

Supplemental results and methods

Supplemental results

Self-reported affect (PANAS and VAS-scales).

Self-reported positive affect (PA) decreased after the rumination induction and remained stable after the distraction induction (Fig. S3a; linear mixed model with induction x timepoint interaction for PANAS PA; $F(1, 69) = 52.98, p < .0001, \eta_p = 0.43$). At post-induction, PA was significantly higher in the distraction condition (Post: $t(69) = -6.58, p < .0001, d = -0.79$), while it was significantly lower at pre-induction ($t(69) = 3.71, p < .0005, d = -0.45$).

Self-reported negative affect (NA) increased after the rumination induction and decreased after the distraction induction (Fig. S3b; linear mixed model with induction x timepoint interaction for PANAS NA; $F(1, 69) = 103.15, p < .0001, \eta_p = 0.60$). At post-induction, NA was significantly higher in the rumination condition (Post: $t(69) = 9.94, p < .0001, d = 1.20$), while it was significantly lower at pre-induction (Pre: $t(69) = -4.42, p < .0001, d = -0.53$). Consistently with the questionnaire self-reports, VAS-reported affect gradually worsened during the rumination induction and remained almost stable during the distraction induction (Fig. S3c; significant interaction in the linear mixed model between induction and timepoint for VAS reported affect; $F(8, 391) = 13.11, p < .0001, \eta_p = 0.21$). Thus, VAS-reported affect differed at each time point between both induction conditions with the exception of minute 0, which was before the inductions (Fig. S3c).

Decoder Post-hoc Accuracy Analysis.

Estimated marginal means of the decoding accuracies from minute one ($t(184) = -2.83, p = .005, d = -0.21$), as well as minute six ($t(184) = -2.87, p = .005, d = -0.21$) and minute seven ($t(184) = -2.87, p = .005, d = -0.21$) differed significantly from minute 0.

Supplemental methods

Perserverative Thinking Questionnaire (PTQ)

The German version of the PTQ comprises 15 items to assess the core processes of repetitive negative thinking: repetitive, intrusive, difficult to disengage from, unproductive and capturing mental capacity. Nine items load on the first three processes and three on each of the last two. Furthermore, a total sum score for all 15 items can be computed and assesses the general tendency to ruminate. In the PTQ-S, the state version (PTQ-S), instructions change to how participants thought about negative events and problems in the last moments. Higher values correspond to higher levels of rumination. Internal consistency for the total sum score ranges from $\alpha = .94$ to $\alpha = .95$ ¹. From total 288 timepoints seven were missing (2.43%). Missing values were handled by averaging the total sum score of the PTQ-S per induction and timepoint over the three sessions.

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)

The German version of the PANAS measures the affect loading on two factors (positive vs. negative affect; PA/NA). 20 adjectives (10 for each factor) were presented to the participants. They were then prompted to provide responses indicating their current feelings on a scale ranging from 1 (“not at all”) to 5 (“extremely”) with respect to the corresponding adjective. Higher values correspond to either more positive or negative affect². Internal consistency for the two dimensions amounts to $\alpha = .86$ ³.

Visual Analogue Scales (VAS)

Adapted to the self-assessment manikins from Bradley and Lang⁴ the authors designed manikins assessing rumination, and affect. The VAS range from 1 to 7. For rumination one corresponds to “no rumination” and seven to “a lot”. On the VAS for affect low values correspond to positive affect and high values to negative. From in sum 1296 datapoints of self-reported rumination and affect based on the VAS scale 54 from each scale were missing

Decoding ruminative states

(4.17%). Missings were handled by averaging the VAS responses per induction and timepoint over the three sessions.

Supplemental figures




Figure S1. Self-report data from the VAS scales only for the first and last runs in each session for rumination and distraction conditions. Time course of VAS self-reported rumination (across-participant mean \pm SEM) and individual data in the background for a) only the first run of each session and b) the last run of each session (for the pilot sample last run comprised run two and three). VAS were recorded after the resting state baseline measurement before the inductions (minute 0) and always after 1 minute during the induction (minute 1 – 8).

Decoding ruminative states

Self-reported rumination (VAS) during the inductions for 14 subjects whose decoder accuracy differed not from chance-level




Figure S2. Self-report data from the VAS scales only for the subsample whose decoder performance did not differ from chance-level ($n = 14$). Time course of VAS self-reported rumination (across-participant mean \pm SEM and individual data in the background). VAS were recorded after the resting state baseline measurement before the inductions (minute 0) and always after 1 minute during the induction (minute 1 – 8).

Decoding ruminative states




Figure S3. Self-reported affect from the questionnaire and VAS scales for the rumination and distraction conditions. a) The total score of the PANAS positive affect for pre and post timepoints for each induction (across-participant mean \pm SEM and individual data in the

Decoding ruminative states

background). b) The total score of the PANAS negative affect for pre and post timepoints for each induction (across-participant mean \pm SEM and individual data in the background). c) Time course of VAS self-reported affect (across-participant mean \pm SEM and individual data in the background). Higher values indicate more negative affect. Asterisks indicate significant results of post-hoc pairwise two-sided *t*-tests between rumination and distraction (see Tab. S3). VAS were recorded after the resting-state baseline measurement before the inductions (minute 0) and always after 1 minute during the induction (minute 1 – 8).

Supplemental tables

Table S1. Comparison of average self-reported VAS rumination (across-participant estimated marginal means and SE) for rumination versus distraction inductions at each timepoint.

Timepoint (minute)	Rumination	Distraction	Test statistic
0	2.38 (0.18)	2.92 (0.18)	$t(391) = -2.62, p < .005, d = -0.13$
1	3.47 (0.18)	2.69 (0.18)	$t(391) = 3.81, p < .0005, d = 0.19$
2	3.80 (0.18)	2.49 (0.18)	$t(391) = 6.39, p < .0001, d = 0.32$
3	4.06 (0.18)	2.35 (0.18)	$t(391) = 8.36, p < .0001, d = 0.42$
4	4.43 (0.18)	2.46 (0.18)	$t(391) = 9.66, p < .0001, d = 0.49$
5	4.18 (0.18)	2.53 (0.18)	$t(391) = 8.06, p < .0001, d = 0.41$
6	4.53 (0.18)	2.44 (0.18)	$t(391) = 10.23, p < .0001, d = 0.52$
7	4.29 (0.18)	2.39 (0.18)	$t(391) = 9.32, p < .0001, d = 0.47$
8	4.45 (0.18)	2.47 (0.18)	$t(391) = 9.69, p < .0001, d = 0.49$

At each timepoint, paired two-sided t-tests (Bonferroni corrected for nine tests) were calculated to compare both inductions. Higher values indicate higher self-reported rumination.

Table S2. Average difference in estimated marginal means of VAS rumination for each timepoint compared to minute 0 for both inductions.

Timepoint (minute)	Test statistic rumination induction	Test statistic distraction induction
0 vs. 1	$t(391) = -5.30, p < .0001, d = -0.27$	$t(391) = 1.12, p = .263, d = 0.06$
0 vs. 2	$t(391) = -6.94, p < .0001, d = -0.35$	$t(391) = 2.07, p = .039, d = 0.10$
0 vs. 3	$t(391) = -8.23, p < .0001, d = -0.42$	$t(391) = 2.75, p = .006, d = 0.14$
0 vs. 4	$t(391) = -10.03, p < .0001, d = -0.51$	$t(391) = 2.24, p = .025, d = 0.11$
0 vs. 5	$t(391) = -8.81, p < .0001, d = -0.45$	$t(391) = 1.87, p = .062, d = 0.09$
0 vs. 6	$t(391) = -10.51, p < .0001, d = -0.53$	$t(391) = 2.35, p = .020, d = 0.12$
0 vs. 7	$t(391) = -9.35, p < .0001, d = -0.47$	$t(391) = 2.58, p = .010, d = 0.13$
0 vs. 8	$t(391) = -10.13, p < .0001, d = -0.51$	$t(391) = 2.18, p = .030, d = 0.11$

VAS-rumination at each timepoint of each induction is compared with VAS-rumination at minute 0, which belongs to the self-reported VAS rumination before the inductions and after a one-minute resting state measurement, by using paired two-sided t-tests. p-values are Bonferroni corrected for 16 tests. Lower t-values indicate an increase in rumination over time, while higher t-values indicate a decrease in rumination.

Table S3. Comparison of average self-reported VAS affect (across-participant estimated marginal means and SE) for rumination versus distraction inductions at each timepoint.

Timepoint (minute)	Rumination	Distraction	Test statistic
0	2.65 (0.19)	3.16 (0.19)	$t(391) = -2.49, p = .013, d = -0.13$
1	3.67 (0.19)	3.03 (0.19)	$t(391) = 3.13, p = .002, d = 0.16$
2	3.91 (0.19)	2.80 (0.19)	$t(391) = 5.45, p < .0001, d = 0.28$
3	4.03 (0.19)	2.90 (0.19)	$t(391) = 5.51, p < .0001, d = 0.28$
4	4.30 (0.19)	2.75 (0.19)	$t(391) = 7.59, p < .0001, d = 0.38$
5	4.26 (0.19)	2.84 (0.19)	$t(391) = 6.98, p < .0001, d = 0.35$
6	4.59 (0.19)	2.81 (0.19)	$t(391) = 8.71, p < .0001, d = 0.44$
7	4.39 (0.19)	2.76 (0.19)	$t(391) = 7.80, p < .0001, d = 0.39$
8	4.63 (0.19)	2.77 (0.19)	$t(391) = 9.12, p < .0001, d = 0.46$

At each timepoint, paired two-sided t-tests (Bonferroni corrected for nine tests) were calculated to compare both inductions. Higher VAS-values indicate higher self-reported negative affect.

Table S4. Individual decoding accuracies for each one-minute bin of the eight-minute induction phase.

	Minute 0	Minute 1	Minute 2	Minute 3	Minute 4	Minute 5	Minute 6	Minute 7	Minute 8	Mean
	0.400	0.500	0.550	0.575	0.650	0.500	0.625	0.825*	0.425	0.581*
	0.646	0.917*	0.833*	0.792	0.833*	0.833*	0.854*	0.771	0.771	0.826*
	0.594	0.656	0.563	0.594	0.469	0.594	0.438	0.406	0.531	0.531
	0.500	0.450	0.375	0.450	0.625	0.475	0.550	0.550	0.475	0.494
	0.450	0.525	0.400	0.400	0.525	0.400	0.425	0.475	0.550	0.463
	0.521	0.667	0.500	0.563	0.500	0.583	0.500	0.500	0.479	0.536
	0.792*	0.792*	0.813*	0.729	0.771*	0.813*	0.771*	0.750*	0.625	0.758*
	0.271	0.333	0.229	0.250	0.188	0.208	0.396	0.250	0.354	0.276
	0.354	0.375	0.417	0.563	0.542	0.479	0.563	0.438	0.354	0.466
	0.688	0.563	0.729	0.500	0.625	0.583	0.604	0.750	0.646	0.625*
	0.667	0.667	0.854*	0.479	0.479	0.667	0.771	0.708	0.542	0.646*
	0.646	0.542	0.521	0.708	0.542	0.604	0.750	0.708	0.583	0.620*
	0.479	0.688	0.563	0.292	0.521	0.396	0.521	0.500	0.583	0.508
	0.468	0.630	0.565	0.609	0.574	0.457	0.326	0.326	0.277	0.471
	0.333	0.646	0.688	0.667	0.438	0.667	0.500	0.458	0.667	0.591*
	0.313	0.479	0.604	0.396	0.417	0.500	0.479	0.521	0.458	0.482
	0.458	0.625	0.792	0.792	0.917*	0.833*	0.833*	0.688	0.729	0.776*
	0.396	0.542	0.500	0.542	0.500	0.563	0.479	0.500	0.375	0.500
	0.417	0.396	0.375	0.458	0.583	0.438	0.417	0.479	0.521	0.458
	0.333	0.563	0.583	0.542	0.375	0.563	0.646	0.688	0.667	0.578*
	0.292	0.333	0.417	0.375	0.479	0.583	0.500	0.583	0.625	0.487
	0.583	0.646	0.417	0.646	0.604	0.563	0.604	0.625	0.542	0.581*
	0.275	0.250	0.375	0.450	0.325	0.325	0.425	0.350	0.225	0.341
	0.583	0.521	0.583	0.313	0.542	0.521	0.354	0.479	0.375	0.461
Mean	0.477	0.554°	0.552°	0.528	0.543	0.548	0.555°	0.555°	0.516	0.544*

Individual decoding accuracies are represented in the cells for every minute. The bins with individually highest decoding accuracies are printed in bold. Additionally, the means across participants per minute are shown in the bottom line of the table. Means per participant across minute (omitting minute 0) can be found in the right column of the table. Decoding accuracies that were significant ($p < 0.05$) at individual or group level are marked with asterisks. Marginal significant results are marked with circles ($p < .10$). The overall mean (omitting minute 0) is printed in the right bottom cell.

Table S5. Individual correlations between probability estimates for rumination predicted by the decoder and self-reported rumination from VAS scales across all timepoints.

Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6
0.418	0.882	0.021	0.055	-0.028	0.637
Participant 7	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12
0.624	-0.649	-0.170	0.526	0.600	0.324
Participant 13	Participant 14	Participant 15	Participant 16	Participant 17	Participant 18
-0.021	-0.144	0.359	0.048	0.021	0.040
Participant 19	Participant 20	Participant 21	Participant 22	Participant 23	Participant 24
-0.188	0.316	0.279	0.626	0.641	-0.371

VAS values and probability estimates were averaged across sessions and runs for every induction before computing the pairwise correlations for all timepoints of the induction phase per participant between self-reported VAS-rumination and decoded rumination. Pairwise correlations were calculated per subject. Higher coefficients indicate that higher probability estimates are correlated with higher self-reported rumination.

Table S6. Individually significant SVM feature weights in 10 participants with decoder performances above chance level.

Participant	Alpha	Beta	Theta	Conn
1		FP2, AF7, AF8, F5		PO4/FC1
2				
7				
10				
11	T7		T7	
12		Oz, F6	F6	
15				
17		AF8, F5		
20		FT7		
22	P6	P6, PO4		F4/FT9, C5/PO8

Weights were extracted per participant, induction, bin and cross-validation. They were then averaged across cross-validation folds and runs. Significance was determined from p-values ($p < .05$). p-values were computed using a randomization test combined with a max-stat approach to correct for multiple comparison across features. The approach was implemented in each participant.

Decoding ruminative states

Table S7. Individual decoder performance for each one-minute bin of the eight-minute induction phase in a pilot sample for a decoder classifying rumination versus distraction and positive affect.

	Minute 0	Minute 1	Minute 2	Minute 3	Minute 4	Minute 5	Minute 6	Minute 7	Minute 8	Mean
	0.453	0.391	0.422	0.344	0.547	0.422	0.453	0.594	0.453	0.453
	0.306	0.611	0.694	0.653	0.653	0.583	0.653	0.667	0.528	0.630
	0.321	0.321	0.286	0.429	0.429	0.429	0.411	0.375	0.304	0.373
	0.219	0.297	0.266	0.266	0.219	0.141	0.328	0.406	0.250	0.271
	0.297	0.281	0.313	0.453	0.219	0.313	0.266	0.281	0.281	0.301
	0.389	0.431	0.444	0.375	0.444	0.181	0.125	0.222	0.194	0.302
Mean	0.331	0.389	0.404	0.420	0.418	0.345	0.373	0.424	0.335	0.388

In the pilot sample (n = 6) a decoder was trained based on induced ruminative states in contrast to induced distraction and induced positive affect. Individual decoding accuracies are represented in the cells for every minute. Additionally, the means across participants per minute are shown in the bottom line of the table. Means per participant across minutes (omitting minute 0) can be found in the right column of the table. The overall mean (omitting minute 0) is printed in the right bottom cell. Please note that chance level with 3 label categories is 1/3.

Table S8. Individual decoding accuracies for each one-minute bin of the eight-minute induction phase from a non-linear polynomial SVM.

	Minute 0	Minute 1	Minute 2	Minute 3	Minute 4	Minute 5	Minute 6	Minute 7	Minute 8	Mean
	0.475	0.400	0.575	0.475	0.325	0.575	0.600	0.675	0.600	0.528
	0.667	0.583	0.625	0.708	0.583	0.604	0.667	0.583	0.646	0.625
	0.656	0.531	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.438	0.438	0.500	0.500	0.488
	0.450	0.400	0.400	0.500	0.575	0.425	0.600	0.500	0.400	0.475
	0.475	0.575	0.350	0.300	0.450	0.400	0.425	0.400	0.400	0.413
	0.500	0.667	0.667	0.604	0.646	0.500	0.500	0.438	0.292	0.539
	0.896	0.708	0.771	0.542	0.521	0.708	0.646	0.521	0.542	0.620
	0.500	0.438	0.500	0.354	0.500	0.521	0.333	0.500	0.438	0.448
	0.458	0.583	0.375	0.500	0.500	0.479	0.604	0.500	0.500	0.505
	0.667	0.500	0.500	0.521	0.542	0.542	0.500	0.583	0.521	0.526
	0.708	0.667	0.729	0.667	0.479	0.500	0.438	0.583	0.563	0.578
	0.604	0.688	0.521	0.563	0.521	0.688	0.542	0.500	0.563	0.573
	0.500	0.354	0.500	0.500	0.458	0.354	0.500	0.500	0.646	0.477
	0.489	0.522	0.478	0.478	0.574	0.500	0.543	0.630	0.532	0.532
	0.500	0.458	0.625	0.646	0.667	0.667	0.479	0.479	0.500	0.565
	0.479	0.500	0.500	0.458	0.417	0.500	0.375	0.521	0.417	0.461
	0.500	0.542	0.521	0.500	0.771	0.667	0.625	0.583	0.563	0.596
	0.500	0.479	0.521	0.542	0.521	0.500	0.521	0.521	0.333	0.492
	0.500	0.375	0.333	0.521	0.542	0.438	0.333	0.458	0.479	0.435
	0.521	0.396	0.604	0.500	0.542	0.479	0.396	0.563	0.563	0.505
	0.500	0.542	0.479	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.646	0.542	0.354	0.508
	0.500	0.646	0.500	0.500	0.563	0.583	0.563	0.625	0.563	0.568
	0.300	0.350	0.500	0.400	0.425	0.250	0.475	0.375	0.375	0.394
	0.500	0.500	0.625	0.438	0.375	0.458	0.396	0.500	0.458	0.469
Mean	0.535	0.517	0.529	0.509	0.521	0.511	0.506	0.524	0.489	0.513

Individual decoding accuracies are represented in the cells for every minute. Additionally, the averages across participants per bin are shown in the bottom line of the table. Means per participant across minutes (omitting minute 0) can be found in the right column of the table. The overall mean (omitting minute 0) is printed in the right bottom cell.

Table S9. Individual decoding accuracies for each one-minute bin of the eight-minute induction phase from a non-linear radial SVM.

	Minute 0	Minute 1	Minute 2	Minute 3	Minute 4	Minute 5	Minute 6	Minute 7	Minute 8	Mean
	0.550	0.500	0.525	0.475	0.550	0.525	0.625	0.650	0.475	0.541
	0.417	0.833	0.875	0.708	0.854	0.833	0.813	0.854	0.708	0.810
	0.563	0.750	0.469	0.563	0.656	0.500	0.375	0.500	0.469	0.535
	0.575	0.425	0.600	0.575	0.625	0.575	0.700	0.550	0.600	0.581
	0.425	0.600	0.400	0.600	0.600	0.400	0.425	0.575	0.450	0.506
	0.521	0.521	0.500	0.542	0.500	0.500	0.458	0.500	0.354	0.484
	0.813	0.708	0.792	0.833	0.771	0.792	0.708	0.708	0.792	0.763
	0.250	0.292	0.271	0.479	0.417	0.500	0.271	0.271	0.292	0.349
	0.333	0.271	0.333	0.458	0.396	0.333	0.354	0.292	0.333	0.346
	0.729	0.667	0.708	0.542	0.458	0.604	0.625	0.563	0.521	0.586
	0.771	0.646	0.896	0.583	0.458	0.771	0.646	0.688	0.500	0.648
	0.625	0.729	0.688	0.667	0.604	0.708	0.688	0.688	0.625	0.674
	0.417	0.708	0.542	0.333	0.458	0.438	0.521	0.479	0.667	0.518
	0.511	0.435	0.543	0.391	0.404	0.543	0.370	0.435	0.340	0.433
	0.542	0.500	0.500	0.646	0.479	0.479	0.479	0.479	0.500	0.508
	0.438	0.646	0.500	0.396	0.583	0.646	0.563	0.542	0.500	0.547
	0.313	0.667	0.854	0.625	0.875	0.729	0.833	0.521	0.729	0.729
	0.583	0.500	0.375	0.500	0.604	0.646	0.500	0.583	0.542	0.531
	0.625	0.521	0.625	0.563	0.583	0.625	0.750	0.583	0.688	0.617
	0.438	0.417	0.563	0.458	0.417	0.604	0.479	0.583	0.500	0.503
	0.375	0.500	0.396	0.396	0.396	0.521	0.563	0.604	0.458	0.479
	0.667	0.521	0.438	0.604	0.583	0.583	0.625	0.729	0.667	0.594
	0.275	0.475	0.400	0.400	0.425	0.350	0.500	0.325	0.500	0.422
	0.250	0.396	0.563	0.208	0.563	0.458	0.354	0.438	0.292	0.409
Mean	0.500	0.551	0.556	0.523	0.553	0.569	0.551	0.547	0.521	0.546

Individual decoding accuracies are represented in the cells for every minute. Additionally, the averages across participants per bin are shown in the bottom line of the table. Means per participant across minutes (omitting minute 0) can be found in the right column of the table. The overall mean (omitting minute 0) is printed in the right bottom cell.

Table S10. Participants' sociodemographic information.

	N (%) or Mean (SD); [Range]
Age	
Years	24.58 (4.63); [18-35]
Gender	
Female	17 (70.8)
Male	7 (29.2)
Other	0
Highest level of education	
None	0
Secondary	2 (8.3)
Vocational	0
Highschool diploma	22 (91.7)
Relationship Status	
Married or living with a partner	11 (45.8)
Single, separated, widowd	13 (54.2)
Number of children	
0	24 (100)
Current diagnosis (inclusion criteria)	
Moderate depression (F32.1)	8 (33.3)
Recurrent moderate depression (F33.1)	16 (66.7)
Current diagnosis (additional)	
Dysthymia (F34.1)	5 (20.8)
Social anxiety (F40.1)	1 (4.2)
Posttraumatic stress disorder (F43.1)	2 (8.4)
Alcohol abuse (F10.10)	1 (4.2)
Becks Depression Inventory (BDI-II)	
Total Score	27.46 (5.63); [20-42]
Perserverative Thinking Questionnaire (PTQ)	
Total Score	39.71 (6.82); [30-55]
Core features of RNT	24.00 (5.03); [15-34]
Unproductiveness	8.92 (1.86); [5-12]
Mental Capacity	6.79 (2.47); [4-12]

Literature

1. Ehring T, Zetsche U, Weidacker K, Wahl K, Schönfeld S, Ehlers A. The Perseverative Thinking Questionnaire (PTQ): validation of a content-independent measure of repetitive negative thinking. *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry* 2011; **42**(2): 225-232.
2. Breyer B, Bluemke M. *Deutsche Version der Positive and Negative Affect Schedule PANAS (GESIS Panel)*, 2016.
3. Krohne H, Egloff B, Kohlmann C-W, Tausch A. Untersuchungen mit einer deutschen Version der "Positive and Negative Affect Schedule" (PANAS). *Diagnostica* 1996; **42**: 139-156.
4. Bradley MM, Lang PJ. Measuring emotion: The self-assessment manikin and the semantic differential. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry* 1994; **25**(1): 49-59.