ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Hyperparameter-tuned prediction of somatic symptom disorder using functional near Infrared spectroscopy based dynamic functional connectivity

To cite this article before publication: Aykut Eken *et al* 2019 *J. Neural Eng.* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/ab50b2>

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2019 IOP Publishing Ltd.

During the embargo period (the 12 month period from the publication of the Version of Record of this article), the Accepted Manuscript is fully protected by copyright and cannot be reused or reposted elsewhere.

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a subscription basis, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 licence after the 12 month embargo period.

After the embargo period, everyone is permitted to use copy and redistribute this article for non-commercial purposes only, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions will likely be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected, unless specifically stated otherwise in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

Hyperparameter-Tuned Prediction of Somatic Symptom Disorder Using Functional Near Infrared Spectroscopy Based Dynamic Functional Connectivity

Aykut Eken^{1,2}, Burçin Çolak³, Neşe Burcu Bal⁴, Adnan Kuşman³, Selma Çilem Kızılpınar³,
Damla Sayar Akaslan³, Bora Baskak^{3,5}

1. ICFO- Institut de Ciències Fotòniques Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Castelldefels, Barcelona, Spain
2. Center for Brain and Cognition, Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, Spain
3. Ankara University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, Ankara, Turkey
4. Health Sciences University, Department of Psychiatry, Istanbul, Turkey
5. Ankara University, Brain Research and Application Center, Ankara, Turkey

Corresponding author

Aykut Eken

The Institute of Photonic Sciences (ICFO)

Medical Optics Research Group

Av. Carl Friederich Gauss, 3, Castelldefels

Barcelona, Spain

Tel: +34 935542279

Fax : +34 935534000

e-mail : aykut.eken@icfo.eu

ABSTRACT

Objective : Somatic Symptom Disorder (SSD) is a reflection of medically unexplained physical symptoms that lead to distress and impairment in social and occupational functioning. SSD is phenomenologically diagnosed and its neurobiology remains unsolved.

Approach : In this study, we performed hyper-parameter optimized classification to distinguish 19 persistent SSD patients and 21 healthy controls by utilizing Functional Near Infrared Spectroscopy via performing two painful stimulation experiments, Individual Pain Threshold (IND) and Constant Sub-Threshold (SUB), that include conditions with different levels of pain (INDc & SUBc) and brush stimulation. We estimated dynamic functional connectivity time series by using sliding window correlation method and extracted features from these time series for these conditions and different cortical regions.

Main Results : Our results showed that we found highest specificity (85%) with highest accuracy (82%) and 81% sensitivity using SVM classifier by utilizing connections between Right Superior Temporal– Left Angular Gyri, Right Middle Frontal (MFG) – Left Supramarginal Gyri and Right Middle Temporal – Left Middle Frontal Gyri from INDc condition.

Significance : Our results suggest that fNIRS may distinguish subjects with SSD from healthy controls by applying pain in levels of individual pain-threshold and bilateral MFG, left Inferior Parietal and Right Temporal Gyrus might be robust biomarkers to be considered for SSD neurobiology.

Keywords : Somatic Symptom Disorder, fNIRS, Machine Learning, Dynamic Functional Connectivity, Hyperparameter Optimization

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. Introduction

Somatoform disorders are characterized by the presence of physical symptoms that suggest a general medical condition which are not fully explained by a general medical condition, by the direct effects of a substance, or by another mental disorder. According to the 5th version of Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) somatoform disorder definition was replaced by ‘somatic symptom and related disorders’ and encompass a group of disorders such as somatic symptom disorder (SSD), illness anxiety disorder and conversion disorder. Particularly, the persistent SSD diagnosis require existence of somatic symptoms accompanied by excessive thoughts, feelings or behaviors related with somatic symptoms that endure more than 6 months. According to the DSM-5, in order to meet the diagnostic criteria, the symptoms must lead to clinically significant distress in daily life or impairment in social, occupational, or other areas of functioning.

Epidemiologically, the prevalence of SSD is estimated as 5-7% in the general population (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) and increases up to 17% in primary care admissions (Kurlansik & Maffei, 2016). Economic burden is also devastating. This group of disorders are associated with a high economic cost not only by overutilization of the health care system (Barsky et al., 2005), but unemployment and early retirement rates as well as absenteeism from work are also considerably high (Konnopka et al., 2013). In spite of this economic burden, current diagnosis of these disorders solely depends on direct observation

of symptoms and underlying neurobiology is not clear. Cognitive alterations in perception, processing an attribution of pain have been proposed (Barsky et al., 1988) and structural and functional neuroimaging studies revealed some of the underlying neural circuits. In an fMRI study, it was showed that patients display increased activity as response to painful stimuli in known pain processing regions such as thalamus, basal ganglia, operculo-insular cortex as well as prefrontal and temporal cortices (Stoeter et al., 2007). In another study Yoshino and colleagues found evidence regarding higher activity during resting state in the precentral gyrus which is also an element of the pain network (Yoshino et al., 2014). Browning and colleagues reviewed neuroimaging studies in somatoform disorders and concluded that when compared with nonclinical groups, somatoform diagnoses are associated with increased activity of limbic and cortical regions in response to painful stimuli and a generalized decrease in gray matter density (Browning et al., 2011). But great majority of these studies enrolled subjects with former definition of somatoform pain disorder and fibromyalgia where the prominent symptom was pain. Very few studies of patients with former diagnosis of 'somatization disorder' with a range of somatic symptoms have been published which reported anomalies in resting activation (Garcia-Campayo et al., 2001; Hakala et al., 2006) and some structural differences (Hakala et al., 2004). Browning and colleagues commented that published studies in somatization disorder involve small samples (maximum n=11, with similar cohorts of patients repeatedly analyzed in different studies) and therefore clear conclusions cannot be drawn about the patterns of activation associated with this diagnosis (Browning et al., 2011). Ever since that review, a literature survey fails to identify a functional neuroimaging study which evaluates response to painful stimuli in subjects with persistent somatic symptom disorder. Another review that focuses on functional somatic syndromes showed that central sensitization might be an common indicator for them (Bourke et al., 2015).

The vast majority of the studies conducted on somatoform disorders were performed using Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI). However, fMRI has several limitations compared with other neuroimaging modalities such as being expensive, noisy scanner, strict restrictions of motion and stressful environment that may cause several false positive activations (Scarapicchia et al., 2017) particularly in psychiatric populations (Baskak, 2018). fNIRS is a relatively new imaging technology capable of measuring cortical activity and can be simultaneously used with EEG (Chiarelli et al., 2018; Chiarelli et al., 2017; Dutta et al., 2015; Kassab et al., 2018; Koo et al., 2015; Peng et al., 2016). To perform experiments using fNIRS in a more naturalistic environment is more possible than using fMRI (Rolfe, 2000). Since fNIRS is relatively insensitive to motion artifacts, subjects can be examined in a natural sitting position, without any surrounding distraction (Takizawa et al., 2008). fNIRS may especially be suitable for subjects with SSD who may be sensitive to physical restriction and discomfort associated with MRI environment. Because, there are some indirect evidences that MRI environment leads to significant changes in hypothalamo-pituitary-adrenal axis (Tessner et al., 2006), a system which is found disturbed in subjects with functional somatic symptoms (Janssens et al., 2012).

Several techniques adopted from machine learning approaches have been utilized in neuroimaging for the classification of several pain related psychiatric disorders (see reviews (Davis et al., 2017; Lotsch & Ultsch, 2018)). In details, these algorithms were successfully employed for the classification of subjects with fibromyalgia (Gokcay et al., 2018; Lopez-Sola et al., 2017; Robinson et al., 2015; Sundermann et al., 2014) as well as chronic back pain (Callan et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2018; Mano et al., 2018).

We aimed to examine cortical activity in response to painful stimuli in subjects with DSM-5 persistent SSD with fNIRS. We tried to predict membership to SSD diagnostic category with sufficient sensitivity and accuracy by using features extracted from fNIRS signals acquired after an experimental task that includes painful and non-painful stimulation. Here it is important to note that as most psychiatric diagnoses, current diagnosis of SSD is made by assessing clusters of symptoms in a psychiatric interview and our aim is not to test a costly neuro-imaging based alternative. However, construct validity of psychiatric diagnoses is of great concern (Jablensky, 2016) and neurophysiologic measures including functional neuroimaging are proposed to test validity of these disorders by investigating possible biomarkers which may help to reveal the true neurobiology behind these (Andreasen, 1995; Linden & Fallgatter, 2009) disorders. We accordingly aimed (i) to assess robust, task-specific and region-based biomarker/s for SSD by using fNIRS, and (ii) to create a hyperparameter-tuned machine learning model by using these biomarkers that maximize the accuracy, sensitivity and specificity.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

The index group comprised 19 consecutive outpatients with SSD. Participants were evaluated by two experienced psychiatrists and those diagnosed with DSM-5 persistent SSD were invited to participate. Inclusion criteria were (i) age between 18-65, (ii) being predominantly right handed, (iii) willing to participate into the study. Subjects with (i) major depressive episode (ii) history of neurological disorders, (iii) chronic general medical condition, (iv) head trauma (resulting in loss of consciousness longer than 30 minutes), as well as (v) alcohol and/or substance use disorder (except tobacco) were excluded. Depression and

SSD are highly comorbid disorders and although we excluded clinically established cases of depression, sub clinical depressive symptoms may also interfere with cortical processing of pain (Rodriguez-Raecke et al., 2014; Strigo et al., 2008; Vossen et al., 2006). We therefore applied Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) (Hisli, 1998) and subjects with BDI scores over 30 which corresponds to depressive symptoms above moderate level were also excluded (N=11). Thus the index group was composed of the remaining 19 subjects. The control group consisted of 21 healthy participants were also evaluated by two experienced psychiatrists in order to rule out existence or history of a psychiatric disorder and psychotropic drug use. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were the same as the index group. Handedness was assessed with Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (Oldfield, 1971). All participants stopped the intake for analgesic drugs at least 48 h before the experiment. They were also informed about the protocol that was approved by the Ankara University Ethical Board Committee (No. 04-240-18). The protocol was performed according to the Helsinki declaration and subjects signed informed consent before participation.

2.2. Pain Threshold Measurement

Pain threshold measurement was performed by applying Quantitative Sensory Testing (QST) method via electronic Von Frey (eVF) aesthesiometer (Ugo Basile Co, Italy) as previously published (Ambalavanar et al., 2006; KuKanich et al., 2005; Tena et al., 2012; Vivancos et al., 2004). We applied eVF five times on to the right thumb of every participant and they are asked to give a verbal response as soon as they feel unpleasant. After these five measurement, we calculated the average of this five measurements and result was recorded as individual mechanical pain threshold.

2.3. Experimental Design

We conducted two different painful stimulation experiments by using eVF to apply painful stimuli (i) at a constant sub-threshold level (SUB) and (ii) at the individual pain threshold level (IND). In both experiments, we also performed brush stimulation (BS) as the control condition. In BS condition, we used a toothbrush and applied it manually to the thumb 24 times during the stimulation period. In the SUB experiment during painful stimulation condition (SUBc), a constant painful stimulus (130 gf/ cm²) and in the IND experiment during painful stimulation condition (INDc) stimulus at the individual pain threshold that was calculated for each individual was applied. After 50 seconds resting period, we applied 24 seconds painful stimulation and 40 seconds resting period as three trials and 24 seconds brush stimulation with 40 seconds resting period as three trials. The experimental design is illustrated in Figure 1.a. While performing INDc and SUBc, the applicant applied the painful stimulation 12 times during 24 seconds. In Figure 1.b and c., painful stimulation for one trial and eVF are shown respectively. After every painful stimulus trial, we applied the Visual Analog Scale (VAS) to the participant to rate the pain intensity between 0-100.

Figure 1. Experimental design representation for SUB and IND. (a) Experimental block design (b) Painful stimulation in one pain condition. In this graph, the waveform represents a constant sub-threshold painful stimulation (SUBc) for 24 sec. (c) Electronic Von-Frey Anesthesiometer that was used to painful stimulation application.

2.4. fNIRS System

In our study, fNIRS experiments were carried out at Ankara University Brain Research Center (AÜBAUM) with Hitachi ETG-4000 continuous wave (CW) fNIRS system (Hitachi Co., Japan). Optical near-infrared light with two different wavelengths (695 and 830 nm) were sent to the head surface via a source optode and captured back by a detector optode. We used the 3 x 11 optode configuration including 52 channels. Source - detector distance were 2.5 cm. Sampling frequency was 10 Hz.

2.5. Probe Positioning

While positioning the probe on the scalp, we utilized the EEG 10-20 system to place the probe set. Due to performing a painful stimulation experiment, we focused on placing probes around

the postcentral gyrus that corresponds to the C3 and C4 channels in EEG 10-20 systems according to the previous studies (Koessler et al., 2009; Okamoto et al., 2004). In this system, 50% of the distance from nasion to inion corresponds to the channel Cz. After defining the position of Cz, we set the 3 x 11 probe holders for each hemisphere over the line passing through both ears. C3 and C4 electrode positions were defined by measuring the distance between both tragi, and 30% of this value gave us the position of C3 from left tragus and C4 from the right tragus, which corresponded to the left and right SI, respectively. Detector numbers 17 and 22 were placed onto the C3 and C4 electrode positions that correspond to left and right postcentral gyrus according to the previous studies. After positioning the probe holder we marked source and detector positions by using a three-dimensional digitizer (Polhemus Co., Vermont) to determine the exact position of each channel in a further step. After acquiring the position file, we utilized it for spatial registration to the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) template to determine the corresponding landmarks using NIRS analysis package (Fekete et al., 2011). Then, we averaged coordinate values of all participants (Asano et al., 2004). To obtain brain regions corresponding to MNI coordinates, we used LONI Probabilistic Brain Atlas (LPBA 40) (Shattuck et al., 2008). Channel configuration on the head is shown in Figure 2. Channel numbers and corresponding cortical regions with average MNI coordinates are shown in Table 1.

Figure 2. Channel and optode configuration of 3 x 11 probe setting. In this figure, locations that are represented as squares are channels. White circles that include numbers in black are detectors. Red circles that include numbers in black are sources. R : Right, L : Left

2.6. Data Analysis

We first converted our optical density time series to concentration changes of Oxy-hemoglobin (ΔHbO_2) and De-oxyhemoglobin (ΔHb) time series by using Modified Beer–Lambert law (Cope & Delpy, 1988). After this procedure, we performed preprocessing to ΔHbO_2 and ΔHb signals and performed a region of interest (ROI) analysis using only channel information and ΔHbO_2 due to having higher SNR than ΔHb (Homae et al., 2010; Montero-Hernandez et al., 2018; Niu et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2010) and it was more associated with CBF than ΔHb was (Strangman et al., 2002). We performed sliding window correlation (SWC) (Sakoglu et al., 2010) that was previously used in fNIRS (Z. Li et al., 2015) to obtain dynamic functional connectivity (dFC) changes by using time series in regions. After extracting dFC changes and averaging them according to the different conditions INDc, SUBc and BS, mean

averaged dFC values were used to create a feature vector for these conditions. Among these extracted features, we selected the most discriminative features by using least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO). Finally, we performed classification by using these features and utilizing different classification methods with defined optimum hyperparameters via Bayesian optimization. Our whole data analysis procedure are shown in Figure 3.

Channel Number	Probability	Region	Mean X	Mean Y	Mean Z	Std. Dev (mm).
1	0,93	R middle occipital gyrus	52	-75	22	14,26
2	1,00	R angular gyrus	54	-64	44	11,92
3	0,88	R angular gyrus	46	-54	60	9,09
4	1,00	R superior parietal gyrus	31	-48	73	6,85
5	0,83	R superior parietal gyrus	11	-45	79	5,89
6	0,69	L superior parietal gyrus	-12	-45	78	6,27
7	1,00	L superior parietal gyrus	-32	-49	71	6,64
8	0,78	L angular gyrus	-46	-56	58	8,25
9	0,97	L angular gyrus	-53	-68	41	11,21
10	0,98	L middle occipital gyrus	-51	-79	19	13,35
11	0,58	R middle occipital gyrus	60	-67	6	14,97
12	0,91	R angular gyrus	62	-56	32	12,36
13	0,64	R angular gyrus	58	-45	53	9,12
14	0,64	R superior parietal gyrus	42	-37	68	7,68
15	0,69	R postcentral gyrus	22	-31	77	4,81
16	0,34	R precentral gyrus	-1	-29	76	4,18
17	0,60	L postcentral gyrus	-25	-33	75	6,10
18	0,62	L superior parietal gyrus	-45	-39	65	6,90
19	0,67	L angular gyrus	-58	-49	49	9,19
20	0,93	L angular gyrus	-61	-61	26	12,15
21	0,60	L middle occipital gyrus	-57	-73	1	13,82
22	0,56	R middle temporal gyrus	68	-48	15	12,27
23	0,81	R supramarginal gyrus	67	-37	40	10,18
24	0,74	R supramarginal gyrus	54	-28	60	8,76
25	0,60	R precentral gyrus	33	-20	73	7,97
26	0,63	R precentral gyrus	10	-15	77	6,10
27	0,72	L precentral gyrus	-14	-16	78	6,96
28	0,69	L postcentral gyrus	-38	-23	71	7,16
29	0,74	L supramarginal gyrus	-56	-32	55	8,54
30	0,92	L supramarginal gyrus	-66	-42	34	11,17
31	0,82	L middle temporal gyrus	-66	-54	8	13,08
32	0,92	R middle temporal gyrus	71	-39	-5	13,46
33	0,50	R supramarginal gyrus	71	-27	22	11,12
34	0,86	R supramarginal gyrus	64	-17	46	9,36
35	0,53	R postcentral gyrus	45	-9	63	8,87
36	0,83	R superior frontal gyrus	21	-2	74	6,90
37	0,63	L superior frontal gyrus	-2	-1	73	6,40
38	0,61	L superior frontal gyrus	-26	-4	72	7,61
39	0,63	L postcentral gyrus	-49	-12	60	8,02
40	0,75	L supramarginal gyrus	-64	-22	41	9,88
41	0,91	L superior temporal gyrus	-69	-33	16	11,65
42	0,55	L middle temporal gyrus	-67	-45	-12	13,41
43	0,71	R superior temporal gyrus	71	-18	3	13,16
44	0,86	R postcentral gyrus	68	-8	29	11,35
45	0,82	R precentral gyrus	55	2	50	9,95
46	0,67	R middle frontal gyrus	34	9	65	8,52
47	1,00	R superior frontal gyrus	10	12	71	7,07
48	1,00	L superior frontal gyrus	-14	12	71	7,45
49	0,90	L middle frontal gyrus	-39	7	62	8,59
50	0,73	L precentral gyrus	-58	-3	45	9,50
51	0,77	L postcentral gyrus	-67	-13	22	10,96
52	0,90	L middle temporal gyrus	-70	-24	-4	12,23

Table 1. Channel numbers and average coordinate positions with corresponding cortical structures registered onto MNI space after using LPBA 40 cortical atlas. Probability values were obtained from LPBA 40 cortical atlas. (L : Left, R: Right).

2.6.1. fNIRS Preprocessing

We used MATLAB (MathWorks, Inc., Natick, Massachusetts) for preprocessing of ΔHbO_2 data. Preprocessing pipeline included baseline correction, detrending to eliminate low frequency drift, filtering for removal of physiological confounding effects and motion artifacts and averaging of blocks in the same condition. First, we performed baseline correction by removing the mean of whole time series for every channel. Then, we removed the very low frequency global drift (<0.01 Hz) by using Wavelet-Based Minimum Description Length Detrending (Jang et al., 2009). To remove the physiological confounding effects such as Mayer waves, respiration and heart-beat, we performed a $0.01 - 0.1$ Hz 2^{nd} order butterworth band-pass filter. After, these preprocessing steps we visually checked the whole time series and performed motion artifact removal using wavelet filtering (Molavi & Dumont, 2012). We used daubechies 6 (db6) wavelet to remove the motion artifacts.

Figure 3. Data analysis procedure. In this diagram, after pre-processing and region of interest (ROI) analysis of two different regions (A & B) it was shown how to extract features. Dynamic functional connectivity was applied to estimate the correlation vector ($r_{AB}(t)$) to these regions by using sliding window correlation (SWC). Trial extraction and averaging was performed by utilizing boxcar function that includes related trials with Pain (P) and Brush (B) for both IND and SUB experiments. After trial extraction and averaging, we obtained mean $r_{AB}(t)$ for both SUBc or INDc and BS conditions. After performing this procedure for every participant and every region, least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) was performed to find the best features for 3 different conditions and hyperparameter tuned classification for SSD and HC was performed.

2.6.2. Region of Interest (ROI) Analysis

After preprocessing steps, we averaged the ΔHbO_2 time series in channels that corresponds to the same region according to the LONI probabilistic atlas for every subject. After mapping the channels to this atlas, we reduced our 52 channels up to 20 bilateral regions. Among these 20 bilateral regions, we only excluded bilateral middle occipital gyrus

from analysis due to less relevance with pain perception in SSD (Gundel et al., 2008; Stoeter et al., 2007) and also for the resting-state functional connectivity studies (Song et al., 2015; Su et al., 2014). Remaining 18 regions are bilateral angular gyrus (AG), superior parietal gyrus (SPG), supramarginal gyrus (SMG), pre central gyrus (PreCG), post central gyrus (PostCG), middle frontal gyrus (MFG), superior frontal gyrus (SFG), middle temporal gyrus (MTG) and superior temporal gyrus (STG). An example to our preprocessing and ROI analysis results are shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4. An example to preprocessing results (A) and its ROI analysis (B) of fNIRS signals of a healthy control participant. Black represents the HRF convolved boxcar function.

2.6.3. Identifying Ideal Features

2.6.3.1. Feature Extraction Using Sliding Window Correlation

After ROI analysis, we performed sliding window correlation (SWC) for every experiment and every region to estimate the dynamic functional connectivity (dFC) maps. For dFC estimation, $r_{x,y}$ represents correlation coefficients vector, x and y are the ΔHbO_2 signals

for two different regions and i is the index. l and t represent the window size and index in this window ($t: l, l + 1, l + 2, l + 3 \dots$).

$$r_{xy}(l) = \frac{\sum_{i=t-l+1}^t (x_i - \bar{x}_l)(y_i - \bar{y}_l)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=t-l+1}^t (x_i - \bar{x}_l)^2 \sum_{i=t-l+1}^t (y_i - \bar{y}_l)^2}}$$

For this study, we chose time window 24 sec that represents 240 samples. After obtaining the correlation vector r_{xy} , we performed trial extraction over this vector using the task waveform. We separately averaged the corresponding blocks for both brush and painful stimulation. After this block averaging, we estimated the mean value for both averaged trials. For 18 regions we had a 18 x 18 connection matrix for all conditions. However, we only used the upper diagonal part by excluding the diagonal side. Therefore, we obtained $18 \times 17 / 2 = 153$ values for both painful and brush stimulation ΔHbO_2 responses. We applied this procedure for three different conditions (SUBc, INDc, BS) that we obtained from SUB and IND separately. Due to having BS conditions from both experiments, we averaged the BS values for every subject. Therefore, we obtained three feature vectors (SUBc, INDc, BS) that has dimensions of 40×153 . Due to having values between $[-1, 1]$, we did not perform any normalization like z-score.

2.6.3.2. Feature Selection Using LASSO Regression

After creating the feature vectors for three conditions, we utilized least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) regression to find the most informative features among the 153 features (Tibshirani, 1996). LASSO is a penalized regression method that estimates coefficient vector $\hat{\beta}$ and adds an penalty factor to these coefficients by performing

L1 regularization. $\hat{\beta}$ is the coefficient vector that has the d number of features. y_i is the binomial response that represents SSD as 1 and HC as 0 and $x_i : (x_1, x_2, x_3 \dots x_d)^T$ for i^{th} observation. N represents the number of observation. λ is a positive the regularization parameter on the L1 penalty. Our objective function and penalty factor are defined as;

$$\min_{\hat{\beta}} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - x_i^T \hat{\beta})^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^d |\beta_j| \right\}$$

LASSO is an effective feature reduction method over datasets that has small sample size and high number of dimension (Zou & Hastie, 2005). We performed LASSO with 5-fold cross validation to obtain optimal λ with mean squared error criterion. According to this optimal λ value, we selected the features that their corresponding coefficients are non-zero. After performing LASSO, for INDc, connections between Right STG / Left AG, Right MFG / Left SMG, Right MTG / Left MFG, for SUBc condition, connections between Left MFG / Left SPG, Left SFG / Left AG, Right AG / Left STG, for BS condition connections between Right SFG / Left PreCG, Right MFG / Left MFG, Right PostCG / Left STG were used as features for these three feature vectors. Therefore, we obtained three 40 x 3 feature vectors for INDc, SUBc and BS conditions. Connections used as features for all these conditions are shown in Figure 5 and mean correlation vectors for these regions are shown in Figure 6.

2.6.4. Hyperparameter Optimization and Classification

After selection of most informative features for separate feature vectors of different conditions (INDc, SUBc, BS), due to having low number of features for both three feature sets, we performed Bayesian optimization algorithm on the models that we trained by using these datasets to choose the best parameters that minimizes the validation loss. In this method, we call the θ as set of hyperparameters and $L(\theta)$ validation loss function. Our objective is to find the θ^* values that minimizes this function.

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} L(\theta)$$

To minimize $L(\theta)$, we used an acquisition function F to sample the $L(\theta)$, at θ_i .

$$\theta_i = \arg \max_{\theta} F(\theta | S_{1:k-1}).$$

In this equation, F is the acquisition function. In this study, we used Expected-Improvement criteria as acquisition function to choose the next set of hyperparameters for all classifiers. $S_{1:k-1} = [(\theta_1, C_1), (\theta_2, C_2) \dots \dots (\theta_{k-1}, C_{k-1})]$ is the set hyperparameters for every run of classifier and validation loss values. k is the number of repetition $1, 2, \dots, k - 1$. Bayesian optimization algorithm works as below;

- Finding the next set of hyperparameters by optimizing the acquisition function F on $\theta_i = \arg \max_{\theta} F(\theta | S_{1:k-1})$
- Finding an time point that is possibly noisy $C_k = L(\theta_k) + \epsilon_k$
- Updating the hyperparameter and validation loss values set $S_{1:k} = [S_{1:k-1}, (\theta_k, C_k)]$

While performing hyperparameter optimization, we used leave one out cross validation (LOOCV) to generalize the minimum classification error. We applied hyperparameter tuning for Support Vector Machine (SVM) and Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) methods. For SVM, we considered linear, polynomial (deg. 2-10) and radial basis function (RBF) as kernel with regularization parameter (C) and sigma value (σ) for RBF. We used log transformed values between $10^{-6} - 10^6$ for C and σ . For DA, we considered linear, quadratic, diagonal linear, diagonal quadratic, pseudo linear, pseudo quadratic discriminant types with linear coefficient threshold (δ) and regularization parameter (γ). For δ , we considered log transformed values between $10^{-6} - 10^6$ and for γ we considered values

between 0-1. All these procedures were performed by using MATLAB Statistics and Machine Learning Toolbox (MathWorks, Inc., Natick, Massachusetts).

Figure 5. Selected connections as features by using 10-fold Cross Validation of LASSO for classifiers. Regions are defined according to the Table 1. a) Connections for INDc condition b) Connections for BS condition. c & d) Connections for SUBc condition.

2.6.5. Nested Cross Validation

After extracting features and creating feature vector with size of 40 x 3 for three conditions, we applied a nested cross validation (CV) procedure to optimize hyperparameters and generalize classifier results. In this nested cross validation model, the outer 10- fold CV loop was used to test generalization of classification model with the tuned hyperparameters (for SVM, kernel, C and σ for RBF and for DA, discriminant type, δ and γ). The inner loop includes the hyperparameter optimization with 10-fold CV.

Figure 6. Mean dynamic correlation vector ($r_{AB}(t)$) for (a) BS condition (b) SUBc condition (c) INDc condition of both SSD and HC groups. Green : Mean

2.6.6. Statistical Analysis of VAS Data

All statistical analyses were performed by using SPSS 20.0. For Age and Pain Threshold comparison we used paired t-test and for comparison of VAS ratings, we performed a 2 x 2 (Group (SSD & HC) x Condition (SUBc & INDc)) ANOVA to find whether there is a statistically significant difference between groups or stimulation. We performed Pearson's correlation between clinical data and features for every condition.

3. Results

3.1. Clinical Data Analysis

Demographic and clinical scores are shown in Table 2. There was no difference between groups for Age (t-val. = 0.82, p=0.41) and Pain Threshold (t-val. = -0.62, p=0.53) variables. SSD patients showed significantly higher BDI (t-val. = 5.38, p<0.001) than healthy controls. VAS ratings of SUB were 48.59 ± 18.37 for SSD patients and 43.33 ± 16.00 for HC. For INDc, VAS ratings were 68.94 ± 17.74 and 68.80 ± 14.61 for SSD patients and HC respectively. ANOVA results revealed that there was no group difference between SSD and HC groups (F(1,79)=0.91, p=0.34). There was a significant difference between SUBc and INDc (F(1,79) = 28.79, p=0.00). Post hoc results using Bonferroni correction revealed that INDc caused higher VAS score than SUBc (mean ± std. dev = 20.99 ± 3.91, 95% CI : 13.20-28.79). There was no interaction between group and stimulation type (F(1,79)=0.02, p=0.894).

	<i>Somatoform Patients</i> (n=19, 7 F, 12 M)	<i>Healthy Controls</i> (n=21, 8 F, 13 M)	<i>t-value</i>	<i>95% -CI</i>	<i>P-value</i>
<i>Age (years)</i>	43.47 ± 12.59	40.00 ± 13.97	0.82	-5.07 – 12.02	0.41
<i>Pain Threshold (gf/mm2)</i>	186.84 ± 22.12	190.47 ± 13.95	-0.62	-15.35 – 8.08	0.53
<i>BDI</i>	21.25 ± 12.67	5.50 ± 4.57	5.38	9.82 – 21.67	<0.001**

Table 2. Clinical and Demographic information of participants. Mean and standard deviation values with t-values, 95-% Confidence interval and p-values are shown. BDI: Beck Depression

Inventory, CI: Confidence interval, gf / mm²: gram force / millimeter square, M: Male, F: Female. n : number of participants. ** : $p < 0.001$, * : $p < 0.05$

3.2. Classification and Hyperparameters Optimization Results

All classification results with optimum hyperparameters for both classifiers are shown in Table 3, scatter plot of data for every condition are shown in Figure 7 and all receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves related with these classification results are shown in Figure 8. For feature vector of BS condition with SVM classifier, we found the mean and standard error of training accuracy, test accuracy, sensitivity, specificity and area under curve (AUC) values as 0.79 ± 0.01 , 0.75 ± 0.01 , 0.86 ± 0.07 , 0.65 ± 0.13 and 0.89 ± 0.01 respectively. For DA classifier, the mean and standard error of training accuracy, test accuracy, sensitivity, specificity and AUC values were 0.75 ± 0.01 , 0.72 ± 0.07 , 0.78 ± 0.11 , 0.70 ± 0.11 and 0.90 ± 0.02 respectively.

For feature vector of SUBc condition with SVM classifier, we found the mean and standard error of training accuracy, test accuracy, sensitivity, specificity and AUC values as 0.81 ± 0.01 , 0.72 ± 0.07 , 0.75 ± 0.08 , 0.70 ± 0.11 and 0.89 ± 0.01 respectively. For DA classifier, the mean and standard error of training accuracy, test accuracy, sensitivity, specificity and AUC were 0.78 ± 0.01 , 0.75 ± 0.06 , 0.75 ± 0.08 , 0.75 ± 0.08 and 0.88 ± 0.01 respectively.

Figure 7. Extracted Features from (a) BS condition, (b) SUBc condition (c) INDc condition. Black and red dots represent the mean correlation value of averaged extracted correlation vector for related condition of SSD patients and healthy controls respectively.

For feature vector of INDc condition with SVM classifier, the mean and standard error of training accuracy, test accuracy, sensitivity, specificity and AUC was found 0.80 ± 0.02 , 0.82 ± 0.05 , 0.81 ± 0.07 , 0.85 ± 0.07 and 0.92 ± 0.02 respectively. For DA classifier, the mean and standard error of training accuracy, test accuracy, sensitivity, specificity and AUC values were 0.79 ± 0.01 , 0.75 ± 0.07 , 0.81 ± 0.07 , 0.65 ± 0.13 and 0.89 ± 0.01 respectively.

Condition	Classifier	Training Accuracy	Test Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity	AUC
BS	SVM	0.79 ± 0.01	0.75 ± 0.06	0.86 ± 0.07	0.65 ± 0.13	0.89 ± 0.01
	DA	0.75 ± 0.01	0.72 ± 0.07	0.78 ± 0.11	0.70 ± 0.11	0.90 ± 0.02
SUBc	SVM	0.81 ± 0.01	0.72 ± 0.07	0.75 ± 0.08	0.70 ± 0.11	0.89 ± 0.01
	DA	0.78 ± 0.01	0.75 ± 0.06	0.75 ± 0.08	0.75 ± 0.08	0.88 ± 0.01
INDc	SVM	0.80 ± 0.02	0.82 ± 0.05	0.81 ± 0.07	0.85 ± 0.07	0.92 ± 0.02
	DA	0.79 ± 0.01	0.75 ± 0.07	0.81 ± 0.07	0.65 ± 0.13	0.89 ± 0.01

Table 3 : Classification results of experiments after nested cross-validation. Results are shown as mean and standard error. BS : Brush stimulation, SUBc : Constant sub- threshold painful stimulation condition, INDc : Individual pain threshold stimulation condition. SVM : Support Vector Machine, DA : Discriminant Analysis. AUC: Area Under Curve

3.3. Correlation Between Features and Psychological Features

Among all conditions and all connections, for SUBc there was a significant negative correlation between L SFG – L AG connection and BDI score ($r = -0.33$, $p < 0.05$). None of the features in any condition showed significant correlation with individual pain thresholds.

Figure 8. Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves for different feature sets and different classifiers.

4. Discussion

In this study, we used fNIRS task-based dFC features to classify SSD. Our objective was to estimate significant biomarker/s from different experiments that accurately discriminates SSD patients and healthy controls. After estimating dynamic functional connectivity based features using LASSO, we performed hyperparameter optimized classification using these features. According to our results, we found the most discriminative and accurate biomarkers as connections between Right STG – Left AG, Right MFG – Left SMG and Right MTG – Left MFG as a result of INDc condition by using SVM.

4.1. Clinical Data

We found SSD group showed significantly higher BDI scores than healthy controls. This is an expected finding. There are several studies that associates depressive symptoms with SSD (Bohman et al., 2010; Egger et al., 1999; Haug et al., 2004; Kroenke et al., 1997; van Boven et al., 2011). In addition to this, we could not find any significant difference between pain-thresholds and for VAS ratings we could not find any significant difference in group main effect and INDc condition caused higher VAS scores than SUBc as expected. These findings might suggest that SSD group might not include any painful disorder.

4.2. Features as Biomarkers for Different Conditions

After dFC estimation and selecting features, we found three discriminative features for every condition. Among these conditions we found the highest accuracy, specificity, AUC and 81% sensitivity for INDc. For INDc, the most discriminative features were found as Right STG – Left AG, Right MFG – Left SMG, Right MTG – Left MFG. Our initial approach for classification was to utilize statistical features HbO₂ response such as mean and variance that were previously used in BCI studies (Naseer & Hong, 2015) and then to perform the exactly same procedure stated above. However, the accuracy results for both three conditions (INDc, SUB, BS) varied between 55% - 60% which were below to be of use as a clinical marker. We therefore focused on the different features to increase the accuracy.

Right STG was found a common region in somatoform pain disorder patients both pain and stress condition (Stoeter et al., 2007) and also Fibromyalgia (Gracely et al., 2002). In addition to these information, RSFC study revealed that increased inferior temporal gyrus connectivity was found in SSD patients (Su et al., 2015). Moreover, temporal lobe was generally found active in painful stimulation studies in healthy participants (Bingel et al., 2002; Godinho et al., 2006; Moulton et al., 2011; Ploghaus et al., 2001; Ploghaus et al., 2000). Its functional role in pain processing is not well known, however some studies revealed that

superior temporal gyrus activation might be associated with moral judgements and sadness (Habel et al., 2005; Moll et al., 2002).

For subparts of inferior parietal lobe, RSFC studies revealed that Left AG was found significantly higher in SSD patients compared with HC (Song et al., 2015) and SMG (BA 40) causes difference between SSD and HC (Q. Li et al., 2016). Left SMG was found higher in somatoform pain disorder patients than healthy controls in a painful heat stimulation study (Gundel et al., 2008) and a recent study revealed that there is a decreased interhemispheric connectivity in AG and SMG regions for SSD patients (Su et al., 2016). SMG is also effective region in emotional network that may affect pain perception (Sommer et al., 2010) and also plays important role in temperature and pressure perception. (Carlsson et al., 2000; Mima et al., 1999; Tseng et al., 2010). IPL was also found active in pain processing for Fibromyalgia patients (Gomez et al., 2009; Gracely et al., 2002). Some studies suggest that IPL activation might be related with attention to body or sensory stimuli (Bornhovd et al., 2002; Derbyshire et al., 1997; Downar et al., 2000, 2001; Seminowicz & Davis, 2006).

MFG is an effective region in pain processing and considered as a potential biomarker in nociception (Aasted et al., 2016; Coghill et al., 2001; Jahn et al., 2016; Ong et al., 2019; Perlaki et al., 2015; Symonds et al., 2006) however its contribution to pain processing is not well known. An fMRI study on healthy participants that compares the high and low levels of painful stimulation showed that Left MFG showed higher activation in during high levels of pain application than low levels of pain application (Kong et al., 2010).

4.3. Classification Results

Among classification results, we obtained highest test accuracy (82%) and specificity (85%) with 81% sensitivity from INDc with SVM classifier. Among all these results we found the highest sensitivity as 86% for BS condition by using an SVM classifier. In addition to these

1
2
3 results, we found the highest AUC value for INDc with SVM classifier. Due to these plus signs,
4
5 we interpreted that our optimum classification results was found by performing INDc
6
7 condition with a SVM classifier. A recent RSFC study that includes 53 participants (25 SSD, 28
8
9 HC) revealed that medial prefrontal cortex – anterior cingulate cortex connection difference
10
11 between SSD and HC might be used to distinguish with 84% sensitivity and 85% specificity and
12
13 suggests that this connection can be used as a biomarker (Ou et al., 2018). When we compared
14
15 our results with this study, we found the same specificity score and a slightly lower the
16
17 sensitivity score. We thought that this might be due to having less number of samples. Also,
18
19 due to not having any accuracy result in that study, we could not compare our accuracy and
20
21 AUC results. Another recent study that uses symptom self-rating scale (SCL-90) data with
22
23 machine learning methods showed that SSD can be classified with an 96% accuracy, 90%
24
25 specificity and 97% sensitivity (Lv et al., 2018) and another study that proposes to classify a
26
27 framework for classification of SSD by using SCL-90 data showed that 95% accuracy, 97%
28
29 sensitivity and 90% specificity (Luo et al., 2019). However, as we stated above, self- reporting
30
31 is a subjective approach for diagnosis and can be significantly affected from external factors
32
33 (Lee et al., 2018).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Another important finding in this study is that neural markers of BS stimulation
43
44 discriminated the SSD and HC with a high sensitivity of 86%. A behavioral study by using
45
46 Somatic Signal Detection Task (Lloyd et al., 2008) on SSD patients showed that tactile
47
48 detection thresholds of SSD patients are significantly lower than control groups (Katzner et al.,
49
50 2012). Another study that focused on tactile stimulus perception on Fibromyalgia (FM) and
51
52 Somatoform Pain Disorder (SPD) which is a subtype of SSD showed that FM and SPD groups
53
54 showed higher perceptual ratings to tactile stimulation to both their hands (Karst et al., 2005).
55
56
57
58
59
60

These perceptual differences might have neural reflections that can be utilized to discriminate SSD patients and healthy controls.

We also found a notable accuracy in both SUBc and INDc stimulation. Applying painful stimulus to these patients might reveal some differed neural activations compared with HC. Because, the term “central sensitization” might be an discriminative factor for diagnosis of SSD patients, which might be a common factor in somatic syndromes (Bourke et al., 2015). Compared with BS stimulation, INDc shows a notably higher sensitivity, which might show us painful stimulation based neural markers might be also an discriminative factors. An fMRI study focused on painful stimulation response in SSD patients revealed that SSD group showed an augmented prefrontal, temporal and parietal regions with sub cortical regions such as thalamus, basal ganglia and also an overactivation in STG which is a region that we utilized both in SUBc and INDc conditions to classify SSD was found (Stoeter et al., 2007). Another fMRI study also revealed that painful stimulation based neural activity in SMG was observed higher in SSD patients than healthy controls which is also we used in INDc for classification (Gundel et al., 2008).

Our study also proposed that fNIRS might be a robust tool for diagnosis of SSD. To our best knowledge, there is only one study that focuses on somatoform pain disorder by using fNIRS (Ren et al., 2017). In addition this, there are few fNIRS studies that focused on classifying neurological disorders by utilizing machine learning approaches such as ADHD (Monden et al., 2015; Sutoko et al., 2019), Alzheimer (Perpetuini et al., 2019), traumatic brain injury (Karamzadeh, Amyot, Kenney, Anderson, et al., 2016; Karamzadeh, Amyot, Kenney, Chowdhry, et al., 2016), depression (Zhu & Mehta, 2017), Fibromyalgia (Gokcay et al., 2018). Classification accuracies with sensitivity and specificity scores showed that fNIRS can be considered as an essential tool suggests a neurobiological support to valid diagnosis of SSD

that is phenomenologically diagnosed and for diagnosis of other psychological disorders (see reviews (Baskak, 2018; Ehliis et al., 2014; Lai et al., 2017)).

4.4. Correlation Results with Corresponding Biomarkers

Among our features, we obtained a significant negative correlation between BDI scores and L SFG – L AG connection of SUBc. Previous resting-state fMRI study that focused on sub regions of L SFG revealed that L AG is strongly associated with anteromedial and dorsolateral parts of SFG (W. Li et al., 2013). In addition to this, a recent study that focused on efficiency of electroconvulsive therapy on depression patients showed that increased functional connectivity strength of L AG was observed in depression patients after electroconvulsive therapy (Wei et al., 2018). These findings revealed that L AG – L SFG relationship might be an effective indicator for depressive symptom of SSD.

5. Limitations

In the current study, we used fNIRS to demonstrate its efficiency while diagnosing SSD in clinics and classify whether the participant has a SSD or not by using hyper-parameter tuned machine learning approaches. However, there are some points that should be addressed.

Our primary limitation is the number of subjects that participates to this study. While performing machine learning approaches in medicine, using larger samples provides to create more reliable and robust models. Due to this reason, more extensive research with larger population sizes must be realized.

Second limitation is while estimating the connections, we had to discard the sub cortical activities due to being unable to measure deep regions more than 2-3 cm. Our features was estimated by considering only cortical regions. This deprived us to observe the some

1
2
3 direct connections between regions. We had to estimate the functional connectivity based
4
5 features just considering the cortical regions.
6
7

8 Our third limitation was to be unable to use short source-detector separation for
9
10 eliminating skin/scalp blood flow reaction to experimental stimuli from our time series. Due
11
12 to not having any rule of thumb to remove this effect except using short separation, this effect
13
14 might be available in our time series.
15
16
17

18 Finally our primary aim was to assess neurobiology of SSD and we therefore excluded
19
20 subjects with major depressive disorder. Due to high comorbidity of these two disorders, this
21
22 preference of ours inevitably led to a lower external validity. Our results may not be
23
24 generalized to all subjects with SSD.
25
26
27

28 **6. Conclusions**

29
30 In this study we have shown that after controlling for depressive symptoms, subjects
31
32 with DSM-5 diagnosis of SSD can be differentiated from healthy control subjects by means of
33
34 a machine learning algorithm based on extracted features from estimated dynamic functional
35
36 connectivity time series as response to painful stimuli. Our study includes several novel
37
38 approaches. To our best knowledge, this is the first study that focuses on painful and non-
39
40 painful stimulation effects together on SSD patients, proposes biomarkers for SSD by using
41
42 fNIRS and performs a hyperparameter optimized classification using these fNIRS based
43
44 biomarkers. Previous studies with similar methodology pointed out that some somatoform
45
46 disorders such as somatoform pain disorder or fibromyalgia may also be associated with
47
48 altered activity response to painful stimuli. Nevertheless, sample enrolled in the present study
49
50 have prominent differences compared to those studies.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

According to our findings, highest accuracy, highest specificity and 90% sensitivity were obtained by features that was derived from task based dynamic functional connectivity by performing an IND experiment. Right temporal, bilateral middle frontal and left inferior parietal gyri were found as important biomarkers. Although we have shown that this algorithm is capable of categorizing subjects with SSD with acceptable sensitivity and specificity, given that SSD is a phenomenologically diagnosed syndrome, it would be too assertive to suggest fNIRS as a diagnostic tool for this syndrome. Therefore the present study would rather be evaluated as a pilot study with positive results supporting the validity of the SSD diagnosis in the DSM-5.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Acknowledgements

The authors express their gratitude to the Ankara University BAUM Center for data acquisition and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Didem Gökçay from Middle East Technical University to provide eVF anesthesiometer. We also acknowledge the support, in part, of the Fogarty International Center, United States/ NIH Grant (No: D43TW005807 - Bora Baskak, MD) during the preparation of this manuscript.

7. References

- Aasted, C. M., Yucel, M. A., Steele, S. C., Peng, K., Boas, D. A., Becerra, L., & Borsook, D. (2016). Frontal Lobe Hemodynamic Responses to Painful Stimulation: A Potential Brain Marker of Nociception. *PLoS One*, 11(11), e0165226. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0165226
- Ambalavanar, R., Moritani, M., Moutanni, A., Gangula, P., Yallampalli, C., & Dessem, D. (2006). Deep tissue inflammation upregulates neuropeptides and evokes nociceptive behaviors which are modulated by a neuropeptide antagonist. *Pain*, 120(1-2), 53-68. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2005.10.003
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC.
- Andreasen, N. C. (1995). The validation of psychiatric diagnosis: new models and approaches. *Am J Psychiatry*, 152(2), 161-162. doi:10.1176/ajp.152.2.161
- Asano, T., Takahashi, K. A., Fujioka, M., Inoue, S., Ueshima, K., Hirata, T., . . . Kubo, T. (2004). Relationship between postrenal transplant osteonecrosis of the femoral head and gene polymorphisms related to the coagulation and fibrinolytic systems in Japanese subjects. *Transplantation*, 77(2), 220-225. doi:10.1097/01.TP.0000101433.99651.96
- Barsky, A. J., Goodson, J. D., Lane, R. S., & Cleary, P. D. (1988). The amplification of somatic symptoms. *Psychosom Med*, 50(5), 510-519.
- Barsky, A. J., Orav, E. J., & Bates, D. W. (2005). Somatization increases medical utilization and costs independent of psychiatric and medical comorbidity. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 62(8), 903-910. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.62.8.903
- Baskak, B. (2018). The Place of Functional Near Infrared Spectroscopy in Psychiatry. *Noro Psikiyatr Ars*, 55(2), 103-104. doi:10.29399/npa.23249
- Bingel, U., Quante, M., Knab, R., Bromm, B., Weiller, C., & Buchel, C. (2002). Subcortical structures involved in pain processing: evidence from single-trial fMRI. *Pain*, 99(1-2), 313-321.
- Bohman, H., Jonsson, U., Von Knorring, A. L., Von Knorring, L., Paaren, A., & Olsson, G. (2010). Somatic symptoms as a marker for severity in adolescent depression. *Acta Paediatr*, 99(11), 1724-1730. doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2010.01906.x
- Bornhovd, K., Quante, M., Glauche, V., Bromm, B., Weiller, C., & Buchel, C. (2002). Painful stimuli evoke different stimulus-response functions in the amygdala, prefrontal, insula and somatosensory cortex: a single-trial fMRI study. *Brain*, 125, 1326-1336.
- Bourke, J. H., Langford, R. M., & White, P. D. (2015). The common link between functional somatic syndromes may be central sensitisation. *J Psychosom Res*, 78(3), 228-236. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2015.01.003>

- Browning, M., Fletcher, P., & Sharpe, M. (2011). Can neuroimaging help us to understand and classify somatoform disorders? A systematic and critical review. *Psychosom Med*, 73(2), 173-184. doi:10.1097/PSY.0b013e31820824f6
- Callan, D., Mills, L., Nott, C., England, R., & England, S. (2014). A tool for classifying individuals with chronic back pain: using multivariate pattern analysis with functional magnetic resonance imaging data. *PLoS One*, 9(6), e98007. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0098007
- Carlsson, K., Petrovic, P., Skare, S., Petersson, K. M., & Ingvar, M. (2000). Tickling expectations: neural processing in anticipation of a sensory stimulus. *J Cogn Neurosci*, 12(4), 691-703.
- Chiarelli, A. M., Croce, P., Merla, A., & Zappasodi, F. (2018). Deep learning for hybrid EEG-fNIRS brain-computer interface: application to motor imagery classification. *J Neural Eng*, 15(3), 036028. doi:10.1088/1741-2552/aaaf82
- Chiarelli, A. M., Zappasodi, F., Di Pompeo, F., & Merla, A. (2017). Simultaneous functional near-infrared spectroscopy and electroencephalography for monitoring of human brain activity and oxygenation: a review. *Neurophotonics*, 4(4), 041411. doi:10.1117/1.NPh.4.4.041411
- Coghill, R. C., Gilron, I., & Iadarola, M. J. (2001). Hemispheric lateralization of somatosensory processing. *J Neurophysiol*, 85(6), 2602-2612. doi:10.1152/jn.2001.85.6.2602
- Cope, M., & Delpy, D. T. (1988). System for long-term measurement of cerebral blood and tissue oxygenation on newborn infants by near infra-red transillumination. *Med Biol Eng Comput*, 26(3), 289-294.
- Davis, K. D., Flor, H., Greely, H. T., Iannetti, G. D., Mackey, S., Ploner, M., . . . Wager, T. D. (2017). Brain imaging tests for chronic pain: medical, legal and ethical issues and recommendations. *Nat Rev Neurol*, 13(10), 624-638. doi:10.1038/nrneurol.2017.122
- Derbyshire, S. W., Jones, A. K., Gyulai, F., Clark, S., Townsend, D., & Firestone, L. L. (1997). Pain processing during three levels of noxious stimulation produces differential patterns of central activity. *Pain*, 73(3), 431-445.
- Downar, J., Crawley, A. P., Mikulis, D. J., & Davis, K. D. (2000). A multimodal cortical network for the detection of changes in the sensory environment. *Nat Neurosci*, 3(3), 277-283. doi:10.1038/72991
- Downar, J., Crawley, A. P., Mikulis, D. J., & Davis, K. D. (2001). The effect of task relevance on the cortical response to changes in visual and auditory stimuli: an event-related fMRI study. *Neuroimage*, 14(6), 1256-1267. doi:10.1006/nimg.2001.0946
- Dutta, A., Jacob, A., Chowdhury, S. R., Das, A., & Nitsche, M. A. (2015). EEG-NIRS based assessment of neurovascular coupling during anodal transcranial direct current stimulation--a stroke case series. *J Med Syst*, 39(4), 205. doi:10.1007/s10916-015-0205-7

- Egger, H. L., Costello, E. J., Erkanli, A., & Angold, A. (1999). Somatic complaints and psychopathology in children and adolescents: stomach aches, musculoskeletal pains, and headaches. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*, 38(7), 852-860. doi:10.1097/00004583-199907000-00015
- Ehlis, A. C., Schneider, S., Dresler, T., & Fallgatter, A. J. (2014). Application of functional near-infrared spectroscopy in psychiatry. *Neuroimage*, 85 Pt 1, 478-488. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.03.067
- Fekete, T., Rubin, D., Carlson, J. M., & Mujica-Parodi, L. R. (2011). The NIRS Analysis Package: noise reduction and statistical inference. *PLoS One*, 6(9), e24322. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0024322
- Garcia-Campayo, J., Sanz-Carrillo, C., Baringo, T., & Ceballos, C. (2001). SPECT scan in somatization disorder patients: an exploratory study of eleven cases. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*, 35(3), 359-363. doi:10.1046/j.1440-1614.2001.00909.x
- Godinho, F., Magnin, M., Frot, M., Perchet, C., & Garcia-Larrea, L. (2006). Emotional modulation of pain: is it the sensation or what we recall? *J Neurosci*, 26(44), 11454-11461. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2260-06.2006
- Gokcay, D., Eken, A., & Baltaci, S. (2018). Binary Classification Using Neural and Clinical Features: An Application in Fibromyalgia with Likelihood based Decision Level Fusion. *IEEE J Biomed Health Inform*. doi:10.1109/JBHI.2018.2844300
- Gomez, J. M., Vilarrasa, N., Masdevall, C., Pujol, J., Solano, E., Soler, J., . . . Vendrell, J. (2009). Regulation of bone mineral density in morbidly obese women: a cross-sectional study in two cohorts before and after bypass surgery. *Obes Surg*, 19(3), 345-350. doi:10.1007/s11695-008-9529-4
- Gracely, R. H., Petzke, F., Wolf, J. M., & Clauw, D. J. (2002). Functional magnetic resonance imaging evidence of augmented pain processing in fibromyalgia. *Arthritis Rheum*, 46(5), 1333-1343. doi:10.1002/art.10225
- Gundel, H., Valet, M., Sorg, C., Huber, D., Zimmer, C., Sprenger, T., & Tolle, T. R. (2008). Altered cerebral response to noxious heat stimulation in patients with somatoform pain disorder. *Pain*, 137(2), 413-421. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2007.10.003
- Habel, U., Klein, M., Kellermann, T., Shah, N. J., & Schneider, F. (2005). Same or different? Neural correlates of happy and sad mood in healthy males. *Neuroimage*, 26(1), 206-214. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.01.014
- Hakala, M., Karlsson, H., Kurki, T., Aalto, S., Koponen, S., Vahlberg, T., & Niemi, P. M. (2004). Volumes of the caudate nuclei in women with somatization disorder and healthy women. *Psychiatry Res*, 131(1), 71-78. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2004.03.001

- Hakala, M., Vahlberg, T., Niemi, P. M., & Karlsson, H. (2006). Brain glucose metabolism and temperament in relation to severe somatization. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*, 60(6), 669-675. doi:10.1111/j.1440-1819.2006.01581.x
- Haug, T. T., Mykletun, A., & Dahl, A. A. (2004). The association between anxiety, depression, and somatic symptoms in a large population: the HUNT-II study. *Psychosom Med*, 66(6), 845-851. doi:10.1097/01.psy.0000145823.85658.0c
- Hisli, N. (1998). A study on the validity of the Beck depression inventory. *Turk Psychol J*, 6, 118-123.
- Homae, F., Watanabe, H., Otobe, T., Nakano, T., Go, T., Konishi, Y., & Taga, G. (2010). Development of global cortical networks in early infancy. *J Neurosci*, 30(14), 4877-4882. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5618-09.2010
- Jablensky, A. (2016). Psychiatric classifications: validity and utility. *World Psychiatry*, 15(1), 26-31. doi:10.1002/wps.20284
- Jahn, A., Nee, D. E., Alexander, W. H., & Brown, J. W. (2016). Distinct Regions within Medial Prefrontal Cortex Process Pain and Cognition. *J Neurosci*, 36(49), 12385-12392. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2180-16.2016
- Jang, K. E., Tak, S., Jung, J., Jang, J., Jeong, Y., & Ye, J. C. (2009). Wavelet minimum description length detrending for near-infrared spectroscopy. *J Biomed Opt*, 14(3), 034004. doi:10.1117/1.3127204
- Janssens, K. A., Oldehinkel, A. J., Verhulst, F. C., Hunfeld, J. A., Ormel, J., & Rosmalen, J. G. (2012). Symptom-specific associations between low cortisol responses and functional somatic symptoms: the TRAILS study. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 37(3), 332-340. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2011.06.016
- Karamzadeh, N., Amyot, F., Kenney, K., Anderson, A., Chowdhry, F., Dashtestani, H., . . . Gandjbakhche, A. H. (2016). A machine learning approach to identify functional biomarkers in human prefrontal cortex for individuals with traumatic brain injury using functional near-infrared spectroscopy. *Brain Behav*, 6(11), e00541. doi:10.1002/brb3.541
- Karamzadeh, N., Amyot, F., Kenney, K., Chowdhry, F., Anderson, A., Chernomordik, V., . . . Gandjbakhche, A. (2016, 2016/04/25). *A Machine Learning Approach to Identify Functional Biomarkers for Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Using Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (fNIRS)*. Paper presented at the Biomedical Optics 2016, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.
- Karst, M., Rahé-Meyer, N., Gueduek, A., Hoy, L., Borsutzky, M., & Passie, T. (2005). Abnormality in the self-monitoring mechanism in patients with fibromyalgia and somatoform pain disorder. *Psychosom Med*, 67(1), 111-115. doi:10.1097/01.psy.0000146327.73705.9c

Kassab, A., Le Lan, J., Tremblay, J., Vannasing, P., Dehbozorgi, M., Pouliot, P., . . . Nguyen, D. K. (2018). Multichannel wearable fNIRS-EEG system for long-term clinical monitoring. *Hum Brain Mapp*, 39(1), 7-23. doi:10.1002/hbm.23849

Katzer, A., Oberfeld, D., Hiller, W., Gerlach, A. L., & Witthoft, M. (2012). Tactile perceptual processes and their relationship to somatoform disorders. *J Abnorm Psychol*, 121(2), 530-543. doi:10.1037/a0026536

Koessler, L., Maillard, L., Benhadid, A., Vignal, J. P., Felblinger, J., Vespignani, H., & Braun, M. (2009). Automated cortical projection of EEG sensors: anatomical correlation via the international 10-10 system. *Neuroimage*, 46(1), 64-72. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.02.006

Kong, J., Loggia, M. L., Zyloney, C., Tu, P., Laviolette, P., & Gollub, R. L. (2010). Exploring the brain in pain: activations, deactivations and their relation. *Pain*, 148(2), 257-267. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2009.11.008

Konnopka, A., Kaufmann, C., Konig, H. H., Heider, D., Wild, B., Szecsenyi, J., . . . Schaefer, R. (2013). Association of costs with somatic symptom severity in patients with medically unexplained symptoms. *J Psychosom Res*, 75(4), 370-375. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2013.08.011

Koo, B., Lee, H. G., Nam, Y., Kang, H., Koh, C. S., Shin, H. C., & Choi, S. (2015). A hybrid NIRS-EEG system for self-paced brain computer interface with online motor imagery. *J Neurosci Methods*, 244, 26-32. doi:10.1016/j.jneumeth.2014.04.016

Kroenke, K., Jackson, J. L., & Chamberlin, J. (1997). Depressive and anxiety disorders in patients presenting with physical complaints: clinical predictors and outcome. *Am J Med*, 103(5), 339-347.

KuKanich, B., Lascelles, B. D., & Papich, M. G. (2005). Assessment of a von Frey device for evaluation of the antinociceptive effects of morphine and its application in pharmacodynamic modeling of morphine in dogs. *Am J Vet Res*, 66(9), 1616-1622.

Kurlansik, S. L., & Maffei, M. S. (2016). Somatic Symptom Disorder. *Am Fam Physician*, 93(1), 49-54.

Lai, C. Y. Y., Ho, C. S. H., Lim, C. R., & Ho, R. C. M. (2017). Functional near-infrared spectroscopy in psychiatry. *BJPsych Advances*, 23(5), 324-330. doi:10.1192/apt.bp.115.015610

Lee, J., Mawla, I., Kim, J., Loggia, M. L., Ortiz, A., Jung, C., . . . Napadow, V. (2018). Machine learning-based prediction of clinical pain using multimodal neuroimaging and autonomic metrics. *Pain*. doi:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001417

Li, Q., Xiao, Y., Li, Y., Li, L., Lu, N., Xu, Z., . . . Yuan, Y. (2016). Altered regional brain function in the treatment-naïve patients with somatic symptom disorder: a resting-state fMRI study. *Brain Behav*, 6(10), e00521. doi:10.1002/brb3.521

- Li, W., Qin, W., Liu, H., Fan, L., Wang, J., Jiang, T., & Yu, C. (2013). Subregions of the human superior frontal gyrus and their connections. *Neuroimage*, 78, 46-58. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.04.011
- Li, Z., Liu, H., Liao, X., Xu, J., Liu, W., Tian, F., . . . Niu, H. (2015). Dynamic functional connectivity revealed by resting-state functional near-infrared spectroscopy. *Biomed Opt Express*, 6(7), 2337-2352. doi:10.1364/BOE.6.002337
- Linden, D. E., & Fallgatter, A. J. (2009). Neuroimaging in psychiatry: from bench to bedside. *Front Hum Neurosci*, 3, 49. doi:10.3389/neuro.09.049.2009
- Lloyd, D. M., Mason, L., Brown, R. J., & Poliakoff, E. (2008). Development of a paradigm for measuring somatic disturbance in clinical populations with medically unexplained symptoms. *J Psychosom Res*, 64(1), 21-24. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2007.06.004
- Lopez-Sola, M., Woo, C. W., Pujol, J., Deus, J., Harrison, B. J., Monfort, J., & Wager, T. D. (2017). Towards a neurophysiological signature for fibromyalgia. *Pain*, 158(1), 34-47. doi:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000000707
- Lotsch, J., & Ultsch, A. (2018). Machine learning in pain research. *Pain*, 159(4), 623-630. doi:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001118
- Luo, J., Chen, H., Hu, Z., Huang, H., Wang, P., Wang, X., . . . Wen, C. (2019). A New Kernel Extreme Learning Machine Framework for Somatization Disorder Diagnosis. *IEEE Access*, 1-1. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2900985
- Lv, X., Chen, H., Zhang, Q., Li, X., Huang, H., & Wang, G. (2018). An Improved Bacterial-Foraging Optimization-Based Machine Learning Framework for Predicting the Severity of Somatization Disorder. *Algorithms*, 11(2). doi:10.3390/a11020017
- Mano, H., Kotecha, G., Leibnitz, K., Matsubara, T., Sprenger, C., Nakae, A., . . . Seymour, B. (2018). Classification and characterisation of brain network changes in chronic back pain: A multicenter study. *Wellcome Open Res*, 3, 19. doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.14069.2
- Mima, T., Sadato, N., Yazawa, S., Hanakawa, T., Fukuyama, H., Yonekura, Y., & Shibasaki, H. (1999). Brain structures related to active and passive finger movements in man. *Brain*, 122 (Pt 10), 1989-1997.
- Molavi, B., & Dumont, G. A. (2012). Wavelet-based motion artifact removal for functional near-infrared spectroscopy. *Physiol Meas*, 33(2), 259-270. doi:10.1088/0967-3334/33/2/259
- Moll, J., de Oliveira-Souza, R., Bramati, I. E., & Grafman, J. (2002). Functional networks in emotional moral and nonmoral social judgments. *Neuroimage*, 16(3 Pt 1), 696-703.

- Monden, Y., Dan, I., Nagashima, M., Dan, H., Uga, M., Ikeda, T., . . . Yamagata, T. (2015). Individual classification of ADHD children by right prefrontal hemodynamic responses during a go/no-go task as assessed by fNIRS. *Neuroimage Clin*, 9, 1-12. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2015.06.011
- Montero-Hernandez, S., Orihuela-Espina, F., Sucar, E. L., Pinti, P., Hamilton, A., Burgess, P., & Tachtsidis, I. (2018). Estimating Functional Connectivity Symmetry between Oxy- and Deoxy-Haemoglobin: Implications for fNIRS Connectivity Analysis. *Algorithms*, 11(5). doi:10.3390/a11050070
- Moulton, E. A., Becerra, L., Maleki, N., Pendse, G., Tully, S., Hargreaves, R., . . . Borsook, D. (2011). Painful heat reveals hyperexcitability of the temporal pole in interictal and ictal migraine States. *Cereb Cortex*, 21(2), 435-448. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhq109
- Naseer, N., & Hong, K. S. (2015). fNIRS-based brain-computer interfaces: a review. *Front Hum Neurosci*, 9, 3. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2015.00003
- Niu, H., Khadka, S., Tian, F., Lin, Z. J., Lu, C., Zhu, C., & Liu, H. (2011). Resting-state functional connectivity assessed with two diffuse optical tomographic systems. *J Biomed Opt*, 16(4), 046006. doi:10.1117/1.3561687
- Okamoto, M., Dan, H., Sakamoto, K., Takeo, K., Shimizu, K., Kohno, S., . . . Dan, I. (2004). Three-dimensional probabilistic anatomical cranio-cerebral correlation via the international 10-20 system oriented for transcranial functional brain mapping. *Neuroimage*, 21(1), 99-111.
- Oldfield, R. C. (1971). The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory. *Neuropsychologia*, 9(1), 97-113.
- Ong, W. Y., Stohler, C. S., & Herr, D. R. (2019). Role of the Prefrontal Cortex in Pain Processing. *Mol Neurobiol*, 56(2), 1137-1166. doi:10.1007/s12035-018-1130-9
- Ou, Y., Liu, F., Chen, J., Pan, P., Wu, R., Su, Q., . . . Guo, W. (2018). Increased coherence-based regional homogeneity in resting-state patients with first-episode, drug-naïve somatization disorder. *J Affect Disord*, 235, 150-154. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2018.04.036
- Peng, K., Nguyen, D. K., Vannasing, P., Tremblay, J., Lesage, F., & Pouliot, P. (2016). Using patient-specific hemodynamic response function in epileptic spike analysis of human epilepsy: a study based on EEG-fNIRS. *Neuroimage*, 126, 239-255. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.11.045
- Perlaki, G., Orsi, G., Schwarcz, A., Bodi, P., Plozer, E., Biczó, K., . . . Janszky, J. (2015). Pain-related autonomic response is modulated by the medial prefrontal cortex: An ECG-fMRI study in men. *J Neurol Sci*, 349(1-2), 202-208. doi:10.1016/j.jns.2015.01.019
- Perpetuini, D., Chiarelli, M. A., Cardone, D., Filippini, C., Bucco, R., Zito, M., & Merla, A. (2019). Complexity of Frontal Cortex fNIRS Can Support Alzheimer Disease Diagnosis in Memory and Visuo-Spatial Tests. *Entropy*, 21(1). doi:10.3390/e21010026

- Ploghaus, A., Narain, C., Beckmann, C. F., Clare, S., Bantick, S., Wise, R., . . . Tracey, I. (2001). Exacerbation of pain by anxiety is associated with activity in a hippocampal network. *J Neurosci*, 21(24), 9896-9903.
- Ploghaus, A., Tracey, I., Clare, S., Gati, J. S., Rawlins, J. N., & Matthews, P. M. (2000). Learning about pain: the neural substrate of the prediction error for aversive events. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 97(16), 9281-9286. doi:10.1073/pnas.160266497
- Ren, X., Lu, J., Liu, X., Shen, C., Zhang, X., Ma, X., . . . Liu, P. (2017). Decreased prefrontal brain activation during verbal fluency task in patients with somatoform pain disorder: An exploratory multi-channel near-infrared spectroscopy study. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry*, 78, 153-160. doi:10.1016/j.pnpbp.2017.05.006
- Robinson, M. E., O'Shea, A. M., Craggs, J. G., Price, D. D., Letzen, J. E., & Staud, R. (2015). Comparison of machine classification algorithms for fibromyalgia: neuroimages versus self-report. *J Pain*, 16(5), 472-477. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2015.02.002
- Rodriguez-Raecke, R., Ihle, K., Ritter, C., Muhtz, C., Otte, C., & May, A. (2014). Neuronal differences between chronic low back pain and depression regarding long-term habituation to pain. *Eur J Pain*, 18(5), 701-711. doi:10.1002/j.1532-2149.2013.00407.x
- Sakoglu, U., Pearlson, G. D., Kiehl, K. A., Wang, Y. M., Michael, A. M., & Calhoun, V. D. (2010). A method for evaluating dynamic functional network connectivity and task-modulation: application to schizophrenia. *MAGMA*, 23(5-6), 351-366. doi:10.1007/s10334-010-0197-8
- Scarapicchia, V., Brown, C., Mayo, C., & Gawryluk, J. R. (2017). Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy: Insights from Combined Recording Studies. *Front Hum Neurosci*, 11, 419. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2017.00419
- Seminowicz, D. A., & Davis, K. D. (2006). Cortical responses to pain in healthy individuals depends on pain catastrophizing. *Pain*, 120(3), 297-306. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2005.11.008
- Shattuck, D. W., Mirza, M., Adisetiyo, V., Hojatkashani, C., Salamon, G., Narr, K. L., . . . Toga, A. W. (2008). Construction of a 3D probabilistic atlas of human cortical structures. *Neuroimage*, 39(3), 1064-1080. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.09.031
- Sommer, M., Sodian, B., Dohnel, K., Schwerdtner, J., Meinhardt, J., & Hajak, G. (2010). In psychopathic patients emotion attribution modulates activity in outcome-related brain areas. *Psychiatry Res*, 182(2), 88-95. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2010.01.007
- Song, Y., Su, Q., Jiang, M., Liu, F., Yao, D., Dai, Y., . . . Guo, W. (2015). Abnormal regional homogeneity and its correlations with personality in first-episode, treatment-naive somatization disorder. *Int J Psychophysiol*, 97(2), 108-112. doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2015.05.012
- Stoeter, P., Bauermann, T., Nickel, R., Corluka, L., Gawehn, J., Vucurevic, G., . . . Egle, U. T. (2007). Cerebral activation in patients with somatoform pain disorder exposed to pain and stress: an fMRI study. *Neuroimage*, 36(2), 418-430. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.01.052

Strangman, G., Culver, J. P., Thompson, J. H., & Boas, D. A. (2002). A quantitative comparison of simultaneous BOLD fMRI and NIRS recordings during functional brain activation. *Neuroimage*, 17(2), 719-731.

Strigo, I. A., Simmons, A. N., Matthews, S. C., Craig, A. D., & Paulus, M. P. (2008). Association of major depressive disorder with altered functional brain response during anticipation and processing of heat pain. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 65(11), 1275-1284. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.65.11.1275

Su, Q., Yao, D., Jiang, M., Liu, F., Jiang, J., Xu, C., . . . Guo, W. (2014). Dissociation of regional activity in default mode network in medication-naïve, first-episode somatization disorder. *PLoS One*, 9(7), e99273. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0099273

Su, Q., Yao, D., Jiang, M., Liu, F., Jiang, J., Xu, C., . . . Guo, W. (2015). Increased functional connectivity strength of right inferior temporal gyrus in first-episode, drug-naïve somatization disorder. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*, 49(1), 74-81. doi:10.1177/0004867414553949

Su, Q., Yao, D., Jiang, M., Liu, F., Long, L., Dai, Y., . . . Guo, W. (2016). Decreased interhemispheric functional connectivity in insula and angular gyrus/supramarginal gyrus: Significant findings in first-episode, drug-naïve somatization disorder. *Psychiatry Res Neuroimaging*, 248, 48-54. doi:10.1016/j.pscychresns.2016.01.008

Sundermann, B., Burgmer, M., Pogatzki-Zahn, E., Gaubitz, M., Stuber, C., Wessolleck, E., . . . Pfleiderer, B. (2014). Diagnostic classification based on functional connectivity in chronic pain: model optimization in fibromyalgia and rheumatoid arthritis. *Acad Radiol*, 21(3), 369-377. doi:10.1016/j.acra.2013.12.003

Sutoko, S., Monden, Y., Tokuda, T., Ikeda, T., Nagashima, M., Kiguchi, M., . . . Dan, I. (2019). Distinct Methylphenidate-Evoked Response Measured Using Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy During Go/No-Go Task as a Supporting Differential Diagnostic Tool Between Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder and Autism Spectrum Disorder Comorbid Children. *Front Hum Neurosci*, 13, 7. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2019.00007

Symonds, L. L., Gordon, N. S., Bixby, J. C., & Mande, M. M. (2006). Right-lateralized pain processing in the human cortex: an fMRI study. *J Neurophysiol*, 95(6), 3823-3830. doi:10.1152/jn.01162.2005

Tena, B., Escobar, B., Arguis, M. J., Cantero, C., Rios, J., & Gomar, C. (2012). Reproducibility of Electronic Von Frey and Von Frey monofilaments testing. *Clin J Pain*, 28(4), 318-323. doi:10.1097/AJP.0b013e31822f0092

Tessner, K. D., Walker, E. F., Hochman, K., & Hamann, S. (2006). Cortisol responses of healthy volunteers undergoing magnetic resonance imaging. *Hum Brain Mapp*, 27(11), 889-895. doi:10.1002/hbm.20229

- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 58(1), 267-288.
- Tseng, P., Hsu, T. Y., Muggleton, N. G., Tzeng, O. J., Hung, D. L., & Juan, C. H. (2010). Posterior parietal cortex mediates encoding and maintenance processes in change blindness. *Neuropsychologia*, 48(4), 1063-1070. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.12.005
- van Boven, K., Lucassen, P., van Ravesteijn, H., olde Hartman, T., Bor, H., van Weel-Baumgarten, E., & van Weel, C. (2011). Do unexplained symptoms predict anxiety or depression? Ten-year data from a practice-based research network. *Br J Gen Pract*, 61(587), e316-325. doi:10.3399/bjgp11X577981
- Vivancos, G. G., Verri, W. A., Jr., Cunha, T. M., Schivo, I. R., Parada, C. A., Cunha, F. Q., & Ferreira, S. H. (2004). An electronic pressure-meter nociception paw test for rats. *Braz J Med Biol Res*, 37(3), 391-399.
- Vossen, H. G., van Os, J., Hermens, H., & Lousberg, R. (2006). Evidence that trait-anxiety and trait-depression differentially moderate cortical processing of pain. *Clin J Pain*, 22(8), 725-729. doi:10.1097/01.aip.0000210913.95664.1a
- Wei, Q., Bai, T., Chen, Y., Ji, G., Hu, X., Xie, W., . . . Tian, Y. (2018). The Changes of Functional Connectivity Strength in Electroconvulsive Therapy for Depression: A Longitudinal Study. *Front Neurosci*, 12, 661. doi:10.3389/fnins.2018.00661
- Yoshino, A., Okamoto, Y., Kunisato, Y., Yoshimura, S., Jinnin, R., Hayashi, Y., . . . Yamawaki, S. (2014). Distinctive spontaneous regional neural activity in patients with somatoform pain disorder: a preliminary resting-state fMRI study. *Psychiatry Res*, 221(3), 246-248. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2013.12.006
- Zhang, Y. J., Lu, C. M., Biswal, B. B., Zang, Y. F., Peng, D. L., & Zhu, C. Z. (2010). Detecting resting-state functional connectivity in the language system using functional near-infrared spectroscopy. *J Biomed Opt*, 15(4), 047003. doi:10.1117/1.3462973
- Zhu, Y., & Mehta, M. S. R. K. (2017, 5-8 Nov. 2017). *Machine learning approach on frontal lobe activity to assess depression in adults: Implications for rehabilitation outcomes*. Paper presented at the 2017 International Symposium on Wearable Robotics and Rehabilitation (WeRob).
- Zou, H., & Hastie, T. (2005). Regularization and Variable Selection via the Elastic Net. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 67(2), 301-320.