

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL: Comparing Structure-Function Relationships in Brain Networks Using EEG and fNIRS

Rosmary Blanco^{1,*}, Maria Giulia Preti^{2,3,4}, Cemal Koba¹, Dimitri Van De Ville^{2,3,4}, and Alessandro Crimi^{1,5}

¹Computer Vision lab, Sano Center for Computational Medicine, Krakow, Poland

²CIBM Center for Biomedical Imaging, Switzerland

³Neuro-X Institute, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Geneva, Switzerland

⁴Department of Radiology and Medical Informatics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Switzerland

⁵Computer Science faculty, AGH University of Science and Technology, Krakow, Poland

*r.blanco@sanoscience.org

ABSTRACT

Identifying relationships between structural and functional networks is crucial for understanding the large-scale organization of the human brain. The potential contribution of emerging techniques like functional near-infrared spectroscopy to investigate the structure-functional relationship has yet to be explored. In our study, using simultaneous Electroencephalography (EEG) and Functional near-infrared spectroscopy (fNIRS) recordings from 18 subjects, we characterize global and local structure-function coupling using source-reconstructed EEG and fNIRS signals in both resting state and motor imagery tasks, as this relationship during task periods remains underexplored. Employing the mathematical framework of graph signal processing, we investigate how this relationship varies across electrical and hemodynamic networks and different brain states. Results show that fNIRS structure-function coupling resembles slower-frequency EEG coupling at rest, with variations across brain states and oscillations. Locally, the relationship is heterogeneous, with greater coupling in the sensory cortex and increased decoupling in the association cortex, following the unimodal to transmodal gradient. Discrepancies between EEG and fNIRS are noted, particularly in the frontoparietal network. Cross-band representations of neural activity revealed lower correspondence between electrical and hemodynamic activity in the transmodal cortex, irrespective of brain state while showing specificity for the somatomotor network during a motor imagery task. Overall, these findings initiate a multimodal comprehension of structure-function relationship and brain organization when using affordable functional brain imaging.

Table S1. Global structure-function coupling: Summary of Statistical Tests Comparing EEG and fNIRS Measures Across Different Conditions and Modalities: Overall comparison between EEG and fNIRS for each condition; Comparison of EEG and fNIRS measures within each modality for each condition; Comparison between conditions for each modality; Comparison between band-limited EEG and fNIRS measures for each condition. P-values (FDR-corrected for multiple comparisons) and z-values are reported for each comparison, indicating the significance of observed differences (in red) or similarities between the measures.

Global structure-function coupling															
Overall comparison between modalities				EEG within modality comparison for each condition						Comparison between band-limited EEG and fNIRS for each condition					
RS				RS			Task			RS		RS		RS	
Modality_1	Modality_2	p-val	z-val	p-val	z-val		p-val	z-val		p-val	z-val	p-val	z-val	p-val	z-val
EEG	NIRS	0.0004	3.5490	<i>delta vs theta</i>	0.001	-6.409	<i>delta vs theta</i>	0.001	-9.680	<i>delta vs hbo</i>	0.001	5.725	<i>delta vs hbr</i>	0.312	-1.012
					9.594	<i>delta vs alpha</i>	0.001	-9.227	<i>theta vs hbo</i>	0.001	7.719	<i>theta vs hbr</i>	0.455	0.747	
					-11.789	<i>delta vs beta</i>	0.2378	-1.181	<i>alpha vs hbo</i>	0.445	0.765	<i>alpha vs hbr</i>	0.001	-5.517	
					-11.827	<i>delta vs gamma</i>	0.0010	-8.472	<i>beta vs hbo</i>	0.001	10.864	<i>beta vs hbr</i>	0.001	5.466	
					12.845	<i>theta vs alpha</i>	0.4394	0.773	<i>gamma vs hbo</i>	0.001	11.052	<i>gamma vs hbr</i>	0.001	5.652	
					-9.701	<i>theta vs beta</i>	0.001	9.631	Task						
					-9.272	<i>theta vs gamma</i>	0.0167	2.394	<i>delta vs hbo</i>	0.248	1.155	<i>delta vs hbr</i>	0.001	-3.990	
					-15.972	<i>alpha vs beta</i>	0.001	11.141	<i>theta vs hbo</i>	0.001	7.442	<i>theta vs hbr</i>	0.504	0.668	
					-15.451	<i>alpha vs gamma</i>	0.0514	1.948	<i>alpha vs hbo</i>	0.001	7.196	<i>alpha vs hbr</i>	0.699	0.386	
					0.043	<i>beta vs gamma</i>	0.001	-10.981	<i>beta vs hbo</i>	0.043	2.028	<i>beta vs hbr</i>	0.001	-3.889	
									<i>gamma vs hbo</i>	0.001	6.515	<i>gamma vs hbr</i>	0.454	-0.749	
				fNIRS within modality comparison for each condition											
				RS			Task								
					p-val	z-val		p-val	z-val						
RS vs Task hbo		0.769	0.294	<i>hbo vs hbr</i>	0.001	-7.842	<i>hbo vs hbr</i>	0.001	-8.054						
RS vs Task hbr		0.423	0.800												

Table S2. Mean and std of SDI values across ROIs and subjects for each EEG band and fNIRS chromophore, in RS and task conditions.

	Delta	Theta	Alpha	Beta	Gamma	HbO	HbR
RS	1.11 ± 0.12	1.16 ± 0.08	0.95 ± 0.13	1.30 ± 0.09	1.30 ± 0.1	1.0 ± 0.1	1.19 ± 0.09
Task	0.98 ± 0.07	1.13 ± 0.11	1.11 ± 0.09	0.97 ± 0.08	1.07 ± 0.07	0.96 ± 0.06	1.14 ± 0.08

Table S3. Regions of interest (ROIs) displaying significant disparities between EEG and fNIRS.

Number of different ROIs					
	RS	Task		RS	Task
<i>Delta vs HbO</i>	24	21	<i>Delta vs HbR</i>	25	23
<i>Theta vs HbO</i>	28	20	<i>Theta vs HbR</i>	22	20
<i>Alpha vs HbO</i>	25	20	<i>Alpha vs HbR</i>	27	21
<i>Beta vs HbO</i>	32	22	<i>Beta vs HbR</i>	20	24
<i>Gamma vs HbO</i>	32	20	<i>Gamma vs HbR</i>	22	22

Table S4. SDI mean and std for each network, band, and hemoglobin type for the two conditions (RS and Task)

	RS						Task				
	DMN	DAN	FPN	VIS	SMN		DMN	DAN	FPN	VIS	SMN
<i>Delta</i>	1.14 ± 0.17	1.51 ± 0.19	0.95 ± 0.21	0.67 ± 0.15	0.48 ± 0.10	<i>Delta</i>	1.13 ± 0.13	1.27 ± 0.12	0.90 ± 0.20	0.55 ± 0.09	0.38 ± 0.05
<i>Theta</i>	1.17 ± 0.16	1.54 ± 0.12	1.06 ± 0.22	0.78 ± 0.16	0.49 ± 0.08	<i>Theta</i>	1.14 ± 0.18	1.46 ± 0.15	1.25 ± 0.25	0.65 ± 0.12	0.47 ± 0.08
<i>Alpha</i>	1.06 ± 0.16	1.3 ± 0.21	0.77 ± 0.24	0.63 ± 0.18	0.36 ± 0.06	<i>Alpha</i>	1.13 ± 0.18	1.45 ± 0.11	1.19 ± 0.23	0.64 ± 0.11	0.51 ± 0.07
<i>Beta</i>	1.27 ± 0.14	1.58 ± 0.12	1.52 ± 0.25	0.85 ± 0.15	0.51 ± 0.09	<i>Beta</i>	1.09 ± 0.14	1.28 ± 0.12	0.84 ± 0.12	0.57 ± 0.09	0.37 ± 0.04
<i>Gamma</i>	1.26 ± 0.14	1.6 ± 0.15	1.49 ± 0.23	0.85 ± 0.14	0.52 ± 0.09	<i>Gamma</i>	1.12 ± 0.13	1.39 ± 0.09	1.0 ± 0.11	0.64 ± 0.08	0.44 ± 0.05
<i>HbO</i>	0.87 ± 0.11	1.2 ± 0.12	1.02 ± 0.24	0.69 ± 0.19	0.56 ± 0.20	<i>HbO</i>	0.93 ± 0.10	1.19 ± 0.14	0.91 ± 0.20	0.68 ± 0.12	0.52 ± 0.12
<i>HbR</i>	0.99 ± 0.16	1.35 ± 0.14	1.54 ± 0.31	0.81 ± 0.19	0.69 ± 0.21	<i>HbR</i>	0.99 ± 0.15	1.33 ± 0.12	1.38 ± 0.15	0.78 ± 0.12	0.58 ± 0.13

Table S5. Network structure-function coupling: Summary of Statistical Tests Comparing cross-band EEG and fNIRS Measures Across Different Conditions. P-values and z-values are reported for each comparison, indicating the significance of observed differences (in red) or similarities between the measures.

RS										
Group1	Group2	Network	p_value	z_value		Group1	Group2	Network	p_value	z_value
<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbO</i>	<i>DMN</i>	0.000	3.724		<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbR</i>	<i>DMN</i>	0.004	2.853
<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbO</i>	<i>AN</i>	0.000	3.593		<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbR</i>	<i>AN</i>	0.010	2.591
<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbO</i>	<i>FPN</i>	0.064	1.851		<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbR</i>	<i>FPN</i>	0.001	-3.245
<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbO</i>	<i>VIS</i>	0.396	0.849		<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbR</i>	<i>VIS</i>	0.500	-0.675
<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbO</i>	<i>SMN</i>	0.248	-1.154		<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbR</i>	<i>SMN</i>	0.002	-3.114
Task										
Group1	Group2	Network	p_value	z_value		Group1	Group2	Network	p_value	z_value
<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbO</i>	<i>DMN</i>	0.000	3.593		<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbR</i>	<i>DMN</i>	0.048	1.982
<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbO</i>	<i>AN</i>	0.001	3.201		<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbR</i>	<i>AN</i>	0.647	0.457
<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbO</i>	<i>FPN</i>	0.078	1.764		<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbR</i>	<i>FPN</i>	0.000	-3.636
<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbO</i>	<i>VIS</i>	0.122	-1.546		<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbR</i>	<i>VIS</i>	0.000	-3.593
<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbO</i>	<i>SMN</i>	0.022	-2.286		<i>EEG</i>	<i>HbR</i>	<i>SMN</i>	0.001	-3.332