy (SEM)	RMSE (SEM)	*p*
5	1	0.481 (0.017)	0.32 (0.024)	0.512 (0.018)	0.055
10	2	0.475 (0.015)	0.328 (0.022)	0.517 (0.019)	0.016
15	3	0.461 (0.015)	0.348 (0.022)	0.52 (0.02)	0.002
20	3	0.482 (0.02)	0.318 (0.028)	0.52 (0.02)	0.036
25	3	0.471 (0.011)	0.334 (0.015)	0.52 (0.02)	0.01
30	4	0.465 (0.015)	0.342 (0.022)	0.522 (0.019)	0.002

Table S13. PLS of Nodal Strength across connectome thresholds

		Nodal Strength		Permutation Test	
Threshold (%)	PLS Components	RMSE (SEM)	Accuracy (SEM)	RMSE (SEM)	*p*
5	3	0.475 (0.016)	0.328 (0.022)	0.518 (0.018)	0.014
10	7	0.471 (0.017)	0.334 (0.024)	0.522 (0.018)	0.002
15	1	0.488 (0.009)	0.31 (0.013)	0.513 (0.019)	0.112
20	6	0.471 (0.013)	0.334 (0.019)	0.52 (0.018)	0.005
25	6	0.474 (0.014)	0.33 (0.02)	0.52 (0.018)	0.007
30	1	0.49 (0.016)	0.306 (0.022)	0.512 (0.018)	0.128

Table S14. PLS of Connector Hub Strength across connectome thresholds

			Connector Hub Strength		Permutation Test	
Threshold (%)	Hubs	PLS Components	RMSE (SEM)	Accuracy (SEM)	RMSE (SEM)	*p*
5	36	1	0.488 (0.011)	0.31 (0.015)	0.511 (0.017)	0.108
10	39	1	0.469 (0.013)	0.336 (0.018)	0.51 (0.018)	0.017
15	34	2	0.459 (0.015)	0.351 (0.021)	0.515 (0.018)	<0.001
20	30	2	0.476 (0.017)	0.327 (0.024)	0.515 (0.018)	0.022
25	31	1	0.463 (0.016)	0.346 (0.023)	0.515 (0.018)	0.003
30	31	1	0.483 (0.016)	0.316 (0.023)	0.509 (0.017)	0.073

Table S15. PLS of Provinicial Hub Strength across connectome thresholds

			Provincial Hub Strength		Permutation Test	
Threshold (%)	Hubs	PLS Components	RMSE (SEM)	Accuracy (SEM)	RMSE (SEM)	*p*
5	122	4	0.467 (0.019)	0.339 (0.027)	0.519 (0.018)	0.006
10	114	4	0.471 (0.015)	0.333 (0.021)	0.518 (0.018)	0.008
15	106	6	0.484 (0.016)	0.315 (0.022)	0.52 (0.019)	0.033
20	104	7	0.465 (0.02)	0.343 (0.028)	0.521 (0.019)	0.003
25	103	7	0.468 (0.017)	0.338 (0.024)	0.521 (0.019)	0.004
30	104	6	0.49 (0.018)	0.306 (0.025)	0.52 (0.019)	0.069

Additional Components of the PLS



Figure S7. PLS components 3-5 of nodal strength (top to bottom) that predicted group membership. The brain plots (left) show the 5% largest loadings of nodes onto each component relative to their standard error over 1000 bootstrapped samples. The size of the node is proportional to its absolute loading and the colour corresponds to its ICN: default-mode (red), fronto-parietal (orange), dorsal attention (green), subcortical (black), ventral attention (pink), and somatomotor (blue). The boxplots (right) show the bootstrapped distribution of component scores for each group and significant group differences assessed by a permutation test.



Figure S8. PLS components 3-7 of provincial hub strength (top to bottom) that predicted group membership. The brain plots (left) show the 10% largest loadings of nodes onto each component relative to their standard error over 1000 bootstrapped samples. The size of the node is proportional to its absolute loading and the colour corresponds to its ICN: default-mode (red), somatomotor (blue), visual (purple), ventral attention (pink), fronto-parietal (orange), and subcortical (black). The boxplots (right) show the bootstrapped distribution of component scores for each group and significant group differences assessed by a permutation test.

References

Behzadi, Y., Restom, K., Liau, J., & Liu, T. T. (2007). A component based noise correction method (CompCor) for BOLD and perfusion based fMRI. *NeuroImage*, *37*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.04.042

Murphy, K., & Fox, M. D. (2017). Towards a consensus regarding global signal regression for resting state functional connectivity MRI. *NeuroImage*, *154*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.11.052

Power, J. D., Barnes, K. A., Snyder, A. Z., Schlaggar, B. L., & Petersen, S. E. (2012). Spurious but systematic correlations in functional connectivity MRI networks arise from subject motion. *NeuroImage*, *59*(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.10.018

Pruim, R. H. R., Mennes, M., van Rooij, D., Llera, A., Buitelaar, J. K., & Beckmann, C. F. (2015). ICA-AROMA: A robust ICA-based strategy for removing motion artifacts from fMRI data. *NeuroImage*, *112*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.02.064

Schaefer, A., Kong, R., Gordon, E. M., Laumann, T. O., Zuo, X.-N., Holmes, A. J., … Yeo, B. T. T. (2018). Local-Global Parcellation of the Human Cerebral Cortex from Intrinsic Functional Connectivity MRI. *Cerebral Cortex*, *28*(9). https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhx179

Whitfield-Gabrieli, S., & Nieto-Castanon, A. (2012). Conn: a functional connectivity toolbox for correlated and anticorrelated brain networks. *Brain Connect*, *2*(3), 125–141. https://doi.org/10.1089/brain.2012.0073