Supporting Information to

Effects of spatial sampling on network alterations

in idiopathic generalized epilepsy - can routine EEG be enough?

Christina Stier^{1, 2, 3}, Markus Loose¹, Carmen Loew¹, Marysol Segovia Oropeza¹, Sangyeob Baek⁴, Holger Lerche², Niels K. Focke^{1,2}

¹ Clinic of Neurology, University Medical Center Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany
² Department of Neurology and Epileptology, Hertie Institute for Clinical Brain Research, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany
³ Institute for Biomagnetism and Biosignal analysis, University of Münster, Münster, Germany
⁴ MEG-Center, Hertie Institute for Clinical Brain Research, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany **Table S1** Demographics and clinical information.

	Main study sample		Clinical routine sample	
	Patients	Controls	Patients	Controls
Total (n)	35	54	71	43
Site: total n Göttingen/Tübingen	10/25	15/39	71	43
Female, n (%)	18 (72)	27 (49)	35 (49)	26 (60)
Mean age (y), (sd)	32 (11.6)	31 (12.2)	29 (10.2)	28 (8.8)
GSWD during EEG recordings, n (%)	13 (37)	0 (0)	19 (27)ª	0 (0)
Seizure free > 12 months, n (%)	19 (54)	-	55 (77)	-
Drug intake at measurement, n (%)	2 (6)	-	13 (10)	-
Epilepsy syndrome, n (%)				
CAE	5 (14)	-	3 (4)	-
JAE	10 (29)	-	7 (10)	-
JME	7 (20)	-	23 (32)	-
GTCS	6 (17)	-	19 (27)	-
IGE	7 (20)	-	19 (27)	-

Abbreviations: CAE = childhood absence epilepsy; GSWD = generalized spike-wave discharges; GTCS = generalized tonic clonic seizures only; IGE = genetic generalized epilepsy (unclassified); IQR = interquartile range; JAE = juvenile absence epilepsy; JME = juvenile myoclonic epilepsy; sd = standard deviation; y = years. ^a Including eight patients who showed hyperventilation-induced GSWD.



Figure S1 Deviations from the original effect size maps (256 channels, individual head models) for connectivity at different channel sets and parcellations

Statistical group comparisons (IGE > controls) were performed separately for different parcellations of the brain (vertices, anatomical regions, and functional networks), including age, sex, and scanner site as covariates. Standardized effect sizes (Cohen d) were calculated based on the resulting t-values corrected for the influence of the covariates. For each resolution, the differences between the Cohen d-maps for the 256 channel-layout and those for the reduced layouts (19 to 192 channel densities) were then calculated and color-coded (**A-C**). Green and yellow colors indicate larger effect sizes and blue colors depict smaller effect sizes in the 256-reference map than in the respective lower sampling map. The results shown in (**A**) rely on EEG signals projected to 2004 vertices using individual head models and different channel compositions. For the anatomical (**B**) and network-based (**C**) analyses, individual connectivity values at the vertices were averaged for each region of interest (Desikan et al., 2006; Yeo et al., 2011).



Figure S2 Deviations from the original effect size maps (256 channels, individual head models) for power at different channel sets and parcellations

Statistical group comparisons (IGE > controls) were performed separately for different parcellations of the brain (vertices, anatomical regions, and functional networks), including age, sex, and scanner site as covariates. Standardized effect sizes (Cohen d) were calculated based on the resulting t-values corrected for the influence of the covariates. For each resolution, the differences between the Cohen d-maps for the 256 channel-layout and those for the reduced layouts (19 to 192 channel densities) were then calculated and color-coded (A-C). Green and yellow colors indicate larger effect sizes and blue colors depict smaller effect sizes in the 256-reference map than in the respective lower sampling map. The results shown in (A) rely on EEG signals projected to 2004 vertices using individual head models and different channel compositions. For the anatomical (B) and network-based (C) analyses, individual power values at the vertices were averaged for each region of interest (Desikan et al., 2006; Yeo et al., 2011).

References

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. Psychological bulletin, 112(1), 155.

- Desikan, R. S., Ségonne, F., Fischl, B., Quinn, B. T., Dickerson, B. C., Blacker, D., Buckner, R. L., Dale, A. M., Maguire, R. P., & Hyman, B. T. (2006). An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest. *Neuroimage*, 31(3), 968-980.
- Oostenveld, R., Fries, P., Maris, E., & Schoffelen, J.-M. (2011). FieldTrip: open source software for advanced analysis of MEG, EEG, and invasive electrophysiological data. *Computational intelligence and neuroscience*, 2011.
- Yeo, B. T., Krienen, F. M., Sepulcre, J., Sabuncu, M. R., Lashkari, D., Hollinshead, M., Roffman, J. L., Smoller, J. W., Zöllei, L., & Polimeni, J. R. (2011). The organization of the human cerebral cortex estimated by intrinsic functional connectivity. *Journal of neurophysiology*.