S4 Appendix. Participant-Dependent ML Trials

Table 2: The performance of participant-dependent AutoPyTorch models based on one-hot encoding. Most of the times the performance is very poor both in the training and testing set. We were unable to fit a good model for each pariticpants, we didn't even get it to overfit the training set.

trial	train AUROC ± std	test AUROC ± std
Russian All	0.50 ± 0.01	0.50 ± 0.02
Russian Sham	0.50 ± 0.01	0.50 ± 0.02
Russian VLPFC	0.50 ± 0.00	0.50 ± 0.01
Russian DLPFC Offline	0.50 ± 0.02	0.51 ± 0.03
Russian DLPFC Online	0.50 ± 0.00	0.50 ± 0.02
English All	0.50 ± 0.0	0.50 ± 0.01
English Sham	0.50 ± 0.00	0.50 ± 0.01
English VLPFC	0.50 ± 0.00	0.50 ± 0.01

Table 3: The performance of participant-dependent TPOT models based on FastText word vectors. The performance is rather poor on the testing set. Unlike the models based on one-hot encoded models, we were able to overfit them on the training set with 10-fold crossvalidation, but the generalization ability remained very low.

trial	train AUROC ± std	test AUROC ± std
Russian All	1.0 ± 0.0	0.51 ± 0.07
Russian Sham	1.0 ± 0.0	0.52 ± 0.07
Russian VLPFC	1.0 ± 0.0	0.50 ± 0.07
Russian DLPFC Offline	1.0 ± 0.0	0.54 ± 0.08
Russian DLPFC Online	1.0 ± 0.0	0.51 ± 0.06
English All	1.0 ± 0.0	0.47 ± 0.07
English Sham	1.0 ± 0.0	0.47 ± 0.07
English VLPFC	1.0 ± 0.0	0.47 ± 0.07