

1 Directionality of neural activity in and out of the seizure onset 2 zone in focal epilepsy

3

4 Hamid Karimi-Rouzbahani¹⁻³, Aileen McGonigal¹⁻³

5 ¹Neurosciences Centre, Mater Hospital, South Brisbane, 4101, Australia

6 ²Mater Research Institute, University of Queensland, South Brisbane, 4101, Australia

7 ³Queensland Brain Institute, University of Queensland, St Lucia, 4072, Australia

8

9 Correspondence to: Hamid Karimi-Rouzbahani

10 hamid.karimi-rouzbahani@uq.edu.au

11

12 Abstract

13 Epilepsy affects over 50 million people worldwide, with approximately 30% experiencing drug-
14 resistant forms that may require surgical intervention. Accurate localisation of the epileptogenic zone
15 (EZ) is crucial for effective treatment, but how best to use intracranial EEG data to delineate the EZ
16 remains unclear. Previous studies have used the directionality of neural activities across the brain to
17 investigate seizure dynamics and localise the EZ. However, the different connectivity measures used
18 across studies have often provided inconsistent insights about the direction and the localisation
19 power of signal flow as a biomarker for EZ localisation. In a data-driven approach, this study employs
20 a large set of 13 distinct directed connectivity measures to evaluate neural activity flow in and out
21 the seizure onset zone (SOZ) during interictal and ictal periods. These measures test the hypotheses
22 of "sink SOZ" (SOZ dominantly receiving neural activities during interictal periods) and "source SOZ"
23 (SOZ dominantly transmitting activities during ictal periods). While the results were different across
24 connectivity measures, several measures consistently supported higher connectivity directed
25 towards the SOZ in interictal periods and higher connectivity directed away during ictal period.
26 Comparing six distinct metrics of node behaviour in the network, we found that SOZ separates itself
27 from the rest of the network allowing for the metric of "eccentricity" to localise the SOZ more
28 accurately than any other metrics including "in strength" and "out strength". This introduced a novel
29 biomarker for localising the SOZ, leveraging the discriminative power of directed connectivity
30 measures. This preprint explains novel research which is currently in progress. By using a comprehensive, objective and data-

31 driven approach, this study addresses previously unresolved questions on the direction of neural
32 activities in seizure organisation, and sheds light on dynamics of interictal and ictal activity in focal
33 epilepsy.

34 Keywords

35 drug-resistant epilepsy, seizure onset zone (SOZ) localisation, directed connectivity, brain networks

36 Introduction

37 More than 50 million people worldwide have epilepsy (Kwan & Brodie, 2000), and in about 30% of
38 them, anti-seizure medications cannot effectively control the disorder (Chen et al., 2018). In cases of
39 focal epilepsy, where seizures originate from a specific part of one hemisphere, those with drug-
40 resistant forms may undergo presurgical evaluations to identify seizure-generating areas. This often
41 involves intracranial electroencephalography (EEG) to delineate the epileptogenic zone (EZ),
42 considered to be the sites primarily responsible for generating seizures (Lagarde & Bartolomei,
43 2024). If the clinical risk-benefit analysis is favourable, the EZ can be surgically removed or
44 disconnected through resection or laser ablation. Despite advancements in multimodal approaches
45 like magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), electroencephalography (EEG) and positron emission
46 tomography (PET) scans, and extensive clinical expertise, accurate localisation of the EZ remains
47 challenging and can hinder achieving seizure freedom (Vakharia et al., 2018).

48

49 Quantification methods have shown significant potential in localising the EZ by analysing intracranial
50 EEG signals (Bartolomei et al., 2017; Bernabei et al., 2023; Gentiletti et al., 2022; Grinenko et al.,
51 2018; Karimi-Rouzbahani & McGonigal, 2024). These methods typically focus on either the interictal
52 or ictal time windows. In the ictal window, the most common epileptiform activities include low
53 voltage fast activity (LVFA), baseline slow wave shifts, rhythmic spikes/spike-waves, and preictal low
54 frequency spiking which are more dominant in seizure onset zone (SOZ¹), where seizures are thought
55 to originate from (Bernabei et al., 2023). These features have been successfully extracted from
56 signals and used for EZ localization in previous studies (Di Giacomo et al., 2024; Grinenko et al.,
57 2018). In the interictal window, traditional epileptiform characteristics which are quantified include
58 interictal spikes/discharges and high-frequency oscillations (HFOs), with ongoing debate about which
59 is more effective and ultimately possible increased predictive power by measuring their co-
60 occurrence (Roehri et al., 2018). While clinical observations and animal models suggest spatial

¹ In this work we define the epileptogenic zone (EZ) as the areas primarily responsible for generating seizures (Lagarde & Bartolomei, 2024; Ryvlin et al., 2024) and the seizure onset zone as where seizures start from (Bernabei et al., 2023). Nonetheless, this work analyses the directed connectivity only relative to the SOZ, but we try to use the term used in the original studies when reporting their results.

61 overlap between interictal and ictal neural activities to a variable degree (Avoli et al., 2006), the
62 temporal balance between interictal and ictal states may depend on the directionality of activities
63 measured using functional connectivity properties (Gunnarsdottir et al., 2022; Lagarde, Roehri,
64 Lambert, Trebuchon, et al., 2018). Beyond the abovementioned epileptogenic patterns of ictal (e.g.,
65 LVFA, baseline shifts) and interictal activity (e.g., spikes and HFOs) various other more complex and
66 often nonlinear features have also been successful in localising the SOZ in both windows (Andrzejak
67 et al., 2012; Mooij et al., 2020; Sato et al., 2019). In a recent work, we evaluated the performance of
68 a large array of 34 distinct signal features in localising the EZ in both interictal and ictal windows. We
69 showed that signal power and network-based connectivity features were among the most localising
70 features and were among the most generalisable features across patients (Karimi-Rouzbahani &
71 McGonigal, 2024).

72

73 While many traditional methods for EZ localization focused on univariate or single-channel signal
74 activity, there has been a shift towards multivariate, multi-channel or network-based localisation
75 (Gallagher et al., 2023; Gunnarsdottir et al., 2022; Johnson et al., 2023; Karimi-Rouzbahani et al.,
76 2024; Lagarde, Roehri, Lambert, Trebuchon, et al., 2018; A. Li et al., 2018, 2021). This approach aligns
77 with the understanding of epilepsy as a network disorder (Kramer & Cash, 2012; Spencer, 2002) and
78 has demonstrated better localisation performance compared to univariate methods in several
79 studies (Balatskaya et al., 2020a; Bernabei et al., 2022; Kini et al., 2019). These have established the
80 connectivity measures as valuable biomarkers for EZ localisation. In the interictal period, the
81 consensus is that connectivity is higher within the EZ than within the non-involved zones (NIZ) and
82 that EZ is relatively disconnected from the NIZ (Johnson et al., 2023; Lagarde, Roehri, Lambert,
83 Trébuchon, et al., 2018). In the ictal period, areas within the SOZ increase their internal connectivity
84 and become less connected to non-SOZ areas upon seizure onset (Liu et al., 2021; Runfola et al.,
85 2023; Schindler et al., 2007; Warren et al., 2010). While these studies showed consensus on
86 increased connectivity within the EZ/SOZ and decreased connectivity between EZ/SOZ and non-
87 involved areas, they generally focused on non-directed connectivity methods. Non-directed methods
88 quantify the level of connectivity or interaction between areas but remain silent about the direction
89 of activity flow. Specifically, they quantify the interaction without providing information about
90 whether an area dominantly sends or receives neural activities from other connected areas.

91

92 Recent studies have focused on directed connectivity measures for the localisation of the EZ (Jiang et
93 al., 2022; Z. Li et al., 2023; Nahvi et al., 2023). Directed connectivity methods provide insights into

94 the direction of neural activities relative to each individual brain area and have shown better
95 localising performance than non-directed connectivity measures (Narasimhan et al., 2020). The
96 knowledge about the directionality of neural activity flows within and across epileptogenic networks
97 can provide valuable insights such as where seizures are generated and how they are propagated.
98 Specifically, one hypothesis in epilepsy, which has attracted increasing attention, is the “interictal
99 suppression hypothesis”, which posits that the EZ is inhibited by other brain areas in the interictal
100 period (i.e. that this is why the brain does not continuously seize in subjects with epilepsy), and that
101 seizures occur when this inhibition mechanism fails (Doss et al., 2024; Gunnarsdottir et al., 2022;
102 Jiang et al., 2022; Johnson et al., 2023; Narasimhan et al., 2020; Paulo et al., 2022; Vlachos et al.,
103 2017). However, findings are non-unanimous with some studies showing that interictal neural
104 activities are dominantly towards the EZ (Gunnarsdottir et al., 2022; Jiang et al., 2022; Johnson et al.,
105 2023; Narasimhan et al., 2020; Paulo et al., 2022; Vlachos et al., 2017) and others showing outward
106 from the SOZ (Amini et al., 2011; Bettus et al., 2011; Lagarde, Roehri, Lambert, Trebuchon, et al.,
107 2018; Wilke et al., 2009). In the ictal period also, the intuition is that SOZ not only initiates the
108 seizures but also transmits activity to other brain areas. However, the application of directed
109 connectivity measures has shown discrepant results with some studies showing that ictal activity
110 propagates from the SOZ to other areas (Balatskaya et al., 2020b; Courtens et al., 2016; Jung et al.,
111 2011; Yang et al., 2018) supporting a change of role from “sink” to “source” of activity (Gunnarsdottir
112 et al., 2022; Jiang et al., 2022). Nonetheless, other studies have shown the opposite direction of
113 neural activities dominantly *towards* the SOZ in the ictal period (An et al., 2020; Janca et al., 2021;
114 Mao et al., 2016; Nahvi et al., 2023). While the dominant outflow from the SOZ can be explained by a
115 significant increase in power in the SOZ being propagated to other areas (Liou et al., 2020), it has
116 been postulated that the latter can possibly be justified by potential efforts of the non-SOZ areas to
117 inhibit and stop the seizure (surrounding inhibition) (Schevon et al., 2012).

118
119 One main reason for the discrepancy between studies evaluating the direction of activity flow
120 (connectivity) could be the different directed connectivity methods used in different studies (Lagarde
121 et al., 2022; Lagarde & Bartolomei, 2024). As each of directed connectivity methods is
122 mathematically distinct, they rely on distinct aspects of signals and their potential relationship (i.e.,
123 connectivity). For example, while directed transfer function (DTF) measures the influence of one
124 signal on another in the frequency domain using power analysis and Fourier transform, directed
125 coherence (DCOH) method uses a spectral transfer matrix and normalises the inflow from one signal
126 to another by their noise covariance (Baccalá & Sameshima, 2001). Considering such significant
127 mathematical difference in the directed connectivity methods, this could be suspected to potentially

128 contribute different levels and sometimes opposite directions of activity flow across studies (Plomp
129 et al., 2014). Therefore, the development of more objective and data-driven approaches are required
130 to determine the direction of activity towards and away from the SOZ (Doss et al., 2024; Lagarde &
131 Bartolomei, 2024).

132

133 This study aims to establish the direction of neural activity in and out of the SOZ, in an unbiased,
134 data-driven, and objective fashion. To that end, we used a large set of 13 mathematically distinct
135 methods for quantifying directed connectivity used in the literature in the interictal and ictal periods.
136 We then used network-analysis metrics (also known as connectomes (Doss et al., 2024)) including *in*
137 *strength* and *out strength* to determine the dominant direction of broadband activity flow in and out
138 of the SOZ. The aim is to see if the activities generally and dominantly flow towards or away from the
139 SOZ and test the sink/source hypotheses in epilepsy with minimal effect of subjective method
140 selection. Moreover, the knowledge about the directionality of neural activities in the interictal and
141 ictal periods, if meaningful, can inform the development of automated EZ localisation methods.
142 Specifically, if the SOZ were consistently at the receiving end of activity in the interictal period, this
143 could be a valuable localising piece of information for localisation algorithms. Therefore, to evaluate
144 the localisation power of the directed connectivity methods in intracranial recording, we combined
145 all directed connectivity methods to localise the SOZ in both interictal and ictal periods.

146

147 Methods

148

149 Dataset

150 This study uses a well-structured open-access intracranial dataset which brings together data from
151 multiple centres (Bernabei et al., 2022; Kini et al., 2019). The dataset includes 57 patients who had
152 been implanted with either subdural grid/strip (termed “electrocorticography” (ECoG)) or SEEG as
153 their presurgical workup, and subsequently treated with surgical resection or laser ablation. Two
154 patients’ data were excluded from our analyses as one had no interictal and the other no ictal
155 recordings. Among the 55 patients analysed, 27 patients’ magnetic resonance imaging findings were
156 lesional (28 non-lesional) and 35 patients were implanted with SEEG (20 ECoG (long-term subdural
157 grid/strip recordings)). Thirty-four patients had Engel I, 6 Engel II, 11 Engel III and 2 had Engel IV
158 outcomes. Resections/ablations targeted frontal (FRT) areas in 10 patients, temporal (TPR) in 24,
159 mesiotemporal (MTL) in 15, insular in 2, frontoparietal in 1, parietal in 1 and mesiofrontal areas in 2
160 patients (see patient demographics in Supplementary Table 1). Clinically determined seizure onset

161 channels were provided. Each patient had 2 interictal recordings and between 1 to 5 (*mean* = 3.7)
162 ictal recordings/seizures (110 interictal and 204 ictal recordings over all patients). The interictal data
163 was selected from awake brain activities determined both by the selection of day-time recordings (8
164 am – 8 pm) and the use of a custom non-REM sleep detector (explained in detail in (Bernabei et al.,
165 2022)). The interictal data were at least 2 hours before the beginning of a seizure and at least 2 hours
166 after a subclinical seizure, 6 hours after a focal seizure and 12 hours after a generalised seizure, free
167 of spikes if possible and not within the first 72 h of recording to minimize immediate implant and
168 anaesthesia effects. Epileptogenic zones/resected areas ranged from frontal, frontoparietal,
169 mesiofrontal, temporal, mesiotemporal, parietal and insular areas.

170

171 [Pre-processing](#)

172 Bad channels, as marked in the dataset, were excluded from analyses. An average of 105.6 contacts
173 (*std* = 38.04) per patient remained after bad channels were removed. There was an average of 114.2
174 (*std* = 41.2) and 88.8 (*std* = 25.3) channels recorded in patients implanted with SEEG and ECoG,
175 respectively. Among these, an average of 12.87% (*std* = 11.1%) of channels were in the SOZ area in
176 each patient. The sampling frequencies of the signals varied across patients and ranged from 256 to
177 1024 Hz. We adjusted the sampling rate to 256 Hz across patients for analyses. We applied a 60Hz
178 notch filter to the data to remove line noise. To reduce the computational load, we only kept a
179 maximum of 30 contacts per patient for analysis - in a random sampling procedure, we kept all the
180 channels within the SOZ, and the other channels (remaining of 30) were randomly selected from
181 non-SOZ contacts which were inside the grey matter and at least 10 mm away from other contacts.

182

183 [Calculation of directed connectivity measures](#)

184 We selected a 2-minute window of signal from each interictal recording (4 minutes per patient) and a
185 patient-specific length of signal from each ictal recording (from seizure onset to the termination of
186 seizure). Within those windows, we selected three 2-second epochs of data for analysis. The three
187 epochs were chosen to capture early, mid and late dynamics of the signals within each recording.
188 Specifically, in the 2-minute interictal window, the early, mid and late epochs were separated by 59
189 seconds, and in the ictal period, the early and late epochs were separated by the length of the
190 seizure while the mid epoch was in between the two windows. Our choice of 2-second epochs was to
191 to select a mid-range epoch compared to previous studies which have used a wide range of epochs
192 from 0.25s to 10 minutes to calculate connectivity in the interictal (Balatskaya et al., 2020b; Mooij et

193 al., 2020; Sato et al., 2019) and from 20 to 60 seconds in the ictal (Li et al., 2018; Runfola et al., 2023)
194 data.

195

196 We used the open-source python toolbox called PySpi (Cliff et al., 2023) which implements the
197 largest set of directed and non-directed connectivity measures for time series (here intracranial EEG
198 channels). We used the 13 available directed connectivity measures implemented in the toolbox for
199 this work to follow an unbiased data-driven approach in analysis. The measures are categorised here
200 into “information theory” (n=6), “frequency-domain” (n=6) and “time-domain” (n=1) methods. We
201 briefly explain the characteristics of each connectivity measure below. For more information about
202 each measure, the reader is advised to study the references cited for each measure.

203

204 *Information theory measures*

205 *Additive Noise Model (ANM)*

206 This measure assesses directed nonlinear dependence (or causality) of $x \rightarrow y$ under the assumption
207 that the effect variable, y , is a function of a cause variable, x , along with an independent noise term
208 (Hoyer et al., 2008). PySpi utilises the statistic from Causal Discovery Toolbox (CDT) as connectivity.
209 This involves initially predicting y from x using a Gaussian process using a radial basis function kernel,
210 followed by computing the normalized Hilbert-Schmidt Independence Criterion (HSIC) test statistic
211 from the residuals. ANM is commonly used in causal inference studies, particularly when the
212 underlying causal mechanisms are assumed to be deterministic and additive in nature.

213

214 *Information-Geometric Causal Inference (IGCI)*

215 This measure infers causal influence from x to y within deterministic systems featuring invertible
216 functions (Janzing et al., 2012). In IGCI, causal inference is approached by examining the geometric
217 structure of the joint probability distribution of variables. Specifically, IGCI focuses on estimating the
218 causal influence of one variable (the cause) on another variable (the effect) by analysing the
219 statistical dependencies between them. PySpi utilises CDT, where the difference in differential
220 entropies is computed, with probability density estimated via nearest-neighbour estimators. One of
221 the key features of IGCI is its ability to handle both linear and nonlinear causal relationships, making
222 it applicable to a wide range of data types and systems. Additionally, IGCI can be used to infer causal
223 relationships in scenarios where traditional statistical methods may not be suitable, such as when
224 dealing with high-dimensional or noisy data.

225

226 *Conditional Distribution Similarity Fit (CDS)*

227 This measure provides a quantitative measure of the conditional relationship between variables and
228 can help identify patterns of dependency or causality in empirical data (Cliff et al., 2023). It
229 represents the standard deviation of the conditional probability distribution of y given x . This
230 involves estimating the conditional probability distributions by discretising the values of the x and y
231 and then computing the standard deviation of these conditional distributions. CDSF does not rely on
232 specific parametric models to describe the relationship between variables, which makes it ideal for
233 objective analyses.

234

235 *Regression Error-Based Causal Inference (RECI)*

236 This provides an assessment of the causal impact of $x \rightarrow y$ by measuring the error in a regression of y
237 on x using a monomial (power product) model (Blöbaum et al., 2018). The rationale behind this
238 method is that if there is a causal relationship from x to y , the regression model should capture most
239 of the variation in y . This statistic corresponds to the Mean Squared Error (MSE) resulting from the
240 linear regression of the cubic (with a constant term) of x with y . While linear regression models are
241 commonly used, RECI can also be extended to handle nonlinear relationships between variables.

242

243 *Causally Conditioned Entropy (CCE)*

244 This measure quantifies the remaining uncertainty in time series y given the entire causal past of
245 both time series x and y (Cliff et al., 2023). It is computed as a sum of conditional entropies of y given
246 the past of both x and y with increasing history lengths. CCE is a sophisticated measure for assessing
247 the causal influence of one time series on another by quantifying the remaining uncertainty in the
248 target series after conditioning on the past values of both series. It is a versatile tool that can handle
249 both linear and nonlinear dependencies. For computational efficiency, PySpi sets the history length
250 of 10. This implies that the joint process is assumed to be, at most, a 10th-order Markov chain. We
251 used a Gaussian kernel in this work.

252

253 *Directed Information (DI)*

254 It is a measure for assessing the information flow from a source time series x to a target time series y
255 (Massey, 1990). It is calculated as the difference between the conditional entropy of y given its own
256 past and the *CCE*. This measure provides an interpretable framework for understanding causal
257 influence, as it directly quantifies the amount of information transferred from the source to the

258 target time series. As in *CCE*, the computation of *directed information* is limited to a history length of
259 10. We used a Gaussian kernel in this work.

260

261 *Frequency-domain measures*

262 We also calculated several measures of directed connectivity in the frequency domain. For the
263 frequency-domain measures, we used the full frequency range of 0 to 128Hz (the upper bound is
264 limited by the Nyquist theorem to half the sampling rate) to obtain a broad-band index rather than
265 focusing on a narrow frequency band. This provides general and objective results. The measures are
266 calculated over 125 uniformly sampled bins across the 0 to 128Hz frequency range and averaged.

267

268 *Group Delay (GD)*

269 Group delay quantifies a directed, average time delay between two signals by assessing the slope of
270 the phase differences as a function of frequency (derived through linear regression) (Hannan &
271 Thomson, 1973). This slope is computed solely for coherence values that are statistically significant,
272 and the time delay is acquired through a straightforward rescaling of the slope by 2π . The
273 implementation provides the output in the form of the rescaled time delay statistic. GD's ability to
274 provide directional, frequency-dependent, and time-resolved measures of the interactions between
275 signals is valuable. Its reliance on phase differences makes it particularly effective for studying the
276 temporal dynamics of complex systems.

277

278 *Phase Slope Index (PSI)*

279 This measure serves as a directed metric for assessing information flow, computed using the
280 complex-valued coherence (Nolte et al., 2008). Specifically, it evaluates the consistency of phase
281 difference alterations across a predefined frequency range, with coherence acting as a weighting
282 factor. The implementation computes the measure in the frequency domain. Its reliance on phase
283 coherence makes it robust to noise and effective in identifying directed connectivity within specific
284 frequency bands. However, *PSI* primarily assumes linear relationships in the phase domain. Nonlinear
285 interactions may not be fully captured by this measure. Moreover, accurate phase difference
286 estimation requires high-quality signals. Pre-processing steps such as filtering and artefact removal
287 are crucial for reliable *PSI* computation.

288

289 *Directed Transfer Function (DTF)*

290 This measure uses cross-spectral density matrix which can be decomposed into a noise covariance
291 matrix and a spectral transfer matrix (Eichler, 2006). The *directed transfer function* is derived from
292 this decomposition to quantify the inflow from x to y. This inflow is normalized by the total inflow
293 from all other signals into y, represented by the row-wise sum of the spectral transfer matrix. It can
294 provide frequency-specific insights into connectivity, and its normalisation allows for direct
295 comparison of connectivity between distinct pairs of signals. However, the computationally intensive
296 nature of the method, its assumption linearity limits the application of DTF in detecting nonlinear
297 relationships.

298

299 *Directed Coherence (DCOH)*

300 It is calculated from the inflow from x to y using the spectral transfer matrix (as described in DTF) and
301 is then normalised by their noise covariance (Baccalá & Sameshima, 2001). It can provide frequency-
302 specific insights into connectivity, and its normalisation allows for direct comparison of connectivity
303 between distinct pairs of signals. However, the computationally intensive nature of the method, its
304 assumption linearity limits the application of DCOH in detecting nonlinear relationships. Accurate
305 estimation of *DCOH* requires high-quality signals. Noise and artefacts in the data can affect the
306 reliability of the results, necessitating careful pre-processing steps.

307

308 *Partial Directed Coherence (PDCOH)*

309 The partial directed coherence from x to y is determined by the inflow (as described in DTF),
310 normalized by the total outflow from all other signals into y (the column-wise sum of the spectral
311 transfer matrix) (Baccalá & Sameshima, 2001). As an advantage to *DCOH*, by considering the
312 influence of all other signals in the network (on the signals being evaluated), *PDCOH* provides a more
313 accurate assessment of the true directional relationships between specific signal pairs.

314

315 *Spectral Granger Causality (SGC)*

316 This measure extends the concept of Granger Causality to the frequency domain, enabling the
317 assessment of causal interactions between signals at specific frequencies (Friston et al., 2014). It is
318 calculated using the spectral transfer matrix and noise covariance. These are estimated through
319 either a parametric (VAR model) approach or a nonparametric (spectral factorization) approach. We
320 used the *nonparametric* method to minimise subjective parameter settings. In the PySpi toolbox is
321 implemented using the Spectral Connectivity Toolbox. *SGC's* ability to provide frequency-specific and

322 normalized measures of causality makes it particularly useful where understanding the dynamics of
323 complex systems is important. However, its reliance on linearity and sensitivity to signal quality
324 should be considered when interpreting the results.

325

326 Time-domain measure

327 *Linear Model Fit (LMFIT)*

328 Linear regression is a widely employed method for assessing independence via model fittings (Cliff et
329 al., 2023). We employed ridge regression from the toolbox, which uses ℓ_2 -norm regularization and
330 the mean squared error (MSE) resulting from a regression of y on x . This measure is a powerful and
331 widely used statistical method for modelling the directed relationship between signals. Its simplicity,
332 interpretability, and efficiency make it a valuable tool for relationship analysis, and trend analysis in
333 various fields of study. However, it has several limiting assumptions including that observations are
334 independent of each other. Violation of this assumption (e.g., autocorrelation in time series data) can
335 lead to inaccurate estimates and predictions. Linear regression assumes a linear relationship
336 between signals. If the true relationship is nonlinear, the model may provide biased or inaccurate
337 results. Finally, overfitting can occur when the model is too complex relative to the amount of data
338 available. This can result in poor generalization to new data and unreliable predictions.

339

340 *Node metrics*

341 To characterise the role and behaviour of each node in the brain network, we used several network
342 analysis metrics (i.e., connectomics). Specifically, in network analysis, each network is composed of
343 **nodes** which are the electrode contacts here and **links** which are the (assumed) inter-node
344 connections. Using the open-source brain connectivity toolbox (Rubinov & Sporns, 2010), we
345 extracted six node metrics to evaluate the node behaviour in the network:

346

347 *In strength* is the sum of inward link weights (connectivity values). Nodes with higher *in strength* are
348 influential receivers within the network, as they accumulate a significant amount of incoming
349 influence, resources, or interactions from other nodes.

350

351 *Out strength* is the sum of outward link weights. Nodes with higher *out strength* are influential
352 senders within the network, as they contribute a significant amount of outgoing influence, resources,
353 or interactions to other nodes.

354

355 *First passage time* is the expected number of steps it takes a random walker to reach one node from
356 another. Nodes with higher first passage times are often located on the periphery, farther away from
357 central or densely connected regions.

358

359 *Clustering coefficient* is the fraction of triangles around a node and is equivalent to the fraction of
360 node's neighbours that are neighbours of each other. Nodes with higher clustering coefficients are
361 typically located in densely connected neighbourhoods. These nodes have many connections to
362 neighbouring nodes, forming cohesive groups or communities.

363

364 *Eccentricity* is the maximal shortest path length between a node and any other node. Nodes with
365 higher eccentricity are typically located on the periphery of the network. They are farther away from
366 the central core or densely connected regions.

367

368 *Betweenness centrality* is the fraction of all shortest paths in the network that contain a given node.
369 Nodes with higher betweenness centrality often serve as bridges or connectors between different
370 clusters, communities, or groups within the network. They lie on many of the shortest paths
371 connecting nodes in different regions. Nodes with lower betweenness centrality are typically located
372 on the periphery of clusters or communities within the network. They have fewer connections to
373 other nodes and are less likely to lie on shortest paths between nodes.

374

375 [Multivariate pattern classification for SOZ localisation](#)

376 We employed a standard multivariate pattern classification approach to localize the seizure onset
377 zone (SOZ), distinguishing contacts within the SOZ from those outside it (non-SOZ) (Karimi-
378 Rouzbahani & McGonigal, 2024). Initially, we computed inter-channel directed connectivity values.
379 Subsequently, we calculated the six aforementioned node metrics for each contact based on the
380 connectivity matrix, which has a size of $N \times N$, where N represents the number of nodes or contacts.
381 These metrics were then concatenated and utilised as features for the classifiers. The classification
382 performance gauged the discriminability of SOZ and non-SOZ contacts using directed connectivity
383 measures, assessed by the area-under-the-curve (AUC) metric for comprehensive, threshold-free
384 classification performance. Consistent with recent localisation studies (Jiang et al., 2022; Karimi-

385 Rouzbahani & McGonigal, 2024), we employed decision tree (DT) classifiers, treating each contact as
386 an observation in classification. Our DT classifiers utilised a random forest algorithm with 50 bags of
387 feature combinations, suitable for nonlinear feature classifications and offering insights into feature
388 contributions. This approach clarifies the "contribution" of each feature by permuting the contact
389 labels (i.e., SOZ vs. non-SOZ) in each feature separately and assessing its impact on performance,
390 where contribution is inversely proportional to performance drop. For classification, we conducted
391 separate analyses within interictal and ictal time windows for each patient, employing a 10-fold
392 cross-validation procedure. This procedure was applied individually for each recording data from ictal
393 and interictal packets and also their combinations. To address the imbalance in the number of SOZ to
394 non-SOZ contacts and prevent bias toward one class in classification, we employed an up-sampling
395 procedure to increase the number of observations for the class with fewer observations/contacts,
396 repeating each classification of data 1000 times before averaging the results. Additionally, we
397 generated chance-level performances by shuffling (SOZ/non-SOZ) contact labels 1000 times and
398 recalculating the classification performance, resulting in 1000 chance-level classification outcomes
399 against which we assessed the significance of our true classification performances.

400

401 [Statistical analysis](#)

402 We employed Bayes Factor (BF) analysis for statistical inference. We compared the AUC levels against
403 chance-level AUCs and assessed main effects on classifications. We interpreted levels of BF evidence
404 strictly: BFs above 10 and below 1/10, were considered evidence for the alternative and null
405 hypotheses, respectively. BFs falling between 1/10 and 10 were regarded as providing insufficient
406 evidence either way, indicating that no conclusions could be drawn about the difference between a
407 pair of variables.

408

409 To evaluate the evidence for the null and alternative hypotheses regarding at-chance and above-
410 chance classification, respectively, we compared the classification rates in each analysis with those
411 obtained from null distributions of the same analysis. For this purpose, we conducted an unpaired
412 Bayes factor t-test for the alternative (i.e., difference from chance; H1) and the null (i.e., no
413 difference from chance; H0) hypotheses.

414

415 To assess the evidence for the null and alternative hypotheses regarding the difference between
416 contributions across measures and metrics, we compared the contributions obtained from each of
417 these conditions using paired Bayes factor t-tests.

418

419 For evaluating the main effects of surgery outcome (Engel I/Engel II-IV), region of resection
420 (FRT/TPRMTL), pathology (lesional/non-lesional), and recording modality (SEEG/ECOG), we employed
421 a Bayes factor ANOVA. In this analysis, these four factors served as independent variables, with
422 classification/generalization AUC as the dependent variable.

423

424 To ensure statistical power in ANOVA, we excluded patients with insular, frontoparietal, parietal, and
425 mesiofrontal resections, where the sample size was less than 3. Priors for all Bayes factor analyses
426 were determined based on Jeffrey-Zellner-Siow priors (Jeffreys, 1998; Zellner & Siow, 1980), which
427 are derived from the Cauchy distribution based on the effect size initially calculated in the algorithm
428 using t-tests (Rouder et al., 2012).

429

430 [Data and code availability](#)


431 The dataset used in this study was from previous studies and is available at
432 <https://openneuro.org/datasets/ds004100/versions/1.1.3>. The code developed for this project is
433 available at https://github.com/HamidKarimi-Rouzbahani/Intracranial_epilepsy_connectivity.

434

435 [Results](#)

436 We analysed directed connectivity measures of intracranial neural signals in epileptic patients
437 towards two goals. First, we tested the sink-source hypotheses which suggest that SOZ areas
438 dominantly receive neural activities during the interictal period (i.e., confirming “sink SOZ”
439 hypothesis; Figure 1A). This direction was hypothesised to reverse in the ictal period (i.e., confirming
440 “source SOZ” hypothesis; Figure 1A). Second, we tested to see if directed connectivity measures
441 could localise the SOZ (Figure 1D). Importantly, to address these goals in a data-driven and objective
442 manner, we used a large set of 13 distinct measures of directed connectivity to analyse the data
443 which can clarify if the difference between connectivity methods used could explain the discrepancy
444 in the literature.

445



447 Strength of neural activity flow in and out of the SOZ

448 We evaluated the strength of neural activity towards and away from every node (electrode contact)
449 using *in* and *out strength* node metrics, respectively. Accordingly, nodes with higher *in strength* have
450 stronger inward connectivity than nodes with lower *in strength*, and nodes with higher *out strength*
451 have stronger outward connectivity than nodes with lower *out strength* (see *methods*).

452


453 In the interictal period, across the 13 directed connectivity measures tested, there was evidence (BF
454 > 10) for higher *in strength* in SOZ than non-SOZ areas for 5 connectivity measures (ANM, DI, DTF,
455 DCOH and PDCOH) and there was evidence (BF > 10) for higher *in strength* in non-SOZ than SOZ
456 areas only for the CDS connectivity measure. There was insufficient evidence ($0.1 < \text{BF} < 10$) either
457 way for the rest of the connectivity measures (Figure 2A). In the ictal period, there was evidence (BF
458 > 10) for higher *out strength* in SOZ than non-SOZ areas for ANM and SGC connectivity measures,
459 respectively. There was insufficient evidence ($0.1 < \text{BF} < 10$) either way for the rest of the
460 connectivity measures (Figure 2B).

461

462 The results above were obtained by averaging the results from *early*, *mid* and *late* epochs (time
463 windows) of the interictal and ictal periods (Figure 1B). To evaluate potential temporal variability in
464 connectivity, we also evaluated *in strength* and *out strength* for each individual 2-second epoch
465 (Supplementary Figure 1). The patterns of *in strength* were relatively similar across the three
466 interictal windows (c.f., Figure 2A). The patterns of *out strength* were also similar across the three
467 ictal windows and resembled the averaged results (c.f., Figure 2B).

468

469 While higher *in strength* in SOZ than non-SOZ areas (e.g., in the interictal period; c.f., Figure 2A) does
470 not necessarily correspond to higher *out strength* in non-SOZ than SOZ areas, we tested this opposite
471 non-hypothesised effect as well to ensure we are not overlooking a relevant effect (Supplementary
472 Figure 2). In the interictal period, there was evidence (BF > 10) for higher *out strength* in non-SOZ
473 than SOZ areas for the CDS connectivity measure only. However, there was evidence (BF > 10)
474 respectively for higher *out strength* in SOZ than non-SOZ areas for ANM and SGC, respectively. In the
475 ictal period, there was evidence (BF > 10) for higher *in strength* in non-SOZ than SOZ areas for the
476 CDS only, but also evidence (BF > 10) for higher *in strength* in SOZ than non-SOZ areas. Therefore, the
477 *out strength* during interictal period and the *in strength* during the ictal period provided inconsistent
478 results across connectivity measures to support clear directions of activity flows.



479

480 Together, these results show that distinct measures of connectivity show variable results.

481 Nonetheless, 5 out of 13 connectivity measures consistently supported the “sink SOZ” hypothesis in
 482 the interictal period. Similarly, but less strongly than in the interictal period, two connectivity
 483 measures supported the “source SOZ” hypothesis in the ictal period. These results were relatively
 484 stable within the interictal and ictal periods. Among the 13 connectivity measures evaluated, only
 485 the ANM measure supported both hypotheses.

486

487 [Switching of activity direction from the interictal to ictal period](#)

488 The above results suggested that SOZ areas tend to be the receivers (i.e., sinks) in the interictal
 489 period and the transmitters (i.e., sources) of neural activity in the ictal period. However, it remains
 490 unclear if this tendency of switching roles between being a sink or source is consistent across

491 patients (Doss et al., 2024). Specifically, the higher interictal *in strength* in SOZ compared to non-SOZ
492 and the higher ictal *out strength* in non-SOZ compared to SOZ could have come from distinct subset
493 of patients. To rule this out, we evaluated the correlation between effect sizes in the interictal and
494 ictal periods: effects sizes were calculated as $\Delta = in\ strength_{SOZ} - in\ strength_{non-SOZ}$ during
495 interictal and $\Delta = out\ strength_{SOZ} - out\ strength_{non-SOZ}$ during ictal period (Figure 3A). Majority
496 (8 out of 13) of connectivity measures showed a positive correlation between the direction of effects
497 across the interictal and ictal periods over patients with 5 reaching significance at $p < 0.01$ (*Pearson*
498 correlation). The rest of the 5 connectivity measures showed non-significant negative correlations.
499 Significant correlations suggest that patients in whom *in strength* was higher for SOZ compared to
500 non-SOZ in the ictal period were the same patients in whom the *out strength* was also higher for
501 non-SOZ compared to SOZ in the interictal period.


502

503 To check if this effect was also consistent at the individual contact level, we performed an additional
504 correlation-based analysis. To that end, we evaluated the correlation between the level of interictal
505 *in strength* and ictal *out strength* across SOZ contacts, within each individual patient (Figure 3B, top
506 panel). Results looked like the cross-patient analysis (c.f., Figure 3A) and showed positive correlations
507 for 9 of the connectivity measures while the rest showed negative correlations. This suggests that
508 changes in signal characteristics and connectivity patterns from the interictal to ictal period impacts
509 distinct connectivity measures differently. We repeated the same analysis to check the correlation
510 between the level of interictal *out strength* and ictal *in strength* across non-SOZ contacts, which
511 showed similar results to the SOZ contacts (Figure 3B, bottom panel). The consistent positive
512 correlations across the nine connectivity measures support that the contacts with higher interictal *in*
513 *strength* also showed a higher ictal *out strength*. However, the four measures with non-significant
514 negative correlations, which were all frequency-domain connectivity measures, support a different
515 transition: the contacts with higher interictal *in strength* showed a lower ictal *out strength*. This
516 might be because of the significant changes in the frequency characteristics of signals when going
517 from the interictal to the ictal period which continues to evolve during the seizure period (e.g., low
518 voltage fast activity (Lagarde et al., 2019)) dominantly impacting the frequency-domain connectivity
519 measures.

520

521

522



523

524

525 Separation of the SOZ from the rest of the network


526 Having tested the “sink and source SOZ” hypotheses, we then tested to see if other node metrics
527 would distinguish between SOZ and non-SOZ areas. These metrics were extracted from our directed
528 connectivity measures to determine the role of each node in the network. Initially, similar to *in*
529 *strength* and *out strength*, we compared SOZ and non-SOZ contacts separately for the interictal and
530 ictal periods using four additional node metrics including *first passage time*, *clustering coefficient*,
531 *eccentricity* and *betweenness*.

532

533 In the interictal period (Figure 4A), several node metrics discriminated SOZ from non-SOZ contacts.
534 For instance, there was evidence ($BF > 10$) for higher *first passage time* in SOZ than non-SOZ for five
535 (ANM, DI, DTF, DCOH, and PDCOH), and higher *eccentricity* for five (ANM, RECI, DI, SGC, and LMFIT)
536 connectivity measures. *Clustering coefficient* and *betweenness centrality* showed less consistent
537 results across connectivity measures. There was evidence ($BF > 10$) for higher *clustering coefficient* in
538 SOZ than non-SOZ for three connectivity measures (ANM, DI and DCOH) but also evidence ($BF > 10$)
539 for lower *clustering coefficient* in SOZ than non-SOZ for CDS. There was evidence ($BF > 10$) for higher
540 *betweenness centrality* in SOZ than non-SOZ for three connectivity measures (ANM, RECI and LMFIT)
541 but also evidence ($BF > 10$) for lower *betweenness centrality* in SOZ than non-SOZ for CDS. Relative
542 consistency and non-opposing results across connectivity measures in *first passage time* suggest that
543 SOZ areas has more complex and prolonged interactions with other areas than non-SOZ potentially
544 due to abnormal neural activity, leading to longer *first passage times*. Higher *eccentricity* in SOZ than
545 non-SOZ contacts suggests that the SOZ is positioned distantly from the most central nodes in the
546 network, indicating a more peripheral position or a more complex and distributed network structure
547 for the SOZ than the non-SOZ.

548

549 In the ictal period, results were less consistent across connectivity measures in terms of *first passage*
550 *time* and *clustering coefficient* with two connectivity measures higher for SOZ and one higher for
551 non-SOZ (Figure 4B). There was evidence ($BF > 10$) for higher *eccentricity* in SOZ than non-SOZ for
552 five connectivity measures (ANM, RECI, PSI, SGC, and LMFIT) similar to the interictal period. There
553 was evidence ($BF > 10$) for higher *betweenness centrality* in SOZ than non-SOZ for three connectivity
554 measures (RECI, DCOH and SGC) but also evidence ($BF > 10$) for lower *betweenness centrality* in SOZ
555 than non-SOZ for IGCI. These results align with the interictal results supporting that SOZ areas reside
556 in more peripheral and less central part of the brain network reflecting their separation from the rest
557 of the network.



558

559

560 [Localisation of SOZ using node network metrics](#)

561 Finally, we used our set of 6 node metrics extracted from the 13 connectivity measures to see how
562 precisely we could localise the SOZ. Localisation here refers to the discrimination of contacts within
563 SOZ from those within non-SOZ areas. To this end, we used a decision-tree machine learning
564 classifier to classify the SOZ and non-SOZ contacts using the 78-dimensional feature set (6 node
565 metrics per 13 connectivity measures).

566


567 There was evidence ($BF > 10$) for above-chance (i.e., $AUC > 0.5$) localisation of the SOZ in both
568 interictal and ictal periods at the group level (Figure 5A). At the individual level, the performance
569 varied across patients from around chance level of 0.5 to above 0.9. These results showed that, for
570 some patients, there was enough information in the directed connectivity measures to predict if a
571 node was part of the SOZ or not. These results also showed that interictal activity could also provide
572 as much localisation power as the ictal activity which is dominantly used in clinical practice.

573

574 To see if any of the patient demographic variables (i.e., surgery outcome (Engel I/Engel II-IV), region
575 of resection (FRT/TPRMTL), pathology (lesional/non-lesional), and recording modality (SEEG/ECOG))
576 could explain the localisation performance, we performed a Bayes factor ANOVA t-test with these
577 four factors as independent variables and the localisation performance (AUC) as the dependent
578 variable. There was insufficient evidence ($0.1 < BF < 10$) for an effect of any of the demographic
579 variables on the localisation performance in either interictal or ictal data (Supplementary Figure 3).

580

581



583 We then asked if there was systematic variation across the different recordings (i.e., time windows
584 when the data was sampled within the interictal data and ictal/seizure data) and analysis epochs
585 (i.e., early, mid and late). To perform this analysis, classifiers were trained and tested within each
586 individual recording and epoch. Consistently in interictal and ictal data, we observed a higher
587 localisation performance when localisation was done separately for each individual recording and
588 epoch (Supplementary Figure 4) than when they were all combined (c.f., Figure 5A). Moreover, in the
589 ictal data, we generally observed higher localisation performance in the early than mid and late
590 epochs of data (Supplementary Figure 4B), which can be explained by a stronger separation of SOZ
591 from non-SOZ areas at the onset of seizures. Please note that while the early epoch of data always
592 contained the first two seconds of the ictal activity, the mid and late epochs did not match across
593 patients as the length of seizures differed.

594

595 We then evaluated the contribution of each connectivity measure and node metric to the localisation
596 performance. When comparing the contribution of each connectivity measure, we concatenated its
597 node metrics and when evaluating the contribution of each node metric, we concatenated all the
598 connectivity measures. We concatenated all patients' data in both analyses. In the interictal period
599 (Figure 5B), there was evidence ($BF > 10$) for higher contribution of *eccentricity* than *first passage*
600 *time* and *clustering coefficient* and lower contribution from *betweenness centrality* than the other 5
601 node metrics. The median contributions of other node metrics varied in the range between the
602 medians of *betweenness centrality* and *eccentricity*. There was evidence ($BF > 10$) for higher
603 contributions of DI and ANM and lower contribution of SGC than several other node metrics.

604

605 In the ictal period (Figure 5C), we observed relatively similar contributions of node metrics and
606 connectivity measures. Specifically, node *eccentricity* and *betweenness centrality* showed the highest
607 and lowest contributions among other node metrics. There was also evidence ($BF > 10$) for higher
608 contribution of DI and ANM than other connectivity measures.

609

610 Together, these results show that *in strength* and *out strength* are informative metrics for localising
611 the SOZ. Importantly, we observed that the node metric of *eccentricity*, which reflects how
612 peripheral a node's position was in the network, had even higher localisation power. We also
613 observed that the connectivity metrics of DI and ANM provided the highest localisation power. These
614 results were consistent across both interictal and ictal periods. We also observed that localisation

615 was improved when done separately for each time window and was higher in early than later epochs
616 of the ictal data. These show that, there are subtle variations in node connectivity patterns which can
617 change the discriminability of SOZ from non-SOZ over time.

618

619 Discussion

620 This work was aimed towards two goals. First, this study tested if the SOZ in people with focal
621 epilepsy dominantly receives broadband neural activities in the interictal (resting baseline state)
622 period (“sink SOZ” hypothesis) and dominantly transmits the activities in the ictal (seizure) period
623 (“source SOZ” hypothesis). To that end, we utilised a data-driven approach and recruited a set of 13
624 directed connectivity measures along with 6 metrics of node behaviour in the network. We found
625 that not all connectivity measures supported the above hypotheses. Nonetheless, we found evidence
626 across several connectivity measures supporting these hypotheses. These measures showed that SOZ
627 dominantly received neural activities in the interictal and transmitted them in the ictal period
628 supporting the idea of seizure suppression and propagation, respectively. Second, this study
629 evaluated the predictive power of node metrics extracted from the above-mentioned connectivity
630 measures in localising the SOZ. To that end, we utilised the power of explainable machine learning
631 classifiers to successfully discriminate contacts within from those outside the SOZ. This work makes
632 several contributions to our understanding of epilepsy and how hypothesis-driven biomarkers can
633 localise the SOZ.

634

635 Earlier studies have evaluated the directionality of signals in the interictal and ictal periods. In
636 interictal data, some studies have suggested a leading role (higher outgoing signals) for the
637 epileptogenic zone (EZ) (Bettus et al., 2008; Lagarde, Roehri, Lambert, Trébuchon, et al., 2018;
638 Varotto et al., 2012) whereas others have suggested the opposite (Gunnarsdottir et al., 2022; Jiang et
639 al., 2022; Narasimhan et al., 2020; Paulo et al., 2022; Vlachos et al., 2017). Similar discrepancy exists
640 in studies which used ictal data, with some studies suggesting a leading role for the EZ areas
641 (Balatskaya et al., 2020b; Courtens et al., 2016; Jung et al., 2011; Yang et al., 2018) and others
642 providing evidence for the opposite (An et al., 2020; Janca et al., 2021; Mao et al., 2016; Nahvi et al.,
643 2023). One important reason behind these discrepant results could be the variation in the methods
644 used to measure directed connectivity (Doss et al., 2024; Lagarde et al., 2022; Lagarde & Bartolomei,
645 2024). Basically, distinct connectivity methods rely on distinct signal features to quantify connectivity.
646 As we categorised these methods (c.f., Figure 2), some methods rely on the complexity, randomness,
647 or the predictability of signal samples (information theory methods), whereas some rely on

648 frequency-domain representation of signals (frequency-domain methods) and others simply rely on
649 one-to-one mapping of time samples across areas (time-domain measures e.g., LMFIT) (Cliff et al.,
650 2023). Even different methods within each category work differently. For example, while ANM
651 detects causal relationship which are assumed to be additive with independent noise, IGCI can
652 detect more complex non-additive relationships. Therefore, it is not surprising to be able to detect
653 the directed connectivity using one method but not the other.

654

655 Building on the recent developments in neural decoding (Karimi-Rouzbahani, 2024; Karimi-
656 Rouzbahani, Shahmohammadi, et al., 2021; Karimi-Rouzbahani & Woolgar, 2022) and connectivity
657 analyses (Cliff et al., 2023; Karimi-Rouzbahani et al., 2022; Karimi-Rouzbahani, Ramezani, et al., 2021)
658 and trying to avoid subjective analysis, this study adopts a data-driven and objective approach to test
659 the direction of neural activity flow towards and away from the SOZ, which has been lacking in
660 previous studies that tend to select a priori methods of connectivity analysis (Lagarde & Bartolomei,
661 2024). We showed that several connectivity measures showed higher *in strength* towards SOZ than
662 non-SOZ areas in the interictal and higher *out strength* from SOZ than non-SOZ in the ictal period.
663 These results supported a switching role for the SOZ which not only supports the hypotheses of “sink
664 SOZ” in the interictal (Gunnarsdottir et al., 2022) and “source SOZ” in the ictal period (Schindler et
665 al., 2007), but also serves as a biomarker for localising SOZ. Interestingly, we observed a higher
666 consistency across connectivity measures in the interictal than ictal period. This might suggest that
667 while the inflow of activity in the interictal period might be reflected in a wider range of activity
668 patterns as captured by a higher number of connectivity measures, the outflow of neural activity
669 might be confined to a limited range of activity patterns (Lagarde et al., 2019). This is supported by
670 our observation of less cross-patient generalisable epileptogenic patterns in the interictal than ictal
671 periods (Karimi-Rouzbahani & McGonigal, 2024).

672

673 Only a few studies have evaluated directed connectivity during both interictal and ictal periods in the
674 same patient population. For example, partial directed coherence (PDCOH) method applied to
675 patients with type II focal cortical dysplasia showed a higher *out density* (defined as the ratio
676 between the sum of node degrees and the total number of connections in the network) in the lesion
677 and SOZ areas than non-SOZ areas supporting the “source SOZ” hypothesis in the ictal data, but did
678 not find evidence to support “sink SOZ” in the interictal data (Varotto et al., 2012). On the other
679 hand, phase transfer entropy along with node metrics applied to a sample of 43 temporal lobe
680 epilepsy patients showed higher *out/in degree ratio* in EZ than non-EZ areas consistently through

681 interictal and ictal data supporting “source SOZ” hypothesis in the ictal period (Wang et al., 2017). A
682 more recent study used both interictal and ictal data and supported the “sink SOZ” hypothesis in the
683 interictal and “source SOZ” hypothesis in the ictal data using directed transfer function (DTF)
684 measure (Jiang et al., 2022). Finally, using a novel source-sink index obtained from both interictal and
685 ictal activities, both the interictal sinking and ictal sourcing behaviours were observed for SOZ
686 (Gunnarsdottir et al., 2022). In our work, DTF supported “sink SOZ” in the interictal data but showed
687 insufficient evidence ($0.1 < BF < 10$) for “source SOZ” in the ictal data (c.f., Figure 2A). As these
688 previous studies only used one (Varotto et al., 2012) or a couple (Jiang et al., 2022; Narasimhan et al.,
689 2020; Vlachos et al., 2017) of connectivity measures, there is a possibility that they have missed
690 some features of connectivity to comprehensively test both hypotheses. Importantly, the above-
691 mentioned studies, which tested the directionality of connectivity did not show opposite directions
692 to our present work (i.e., opposite directionality would mean higher *in strength* in the interictal and
693 higher *out strength* in the ictal period for non-SOZ than SOZ). In addition to the large set of
694 connectivity measures and node metrics evaluated in the present work, which evaluates the
695 connectivity more exhaustively, the larger sample size used here compared to those studies allows
696 for a more powerful evaluation.

697

698 Our results suggest that rather than being the most central/connected in the network, the SOZ
699 seems to separate from the rest of the network. It is important to note that our measures of
700 connectivity were extracted from temporal patterns of activity. Therefore, the separation of the SOZ
701 from the rest of the network is more in the temporal sense than spatial and may reflect a more
702 complex and distributed network structure for the SOZ than the non-SOZ. In other words, while
703 spatial proximity of areas can influence the similarity of their activities, separation here means
704 dissimilarity in activity patterns rather than spatial location. This underlines the importance of
705 considering temporal as well spatial features when investigating epileptogenic networks (Bartolomei
706 et al., 2017). The separation of the SOZ is consistent with previous studies which evaluated the
707 temporal dynamics of network configurations. For example, it has been shown that, immediately
708 after the seizure onset, the correlation in the whole-brain network drops significantly (Kerr et al.,
709 2011; Schindler et al., 2007) possibly because of SOZ becoming functionally disconnected from other
710 areas (Warren et al., 2010), which becomes less pronounced later in the seizure (indeed, hyper-
711 correlation of EEG activity in the latter part of seizures has been postulated to be an emergent
712 regulatory mechanism to promote seizure termination (Schindler et al., 2007)). This is also probably
713 why we observed generally higher discrimination of SOZ from non-SOZ immediately after the seizure
714 compared to later epochs (c.f., Supplementary Figure 4). It is important to note that, while our

715 results showed evidence for neural activity dominantly flowing towards the SOZ in the interictal
716 periods, whether this neural activity is inhibitory remains unclear. This is because connectivity
717 methods can not determine whether the transmission is excitatory or inhibitory (Doss et al., 2024;
718 Jiang et al., 2022; Lagarde & Bartolomei, 2024). Low voltage fast activity, the hallmark of focal seizure
719 onset across species, has been shown to be associated with increased firing in GABA-ergic inhibitory
720 interneurons (Gentiletti et al., 2022), triggered by accumulation of extra-cellular potassium. Studies
721 to further evaluate links between electrophysiologic seizure evolution and associated ionic and
722 neurotransmitter changes (e.g. using optogenetic and pharmacological approaches in animal models)
723 have helped advance understanding of the dynamics of focal seizures (Wenzel et al., 2023), but more
724 investigation is needed, and integrating directed connectivity methods into electrophysiologic
725 models may be useful. Better understanding of the preictal to ictal transition may be of particular
726 interest (Capitano et al., 2024)

727 Following more recent broad-band data-driven approaches (Gunnarsdottir et al., 2022), we used
728 broad-band rather than narrow-band signals in our analyses. This aligns with studies which evaluated
729 the connectivity over the broad-band frequency ranges and did not find any differences in
730 directionality of signals across frequency bands (Doss et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2022). Also, studies
731 which suggested an effect of frequency on connectivity have reported inconsistent results. For
732 example, while some studies have shown significantly higher *out/in degree* for EZ than non-EZ in the
733 gamma-band activity (Wang et al., 2017) and higher outward connectivity using single-pulse
734 electrical stimulation (Johnson et al., 2023), other studies have reported a significant decrease in
735 outgoing connectivity from the SOZ in the gamma band frequencies during seizures (Janca et al.,
736 2021).

737

738 Previous studies have also shown that the information in the node metrics (i.e., connectomics),
739 extracted from directed connectivity measures, could discriminate the SOZ from non-SOZ (Sethi et
740 al., 2016; Van Mierlo et al., 2013; Varotto et al., 2012; Vlachos et al., 2017; Wilke et al., 2011).
741 Specifically, Wilke et al., (2011) found that the *betweenness centrality* was correlated with the
742 location of resected cortical regions in patients with seizure-free outcomes. Van Mierlo et al. (2013)
743 found that the electrode contacts with the highest *out degree* always lay within the resected brain
744 regions and that the patient-specific connectivity patterns were consistent over majority of seizures.
745 Sethi et al., (2016) analysed a network constructed from functional MRI (fMRI) data in patients with
746 polymicrogyria and refractory epilepsy, and found that the polymicrogyric nodes showed significantly
747 increased *clustering coefficients* and *characteristic path lengths* compared with the normal

748 contralateral homologous cortical regions. Varotto et al., (2012) analysed the connectivity pattern in
749 patients with type II focal cortical dysplasia and found that *out density* can discriminate SOZ from
750 non-SOZ. Vlachos et al., (2017) evaluated effective inflow obtained from several connectivity
751 measures including (DCOH, PDCOH and DTF) in the interictal period to show that EZ has a higher
752 *inflow* than non-EZ. Higher *Out degree* obtained from DTF in the ictal period accurately determined
753 the EZ nodes in (Yang et al., 2018). The present work is among the few which directly and
754 quantitatively compared the information in several node metrics. Previously, Mao et al., (2016), who
755 used PDC, have shown that *in degree* and *betweenness centrality* had more localisation information
756 than *in degree* in the ictal period. In contrast, another study, which used nonlinear correlation, found
757 more information in *out degree* than *in degree* (Courstens et al., 2016). Current study builds on these
758 previous studies, combines a set of 6 node metrics extracted from 13 distinct connectivity measures
759 to show how accurately they can discriminate SOZ from non-SOZ. We found evidence ($BF > 10$) for
760 above-chance discrimination performance during both interictal and ictal windows, and the DI was
761 among the most informative connectivity measures to localise the SOZ. We also found that
762 *eccentricity* is even a more powerful biomarker for EZ localisation than *in strength* suggested in
763 previous studies (Doss et al., 2024; Johnson et al., 2023).

764

765 It is of note that most of the previous studies have only indicated the discriminability of SOZ from
766 non-SOZ contacts, rather than testing the generalisability of effects across new unseen contacts. Our
767 ML-based method learns the connectivity patterns from a set of training contacts and was able to
768 discriminate the SOZ from non-SOZ in unseen contacts. The lower performance of our node metrics,
769 compared to our recent multi-featural localisation method on the same dataset (Karimi-Rouzbahani
770 & McGonigal, 2024), can be explained by a variety of reasons including higher number of time
771 windows incorporated in the analysis. It is of note that, while the results were above-chance, we did
772 not optimise our classification/localisation pipeline, instead we focused on showing the plausibility of
773 the method for localisation. To make the algorithm ready for real-world application, further
774 optimisations in the pipeline can be made from the machine learning literature such as incorporating
775 univariate signal features (Karimi-Rouzbahani & McGonigal, 2024), and data augmentation. The
776 optimisation of the proposed pipeline is the subject of future work.

777

778 Among the 13 connectivity measures tested in this study only ANM supported both hypotheses. It
779 may suggest that the patterns of activity and in turn connectivity significantly change from the
780 interictal to the ictal period, which may lead to them being missed using any individual connectivity

781 measure. More specifically, while the connectivity between brain areas might be facilitated through
782 the modulation of signal complexities in the interictal period (as captured by CDS and DI, Figure 2A),
783 the connectivity between brain areas might be facilitated by frequency-domain modulations in the
784 ictal period (as captured by SGC, Figure 2B). This makes sense as ictal activities have been shown to
785 strongly modulate the signal power in several frequency bands (Grinenko et al., 2018).

786

787 This work tested two critical hypotheses in epilepsy research and provided evidence that the SOZ
788 seems to dominantly receive neural activities from non-SOZ potentially to be suppressed between
789 seizures, whereas it dominantly transmits neural activities to non-SOZ during seizures. We showed
790 that not all directed connectivity measures can detect those changes in connectivity direction from
791 the interictal to ictal period, as probably the nature of connectivity changes with seizure onset. We
792 also showed that, using a combination of node connectivity metrics extracted from directed
793 connectivity measures, it is possible to localise the SOZ with above-chance performance. These
794 results shed new light on the configuration of brain networks in epilepsy and introduces a potential
795 method for localising the SOZ using explainable machine learning algorithms, as well as providing a
796 rationalized set of measures for further investigation of seizure dynamics.

797

798 Acknowledgements

799 We thank Mater Foundation and Mater Research Institute for supporting this study.

800 References

801

- 802 Amini, L., Jutten, C., Achard, S., David, O., Soltanian-Zadeh, H., Hossein-Zadeh, G. A., Kahane, P.,
803 Minotti, L., & Vercueil, L. (2011). Directed differential connectivity graph of interictal
804 epileptiform discharges. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, *58*(4), 884–893.
805 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TBME.2010.2099227>
- 806 An, N., Ye, X., Liu, Q., Xu, J., & Zhang, P. (2020). Localization of the epileptogenic zone based on ictal
807 stereo-electroencephalogram: Brain network and single-channel signal feature analysis.
808 *Epilepsy Research*, *167*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2020.106475>
- 809 Andrzejak, R. G., Schindler, K., & Rummel, C. (2012). Nonrandomness, nonlinear dependence, and
810 nonstationarity of electroencephalographic recordings from epilepsy patients. *Physical Review E*
811 *- Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, *86*(4).
812 <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.86.046206>
- 813 Avoli, M., Biagini, G., & de Curtis, M. (2006). Do Interictal Spikes Sustain Seizures and
814 Epileptogenesis? *Epilepsy Currents*, *6*(6), 203–207. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1535-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1535-7511.2006.00146.x)
815 [7511.2006.00146.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1535-7511.2006.00146.x)

- 816 Baccalá, L. A., & Sameshima, K. (2001). Partial directed coherence: a new concept in neural structure
817 determination. *Biological Cybernetics*, *84*(6), 463–474. <https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00007990>
- 818 Balatskaya, A., Roehri, N., Lagarde, S., Pizzo, F., Medina, S., Wendling, F., Bénar, C. G., & Bartolomei, F.
819 (2020a). The “Connectivity Epileptogenicity Index ” (cEI), a method for mapping the different
820 seizure onset patterns in StereoElectroEncephalography recorded seizures. *Clinical*
821 *Neurophysiology*, *131*(8), 1947–1955. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2020.05.029>
- 822 Balatskaya, A., Roehri, N., Lagarde, S., Pizzo, F., Medina, S., Wendling, F., Bénar, C. G., & Bartolomei, F.
823 (2020b). The “Connectivity Epileptogenicity Index ” (cEI), a method for mapping the different
824 seizure onset patterns in StereoElectroEncephalography recorded seizures. *Clinical*
825 *Neurophysiology*, *131*(8), 1947–1955. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2020.05.029>
- 826 Bartolomei, F., Lagarde, S., Wendling, F., McGonigal, A., Jirsa, V., Guye, M., & Bénar, C. (2017).
827 Defining epileptogenic networks: Contribution of SEEG and signal analysis. In *Epilepsia* (Vol. 58,
828 Issue 7, pp. 1131–1147). Blackwell Publishing Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.13791>
- 829 Bernabei, J. M., Li, A., Revell, A. Y., Smith, R. J., Gunnarsdottir, K. M., Ong, I. Z., Davis, K. A., Sinha, N.,
830 Sarma, S., & Litt, B. (2023). Quantitative approaches to guide epilepsy surgery from intracranial
831 EEG. *Brain*, *146*(6), 2248–2258. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awad007>
- 832 Bernabei, J. M., Sinha, N., Arnold, T. C., Conrad, E., Ong, I., Pattnaik, A. R., Stein, J. M., Shinohara, R.
833 T., Lucas, T. H., Bassett, D. S., Davis, K. A., & Litt, B. (2022). Normative intracranial EEG maps
834 epileptogenic tissues in focal epilepsy. *Brain*, *145*(6), 1949–1961.
835 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awab480>
- 836 Bettus, G., Ranjeva, J. P., Wendling, F., Bénar, C. G., Confort-Gouny, S., Régis, J., Chauvel, P., Cozzone,
837 P. J., Lemieux, L., Bartolomei, F., & Guye, M. (2011). Interictal functional connectivity of human
838 epileptic networks assessed by intracerebral EEG and BOLD signal fluctuations. *PLoS ONE*, *6*(5).
839 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0020071>
- 840 Bettus, G., Wendling, F., Guye, M., Valton, L., Régis, J., Chauvel, P., & Bartolomei, F. (2008). Enhanced
841 EEG functional connectivity in mesial temporal lobe epilepsy. *Epilepsy Research*, *81*(1), 58–68.
842 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2008.04.020>
- 843 Blöbaum, P., Janzing, D., Washio, T., Shimizu, S., & Schölkopf, B. (2018). *Cause-Effect Inference by*
844 *Comparing Regression Errors*.
- 845 Capitano, F., Kuchenbuch, M., Lavigne, J., Chaptoukaev, H., Zuluaga, M. A., Lorenzi, M., Nabbout, R.,
846 & Mantegazza, M. (2024). Preictal dysfunctions of inhibitory interneurons paradoxically lead to
847 their rebound hyperactivity and to low-voltage-fast onset seizures in Dravet syndrome.
848 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *121*(23).
849 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2316364121>
- 850 Chen, Z., Brodie, M. J., Liew, D., & Kwan, P. (2018). Treatment Outcomes in Patients With Newly
851 Diagnosed Epilepsy Treated With Established and New Antiepileptic Drugs. *JAMA Neurology*,
852 *75*(3), 279. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaneurol.2017.3949>
- 853 Cliff, O. M., Bryant, A. G., Lizier, J. T., Tsuchiya, N., & Fulcher, B. D. (2023). Unifying pairwise
854 interactions in complex dynamics. *Nature Computational Science*, *3*(10), 883–893.
855 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-023-00519-x>

- 856 Courtens, S., Colombet, B., Trébuchon, A., Brovelli, A., Bartolomei, F., & Bénar, C. G. (2016). Graph
857 Measures of Node Strength for Characterizing Preictal Synchrony in Partial Epilepsy. *Brain*
858 *Connectivity*, 6(7), 530–539. <https://doi.org/10.1089/brain.2015.0397>
- 859 Di Giacomo, R., Burini, A., Chiarello, D., Pelliccia, V., Deleo, F., Garbelli, R., de Curtis, M., Tassi, L., &
860 Gnatkovsky, V. (2024). Ictal fast activity *chirps* as markers of the epileptogenic zone. *Epilepsia*,
861 65(6). <https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.17995>
- 862 Doss, D. J., Shless, J. S., Bick, S. K., Makhoul, G. S., Negi, A. S., Bibro, C. E., Rashingkar, R.,
863 Gummadavelli, A., Chang, C., Gallagher, M. J., Naftel, R. P., Reddy, S. B., Williams-Roberson, S.,
864 Morgan, V. L., Johnson, G. W., & Englot, D. J. (2024). The interictal suppression hypothesis is the
865 dominant differentiator of seizure onset zones in focal epilepsy. *Brain*.
866 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awae189>
- 867 Eichler, M. (2006). On the evaluation of information flow in multivariate systems by the directed
868 transfer function. *Biological Cybernetics*, 94(6), 469–482. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00422-006-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00422-006-0062-z)
869 0062-z
- 870 Friston, K. J., Bastos, A. M., Oswal, A., van Wijk, B., Richter, C., & Litvak, V. (2014). Granger causality
871 revisited. *NeuroImage*, 101, 796–808. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.06.062>
- 872 Gallagher, R., Sinha, N., Pattnaik, A., Ojemann, W., Lucas, A., LaRocque, J., Bernabei, J., Greenblatt, A.,
873 Sweeney, E., Chen, I., Davis, K., Conrad, E., & Litt, B. (2023). Quantifying interictal intracranial
874 EEG to predict focal epilepsy. *ArXiv*, *arXiv:2307.15170*.
- 875 Gentiletti, D., de Curtis, M., Gnatkovsky, V., & Suffczynski, P. (2022). Focal seizures are organized by
876 feedback between neural activity and ion concentration changes. *ELife*, 11.
877 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.68541>
- 878 Grinenko, O., Li, J., Mosher, J. C., Wang, I. Z., Bulacio, J. C., Gonzalez-Martinez, J., Nair, D., Najm, I.,
879 Leahy, R. M., & Chauvel, P. (2018). A fingerprint of the epileptogenic zone in human epilepsies.
880 *Brain*, 141(1), 117–131. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awx306>
- 881 Gunnarsdottir, K. M., Li, A., Smith, R. J., Kang, J.-Y., Korzeniewska, A., Crone, N. E., Rouse, A. G., Cheng,
882 J. J., Kinsman, M. J., Landazuri, P., Uysal, U., Ulloa, C. M., Cameron, N., Cajigas, I., Jagid, J.,
883 Kanner, A., Elarjani, T., Bicchi, M. M., Inati, S., ... Sarma, S. V. (2022). Source-sink connectivity: a
884 novel interictal EEG marker for seizure localization. *Brain*, 145(11), 3901–3915.
885 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awac300>
- 886 HANNAN, E. J., & THOMSON, P. J. (1973). Estimating group delay. *Biometrika*, 60(2), 241–253.
887 <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/60.2.241>
- 888 Hoyer, P. O., Janzing, D., Mooij, J., Peters, J., & Schölkopf, B. (n.d.). *Nonlinear causal discovery with*
889 *additive noise models*.
- 890 Janca, R., Jahodova, A., Hlinka, J., Jezdik, P., Svobodova, L., Kudr, M., Kalina, A., Marusic, P., Krsek, P.,
891 & Jiruska, P. (2021). Ictal gamma-band interactions localize ictogenic nodes of the epileptic
892 network in focal cortical dysplasia. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 132(8), 1927–1936.
893 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2021.04.016>
- 894 Janzing, D., Mooij, J., Zhang, K., Lemeire, J., Zscheischler, J., Daniušis, P., Steudel, B., & Schölkopf, B.
895 (2012). Information-geometric approach to inferring causal directions. *Artificial Intelligence*,
896 182–183, 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2012.01.002>

- 897 Jeffreys, H. (1998). *The theory of probability*. OuP Oxford.
- 898 Jiang, H., Kokkinos, V., Ye, S., Urban, A., Bagić, A., Richardson, M., & He, B. (2022). Interictal SEEG
899 Resting-State Connectivity Localizes the Seizure Onset Zone and Predicts Seizure Outcome.
900 *Advanced Science*, 9(18). <https://doi.org/10.1002/advs.202200887>
- 901 Johnson, G. W., Doss, D. J., Morgan, V. L., Paulo, D. L., Cai, L. Y., Shless, J. S., Negi, A. S., Gummadavelli,
902 A., Kang, H., Reddy, S. B., Naftel, R. P., Bick, S. K., Williams Roberson, S., Dawant, B. M., Wallace,
903 M. T., & Englot, D. J. (2023). The Interictal Suppression Hypothesis in focal epilepsy: network-
904 level supporting evidence. *Brain*, 146(7), 2828–2845. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awad016>
- 905 Jung, Y. J., Kang, H. C., Choi, K. O., Lee, J. S., Kim, D. S., Cho, J. H., Kim, S. H., Im, C. H., & Kim, H. D.
906 (2011). Localization of ictal onset zones in Lennox-Gastaut syndrome using directional
907 connectivity analysis of intracranial electroencephalography. *Seizure*, 20(6), 449–457.
908 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seizure.2011.02.004>
- 909 Karimi-Rouzbahani, H. (2024). Evidence for Multiscale Multiplexed Representation of Visual Features
910 in EEG. *Neural Computation*, 36(3), 412–436. https://doi.org/10.1162/neco_a_01649
- 911 Karimi-Rouzbahani, H., & McGonigal, A. (2024). Generalisability of epileptiform patterns across time
912 and patients. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), 6293. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-56990-7>
- 913 Karimi-Rouzbahani, H., Ramezani, F., Woolgar, A., Rich, A., & Ghodrati, M. (2021). Perceptual
914 difficulty modulates the direction of information flow in familiar face recognition. *NeuroImage*,
915 233, 117896. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.117896>
- 916 Karimi-Rouzbahani, H., Shahmohammadi, M., Vahab, E., Setayeshi, S., & Carlson, T. (2021). Temporal
917 Variabilities Provide Additional Category-Related Information in Object Category Decoding: A
918 Systematic Comparison of Informative EEG Features. *Neural Computation*, 1–46.
919 https://doi.org/10.1162/neco_a_01436
- 920 Karimi-Rouzbahani, H., Vogrin, S., Cao, M., Plummer, C., & McGonigal, A. (2024). Multimodal and
921 Quantitative Analysis of the Epileptogenic Zone in the Pre-Surgical Evaluation of Drug-Resistant
922 Focal Epilepsy. *MedRxiv*.
- 923 Karimi-Rouzbahani, H., & Woolgar, A. (2022). When the Whole Is Less Than the Sum of Its Parts:
924 Maximum Object Category Information and Behavioral Prediction in Multiscale Activation
925 Patterns. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2022.825746>
- 926 Karimi-Rouzbahani, H., Woolgar, A., Henson, R., & Nili, H. (2022). Caveats and Nuances of Model-
927 Based and Model-Free Representational Connectivity Analysis. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 16.
928 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2022.755988>
- 929 Kerr, M. S. D., Burns, S. P., Gale, J., Gonzalez-Martinez, J., Bulacio, J., & Sarma, S. V. (2011).
930 Multivariate analysis of SEEG signals during seizure. *Proceedings of the Annual International*
931 *Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, EMBS*, 8279–8282.
932 <https://doi.org/10.1109/IEMBS.2011.6092041>
- 933 Kini, L. G., Bernabei, J. M., Mikhail, F., Hadar, P., Shah, P., Khambhati, A. N., Oechsel, K., Archer, R.,
934 Boccanfuso, J., Conrad, E., Shinohara, R. T., Stein, J. M., Das, S., Kheder, A., Lucas, T. H., Davis, K.
935 A., Bassett, D. S., & Litt, B. (2019). Virtual resection predicts surgical outcome for drug-resistant
936 epilepsy. *Brain*, 142(12), 3892–3905. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awz303>

- 937 Kramer, M. A., & Cash, S. S. (2012). Epilepsy as a disorder of cortical network organization. In
938 *Neuroscientist* (Vol. 18, Issue 4, pp. 360–372). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073858411422754>
- 939 Kwan, P., & Brodie, M. J. (2000). Early Identification of Refractory Epilepsy. *New England Journal of*
940 *Medicine*, 342(5), 314–319. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM200002033420503>
- 941 Lagarde, S., & Bartolomei, F. (2024). Sink into the epileptogenic zone: findings from directed SEEG
942 functional connectivity decomposition. *Brain*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awae256>
- 943 Lagarde, S., Bénar, C. G., Wendling, F., & Bartolomei, F. (2022). Interictal Functional Connectivity in
944 Focal Refractory Epilepsies Investigated by Intracranial EEG. In *Brain Connectivity* (Vol. 12, Issue
945 10, pp. 850–869). Mary Ann Liebert Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1089/brain.2021.0190>
- 946 Lagarde, S., Buzori, S., Trebuchon, A., Carron, R., Scavarda, D., Milh, M., McGonigal, A., & Bartolomei,
947 F. (2019). The repertoire of seizure onset patterns in human focal epilepsies: Determinants and
948 prognostic values. *Epilepsia*, 60(1), 85–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.14604>
- 949 Lagarde, S., Roehri, N., Lambert, I., Trébuchon, A., MCGonigal, A., Carron, R., Scavarda, D., Milh, M.,
950 Pizzo, F., & Colombet, B. (2018). Interictal stereotactic-EEG functional connectivity in refractory
951 focal epilepsies. *Brain-A Journal of Neurology*, 10, 2966–2980.
952 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awy214i>
- 953 Lagarde, S., Roehri, N., Lambert, I., Trebuchon, A., McGonigal, A., Carron, R., Scavarda, D., Milh, M.,
954 Pizzo, F., Colombet, B., Giusiano, B., Medina Villalon, S., Guye, M., Bénar, C. G., & Bartolomei, F.
955 (2018). Interictal stereotactic-EEG functional connectivity in refractory focal epilepsies. *Brain*,
956 141(10), 2966–2980. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awy214>
- 957 Li, A., Chennuri, B., Subramanian, S., Yaffe, R., Gliske, S., Stacey, W., Norton, R., Jordan, A., Zaghoul,
958 K. A., Inati, S. K., Agrawal, S., Haagensen, J. J., Hopp, J., Atallah, C., Johnson, E., Crone, N.,
959 Anderson, W. S., Fitzgerald, Z., Bulacio, J., ... Gonzalez-Martinez, J. (2018). Using network
960 analysis to localize the epileptogenic zone from invasive EEG recordings in intractable focal
961 epilepsy. *Network Neuroscience*, 2(2), 218–240. https://doi.org/10.1162/netn_a_00043
- 962 Li, A., Huynh, C., Fitzgerald, Z., Cajigas, I., Brusko, D., Jagid, J., Claudio, A. O., Kanner, A. M., Hopp, J.,
963 Chen, S., Haagensen, J., Johnson, E., Anderson, W., Crone, N., Inati, S., Zaghoul, K. A., Bulacio,
964 J., Gonzalez-Martinez, J., & Sarma, S. V. (2021). Neural fragility as an EEG marker of the seizure
965 onset zone. *Nature Neuroscience*, 24(10), 1465–1474. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-021-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-021-00901-w)
966 00901-w
- 967 Li, Z., Zhang, H., Niu, S., & Xing, Y. (2023). Localizing epileptogenic zones with high-frequency
968 oscillations and directed connectivity. *Seizure: European Journal of Epilepsy*, 111, 9–16.
969 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seizure.2023.07.013>
- 970 Liou, J., Smith, E. H., Bateman, L. M., Bruce, S. L., McKhann, G. M., Goodman, R. R., Emerson, R. G.,
971 Schevon, C. A., & Abbott, L. (2020). A model for focal seizure onset, propagation, evolution, and
972 progression. *eLife*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.50927>
- 973 Liu, X., Han, F., Fu, R., Wang, Q., & Luan, G. (2021). Epileptogenic Zone Location of Temporal Lobe
974 Epilepsy by Cross-Frequency Coupling Analysis. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 12.
975 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2021.764821>

- 976 Mao, J. W., Ye, X. L., Li, Y. H., Liang, P. J., Xu, J. W., & Zhang, P. M. (2016). Dynamic network
977 connectivity analysis to identify epileptogenic zones based on stereo-electroencephalography.
978 *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, 10(OCT). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2016.00113>
- 979 Massey, J. L. (1990). CAUSALITY, FEEDBACK AND DIRECTED INFORMATION. In *Intl. Symp. on Info. Th.*
980 *and its Applications*.
- 981 Mooij, A. H., Frauscher, B., Gotman, J., & Huiskamp, G. J. M. (2020). A skew-based method for
982 identifying intracranial EEG channels with epileptic activity without detecting spikes, ripples, or
983 fast ripples. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 131(1), 183–192.
984 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2019.10.025>
- 985 Nahvi, M., Ardeshir, G., Ezoji, M., Tafakhori, A., Shafiee, S., & Babajani-Feremi, A. (2023). An
986 application of dynamical directed connectivity of ictal intracranial EEG recordings in seizure
987 onset zone localization. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 386.
988 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2022.109775>
- 989 Narasimhan, S., Kundassery, K. B., Gupta, K., Johnson, G. W., Wills, K. E., Goodale, S. E., Haas, K.,
990 Rolston, J. D., Naftel, R. P., Morgan, V. L., Dawant, B. M., González, H. F. J., & Englot, D. J. (2020).
991 Seizure-onset regions demonstrate high inward directed connectivity during resting-state: An
992 SEEG study in focal epilepsy. *Epilepsia*, 61(11), 2534–2544. <https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.16686>
- 993 Nolte GUIDONOLTE, G., Ziehe ZIEHE, A., Krämer NKRAEMER, N., Popescu FLORINPOPESCU, F., Nolte,
994 G., Ziehe, A., Krämer, N., Popescu, F., & Müller NOLTE ZIEHE KRÄMER POPESCU MÜLLER, K.
995 (n.d.). Comparison of Granger Causality and Phase Slope Index Klaus-Robert Müller. In *JMLR*
996 *Workshop and Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 6).
- 997 Paulo, D. L., Wills, K. E., Johnson, G. W., Gonzalez, H. F. J., Rolston, J. D., Naftel, R. P., Reddy, S. B.,
998 Morgan, V. L., Kang, H., Williams Roberson, S., Narasimhan, S., & Englot, D. J. (2022). SEEG
999 Functional Connectivity Measures to Identify Epileptogenic Zones. *Neurology*, 98(20).
1000 <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000200386>
- 1001 Plomp, G., Quairiaux, C., Michel, C. M., & Astolfi, L. (2014). The physiological plausibility of time-
1002 varying Granger-causal modeling: Normalization and weighting by spectral power. *NeuroImage*,
1003 97, 206–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.04.016>
- 1004 Roehri, N., Pizzo, F., Lagarde, S., Lambert, I., Nica, A., McGonigal, A., Giusiano, B., Bartolomei, F., &
1005 Bénar, C. G. (2018). High-frequency oscillations are not better biomarkers of epileptogenic
1006 tissues than spikes. *Annals of Neurology*, 83(1), 84–97. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.25124>
- 1007 Rouder, J. N., Morey, R. D., Speckman, P. L., & Province, J. M. (2012). Default Bayes factors for ANOVA
1008 designs. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 56(5), 356–374.
1009 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmp.2012.08.001>
- 1010 Rubinov, M., & Sporns, O. (2010). Complex network measures of brain connectivity: Uses and
1011 interpretations. *NeuroImage*, 52(3), 1059–1069.
1012 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.10.003>
- 1013 Runfola, C., Sheheitli, H., Bartolomei, F., Wang, H., & Jirsa, V. (2023). In pursuit of the epileptogenic
1014 zone in focal epilepsy: a dynamical network biomarker approach. *Communications in Nonlinear*
1015 *Science and Numerical Simulation*, 117, 106973. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cnsns.2022.106973>

- 1016 Ryvlin, P., Barba, C., Bartolomei, F., Baumgartner, C., Brazdil, M., Fabo, D., Fahoum, F., Frauscher, B.,
1017 Ikeda, A., Lhatoo, S., Mani, J., McGonigal, A., Metsahonkala, E., Mindruta, I., Nguyen, D. K.,
1018 Rheims, S., Rocamora, R., Rydenhag, B., Schuele, S., ... Beniczky, S. (2024). Grading system for
1019 assessing the confidence in the epileptogenic zone reported in published studies: A Delphi
1020 consensus study. *Epilepsia*, *65*(5), 1346–1359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.17928>
- 1021 Sato, Y., Ochi, A., Mizutani, T., & Otsubo, H. (2019). Low entropy of interictal gamma oscillations is a
1022 biomarker of the seizure onset zone in focal cortical dysplasia type II. *Epilepsy and Behavior*, *96*,
1023 155–159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2019.01.030>
- 1024 Schevon, C. A., Weiss, S. A., McKhann, G., Goodman, R. R., Yuste, R., Emerson, R. G., & Trevelyan, A. J.
1025 (2012). Evidence of an inhibitory restraint of seizure activity in humans. *Nature*
1026 *Communications*, *3*(1), 1060. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms2056>
- 1027 Schindler, K., Leung, H., Elger, C. E., & Lehnertz, K. (2007). Assessing seizure dynamics by analysing
1028 the correlation structure of multichannel intracranial EEG. *Brain*, *130*(1), 65–77.
1029 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awl304>
- 1030 Sethi, M., Pedersen, M., & Jackson, G. D. (2016). Polymicrogyric Cortex may Predispose to Seizures
1031 via Abnormal Network Topology: An fMRI Connectomics Study. *Epilepsia*, *57*(3).
1032 <https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.13304>
- 1033 Spencer, S. S. (2002). Neural Networks in Human Epilepsy: Evidence of and Implications for
1034 Treatment. *Epilepsia*, *43*(3), 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1528-1157.2002.26901.x>
- 1035 Vakharia, V. N., Duncan, J. S., Witt, J., Elger, C. E., Staba, R., & Engel, J. (2018). Getting the best
1036 outcomes from epilepsy surgery. *Annals of Neurology*, *83*(4), 676–690.
1037 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.25205>
- 1038 Van Mierlo, P., Carrette, E., Hallez, H., Raedt, R., Meurs, A., Vandenberghe, S., Van Roost, D., Boon, P.,
1039 Staelens, S., & Vonck, K. (2013). Ictal-onset localization through connectivity analysis of
1040 intracranial EEG signals in patients with refractory epilepsy. *Epilepsia*, *54*(8), 1409–1418.
1041 <https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.12206>
- 1042 Varotto, G., Tassi, L., Franceschetti, S., Spreafico, R., & Panzica, F. (2012). Epileptogenic networks of
1043 type II focal cortical dysplasia: A stereo-EEG study. *NeuroImage*, *61*(3), 591–598.
1044 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.03.090>
- 1045 Vlachos, I., Krishnan, B., Treiman, D. M., Tsakalis, K., Kugiumtzis, D., & Iasemidis, L. D. (2017). The
1046 Concept of Effective Inflow: Application to Interictal Localization of the Epileptogenic Focus
1047 From iEEG. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, *64*(9), 2241–2252.
1048 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TBME.2016.2633200>
- 1049 Wang, M. yang, Wang, J., Zhou, J., Guan, Y. guang, Zhai, F., Liu, C. qing, Xu, F. fei, Han, Y. xian, Yan, Z.
1050 fen, & Luan, G. ming. (2017). Identification of the epileptogenic zone of temporal lobe epilepsy
1051 from stereo-electroencephalography signals: A phase transfer entropy and graph theory
1052 approach. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, *16*, 184–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2017.07.022>
- 1053 Warren, C. P., Hu, S., Stead, M., Brinkmann, B. H., Bower, M. R., & Worrell, G. A. (2010). Synchrony in
1054 Normal and Focal Epileptic Brain: The Seizure Onset Zone is Functionally Disconnected. *Journal*
1055 *of Neurophysiology*, *104*(6), 3530–3539. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00368.2010>

- 1056 Wenzel, M., Huberfeld, G., Grayden, D. B., de Curtis, M., & Trevelyan, A. J. (2023). A debate on the
1057 neuronal origin of focal seizures. *Epilepsia*, *64*(S3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.17650>
- 1058 Wilke, C., Drongelen, W. van, Kohrman, M., & He, B. (2009). Identification of epileptogenic foci from
1059 causal analysis of ECoG interictal spike activity. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *120*(8), 1449–1456.
1060 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2009.04.024>
- 1061 Wilke, C., Worrell, G., & He, B. (2011). Graph analysis of epileptogenic networks in human partial
1062 epilepsy. *Epilepsia*, *52*(1), 84–93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1167.2010.02785.x>
- 1063 Yang, C., Luan, G., Wang, Q., Liu, Z., Zhai, F., & Wang, Q. (2018). Localization of epileptogenic zone
1064 with the correction of pathological networks. *Frontiers in Neurology*, *9*(MAR).
1065 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2018.00143>
- 1066 Zellner, A., & Siow, A. (1980). Posterior odds ratios for selected regression hypotheses. *Trabajos de*
1067 *Estadística Y de Investigacion Operativa*, *31*(1), 585–603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02888369>
- 1068