

The role of etiology in the identification of clinical markers of consciousness: comparing EEG alpha power, complexity, and spectral exponent

Charlotte Maschke ^{a,b}, Laouen Belloli ^{c,d}, Dragana Manasova ^c, Jacobo D. Sitt ^c,
Stefanie Blain-Moraes ^{a, e}

- a) Montreal General Hospital, McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Canada
- b) Integrated Program in Neuroscience, McGill University, Montreal, Canada
- c) Sorbonne Université, Institut du Cerveau–Paris Brain Institute–ICM, Inserm, CNRS, APHP, Hôpital de la Pitié Salpêtrière, Paris, France.
- d) Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- d) Université de Paris, Paris, France.
- e) School of Physical and Occupational Therapy, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

Corresponding author: Stefanie Blain-Moraes

Email: stefanie.blain-moraes@mcgill.ca

Author Contributions: C.M. and S.B.M. designed research; C.M. performed analysis; C.M. wrote the paper, L.B., D.M., J.D.S. provided data; L.B., D.M., J.D.S. and S.B.M. provided feedback.

Running Title: The role of etiology for clinical markers of consciousness

Competing Interest Statement: Jacobo D. Sitt is scientific co-founder of NeuroMeters (scientific advisory activity but no executive or management activity).

1 **1 Abstract**

2 In the search for EEG markers of human consciousness, alpha power has long been considered a
3 reliable marker which is fundamental for the assessment of unresponsive patients from all
4 etiologies. However, recent evidence questioned the role of alpha power as a marker of
5 consciousness and proposed the spectral exponent and spatial gradient as more robust and
6 generalizable indexes. In this study, we analyzed a large-scale dataset of 260 unresponsive
7 patients and investigated etiology-specific markers of level of consciousness, responsiveness and
8 capacity to recover. We compare a set of candidate EEG makers: 1) absolute, relative and flattened
9 alpha power; 2) spatial ratios; 3) the spectral exponent; and 4) signal complexity. Our results
10 support the claim that alpha power is an etiology-specific marker, which has higher diagnostic value
11 for anoxic patients. Meanwhile, the spectral slope showed diagnostic value for non-anoxic patients
12 only. Changes in relative power and signal complexity were largely attributable to changes in the
13 spectral slope. Grouping unresponsive patients from different etiologies together can confound or
14 obscure the diagnostic value of different EEG markers of consciousness. Our study highlights the
15 importance of analyzing different etiologies independently and emphasizes the need to develop
16 clinical markers which better account for inter-individual and etiology-dependent differences.

17 **Keywords:**

18 Brain injury, complexity, consciousness, EEG, spectral exponent

19

20 **2 Introduction**

21 For unresponsive brain-injured patients, the evaluation of level of consciousness and capacity to
22 recover underpins the most crucial decisions about their treatment and continuation of care. The
23 quest for neurophysiological markers of (un)consciousness plays a fundamental role in the
24 development of clinical tools and the understanding of the neurophysiological process underlying
25 consciousness.

26 The loss of oscillatory power – mainly in the alpha frequency band – has often been described as
27 the principal marker for detecting loss of consciousness (Chennu et al. 2014; Sitt et al. 2014; Naro
28 et al. 2016; Piarulli et al. 2016). However, recent work by Colombo et al. (2023) raised strong
29 concerns about the role of alpha power as a marker of consciousness. Instead of marking loss of
30 consciousness, Colombo et al (2023) attributed loss of alpha power to the suppression of cortical
31 activity, which is specific to severe postanoxic injury. As an alternative marker, Colombo et al (2023)
32 proposed the use of 1) the spectral exponent and 2) the alpha posterior anterior ratio. In contrast
33 to alpha power, both measures stratified levels of consciousness in non-anoxic patients and
34 generalized well to pharmacological-induced unconsciousness (Colombo et al. 2023).

35 Indeed, the electroencephalogram (EEG) spectral exponent (i.e., exponential decay of power over
36 frequency) has gained increasing attention as a novel marker of consciousness (Colombo et al.
37 2019; Lendner et al. 2020; Maschke, Duclos, Owen, et al. 2022; Colombo et al. 2023; Leroy et al.
38 2023). Especially in the absence of oscillatory peaks – which is a common phenomenon in
39 disorders of consciousness (DOC) – our group has previously demonstrated diagnostic power of
40 the spectral exponent above and beyond oscillatory power (Maschke, Duclos, Owen, et al. 2022).
41 Besides the spectral exponent, spatial exponents – especially the anteriorization of alpha power –
42 have been widely described as a marker for loss of consciousness in general anesthesia (Purdon
43 et al. 2013; Vijayan et al. 2013; Purdon et al. 2015; Scheinin et al. 2018), sleep (De Gennaro et al.
44 2001) and DOC (Colombo et al. 2023).

45 Although Colombo et al. (2023) concluded that alpha power ‘cannot be a general marker of
46 consciousness’, previous large-scale studies showed high diagnostic value of alpha power for
47 patients in a DOC (Sitt et al. 2014; Engemann et al. 2018). There are three possible explanations
48 for these contradictory findings. First, previously used large-scale datasets of DOC (Sitt et al. 2014;
49 Engemann et al. 2018) contained patients with different etiologies which were not analyzed
50 separately. The co-occurrence of lower levels of consciousness and suppressed broadband power
51 in anoxic patients could induce a spurious diagnostic effect of alpha power when grouped with non-
52 anoxic patients. The diagnostic effect of alpha power could therefore be driven by
53 electrophysiological differences in etiologies, rather than etiology-independent levels of
54 consciousness. Second, candidate markers of consciousness are widely validated against level of
55 consciousness, as assessed using behavioral tools such as the CRS-R score (Kalmar and Giacino
56 2005). However, solely using behavioral tools for patient stratification is insufficient to detect
57 capacity for consciousness despite unresponsiveness and could yield markers of consciousness
58 which are more sensitive to behavioral responsiveness than the actual level of – or capacity for
59 consciousness. Thus, alpha power could be an index of level of behavioral responsiveness, as
60 shown by Sitt et al. (2014) and Engemann et al. (2018), rather than a reliable marker of capacity of
61 consciousness (Colombo et al. 2023). Third, whereas alpha power is often defined as the relative
62 contribution of the alpha bandwidth to the broadband power (herein called relative alpha power),
63 Colombo et al. (2023) estimated power as the absolute amount of power in a given range (i.e.,
64 absolute alpha power). While relative alpha power normalizes for suppression in broadband
65 activity, absolute alpha power is highly influenced by the amount of broadband background activity.
66 Thus, different observations in the role of alpha power for the assessment of levels of
67 consciousness could be driven by the different behavior of relative and absolute alpha power and
68 their interaction with broadband background activity.

69 In addition to spatial and spectral properties, the temporal architecture of EEG signal has gained
70 increasing attention for the evaluation of consciousness. Specifically, reduced spontaneous and
71 evoked signal complexity marks unconsciousness resulting from anesthesia (Bruhn et al. 2000;
72 Zhang et al. 2001; Jordan et al. 2008; Sarasso et al. 2015; Schartner et al. 2015), sleep (Burioka
73 et al. 2005; Mateos et al. 2018), epilepsy (Mateos et al. 2018) and in disorders of consciousness
74 (Sarà and Pistoia 2010; Gosseries et al. 2011; Casali et al. 2013; Sitt et al. 2014; Stefan et al. 2018;
75 Lei et al. 2022). However, it remains unclear whether EEG complexity is an independent marker of
76 level of consciousness, or epiphenomenal to changes in the spectral exponent. Although many
77 studies have demonstrated a strong correlation between spectral exponent and spontaneous
78 (Medel et al. 2020; Alnes et al. 2021; Maschke, Duclos, Owen, et al. 2022) and evoked signal
79 complexity (Colombo et al. 2019; Maschke et al. 2023), most studies of signal complexity do not
80 concurrently analyze changes in the spectral exponent.

81 In this study, we aim to shed light on the gap between those contradictory results by validating and
82 contrasting the proposed markers of consciousness, specifically: 1) absolute alpha power; 2)
83 relative alpha power; 3) the spectral exponent; and 4) the alpha posterior-anterior ratio (PAR); on
84 a large-scale dataset of 260 patients in a DOC. Additionally, we calculate measures of complexity
85 (i.e., Lempel-Ziv complexity), and assess their relationship to the four proposed markers of
86 consciousness.

87 We compare the proposed markers against their ability to index level of and capacity for
88 consciousness (i.e., diagnostic and prognostic value). Following Colombo et al. (2023), we
89 hypothesize etiology-dependent differences in the diagnostic feature performance: while alpha
90 power is expected to index levels of consciousness in anoxic patients, the spectral exponent and
91 spatial gradients are hypothesized to generalize to non-anoxic patients and patients with other
92 etiologies. In addition, we hypothesize that loss of signal complexity in lower levels of
93 consciousness is epiphenomenal to changes in the spectral exponent, rather than an actual change

94 of complexity. Alpha power is still widely used as a marker of level of consciousness in research,
95 as well in clinical applications. This study has the potential to shed further light on the current debate
96 about the identification and validation of neurophysiological markers of consciousness.

97 **3 Materials and methods**

98 **3.1 Dataset**

99 We analyzed an existing dataset containing resting-state EEG recordings from 303 patients with a
100 DOC. All data was recorded in the Pitié - Salpêtrière hospital, Paris France. Consent was provided
101 by the patients' legal representative according to the Declaration of Helsinki. This study was
102 approved by the ethical committee of the Pitié - Salpêtrière hospital under the code 'Recherche en
103 soins courants'. EEG data was acquired using a 256 channel GSN-HydroCel-257 sensor net.

104 **3.2 Preprocessing**

105 Data preprocessing was performed using MNE-python software (Gramfort et al. 2013). All data was
106 downsampled to 250 Hz and filtered between 1 and 45 Hz. Notch filters were applied at 50 and 100
107 Hz. Electrodes which contained no signal or non-physiological artifacts were manually selected by
108 a trained experimenter and removed from subsequent analysis. Due to spatial clustering of bad
109 channels caused by small bandages or patches, removed channels were not interpolated. Data
110 was average referenced and 62 non-brain channels were removed, yielding a maximum of 195
111 remaining channels. Data was epoched in 1 second windows without overlap. Bad epochs were
112 dropped based on a maximal acceptable peak-to-peak amplitude of 200 μ V. A maximum of 5
113 minutes preprocessed EEG was kept for subsequent analysis. From the initial 303 subjects, 33
114 subjects were rejected from subsequent analysis due to poor data quality and less than 2 minutes
115 of clean data. Ten patients were excluded from the etiology-based analysis due to the co-
116 occurrence of anoxic and non-anoxic brain injury (see Figure 1 for a graphic representation of

117 participant inclusion). The remaining 260 patients (156 male, 102 female, 2 unknown, mean age
 118 47.25 ± 17.25 , 187 acute, 70 chronic) had an average of 185.84 ± 8.41 channels and $252.68 \pm$
 119 48.99 seconds of data. No difference was observed in the number of epochs or channels between
 120 different etiologies or diagnostic groups.




Figure 1. Visual representation of patients included in the diagnostic and prognostic analysis in this study. CRSR: Coma Recovery Scale Revised, UWS: Unresponsive Wakefulness Syndrome, MCS: Minimally Conscious State, EMCS: Emergence, LIS: Locked in syndrome.

122 **3.3 Patient Etiology**

123 This study aims to compare the diagnostic value of candidate markers of consciousness in different
124 etiologies, especially anoxic and non-anoxic injuries. We therefore split the patients in three groups,
125 according to their etiology. From the 260 patients included in this study, 87 patients suffered from
126 an anoxic brain injury, 86 patients suffered a non-anoxic injury (n= 63 TBI and n=23 stroke). 86
127 patients were unresponsive following a variety of other etiologies including encephalitis,
128 encephalomyelitis, leukoencephalopathy, hypoglycemia, post-operative complications,
129 intoxication, toxoplasmosis, meningioma, hyperthermia, malaria, undefined etiology,
130 unconsciousness following COVID-19, Guillain Barré and septic chocs.

131 **3.4 Patient Diagnosis**

132 Patients' level of consciousness was assessed on the day of recording by a trained experimenter
133 using the CRS-R score (Kalmar and Giacino 2005). At the time of EEG data acquisition, 13 patients
134 were in a coma, 129 patients were diagnosed with UWS, 70 patients were in MCS-, 31 patients
135 were in MCS+, and 10 patients were in EMCS (see Table 1 for demographic information on each
136 group). Four patients were unresponsive following from Guillain Barré and were therefore classified
137 to be in a locked in syndrome. Three patients had no recorded diagnosis and were excluded from
138 the diagnostic analysis. As we cannot exclude the presence of consciousness despite complete
139 unresponsiveness, the 13 patients in a coma were excluded from the diagnostic analysis (see
140 Figure 1 for a graphic representation of participant inclusion).

141

142

143

Table 1: Demographic information for diagnostic analysis

	N	Age		Sex			CRSR		Etiology			
		Mean	Std	M	F	U	Mean	Std	Anoxic	TBI	Stroke	Other
Coma	13	54.15	19.59	8	5	0	2.23	1.25	4	1	1	7
UWS	129	47.51	16.84	81	47	1	4.77	1.40	59	29	4	37
MCS-	70	44.17	16.07	37	33	0	9.37	2.29	17	22	12	19
MCS+	31	50.87	18.61	19	12	0	12.26	3.12	5	8	5	13
EMCS	10	43.80	21.76	6	4	0	17.60	3.92	0	3	1	6
LIS	4	65.33	9.81	2	1	1	1.5	2.12	0	0	0	4

M: Male, F: Female, U: Unknown, TBI: Traumatic brain injury, Std: Standard deviation, CRSR: Coma Recovery Scale Revised, UWS: Unresponsive Wakefulness Syndrome, MCS: Minimally Conscious State, EMCS: Emergence, LIS: Locked in syndrome

144

145 **3.5 Patient Prognosis**

146 Each patient's level of recovery was evaluated 6- and 12-months following injury using a pseudo
 147 CRS-R via phone call (Kalmar and Giacino 2005) (n= 245 at 6 months, n= 217 at 12 months) and
 148 the GOS-E (Jennett and Bond 1975) (n= 253 at 6 months, n= 213 at 12 months). From the initial
 149 260 patients, 57 patients died due to withdrawal of life supporting treatment. Due to the inability to
 150 assess those patients' 'natural' progression post-injury and to avoid confounding factors such as
 151 patient's and caregivers' socioeconomic status, those patients were excluded from the prognostic
 152 analysis (see Figure 1). For 15 patients, the outcome measure was not available yielding 188
 153 patients with known functional outcome.

154 For the purpose of this study, functional outcome was defined as the maximal level of
155 responsiveness reached within one year post injury (i.e., patients who regained responsiveness,
156 but later deceased were labeled as 'recovered responsiveness', as the reason of death might not
157 be injury-related). As command following is the criteria separating MCS- from MCS+ (Kalmar and
158 Giacino 2005), patients in an MCS+ and patients who regained consciousness were grouped into
159 the prognostic category 'recovered responsiveness' (i.e., Positive Outcome). Patients who did not
160 regain responsiveness (i.e., remained in MCS-, UWS or Coma) and patients who died (not caused
161 by withdrawal of life sustaining treatment) were grouped into the prognostic category named 'did
162 not recover responsiveness' (i.e., Negative Outcome). Patients who were already in an MCS+ or
163 EMCS at time of recording and did not improve over one year post injury were excluded from the
164 prognostic analysis (n=4).

165 Using the GOS-E score, a positive outcome corresponds to a score above 2, while a negative
166 outcome corresponds to values of 1 and 2 (see supplementary Figure S1 for the comparison of
167 prognosis using CRS-R and GOS-E score). For one patient, the outcome was assessed based on
168 only one score, due to missing values in the second test (see supplementary Figure S1).

169 A total of 184 patients were included in the prognostic analysis (see Figure 1), from which 91
170 recovered responsiveness and 93 did not recover responsiveness (see Table 2 for prognostic
171 information on each group, see supplementary Figure S2 for the prognostic groups split by original
172 diagnosis, medical state and patient's sex). No significant diagnostic and prognostic group-
173 difference was found in patient's age and sex.

174

175

176

Table 2: Demographic information for prognostic analysis, spitted by prognostic groups

Outcome	N	Age		Sex			Etiology			
		Mean	Std	M	F	U	Anoxic	TBI	Stroke	Other
Positive	91	44.50	17.47	53	38	0	18	31	11	31
Negative	93	48.68	17.21	58	35	0	35	22	9	27

Positive: Patients who recovered responsiveness within one year post recording. Negative: Patients who did not recover responsiveness within one year post recording. M: Male, F: Female, U: Unknown, TBI: Traumatic brain injury, Std: Standard deviation

177

178 **3.6 Feature extraction**

179 **3.6.1 Spectral features**

180 **Spectral power.** Power spectral density was calculated on each epoch and channel individually
181 using the Welch method implementation from MNE python (Gramfort et al. 2013) with a 1 second
182 windows and 50% overlap ($fmin=1$, $fmax=45$, $n_fft=250$, $n_overlap=125$). Frequency bands were
183 defined as delta (1-4 Hz), theta (4-8Hz), alpha (8-13Hz), low beta (13-20Hz) and high beta (20-30
184 Hz). Prior to power calculation, power spectral density was averaged over epochs, yielding one
185 power spectrum per channel. The power analysis (i.e., absolute, relative and flat power) was
186 performed on each channel individually and subsequently averaged over space.

187 Absolute power in each frequency band was defined as \log_{10} of the area under the PSD curve in
188 the respective frequency band. Relative power was defined as the area under the PSD curve in the
189 respective frequency band, divided by the area of the full spectrum (1-45 Hz). Relative power thus
190 reflects a percentual contribution of a specific frequency range to the whole spectrum. In contrast

191 to absolute alpha power, which is affected by global power suppression, relative contribution of
192 alpha power to the power spectrum corrects for differences in broadband power and captures
193 differences in the shape of the power-spectral density, rather than the absolute height of a specific
194 band. Flattened power was calculated using the ‘fitting oscillations and one over f’
195 `foof_spectrum_flat` function (Donoghue et al. 2020). This function subtracts the aperiodic
196 component from the power spectrum, leaving only the oscillatory peaks. Flattened power was
197 defined as the area under the flattened power spectral density in the respective frequency band.

198 **Posterior-Anterior Ratio.** Posterior-Anterior ratio (PAR) was defined as the geometric mean of all
199 posterior values of absolute power (i.e., area under the PSD curve without log) divided by the
200 geometric mean of anterior values, following Colombo et al. (2023). While anterior-dominated
201 activity results in a PAR between 0 and 1, with 0 being total anteriorization, values above 1 indicate
202 posterior-dominant activity. The posterior-anterior regions were split along the line of Cz, electrodes
203 on the midline were not included in the analysis (see supplementary Figure S3). The Python
204 function for the calculation of the posterior-anterior ratio is available at
205 <https://github.com/BIAPT/Markers>.

206 **Aperiodic signal components.** The aperiodic signal components (i.e., spectral exponent and
207 offset) were calculated using the fixed mode of the ‘fitting oscillations and one over f’ algorithm
208 (Donoghue et al. 2020). To avoid overfitting and detection of spurious oscillation, hyperparameters
209 for the peak detection were used as recommended by Gerster et al. (2022) (*min_peak_height=0.1*,
210 *max_n_peaks=3*, *peak_width_limits=(2, 5.0)*). Aperiodic components were calculated on the power
211 spectrum of each channel individually and averaged subsequently over space.

212 **Complexity.** Signal complexity was calculated using Lempel-Ziv complexity (Lempel and Ziv
213 1976). EEG signal was epoched in 10 second non-overlapping windows and was discretized using
214 the signal mean as a threshold. Signal complexity was calculated for every channel and epoch

215 individually and averaged over epochs subsequently. To account for possible influence of the
216 signals' spectral properties, LZC was estimated using two different methods for normalization: 1)
217 shuffle normalization and 2) phase normalization.

218 In shuffle normalized LZC, the complexity of the binarized EEG timeseries was normalized using
219 the mean after randomly shuffling the previously obtained binary series 100 times. While complexity
220 of 0 indicate a repetitive and easily compressible signal, complex signals which not easily
221 compressible approach complexity values of 1.


222 For the phase normalized LZC, each signals' complexity was normalized using the mean
223 complexity of surrogate signals. Phase-randomization has previously been used as a tool to
224 decorrelate changes in complexity from pure spectral signal changes (Schartner et al. 2017; Toker
225 et al. 2022). The surrogate signal was obtained by randomizing the phase of the original time series
226 while maintaining most of its spectral properties. 100 surrogate signals were obtained for every
227 epoch and channel individually. Complexity values above 1 indicate a higher signal complexity,
228 relative to other signals with comparable spectral properties. Values below one indicates a relatively
229 lower signal complexity. Our custom python code for the calculation of shuffle- and phase-
230 normalized LZC is available at <https://github.com/BIAPT/Markers>.

231 **3.7 Diagnostic and prognostic analysis**

232 To assess each features' ability to index levels of consciousness we used five different approaches,
233 summarized in Figure 2: 1) the correlation with patients' diagnosed level of consciousness (UWS,
234 MCS-, MCS+, EMCS); 2) the correlation with patient's total CRS-R score; 3) the distinction between
235 patients in a UWS and patients with higher levels of consciousness (MCS-, MCS+ and EMCS); 4)
236 the distinction between unresponsive patients (UWS and MCS-) and patients with some level of
237 responsiveness (MCS + and EMCS); and 5) the distinction patients according to their outcome (see

238 Figure 2). To account for the possible influence of etiology, all analyses were performed first on the
 239 totality of patients and then in subgroups according to patient's etiology (i.e., anoxic, non-anoxic
 240 and other injuries).

241 In the above-described analysis, patients with different diagnoses were grouped together as 'higher
 242 levels of consciousness' (i.e., MCS-, MCS+ and EMCS) or 'some level of responsiveness (i.e.,
 243 MCS+ and EMCS). Although this approach provides a larger contrast, it also introduces a variety
 244 of confounding factors, as patients do not differ solely in their level of consciousness. Within the
 245 category of MCS alone, patients may range from completely unconsciousness despite residual
 246 cortical activity and overt behavior to self-conscious individuals who lack the executive capacity to
 247 respond (Naccache 2018). To maximally reduce confounding factors, we additionally investigate
 248 the minimal contrast between adjacent diagnostic groups (i.e., UWS to MCS-, UWS to all MCS,
 249 MCS- to MCS+).



* The statistical difference for a minimal contrast between two groups (UWS to MCS-, MCS- to MCS+ and UWS to all MCS) are indicated in Figure 4.

Figure 2: Overview of analysis used to assess the value of candidate features for the assessment of level of (analysis 1-4) and capacity for consciousness (analysis 5). CRSR: Coma Recovery Scale Revised, UWS: Unresponsive Wakefulness Syndrome, MCS: Minimally Conscious State, EMCS: Emergence

250 **3.8 Statistical analysis**

251 Correlation with the patient's level of consciousness and total CRS-R score was performed using
252 a partial Spearman rank partial correlation (Spearman's Rho), implemented by the pingouin
253 package (Vallat 2018). Features such as the spectral exponent (Voytek et al. 2015) and alpha PAR
254 (Chiang et al. 2011) are variable over lifespan. To account for interactions between candidate
255 measures and patient age, all correlations were performed using age as a covariate. A feature's
256 ability to differentiate patients, according to analysis 3-5 was assessed using a Mann-Whitney-U-
257 test. We corrected for multiple comparisons using the group-wise Holm correction (i.e., correction
258 was performed for all seven metrics of interest within one etiology). In the first analysis, spearman
259 correlation was applied for the relative rank of patient diagnosis (0: UWS, 1: MCS-, 2: MCS+ and
260 3: EMCS). In the second analysis, we performed the Spearman rank test using patients' total CRS-
261 R score.

262 **4 Results**

263 We first report the effect of grouping different etiologies of unresponsive patients on the candidate
264 EEG markers. Subsequently, we contrast the diagnostic value of alpha power between its various
265 instantiations (i.e., absolute, relative and flattened alpha power). We then compare the diagnostic
266 value of spatial and spectral gradients (i.e., alpha PAR and the spectral exponent). Finally, we
267 explore the influence of spectral properties on signal complexity. A summary of results from all five
268 conducted analysis is presented in Figure 3, the corresponding statistical tables can be found in
269 the supplementary material (see supplementary Table S1-S5).

All patients	Alpha Power			Gradients		Complexity	
	Alpha absolute	Alpha relative	Alpha flat	Alpha PAR	Exponent	LZC shuffled	LZC phasnorm
1 Level of Consciousness	■	■	■	■	-	-	■
2 Total CRS-R score	■	■	■	■	-	■	■
3 UWS vs. higher levels of consciousness	■	■	■	■	-	-	■
4 Responsiveness	■	■	-	-	-	■	■
5 Capacity to recover consciousness	-	-	-	-	■	■	-
Anoxic	Alpha absolute	Alpha relative	Alpha flat	Alpha PAR	Exponent	LZC shuffled	LZC phasnorm
1 Level of Consciousness	■	■	■	-	-	-	-
2 Total CRS-R score	-	■	-	-	-	-	■
3 UWS vs. higher levels of consciousness	■	■	■	-	-	-	-
4 Responsiveness	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Capacity to recover consciousness	-	-	-	-	■	■	-
Non-Anoxic	Alpha absolute	Alpha relative	Alpha flat	Alpha PAR	Exponent	LZC shuffled	LZC phasnorm
1 Level of Consciousness	■	■	-	-	■	■	■
2 Total CRS-R score	■	■	-	-	■	■	■
3 UWS vs. higher levels of consciousness	-	■	-	-	-	■	-
4 Responsiveness	■	■	-	-	■	■	■
5 Capacity to recover consciousness	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other etiologies	Alpha absolute	Alpha relative	Alpha flat	Alpha PAR	Exponent	LZC shuffled	LZC phasnorm
1 - 5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Figure 3: Overview of all analysis results first presented for all etiologies, then split into groups based on patient etiology. Green squares represent significant effects. Yellow squares indicate effects which lost significance after correcting for multiple comparison. All statistical tables can be found in the supplementary Tables S1-S5.

PAR: Posterior anterior ratio, LZC Lempel-Ziv Complexity.

271 **4.1 Grouping unresponsive patients from different etiologies can induce spurious**
272 **correlations or obscure existing markers of diagnosis.**

273 Figure 3 illustrates a discrepancy between effects observed on the whole-group level and
274 diagnostic value of candidate EEG markers on individual etiologies. We present two examples of
275 diagnostic effects which were observed on the whole group of unresponsive patients but did not
276 generalize to individual subgroups.

277 When analyzing patients from all etiologies grouped together, absolute alpha power significantly
278 correlated with patient's level of consciousness ($r(238) = 0.31, p < 0.001$) (analysis 1). However,
279 after splitting patients according to their etiology, the correlation between the levels of
280 consciousness and absolute alpha power remained only for anoxic patients ($r(79) = 0.38, p < 0.01$)
281 (analysis 1). For non-anoxic patients, the relation between absolute alpha power and levels of
282 consciousness strongly weakened and lost significance after p-value correction. No significant
283 correlation was found for patients with other etiologies. A post-hoc analysis confirmed that anoxic
284 patients in this dataset were characterized by a significantly lower CRS-R score ($U = 2235,$
285 $p < 0.001$) and broadband power ($U = 2291, p < 0.001$), compared to non-anoxic patients. The lower
286 broadband power resulted also in significantly reduced absolute alpha power ($U = 2491, p < 0.001$)
287 in anoxic patients. Our results demonstrate that lower CRS-R score and reduced broadband power
288 in anoxic patients can induce a spurious group-level diagnostic value of an EEG marker for patients
289 in a DOC, which might vanish when considering etiologies individually.

290 An even stronger effect was observed for alpha PAR, which had diagnostic value solely on a whole-
291 group level (i.e., analysis 1-3). Similar to alpha power, a post-hoc analysis confirmed that anoxic
292 patients were characterized by a significantly more posterior-dominant alpha activity (i.e., lower
293 alpha PAR) ($U = 2285, p < 0.001$), compared to non-anoxic patients. When performing the analysis
294 on individual etiologies independently, the diagnostic effects vanished for all groups. Beyond

295 inducing spurious correlations, grouping all unresponsive subjects together also overshadowed
296 existing etiology-specific diagnostic markers. When analyzing all etiologies together, the spectral
297 exponent did not have any diagnostic value (analysis 1-3). However, splitting subjects by etiology
298 revealed a strong link between the spectral exponent and non-anoxic patients' CRS-R score ($r(82)$
299 $= 0.33$, $p < 0.05$) (analysis 2). In line with our previous findings (Maschke, Duclos, Owen, et al. 2022),
300 a flatter spectral exponent was indicative for higher levels of consciousness.

301 As recommended by Colombo et al. (2023), patients were split in anoxic and non-anoxic (i.e., stroke
302 and TBI) patients. The correlation with patient's level of consciousness was reproduced across
303 patients who suffered a traumatic brain injury and stroke patients. Results are provided in the
304 supplementary material (see supplementary Figure S4, see Discussion).

305 **4.2 Alpha power has a higher diagnostic importance for anoxic compared to non-anoxic** 306 **patients**

307 When splitting the patients according to their etiology into anoxic ($n = 81$), non-anoxic ($n = 84$) and
308 patients with other etiologies ($n = 79$), absolute alpha power maintained strongest diagnostic value
309 for anoxic patients. Absolute alpha power correlated to the level of consciousness of anoxic patients
310 ($r(79) = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$) (analysis 1) and significantly distinguished UWS patients from patients with
311 higher levels of consciousness ($U = 321$, $p < 0.01$) (analysis 3) (see Figure 4 and 5). In line with
312 previous research (Colombo et al. 2023) higher levels of alpha power indicated higher levels of
313 consciousness for anoxic patients. In addition, absolute alpha power significantly differentiated
314 anoxic patients in a UWS from MCS- ($U = 233$, $p < 0.01$) and patients in a UWS from all MCS
315 patients ($U = 321$, $p < 0.001$).

316 For non-anoxic patients, the correlation between absolute alpha power and patient's level of
317 consciousness (analysis 1) lost significance after p-value correction. However, a significant

318 correlation remained between absolute alpha power and non-anoxic patients' CRS-R score ($r(82)$
319 = 0.31, $p < 0.05$) (analysis 2). In addition, absolute alpha power differentiated non-anoxic patients
320 according to their level of responsiveness ($U = 320$, $p < 0.05$) (analysis 4). There was no significant
321 difference in absolute alpha power between non-anoxic patients in a UWS and MCS- or UWS and
322 MCS. However, compared to patients in an MCS- absolute alpha power was significantly increased
323 for non-anoxic patients in a MCS+ ($U = 131$, $p < 0.05$). No diagnostic effects were present for
324 patients with other etiologies. Alpha power had no prognostic value for any of the etiology groups.

325 Compared to absolute alpha power, relative alpha power clearly showed the strongest diagnostic
326 value for non-anoxic patients, with significant effects in analysis 1 to 4. Relative alpha power was
327 significantly correlated with non-anoxic patient's level of consciousness ($r(82) = 0.39$, $p < 0.01$)
328 (analysis 1) and CRS-R score ($r(82) = 0.44$, $p < 0.001$) (analysis 2) (see Figure 4 and 5). In addition,
329 relative alpha power distinguished non-anoxic UWS patients from patients with higher levels of
330 consciousness ($U = 522$, $p < 0.05$) (analysis 3) and stratified patients according to their level of
331 responsiveness ($U = 269$, $p < 0.01$) (analysis 4). In line with this, relative alpha power significantly
332 differentiated non-anoxic patients in a UWS from MCS ($U = 500$, $p < 0.01$) and patients in a MCS-
333 from MCS+ ($U = 128$, $p < 0.05$). In the group of anoxic subjects, all diagnostic effects from analysis
334 1-4 lost significance after p-value correction. Only the minimal contrast comparison between UWS
335 and MCS- ($U = 267$, $p < 0.05$) and UWS and all MCS ($U = 396$, $p < 0.01$) showed significance (see
336 Figure 5). A visualization of spatial distribution of absolute and relative alpha power in UWS and
337 MCS is provided in the supplementary material (see supplementary Figure S5).

338 Flattening alpha power disentangled the effect of alpha oscillation from the background activity or
339 spectral exponent of the power spectral density. After removing the background activity from alpha
340 power (herein called 'flattened alpha power'), this feature exhibited diagnostic value only in anoxic
341 patients. Flattened alpha power correlated with anoxic patients' level of consciousness ($r(79) =$
342 0.31, $p < 0.05$) (analysis 1) and was able to significantly differentiate patients in a UWS from

343 patients with higher levels of consciousness ($U = 363, p < 0.05$) (analysis 3) (see Figure 5). In
344 addition, flattened alpha power significantly distinguished anoxic patients in an UWS from MCS-
345 ($U=231, p<0.01$) and UWS from all MCS ($U=363, p<0.01$) (see Figure 5). No diagnostic effect was
346 found for non-anoxic patients and patients with other etiologies.

347 In summary, absolute alpha power had diagnostic value for both anoxic and non-anoxic subjects.
348 While anoxic patients showed effects in the differentiation of levels of consciousness, the effect in
349 non-anoxic patients was more expressed in differentiating responsiveness. Meanwhile, relative
350 alpha power showed diagnostic effects only for non-anoxic patients. Separating alpha power from
351 the spectral exponent limited the diagnostic value to anoxic patients. In a post-hoc analysis we
352 looked at the relative power in all frequency bands. In line with previous research (Sitt et al. 2014;
353 Engemann et al. 2018) we showed that patient's diagnosis correlated negatively with relative delta
354 power and positively with all relative power bands above 8 Hz (see supplementary Figure S6). This
355 indicates that diagnostic value of relative power in non-anoxic patients is largely attributable to the
356 spectral exponent, rather than the alpha peak. Our results confirm the hypothesis that alpha power
357 has higher diagnostic value for anoxic patients, compared to non-anoxic patients.

358

359

360

361

362

363

364




Figure 4. Spectrograms for different etiologies and diagnostic and prognostic groups.

Power spectral density and of anoxic (left) and non-anoxic (middle) and (right) patients who were unresponsive due to other etiologies. Solid lines represent the mean of the (A) diagnostic and (B) prognostic groups. Shaded areas are the one-sided standard deviation above the mean. UWS: Unresponsive Wakefulness Syndrome, MCS: Minimally Conscious State, EMCS: Emergence, LIS: Locked in syndrome. Coma patients were not included in the diagnostic analysis and are presented for purpose of visualization only (see Methods)

365

366 **4.3 The EEG spectral exponent has more diagnostic value than the spatial gradient.**

367 When analyzing patients from all etiologies grouped together, the alpha PAR showed high
 368 diagnostic value, being significantly correlated with patient's level of consciousness ($r(238) = 0.19$,
 369 $p < 0.05$) (analysis 1) and CRS-R score ($r(238) = 0.19$, $p < 0.05$) (analysis 2). In addition, alpha

370 PAR significantly differentiated patients in a UWS from patients with higher levels of consciousness
371 ($U = 5404$, $p < 0.01$) (analysis 3). In line with Colombo et al (2023), lower CRS-R scores aligned
372 with stronger alpha anteriorization. However, after splitting patients according to their etiology, all
373 effects vanished for all patient groups (see Figure 5).

374 In contrast to the spatial gradient, the spectral exponent did not show diagnostic value on a whole-
375 group level. However, the spectral exponent significantly correlated with non-anoxic patients' CRS-
376 R score ($r(82)=0.33$, $p<0.05$) (analysis 2). In line with previous research (Maschke, Duclos, Owen,
377 et al. 2022), a flatter exponent indicated a higher level of consciousness (see Figure 4 and 5). The
378 correlation between the spectral exponent and non-anoxic patients' level of consciousness as well
379 as its ability to distinguish responsive from unresponsive patients lost significance after p-value
380 correction (see Figure 3 and 5).

381 In addition, it is interesting to note the potential prognostic value of the spectral exponent for anoxic
382 patients. Even though this difference did not remain significant after p-value correction, patients
383 with an unfavorable outcome were characterized by a significantly flatter spectral exponent
384 compared to patients with a favorable outcome ($U = 175$, p uncorrected < 0.01 , p corrected = 0.06).
385 In addition, a post-hoc analysis revealed a positive correlation with anoxic patients' maximal GOS-
386 E score ($r(51) = -0.30$, p uncorrected < 0.05). Despite a strong correlation between the EEG spectral
387 exponent and offset ($r(259) = -0.81$, $p<0.001$), the spectral exponent showed consistently higher
388 diagnostic value than the offset.

389 **4.4 Changes in signal complexity can be largely attributed to changes in the spectral** 390 **exponent.**

391 In line with previous research pointing out the strong relationship between the spectral exponent
392 and Lempel-Ziv Complexity (Medel et al. 2020), the spectral exponent showed a high correlation

393 with the shuffle-normalized LZC ($r(259) = 0.93, p < 0.001$). Normalizing the signal with the phase
394 shuffled surrogates reduced this relationship ($r(269) = 0.52, p < 0.001$), yielding measures of
395 complexity which were more independent of spectral properties.

396 Similar to the results from the spectral exponent, shuffle-normalized LZC did correlate with non-
397 anoxic patients' diagnosed level of consciousness ($r(82) = 0.34, p < 0.05$) (analysis 1) and CRS-R
398 score ($r(82) = 0.39, p < 0.01$) (analysis 2). It further significantly differentiated non-anoxic patients
399 according to their responsiveness ($U = 296, p < 0.05$) (analysis 4). Correcting the Lempel-Ziv
400 complexity for phase differences weakened all previously significant diagnostic value for non-
401 anoxic patients. Thereby, all diagnostic effects of phase-shuffled LZC lost significance after p-value
402 correction. Likewise, correcting the correlation between shuffle-normalized LZC and patients' level
403 of consciousness and CRS-R score by the spectral exponent (i.e., using partial correlation) made
404 the diagnostic effect vanish.

405 Taken together, whereas shuffle-normalized LZC reproduced similar effects as seen in the spectral
406 exponent (see Figure 5), phase-normalization (i.e., reducing the influence of spectral properties on
407 the complexity) reduced the effects or eliminated the observed diagnostic value. However, shuffle-
408 normalized LZC exhibited a generally stronger diagnostic effect compared to the spectral slope
409 (analysis 1-4). Our results indicate that the diagnostic effect of LZC can be largely, but not
410 exclusively, attributed to spectral changes – specifically changes in the spectral exponent – with
411 flatter exponents indicating higher levels of complexity.

412 **4.5 None of the candidate markers generalized to patients with other etiologies.**

413 None of the investigated markers had diagnostic or prognostic value that generalized to patients
414 who were unresponsive due to other injuries (see Discussion).




Figure 5. Correlation between spectral properties and patients' levels of consciousness.

Correlation between patients' diagnosis, and all candidate EEG features. Spearman rank correlation value and degrees of freedom are indicated for each correlation. Each dot corresponds to an individual patient. Corrected significance values are indicated above, with * indicating $p < 0.05$, ** being $p < 0.01$, *** being $p < 0.001$ and n.s. indicating no significance. All non-significant correlations are shaded with grey background. A background with grey and white lines indicates loss of significance after p-value correction. A post-hoc test was performed to assess the minimal contrast between diagnostic groups. P-values are indicated above the bars to differentiate UWS from MCS-, MCS- from MCS+ (first row) and UWS from all MCS (second row). Coma patients were not included in the diagnostic analysis and are presented for purpose of visualization only (see Methods). UWS: Unresponsive Wakefulness Syndrome, MCS: Minimally Conscious State, EMCS: Emergence, LIS: Locked in syndrome, PAR: Posterior anterior ratio, LZC Lempel-Ziv Complexity.

415

416 5 Discussion

417 In this study, we investigated the diagnostic and prognostic value of three classes of EEG features,
418 namely: 1) spectral power; 2) spectral and spatial gradients; and 3) signal complexity; for the
419 assessment of unresponsive patients. Our results indicate that the diagnostic value of absolute and
420 flat alpha power is most strongly expressed in anoxic patients, contributing to growing evidence
421 that alpha power indexes the level of cortical suppression rather than level of consciousness. In
422 contrast, changes in relative power had strong diagnostic effects for non-anoxic patients but were
423 largely attributable to changes in the spectral exponent. The EEG spectral exponent had diagnostic
424 value for non-anoxic patients only. Although the diagnostic value of signal complexity was largely
425 attributable to spectral changes, some diagnostic value remained after correcting for spectral
426 changes. Diagnostic value of signal complexity was largely, but not fully attributable to spectral
427 changes, indicating a need to identify of measures of complexity which are more independent of
428 spectral signal properties. None of the candidate measures generalized to patients with other
429 etiologies.

430

431 ***Etiology is a strong confounding factor in EEG markers of consciousness.***

432 Grouping unresponsive patients from different etiologies together can both induce spurious
433 correlations and obscure existing etiology-based markers of diagnosis. When analyzing all
434 unresponsive patients together, many of the candidate features including absolute alpha power,
435 the alpha PAR and signal complexity showed diagnostic value for unresponsive patients. However,
436 splitting patients into groups based on patients' etiology eliminated the diagnostic value of these
437 markers for individual etiologies. Compared to non-anoxic patients, anoxic patients are often
438 characterized by an overall lower CRS-R score and reduced broadband activity (Estraneo et al.
439 2016; Snider et al. 2022; Colombo et al. 2023). Analyzing anoxic and non-anoxic patients together
440 can therefore induce a spurious correlation driven solely by differences between etiologies, rather
441 than level of consciousness. We confirm our hypothesis that putative EEG markers of
442 consciousness have etiology-dependent differences in their association with patient diagnosis and
443 recommend considering etiologies independently when searching for markers of level of and
444 capacity for consciousness.

445 ***Alpha power has higher diagnostic value for anoxic patients.***

446 Absolute alpha power was related to diagnosis in anoxic and non-anoxic patients. Absolute alpha
447 power was more associated with levels of consciousness in anoxic patients and separated non-
448 anoxic patients only on their level of responsiveness. In contrast, relative alpha power had high
449 diagnostic value for non-anoxic, but not for anoxic patients. However, correcting alpha power for
450 the background activity (i.e., subtracting the aperiodic component from the power spectral density)
451 limited the diagnostic association to anoxic patients only. Thus, non-anoxic patients' diagnostic
452 value of relative alpha power and relative power in other frequency bands (see supplementary
453 material Figure S6) was largely attributable to changes in the spectral exponent. We therefore
454 confirm our hypothesis that alpha power has higher diagnostic value for anoxic patients and

455 highlight the importance of considering the spectral exponent in power analyses. Our results
456 support findings by Colombo et al (2023), who attributed loss of alpha power to global suppression
457 of cortical activity in anoxic patients, rather than level of consciousness.

458 Previous studies (Sitt et al. 2014; Engemann et al. 2018; O'Donnell et al. 2021) demonstrated the
459 diagnostic value of relative alpha power. The authors of Colombo et al. (2023) speculated that
460 those findings could be attributed to the overrepresentation of anoxic patients and the use of
461 neurobehavioral tools for patient stratification. However, the use of relative alpha power in those
462 papers avoids a bias originated by the broadband power suppression of anoxic patients. Instead,
463 our results indicate that the previously identified diagnostic and prognostic value of relative alpha
464 power –specifically for non-anoxic patients– (Sitt et al. 2014; Engemann et al. 2018; O'Donnell et
465 al. 2021) could be partially attributed to changes in the spectral exponent of their EEG.

466 ***The EEG spectral exponent has diagnostic value for non-anoxic patients.***

467 Even though the EEG spectral exponent has been historically neglected, mounting evidence
468 attributes changes in the spectral exponent as an index of altered states of consciousness
469 (Colombo et al. 2019; Lendner et al. 2020; Colombo et al. 2023). In addition, our group previously
470 demonstrated that patients in a DOC are often characterized by a total absence of oscillatory peaks
471 (Maschke, Duclos, Owen, et al. 2022). In the current study, we validate the previously shown
472 diagnostic value of the aperiodic component for non-anoxic patients (Maschke, Duclos, Owen, et
473 al. 2022; Colombo et al. 2023). As demonstrated previously (Maschke, Duclos, Owen, et al. 2022;
474 Colombo et al. 2023), higher levels of consciousness were indexed by a flatter spectral exponent.
475 In line with previous results (Colombo et al. 2023), the spectral exponent had no diagnostic value
476 for anoxic patients. None of the tested measures generalized to patients who did not suffer brain
477 injury. In summary, the spectral exponent has diagnostic value for non-anoxic patients but does
478 not generalize to anoxic subjects and patients with other etiologies.

479 ***Alpha posterior-anterior ratio was not related to diagnosed level of consciousness.***

480 In contrast to the spectral exponent, spatial gradients (i.e. the alpha PAR) showed only little
481 diagnostic value for non-anoxic patients. The positive correlation between the alpha PAR and non-
482 anoxic patient's total CRS-R score lost significance after p-value correction. Colombo et al. (2023)
483 showed that alpha PAR had a stronger capacity to stratify levels of consciousness, compared to
484 alpha power. In their study, alpha PAR indexed levels of consciousness in non-anoxic patients and
485 the reference dataset of anesthetic-induced unconsciousness. In our study, we were not able to
486 replicate the diagnostic value of alpha PAR. We discuss two possible explanations for the
487 contradicting results.

488 First, the study by Colombo et al. (2023) quantified patients' level of consciousness using a neuro-
489 behavioral assessment, combining the CRS-R score (Giacino et al. 2004) (i.e., a behavioral
490 assessment) with the perturbational complexity index (Casali et al. 2013) (i.e., a neurological
491 assessment). While this allowed them to identify unresponsive patients with higher levels of
492 consciousness, our study relied on behavioral assessment only. The reliance on behavioral proxies
493 of consciousness likely underestimated levels of consciousness in our patients, leading to inability
494 to detect diagnostic effect in alpha PAR. However, while the above argument concerns the
495 evaluation of diagnostic value in all features (see Limitations), the inability to replicate results
496 presented by Colombo et al. (2023) only concerned the alpha PAR. We thus consider a second
497 explanation for the contradicting findings.

498 Alpha power is sensitive to demographic characteristics such as age and sex (Jaušovec and
499 Jaušovec 2010; Chiang et al. 2011; Cave and Barry 2021). More specifically, woman have higher
500 broadband power and stronger alpha activity – particularly in parietal and occipital regions
501 (Jaušovec and Jaušovec 2010; Cave and Barry 2021). In addition, the alpha peak has a strong
502 relation to age, moving towards more frontal regions across the lifespan (Chiang et al. 2011).

503 Indeed, a post-hoc analysis on our data confirmed a significant correlation between age and the
504 alpha PAR ($r(181) = -0.30, p < 0.001$), with higher age indicating more anterior-dominant alpha. This
505 relation remained significant after correcting for patients total CRS-R score. To account for the
506 possible sex-based differences, we performed a second post-hoc analysis, investigating the sex-
507 based differences in the diagnostic markers of all candidate features (see supplementary Figure
508 S7). Most interestingly, the alpha PAR in non-anoxic patients showed a diverging effect between
509 men and women. The alpha PAR showed a significant correlation with non-anoxic patients' CRS-
510 R score only in women, but not men. The analysis performed by Colombo et al. (2023) did not
511 account for participants' age and sex. Possible interaction effects should be further investigated to
512 avoid age- or sex-based biases in the clinical assessment of consciousness.

513 ***The EEG spectral exponent might have prognostic value for anoxic unresponsive patients.***

514 In addition to the diagnostic value for non-anoxic patients, this study suggests that the EEG spectral
515 exponent has prognostic value for anoxic patients. Specifically, anoxic patients with a steeper
516 spectral exponent had a higher probability for recovery of consciousness. A post-hoc analysis further
517 confirmed a correlation between the spectral slope and anoxic patients' quality of recovery (i.e.,
518 maximally achieved GOSE score within one year) ($r(51) = -0.30, p < 0.05$), with a steeper spectral
519 slope indicating a higher GOSE score and thus better recovery. Previous results provide evidence
520 linking the flattening of the spectral exponent to higher levels of consciousness (Colombo et al.
521 2019; Lendner et al. 2020; Maschke, Duclos, Owen, et al. 2022). Our group previously demonstrated
522 paradoxical effects on the spectral exponent and signal complexity following exposure to anesthesia
523 (Maschke, Duclos, and Blain-Moraes 2022; Maschke, Duclos, Owen, et al. 2022), where overly-
524 steep spectral exponents flattened in response to anesthesia. We therefore suggest that the EEG
525 spectral exponent can be related to different underlying pathologies: 1) an over-steepening of the
526 spectral exponent indicating altered excitation-inhibition balance; and 2) an over-flattening of the

527 spectral exponent indicating global neuronal cell death and severity of injury in anoxic patients. A
528 previous study investigating the prognostic value of the EEG spectral exponent in cardiac arrest
529 patients did not find a significant difference between recovered and non-recovered patients (Alnes
530 et al. 2021). However, outcome measures in this study might have been affected by the withdrawal
531 of life sustaining treatment and the estimation of the spectral exponent while patients were sedated
532 and in hypothermic treatment. More research needs to be done to further investigate the prognostic
533 value of the spectral exponent for anoxic patients.

534 ***Changes in signal complexity can be largely, but not exclusively, attributed to spectral***
535 ***properties.***

536 The analysis of spontaneous and evoked brain complexity has gained increasing attention as a
537 marker of human consciousness. Reduced brain complexity and entropy of spontaneous EEG
538 activity has been shown during anesthesia-induced unconsciousness (Bruhn et al. 2000; Zhang et
539 al. 2001; Jordan et al. 2008; Schartner et al. 2015), sleep (Burioka et al. 2005; Mateos et al. 2018),
540 epilepsy (Mateos et al. 2018) and in disorders of consciousness (Sarà and Pistoia 2010; Gosseries
541 et al. 2011; Sitt et al. 2014; Stefan et al. 2018; Lei et al. 2022). In this study we demonstrated that
542 the diagnostic value of LZC was largely attributable to changes in the spectral exponent. After
543 correcting the signal complexity to a phase-shuffled signal with similar spectral properties (i.e.,
544 making LZC more independent from the spectral properties) diagnostic value of LZC weakened or
545 vanished completely. However, disentangling signal complexity from the spectral exponent also
546 revealed some diagnostic power of LZC for anoxic patients, which was not present in the classic
547 LZC. We confirm our hypothesize that loss of signal complexity in lower levels of consciousness is
548 epiphenomenal to changes in the spectral exponent and highlight the potential of metrics of signal
549 complexity that rely less on the spectral exponent. LZC is only one measure from a multitude of

550 available complexity and entropy measures (Lau et al. 2022); more research is needed to identify
551 measures of signal complexity which are better suited for the assessment of unresponsive patients.

552 ***None of the candidate EEG markers generalized to patients with other injuries.***

553 In this study, none of the candidate EEG markers showed diagnostic value for the group of patients
554 who were unresponsive caused by other etiologies. One possible explication for this is the high
555 heterogeneity of this group, which was composed of a variety etiologies and different mechanisms
556 leading to alterations in consciousness. Our results indicate the importance of carefully using the
557 term 'markers of consciousness' in the context of the evaluation of unresponsive patients. Previous
558 research has pointed out that correlates of unresponsiveness are not solely markers of
559 consciousness, but are also conflated with indexes of connectedness (Casey et al. 2024). In
560 addition to level of consciousness and connectedness, EEG markers for the clinical assessment of
561 consciousness are likewise influenced by type and severity of injury. Anoxic and non-anoxic brain
562 injuries are highly heterogenous, the aim of identifying a 'one size fits all' marker of level of or
563 capacity for consciousness is overly idealistic in a clinical context. Although it is meaningful to
564 investigate markers of loss of consciousness in the healthy brain through different mechanisms
565 that result in unconsciousness, those mechanisms do not necessarily translate to the injured brain.
566 Instead, we want to point out the need for markers for consciousness and recovery which account
567 for the type and severity of brain injury, and address interindividual and etiology-dependent
568 differences. There is an unmet need for more clinically homogenous large datasets for the
569 investigation of etiology-dependent clinical markers. As an alternative, the use of perturbation for
570 patient-assessment overcomes the problem of individual differences by enabling within-subject
571 analysis. More research is needed on personalized medical approaches for clinical assessment to
572 overcome the limitation of interindividual heterogeneity yielding differences in spontaneous EEG
573 markers.

574 **Limitations**

575 The results of this study need to be interpreted in light of several limitations.

576 First, level of consciousness was assessed using the proxy of responsiveness (CRS-R score).
577 However, the absence of responsiveness is not sufficient to claim the absence of consciousness
578 (Sanders et al. 2012). To partially address this limitation, we conducted five variations of the
579 diagnostic analysis: a basic diagnostic analysis (analysis 1-3); an analysis focused on patient
580 responsiveness (analysis 4); and an analysis focused on the patient's potential to recover (analysis
581 5). To maximally exclude confounding factors beyond the pure level and content of consciousness,
582 we additionally analyzed the minimal contrast between UWS and MCS, MCS- and MCS+. Still, the
583 diagnosis which relies on behavior alone is insufficient to correctly reflect the state of an
584 unresponsive patient and should be ideally paired with evidence from functional brain imaging
585 assessment (Naccache 2018).

586 Second, we combined traumatic brain injury and stroke into the group of non-anoxic patients. The
587 same grouping has been performed in previous research (Colombo et al. 2023), in which they
588 reported diverging effects between anoxic and non-anoxic patients but similar results within the
589 group of non-anoxic patients (i.e., between stroke and TBI patients). In line with this, we performed
590 analysis 1 (i.e., the correlation between candidate features and patients' diagnosed level of
591 consciousness) on TBI and stroke patients individually and provided the results in the
592 supplementary material (see supplementary Figure S4). While similar trends were observed in the
593 individual groups, the possibility to draw conclusions based on statistics is limited by the small
594 sample size of 22 stroke patients. Despite similar cognitive recovery process (Castor and El
595 Massioui 2018), TBI and stroke are still two distinct clinical conditions which should be treated and
596 investigated independently. More research is needed to validate candidate EEG markers for their
597 diagnostic and prognostic value for stroke and TBI patients independently.

598 Third, we only investigated space-averaged EEG features and did not account for the location and
599 severity of injury. Investigating the diagnostic and prognostic value of specific brain regions' EEG
600 values would require accounting for individual characteristics of location and size of injury, which
601 was not available in this dataset. Previous studies demonstrated a steepening of the spectral
602 exponent in the stroke-affected hemisphere, compared to the healthy hemisphere (Lanzone et al.
603 2022). To partially address the spatial variability in EEG features, we performed a post-hoc analysis
604 investigating the prognostic value of the standard deviation of the spectral exponent. More research
605 is required to investigate spatial characteristics of EEG features for the prediction of outcome.

606 **6 Conclusion**

607 Identifying reliable markers of consciousness is fundamental for the assessment unresponsive
608 patients. Alpha power has long been considered a reliable and generalizable clinical index of
609 consciousness; our results support the claim that alpha power is an etiology-specific marker, which
610 has higher diagnostic value for anoxic patients. In addition, we highlight the diagnostic value of the
611 spectral exponent for the assessment of non-anoxic patients and point out the strong dependence
612 between complexity and the spectral exponent. Our results demonstrate the importance of
613 considering etiologies independently when investigating markers for capacity for consciousness.
614 We demonstrated clinical limitations of current EEG markers of consciousness which are not
615 generalizable across different brain pathologies. Moving forward, we encourage the development
616 of within-subject approaches to address the limitation of interindividual heterogeneity.

617 **7 Acknowledgments**

618 SBM is supported by the Canada Research Chairs Program (Tier II). CM is funded through Fonds
619 de recherche du Québec – Santé (FRQS). This research is supported in part by the FRQNT
620 Strategic Clusters Program (2020-RS4-265502 - Centre UNIQUE - Union Neurosciences & Artificial
621 Intelligence – Quebec). This study was funded through an NSERC Discovery Grant (RGPIN-2023-

622 03619) and a France Canada Research Fund New Research Collaborations Program. This
623 research was undertaken thanks in part to funding from the Canada First Research Excellence
624 Fund and Fonds de recherche du Québec, awarded to the Healthy Brains, Healthy Lives initiative
625 at McGill University. This study was partly funded by the European Union (ERA PerMed JTC2019
626 “PerBrain”, grant to JDS) and FLAG-ERA project ModelDXConsciousness. DM received individual
627 funding from Ecole Doctorale Frontières de l’Innovation en Recherche et Education–Programme
628 Bettencourt.

629 **8 References**

630 Alnes SL, Lucia MD, Rossetti AO, Tzovara A. 2021. Complementary roles of neural synchrony
631 and complexity for indexing consciousness and chances of surviving in acute coma. *NeuroImage*.
632 245:118638. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.118638. [accessed 2021 Nov 17].
633 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811921009113>.

634 Bruhn J, Röpcke H, Hoefft A. 2000. Approximate Entropy as an Electroencephalographic Measure
635 of Anesthetic Drug Effect during Desflurane Anesthesia. *Anesthesiology*. 92(3):715–726.
636 doi:10.1097/0000542-200003000-00016. [accessed 2023 Sep 5].
637 <https://doi.org/10.1097/0000542-200003000-00016>.

638 Burioka N, Miyata M, Cornélissen G, Halberg F, Takeshima T, Kaplan DT, Suyama H, Endo M,
639 Maegaki Y, Nomura T, et al. 2005. Approximate Entropy in the Electroencephalogram during Wake
640 and Sleep. *Clin EEG Neurosci*. 36(1):21–24. doi:10.1177/155005940503600106. [accessed 2023
641 Sep 5]. <https://doi.org/10.1177/155005940503600106>.

642 Casali AG, Gosseries O, Rosanova M, Boly M, Sarasso S, Casali KR, Casarotto S, Bruno M-A,
643 Laureys S, Tononi G, et al. 2013. A Theoretically Based Index of Consciousness Independent of
644 Sensory Processing and Behavior. *Science Translational Medicine*. 5(198):198ra105-198ra105.
645 doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.3006294. [accessed 2019 Sep 17].
646 <https://stm.sciencemag.org/content/5/198/198ra105>.

647 Casey CP, Tanabe S, Farahbakhsh ZZ, Parker M, Bo A, White M, Ballweg T, McIntosh A, Filbey
648 W, Banks MI, et al. 2024. Evaluation of putative signatures of consciousness using specific
649 definitions of responsiveness, connectedness, and consciousness. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*.
650 132(2):300–311. doi:10.1016/j.bja.2023.09.031. [accessed 2024 Jan 19].
651 [https://www.bjanaesthesia.org/article/S0007-0912\(23\)00556-1/fulltext](https://www.bjanaesthesia.org/article/S0007-0912(23)00556-1/fulltext).

652 Castor N, El Massioui F. 2018. Traumatic brain injury and stroke: does recovery differ? *Brain Injury*.
653 32(13–14):1803–1810. doi:10.1080/02699052.2018.1508748. [accessed 2024 Jan 30].
654 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699052.2018.1508748>.

- 655 Cave AE, Barry RJ. 2021. Sex differences in resting EEG in healthy young adults. *International*
656 *Journal of Psychophysiology*. 161:35–43. doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2021.01.008. [accessed 2024 Jan
657 31]. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167876021000209>.
- 658 Chennu S, Finoia P, Kamau E, Allanson J, Williams GB, Monti MM, Noreika V, Arnatkeviciute A,
659 Canales-Johnson A, Olivares F, et al. 2014. Spectral Signatures of Reorganised Brain Networks in
660 Disorders of Consciousness. *PLOS Computational Biology*. 10(10):e1003887.
661 doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003887. [accessed 2019 Nov 21].
662 <https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003887>.
- 663 Chiang AKI, Rennie CJ, Robinson PA, van Albada SJ, Kerr CC. 2011. Age trends and sex
664 differences of alpha rhythms including split alpha peaks. *Clinical Neurophysiology*. 122(8):1505–
665 1517. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2011.01.040. [accessed 2024 Jan 31].
666 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1388245711000903>.
- 667 Colombo MA, Comanducci A, Casarotto S, Derchi C-C, Annen J, Viganò A, Mazza A, Trimarchi
668 PD, Boly M, Fecchio M, et al. 2023. Beyond alpha power: EEG spatial and spectral gradients
669 robustly stratify disorders of consciousness. *Cerebral Cortex*:bhad031.
670 doi:10.1093/cercor/bhad031. [accessed 2023 May 22]. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhad031>.
- 671 Colombo MA, Napolitani M, Boly M, Gosseries O, Casarotto S, Rosanova M, Bricchant J-F,
672 Boveroux P, Rex S, Laureys S, et al. 2019. The spectral exponent of the resting EEG indexes the
673 presence of consciousness during unresponsiveness induced by propofol, xenon, and ketamine.
674 *NeuroImage*. 189:631–644. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.01.024. [accessed 2021 Aug 12].
675 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811919300242>.
- 676 De Gennaro L, Ferrara M, Curcio G, Cristiani R. 2001. Antero-posterior EEG changes during the
677 wakefulness-sleep transition. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 112(10):1901–1911. doi:10.1016/s1388-
678 2457(01)00649-6.
- 679 Donoghue T, Haller M, Peterson EJ, Varma P, Sebastian P, Gao R, Noto T, Lara AH, Wallis JD,
680 Knight RT, et al. 2020. Parameterizing neural power spectra into periodic and aperiodic
681 components. *Nat Neurosci*. 23(12):1655–1665. doi:10.1038/s41593-020-00744-x. [accessed 2021
682 Aug 5]. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41593-020-00744-x>.
- 683 Engemann DA, Raimondo F, King J-R, Rohaut B, Louppe G, Faugeras F, Annen J, Cassol H,
684 Gosseries O, Fernandez-Slezak D, et al. 2018. Robust EEG-based cross-site and cross-protocol
685 classification of states of consciousness. *Brain*. 141(11):3179–3192. doi:10.1093/brain/awy251.
686 [accessed 2020 Jan 25]. <https://academic.oup.com/brain/article/141/11/3179/5114404>.
- 687 Estraneo A, Loreto V, Guarino I, Boemia V, Paone G, Moretta P, Trojano L. 2016. Standard EEG
688 in diagnostic process of prolonged disorders of consciousness. *Clinical Neurophysiology*.
689 127(6):2379–2385. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2016.03.021. [accessed 2021 Mar 11].
690 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1388245716300037>.
- 691 Gerster M, Waterstraat G, Litvak V, Lehnertz K, Schnitzler A, Florin E, Curio G, Nikulin V. 2022.
692 Separating Neural Oscillations from Aperiodic 1/f Activity: Challenges and Recommendations.
693 *Neuroinform*. doi:10.1007/s12021-022-09581-8. [accessed 2022 Apr 11].
694 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12021-022-09581-8>.

- 695 Giacino JT, Kalmar K, Whyte J. 2004. The JFK Coma Recovery Scale-Revised: measurement
696 characteristics and diagnostic utility. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 85(12):2020–2029.
697 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2004.02.033.
- 698 Gosseries O, Schnakers C, Ledoux D, Vanhaudenhuyse A, Bruno M-A, Demertzi A, Noirhomme
699 Q, Lehembre R, Damas P, Goldman S, et al. 2011. Automated EEG entropy measurements in
700 coma, vegetative state/unresponsive wakefulness syndrome and minimally conscious state. *Funct*
701 *Neurol.* 26(1):25–30. [accessed 2023 Sep 5].
702 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3814509/>.
- 703 Gramfort A, Luessi M, Larson E, Engemann D, Strohmeier D, Brodbeck C, Goj R, Jas M, Brooks
704 T, Parkkonen L, et al. 2013. MEG and EEG data analysis with MNE-Python. *Frontiers in*
705 *Neuroscience.* 7. [accessed 2022 Mar 23].
706 <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnins.2013.00267>.
- 707 Jaušovec N, Jaušovec K. 2010. Resting brain activity: Differences between genders.
708 *Neuropsychologia.* 48(13):3918–3925. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.09.020. [accessed
709 2024 Jan 31]. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0028393210004100>.
- 710 Jennett B, Bond M. 1975. Assessment of outcome after severe brain damage. *Lancet.*
711 1(7905):480–484. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(75)92830-5.
- 712 Jordan D, Stockmanns G, Kochs EF, Pilge S, Schneider G. 2008. Electroencephalographic Order
713 Pattern Analysis for the Separation of Consciousness and Unconsciousness: An Analysis of
714 Approximate Entropy, Permutation Entropy, Recurrence Rate, and Phase Coupling of Order
715 Recurrence Plots. *Anesthesiology.* 109(6):1014–1022. doi:10.1097/ALN.0b013e31818d6c55.
716 [accessed 2023 Sep 5]. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0b013e31818d6c55>.
- 717 Kalmar K, Giacino JT. 2005. The JFK coma recovery scale—revised. *Neuropsychological*
718 *Rehabilitation.* 15(3–4):454–460. doi:10.1080/09602010443000425. [accessed 2020 Apr 14].
719 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09602010443000425>.
- 720 Lanzone J, Colombo MA, Sarasso S, Zappasodi F, Rosanova M, Massimini M, Di Lazzaro V,
721 Assenza G. 2022. EEG spectral exponent as a synthetic index for the longitudinal assessment of
722 stroke recovery. *Clinical Neurophysiology.* 137:92–101. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2022.02.022.
723 [accessed 2023 Dec 7]. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1388245722001936>.
- 724 Lau ZJ, Pham T, Chen SHA, Makowski D. 2022. Brain entropy, fractal dimensions and
725 predictability: A review of complexity measures for EEG in healthy and neuropsychiatric
726 populations. *European Journal of Neuroscience.* 56(7):5047–5069. doi:10.1111/ejn.15800.
727 [accessed 2022 Oct 23]. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ejn.15800>.
- 728 Lei L, Liu K, Yang Y, Doublier A, Hu X, Xu Y, Zhou Y. 2022. Spatio-temporal analysis of EEG
729 features during consciousness recovery in patients with disorders of consciousness. *Clinical*
730 *Neurophysiology.* 133:135–144. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2021.08.027. [accessed 2023 Sep 5].
731 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1388245721007628>.
- 732 Lempel A, Ziv J. 1976. On the Complexity of Finite Sequences. *IEEE Transactions on Information*
733 *Theory.* 22(1):75–81. doi:10.1109/TIT.1976.1055501.

- 734 Lendner JD, Helfrich RF, Mander BA, Romundstad L, Lin JJ, Walker MP, Larsson PG, Knight RT.
735 2020. An electrophysiological marker of arousal level in humans. *Elife*. 9:e55092.
736 doi:10.7554/eLife.55092.
- 737 Leroy S, Major S, Bublitz V, Dreier JP, Koch S. 2023. Unveiling age-independent spectral markers
738 of propofol-induced loss of consciousness by decomposing the electroencephalographic spectrum
739 into its periodic and aperiodic components. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*. 14. [accessed 2023
740 Sep 27]. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnagi.2022.1076393>.
- 741 Maschke C, Duclos C, Blain-Moraes S. 2022. Paradoxical markers of conscious levels: Effects of
742 propofol on patients in disorders of consciousness. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*. 16.
743 [accessed 2022 Oct 6]. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2022.992649>.
- 744 Maschke C, Duclos C, Owen AM, Jerbi K, Blain-Moraes S. 2022. Aperiodic brain activity and
745 response to anesthesia vary in disorders of consciousness. :2022.04.22.489199.
746 doi:10.1101/2022.04.22.489199. [accessed 2022 Oct 2].
747 <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.04.22.489199v2>.
- 748 Maschke C, O'Byrne J, Colombo MA, Boly M, Gosseries O, Laureys S, Rosanova M, Jerbi K, Blain-
749 Moraes S. 2023. Criticality of resting-state EEG predicts perturbational complexity and level of
750 consciousness during anesthesia. :2023.10.26.564247. doi:10.1101/2023.10.26.564247.
751 [accessed 2023 Dec 7]. <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.10.26.564247v1>.
- 752 Mateos DM, Guevara Erra R, Wennberg R, Perez Velazquez JL. 2018. Measures of entropy and
753 complexity in altered states of consciousness. *Cogn Neurodyn*. 12(1):73–84. doi:10.1007/s11571-
754 017-9459-8. [accessed 2023 Sep 12]. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11571-017-9459-8>.
- 755 Medel V, Irani M, Ossandón T, Boncompte G. 2020. Complexity and 1/f slope jointly reflect cortical
756 states across different E/I balances. [accessed 2021 Aug 24].
757 <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.15.298497v2>.
- 758 Naccache L. 2018. Minimally conscious state or cortically mediated state? *Brain*. 141(4):949–960.
759 doi:10.1093/brain/awx324. [accessed 2024 Mar 4]. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awx324>.
- 760 Naro A, Bramanti P, Leo A, Cacciola A, Bramanti A, Manuli A, Calabrò RS. 2016. Towards a
761 method to differentiate chronic disorder of consciousness patients' awareness: The Low-Resolution
762 Brain Electromagnetic Tomography Analysis. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*. 368:178–183.
763 doi:10.1016/j.jns.2016.07.016. [accessed 2020 Mar 2].
764 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022510X16304294>.
- 765 O'Donnell A, Pauli R, Banellis L, Sokoliuk R, Hayton T, Sturman S, Veenith T, Yakoub KM, Belli A,
766 Chennu S, et al. 2021. The prognostic value of resting-state EEG in acute post-traumatic
767 unresponsive states. *Brain Commun*. 3(2):fcab017. doi:10.1093/braincomms/fcab017. [accessed
768 2024 Jan 23]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8023635/>.
- 769 Piarulli A, Bergamasco M, Thibaut A, Cologan V, Gosseries O, Laureys S. 2016. EEG ultradian
770 rhythmicity differences in disorders of consciousness during wakefulness. *J Neurol*. 263(9):1746–
771 1760. doi:10.1007/s00415-016-8196-y. [accessed 2022 Feb 24]. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-016-8196-y>.
- 772

- 773 Purdon PL, Pierce ET, Mukamel EA, Prerau MJ, Walsh JL, Wong KFK, Salazar-Gomez AF, Harrell
774 PG, Sampson AL, Cimenser A, et al. 2013. Electroencephalogram signatures of loss and recovery
775 of consciousness from propofol. *PNAS*. 110(12):E1142–E1151. doi:10.1073/pnas.1221180110.
776 [accessed 2019 Sep 20]. <https://www.pnas.org/content/110/12/E1142>.
- 777 Purdon PL, Sampson A, Pavone KJ, Brown EN. 2015. Clinical Electroencephalography for
778 Anesthesiologists: Part I: Background and Basic Signatures. *Anesthesiology*. 123(4):937–960.
779 doi:10.1097/ALN.0000000000000841. [accessed 2023 Dec 11].
780 <https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0000000000000841>.
- 781 Sanders RD, Tononi G, Laureys S, Sleigh JW, Warner DS. 2012. Unresponsiveness ≠
782 Unconsciousness. *Anesthesiology*. 116(4):946–959. doi:10.1097/ALN.0b013e318249d0a7.
783 [accessed 2021 Jan 23]. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0b013e318249d0a7>.
- 784 Sarà M, Pistoia F. 2010. Complexity loss in physiological time series of patients in a vegetative
785 state. *Nonlinear Dynamics Psychol Life Sci*. 14(1):1–13.
- 786 Sarasso S, Boly M, Napolitani M, Gosseries O, Charland-Verville V, Casarotto S, Rosanova M,
787 Casali AG, Brichant J-F, Boveroux P, et al. 2015. Consciousness and Complexity during
788 Unresponsiveness Induced by Propofol, Xenon, and Ketamine. *Current Biology*. 25(23):3099–
789 3105. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2015.10.014. [accessed 2020 Mar 2].
790 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960982215012427>.
- 791 Schartner M, Seth A, Noirhomme Q, Boly M, Bruno M-A, Laureys S, Barrett A. 2015. Complexity
792 of Multi-Dimensional Spontaneous EEG Decreases during Propofol Induced General Anaesthesia.
793 *PLOS ONE*. 10(8):e0133532. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0133532. [accessed 2021 Nov 22].
794 <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0133532>.
- 795 Schartner MM, Carhart-Harris RL, Barrett AB, Seth AK, Muthukumaraswamy SD. 2017. Increased
796 spontaneous MEG signal diversity for psychoactive doses of ketamine, LSD and psilocybin. *Sci*
797 *Rep*. 7(1):46421. doi:10.1038/srep46421. [accessed 2021 Nov 22].
798 <https://www.nature.com/articles/srep46421>.
- 799 Scheinin A, Kallionpää RE, Li D, Kallioinen M, Kaisti K, Långsjö J, Maksimow A, Vahlberg T, Valli
800 K, Mashour GA, et al. 2018. Differentiating Drug-related and State-related Effects of
801 Dexmedetomidine and Propofol on the Electroencephalogram. *Anesthesiology*. 129(1):22–36.
802 doi:10.1097/ALN.0000000000002192. [accessed 2023 Dec 11].
803 <https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0000000000002192>.
- 804 Sitt JD, King J-R, El Karoui I, Rohaut B, Faugeras F, Gramfort A, Cohen L, Sigman M, Dehaene S,
805 Naccache L. 2014. Large scale screening of neural signatures of consciousness in patients in a
806 vegetative or minimally conscious state. *Brain*. 137(8):2258–2270. doi:10.1093/brain/awu141.
807 [accessed 2020 Feb 17]. <https://academic.oup.com/brain/article/137/8/2258/2848092>.
- 808 Snider SB, Fischer D, McKeown ME, Cohen AL, Schaper FLWVJ, Amorim E, Fox MD, Scirica B,
809 Bevers MB, Lee JW. 2022. Regional Distribution of Brain Injury After Cardiac Arrest. *Neurology*.
810 98(12):e1238–e1247. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000013301. [accessed 2024 Jan 29].
811 <https://www.neurology.org/doi/10.1212/WNL.0000000000013301>.

812 Stefan S, Schorr B, Lopez-Rolon A, Kolassa I-T, Shock JP, Rosenfelder M, Heck S, Bender A.
813 2018. Consciousness Indexing and Outcome Prediction with Resting-State EEG in Severe
814 Disorders of Consciousness. *Brain Topogr.* 31(5):848–862. doi:10.1007/s10548-018-0643-x.
815 [accessed 2021 Feb 4]. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-018-0643-x>.

816 Toker D, Pappas I, Lendner JD, Frohlich J, Mateos DM, Muthukumaraswamy S, Carhart-Harris R,
817 Paff M, Vespa PM, Monti MM, et al. 2022. Consciousness is supported by near-critical slow cortical
818 electrodynamics. *PNAS.* 119(7). doi:10.1073/pnas.2024455119. [accessed 2022 Feb 16].
819 <https://www.pnas.org/content/119/7/e2024455119>.

820 Vallat R. 2018. Pingouin: statistics in Python. *Journal of Open Source Software.* 3(31):1026.
821 doi:10.21105/joss.01026. [accessed 2023 May 22].
822 <https://joss.theoj.org/papers/10.21105/joss.01026>.

823 Vijayan S, Ching S, Purdon P, Brown E, Kopell N. 2013. Thalamocortical Mechanisms for the
824 Anteriorization of Alpha Rhythms during Propofol-Induced Unconsciousness. *The Journal of*
825 *neuroscience: the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience.* 33:11070–11075.
826 doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5670-12.2013.

827 Voytek B, Kramer MA, Case J, Lepage KQ, Tempesta ZR, Knight RT, Gazzaley A. 2015. Age-
828 Related Changes in 1/f Neural Electrophysiological Noise. *J Neurosci.* 35(38):13257–13265.
829 doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2332-14.2015. [accessed 2021 Dec 9].
830 <https://www.jneurosci.org/content/35/38/13257>.

831 Zhang X-S, Roy RJ, Jensen EW. 2001. EEG complexity as a measure of depth of anesthesia for
832 patients. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering.* 48(12):1424–1433.
833 doi:10.1109/10.966601.

834

835

836