

# Default Mode Network Mechanisms of Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation in Depression

Conor Liston, Ashley C. Chen, Benjamin D. Zebley, Andrew T. Drysdale, Rebecca Gordon, Bruce Leuchter, Henning U. Voss, B.J. Casey, Amit Etkin, and Marc J. Dubin

**Background:** Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) of the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) is an established treatment for depression, but its underlying mechanism of action remains unknown. Abnormalities in two large-scale neuronal networks—the frontoparietal central executive network (CEN) and the medial prefrontal-medial parietal default mode network (DMN)—are consistent findings in depression and potential therapeutic targets for TMS. Here, we assessed the impact of TMS on activity in these networks and their relation to treatment response.

**Methods:** We used resting state functional magnetic resonance imaging to measure functional connectivity within and between the DMN and CEN in 17 depressed patients, before and after a 5-week course of TMS. Motivated by prior reports, we focused on connectivity seeded from the DLPFC and the subgenual cingulate, a key region closely aligned with the DMN in depression. Connectivity was also compared with a cohort of 35 healthy control subjects.

**Results:** Before treatment, functional connectivity in depressed patients was abnormally elevated within the DMN and diminished within the CEN, and connectivity between these two networks was altered. Transcranial magnetic stimulation normalized depression-related subgenual hyperconnectivity in the DMN but did not alter connectivity in the CEN. Transcranial magnetic stimulation also induced anticorrelated connectivity between the DLPFC and medial prefrontal DMN nodes. Baseline subgenual connectivity predicted subsequent clinical improvement.

**Conclusions:** Transcranial magnetic stimulation selectively modulates functional connectivity both within and between the CEN and DMN, and modulation of subgenual cingulate connectivity may play an important mechanistic role in alleviating depression. The results also highlight potential neuroimaging biomarkers for predicting treatment response.

**Key Words:** Central executive network, default mode network, depression, resting state fMRI, TMS

Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) has emerged as a promising tool in the psychiatric treatment arsenal with proven efficacy for the treatment of depression, including in patients otherwise resistant to antidepressant pharmacotherapy (1–3). The current limitations of antidepressant medications highlight the clinical relevance of TMS: typically, only approximately one third of patients achieve full remission with medication during acute phase treatment, with less than half maintaining sustained remission after multiple medication trials, and side effects are a common obstacle to adherence (4–6). For patients who either fail to respond to an antidepressant or experience intolerable side effects, TMS is a potentially useful alternative that is both well tolerated (2) and effective (7,8). Still, most treatment-refractory patients will not achieve full remission (3),

and recent meta-analyses indicate that the effect size (Cohen's *d*) lies in the .39 to .55 range (8,9). For these reasons, there is a pressing clinical need to understand how and for whom TMS works. Studies suggest that the efficacy of TMS might also be improved by optimizing treatment protocols (2), particularly the neuroanatomical target for stimulation (10).

Efforts to predict treatment response and identify optimal stimulation sites will be facilitated by understanding the mechanisms that mediate clinical improvement with TMS, which are currently unknown. Acutely, TMS elicits transient current flow and neuronal depolarization in cortical tissue directly beneath the site of stimulation and in interconnected downstream circuits (11–13). In the longer term, repetitive TMS has more durable effects on neural function. In healthy human subjects, high-frequency TMS to the motor cortex causes long-lasting changes in electrophysiological measures of cortical excitability at the stimulation site (14). These effects depend on *N*-methyl-D-aspartate receptor signaling (15), which suggests that they involve long-term potentiation-like plasticity mechanisms. In addition to local effects at the stimulation site, TMS of the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) also modulates activity in more distant regions that function abnormally in depression (16,17). These observations suggest that TMS may relieve depression by modulating synaptic strength both locally and at distant sites, thereby modulating functional connectivity in cortical networks.

Recent studies have shown that the human brain is intrinsically organized into spatially and temporally dissociable functional networks (18–21) and that neuronal activity patterns within at least two of these—the default mode network (DMN) and the central executive network (CEN)—are consistently abnormal in depression. The DMN has been implicated in rumination, self-referential processing, and episodic memory retrieval and includes areas of medial prefrontal cortex, posterior cingulate

From the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences (CL, ACC, AE), Stanford University School of Medicine, Palo Alto, California; Brain and Mind Research Institute and Department of Psychiatry (CL, ATD, RG, BL, BJC, MJD), Weill Cornell Medical College; Department of Psychiatry (BDZ), Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons; and Department of Radiology (HUV), Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, New York; and Sierra-Pacific Mental Illness Research, Education, and Clinical Center (ACC, AE), Veterans Affairs Palo Alto Health Care System, Palo Alto, California.

Authors CL and ACC contributed equally to this work.

Address correspondence to Conor Liston, M.D., Ph.D., Weill Cornell Medical College; Brain and Mind Research Institute and Department of Psychiatry, Belfer Research Building, 413 East 69th Street, Box 240, New York, NY 10021; E-mail: [col2004@med.cornell.edu](mailto:col2004@med.cornell.edu).

Received Jul 29, 2013; revised Dec 18, 2013; accepted Jan 11, 2014.

0006-3223/\$36.00

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.01.023>

BIOL PSYCHIATRY 2014;76:517–526  
© 2014 Society of Biological Psychiatry

cortex, and multiple (mostly medial) areas of posterior parietal cortex (21–23). In depression, activity in the DMN is correlated with activity in the subgenual cingulate cortex and other limbic areas (24–26). The CEN plays a key role in regulating attention, working memory, and decision making (27) and includes dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and multiple (mostly lateral) areas of posterior parietal cortex. Early efforts to use TMS to treat depression focused on the left DLPFC (28,29), a component of the CEN, because this region was consistently found to be hypoactive in depression (30–32). Likewise, hyperactivity (33,34) and abnormal patterns of connectivity (24,26,33–36) between the subgenual anterior cingulate cortex (sgACC) and other default mode network structures are also consistent findings in depression. Whether TMS has any effect on functional connectivity within these two networks is unknown.

Importantly, activities in the CEN and DMN are also closely coupled. Anatomical tracer studies in nonhuman primates have identified strong, reciprocal connections between the DLPFC, sgACC, and medial prefrontal areas of the DMN (37–41). Activities in the CEN and DMN are anticorrelated in some contexts (18,42), and DMN activity is suppressed during DLPFC-dependent cognitive control tasks (23,43). Moreover, activation of the DLPFC by TMS stimulation concurrent with functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) modulated DLPFC-DMN connectivity (44). In a recent cross-sectional resting state connectivity study, DLPFC target sites that yielded larger treatment effects in previous efficacy studies were more strongly coupled with the sgACC in healthy control subjects, and a similar pattern of DLPFC connectivity was observed in a separate cohort of patients with depression (10). Whether left dorsolateral prefrontal TMS modulates connectivity between these two networks in depression is unknown.

To answer this question, we used resting state functional magnetic resonance imaging (rs-fMRI) to measure functional connectivity in and between the DMN and CEN in depressed patients before and after a 5-week course of dorsolateral prefrontal TMS. By first comparing patients with a cohort of healthy control subjects, we identified abnormal patterns of connectivity in the DMN and CEN before treatment and then tested for changes in connectivity after treatment. Our hypothesis was that TMS acts to relieve depression, at least in part, by normalizing patterns of connectivity both within and between these two networks. A corollary of this hypothesis is that abnormal patterns of connectivity before treatment may be predictive of subsequent treatment response. Accordingly, we also tested whether baseline (pretreatment) connectivity between DLPFC, sgACC, and other nodes of the CEN and DMN correlated with clinical improvements after TMS.

## Methods and Materials

### Subjects

Seventeen outpatients meeting DSM-IV-Text Revision criteria for a nonpsychotic major depressive episode (mean age 42.3, SD = 17.3; 18% male patients) and 35 healthy control subjects (mean age 36, SD = 16; 34% male subjects) participated in this study after providing informed consent. Patients were eligible for inclusion if they met DSM-IV-Text Revision criteria for a major depressive episode with a diagnosis of major depressive disorder or bipolar II disorder and if they also met criteria for treatment resistance, including a failure to respond to at least two previous antidepressant trials at adequate doses for 8 weeks during the

current episode. The recruitment procedure and other inclusion and exclusion criteria for patients and control subjects are described in [Supplement 1](#). Diagnostic and medication histories for the patient group are described in [Table S1](#) in [Supplement 1](#). All aspects of our experimental protocol were approved by the Institutional Review Board of Weill Cornell Medical College and conducted in accordance with institutional guidelines.

### TMS Protocol

All 17 patients completed 25 sessions of 10-Hz excitatory TMS (3) (NeuroStar TMS Therapy System; Neuronetics, Inc., Malvern, Pennsylvania) over the left DLPFC during a 5-week period. We assessed treatment response using the 24-item Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (HAM-D) at baseline and 1 to 3 days after completing treatment. Resting motor thresholds and stimulation intensity for each subject are listed in [Table S2](#) in [Supplement 1](#), and other details of the TMS protocol are described in [Supplement 1](#).

### Magnetic Resonance Imaging Data Acquisition and Analysis

Magnetic resonance imaging data (collected on a 3.0 Tesla Signa Excite MRI Scanner; General Electric Co., Fairfield, Connecticut) were obtained from patients in two sessions that occurred before and after treatment or in a single session for healthy control subjects. Each session included an rs-fMRI sequence (repetition time = 2 sec, 180 volumes) and a T1-weighted anatomical scan. Data preprocessing included motion correction, spatial smoothing, temporal band-pass filtering, detrending, and removal of nuisance signals by regression on six motion parameters (roll, pitch, yaw, and translation in three dimensions) and signal time courses for white matter and cerebrospinal fluid regions of interest determined on an individual basis using an automated segmentation algorithm. One patient was excluded from further analysis due to loss-of-signal artifact ([Figure S1](#) in [Supplement 1](#)). Additional preprocessing information is described in [Supplement 1](#).

To test for functional connectivity differences in depression and for effects of TMS, we generated functional connectivity maps between seeds in the left DLPFC and subgenual cingulate cortex and targets in the CEN and DMN. Regions of interest comprising the DMN ([Figure S2](#) in [Supplement 1](#)) and CEN ([Figure S3](#) in [Supplement 1](#)) were defined a priori based on a previously published report (20), as were coordinates for the sgACC ([Table S3](#) in [Supplement 1](#)) (10,24,26,33,34,45–50) and DLPFC seeds (10). We focused on seeds in the sgACC and DLPFC because functional connectivity between these structures has been implicated in the response to TMS (10). Subgenual anterior cingulate cortex activity is increased in depression (24,26,33–36) and sensitive to treatment (33,34,45–49). Furthermore, although the sgACC does not lie within the DMN, sgACC and DMN activities are highly correlated, especially in depression (24,26). In contrast, left DLPFC activity is consistently decreased in depression (30–32). Our DLPFC seed, which was predicted to lie within the stimulation field ([Supplement 1](#)), is adjacent to the CEN, as defined in a prior report, but not within it (20); however, activity in Brodmann area (BA) 46 is highly correlated with activity throughout the CEN and plays a critical role in cognitive control processes (20,24).

Correlating signal in these two seeds with targets in the DMN and CEN generated two within-network connectivity maps (DLPFC:CEN, sgACC:DMN) and two between-network connectivity maps (DLPFC:DMN, sgACC:CEN). To test for functional connectivity differences in patients versus control subjects, we used analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with age, sex, and head motion

as covariates. To test for effects of TMS on functional connectivity, we used repeated measures ANCOVA, co-varying for age, sex, baseline HAM-D score, TMS intensity (% of resting motor threshold), history of antipsychotic or mood stabilizer use, and lifetime number of antidepressant trials as a proxy for treatment resistance. Finally, to test whether baseline connectivity maps were related to subsequent treatment response, we divided patients into two groups based on a median split of the percent change in HAM-D and tested for differences in their baseline functional connectivity maps (ANCOVA, covariates: age, sex, baseline HAM-D score, and lifetime number of antidepressant trials). In all analyses, significant effects were identified using a cluster threshold to correct for multiple comparisons (51). See Supplement 1 for additional details.

## Results

### Subject Characterization and Effects of TMS on Depression

Seventeen patients with treatment-resistant depression were enrolled in this study, and all completed the 5-week course of TMS. Patients and healthy control subjects ( $n = 35$ ) did not differ significantly in terms of age ( $t = 1.24$ ,  $p = .21$ ), sex ( $t = 1.21$ ,  $p = .20$ ), or head motion during fMRI scanning ( $t = 1.15$ ,  $p = .25$ ). Furthermore, patients' head motion did not differ significantly in the pretreatment versus posttreatment fMRI scans ( $t = 1.22$ ,  $p = .23$ ).

On average, patients' symptoms improved by 9.1 points on the HAM-D from the first to final session (SD 7.5;  $t = 4.92$ ,  $p = .0002$ ; Cohen's  $d = 1.32$ ). There were no significant differences between patients who showed a stronger response to treatment and those who did not (based on a median split of their percent change in HAM-D) in terms of age ( $t = .60$ ,  $p = .56$ ), sex ( $t = 1.89$ ,  $p = .08$ ), pretreatment HAM-D ( $t = 1.48$ ,  $p = .16$ ), stimulation intensity ( $t = .01$ ,  $p = .99$ ), or lifetime number of failed antidepressant trials ( $t = .69$ ,  $p = .50$ ).

### TMS Effects on Connectivity Within the CEN and DMN

To identify likely targets for modulation by TMS, we began by assessing how functional connectivity was altered within the DMN and the CEN in patients with depression relative to a cohort of closely matched control subjects. To determine whether TMS modulates these connectivity patterns, we rescanned the same patients shortly after completing the 5-week stimulation protocol and tested for differences in functional connectivity after treatment.

Within the CEN, we found that functional connectivity was significantly reduced in depressed patients relative to control subjects (Figure 1A). We observed widespread reductions in functional connectivity between the left DLPFC and the premotor cortex (BA6), two posterior parietal areas (BA40, BA7), bilateral cerebellum, and other areas of the lateral prefrontal cortex (BA8/9). Since TMS targets the left DLPFC for stimulation, we predicted that functional connectivity between this region and other areas of the central executive network would be altered, but this is not what we observed. Instead, there were no significant effects on functional connectivity within this network, and all areas of abnormal hypoconnectivity persisted after treatment (Figure 1B,C). Similar results—widespread reductions in connectivity between the left DLPFC and targets in the CEN and other areas that persisted after treatment—were observed in unmasked whole-brain analyses (Figures S4–S6 in Supplement 1). These findings indicate that it

is unlikely that TMS acts by modulating functional connectivity within the central executive network.

In contrast, within the default mode network, we found that functional connectivity was significantly elevated in depressed patients and tended to decrease with treatment. Before treatment, we observed abnormally elevated functional connectivity between the sgACC and the ventromedial prefrontal cortex, pregenual anterior cingulate cortex, thalamus, and precuneus (Figure 2A). Most of these abnormalities resolved after treatment (Figure 2B). Transcranial magnetic stimulation significantly reduced patterns of hyperconnectivity in the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and pregenual anterior cingulate cortex, and connectivity with the precuneus was also statistically indistinguishable from control subjects after treatment (Figure 2B–D). Only connectivity with the thalamus remained abnormally elevated (Figure 2B). Again, similar results were observed in unmasked whole-brain analyses (Figures S7–S9 in Supplement 1). Thus, depressed patients exhibited significant and contrasting abnormalities in within-network connectivity in the DMN and CEN, and TMS selectively attenuated abnormal hyperactivity only in the DMN.

### TMS Effects on Connectivity between the CEN and DMN

One plausible mechanism by which repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of the left DLPFC leads to connectivity changes in the default mode network is through modulating network-level interactions. Therefore, we tested for treatment effects on functional connectivity between these two networks. In our analysis of interactions between the sgACC and CEN, we found that depressed patients exhibited abnormally elevated sgACC connectivity with the caudate nucleus and bilateral posterior parietal areas before treatment (Figure 3A). However, these effects persisted after treatment (Figure 3B; Figure S10 in Supplement 1), and there were no significant effects of TMS.


In contrast, we found that TMS did significantly affect interactions between the DLPFC and DMN. In particular, we observed a pattern of reduced connectivity between the DLPFC and a right parahippocampal area of the DMN before treatment (Figure 3C), and these differences tended to increase after TMS, expanding to include the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and posterior cingulate cortex (Figure 3D–F). Notably, TMS tended to induce anticorrelations in functional coupling between the DLPFC and medial prefrontal areas of the DMN (Figure 3E–F). In conjunction with the findings above, these results indicate that TMS acts not only by reducing subgenual cingulate hyperconnectivity within the DMN but also by modulating between-network interactions with central executive areas.

### sgACC Connectivity Predicts Antidepressant Response to TMS

If TMS improves depressive symptoms by modulating functional connectivity within and between the DMN and CEN, then individual differences in functional connectivity at baseline may contribute to variability in the response to treatment. To evaluate this hypothesis, we tested for a relationship between patients' pretreatment functional connectivity maps (DLPFC:DMN, DLPFC:CEN, sgACC:DMN, and sgACC:CEN) and subsequent improvements in their depressive symptoms. In this analysis, we tested for functional connectivity differences between patients who showed a stronger response to treatment and those who did not, based on a median split of the percent change in HAM-D.

Unexpectedly, treatment response was unrelated to connectivity between the DLPFC and nodes of the CEN or DMN, in which






**Figure 1.** Persistence of depression-related hypoconnectivity in the central executive network after transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS). **(A)** Compared with healthy control subjects, depressed patients exhibited decreased functional connectivity between the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) and multiple nodes of the central executive network, including premotor cortex (Brodmann area [BA] 6), two regions of posterior parietal cortex (PPC): BA40 and BA7, bilateral cerebellum (CB), and other areas of lateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC: BA8/9). Images depict *t* statistics for the contrast of patients pretreatment versus healthy control subjects. These images and all subsequent images are presented in radiological convention and are labeled with the corresponding planar coordinate in Montreal Neurological Institute space. **(B)** These effects persisted when the same patients were scanned after completing a 5-week course of TMS. **(C)** Quantification of data extracted from the coordinates of the peak *t* statistic from each of the areas labeled in panels **(A)** and **(B)**. For coordinates and statistics, see Table S4 in Supplement 1. Error bars = SEM. \**p* < .05, corrected for multiple comparisons. †*p* < .01, uncorrected, but not significant after correcting for multiple comparisons. MDD, major depressive disorder.

we found no significant effects. By contrast, we found that sgACC hyperconnectivity at baseline strongly predicted larger improvements in HAM-D scores, even after controlling for clinical predictors of treatment response, including age, sex, depression severity, and history of treatment refractoriness. That is, in patients who showed a stronger response to TMS, sgACC connectivity before treatment was significantly higher in multiple nodes of the DMN (Figure 4A,B), including ventromedial and dorsomedial prefrontal cortex, pregenual cingulate cortex, and posterior cingulate cortex. Similarly, higher connectivity between the sgACC and both prefrontal and posterior parietal areas of the CEN was associated with larger subsequent clinical improvements (Figure 4C,D). Furthermore, patients who would subsequently show a stronger response to TMS were statistically indistinguishable from those who did not in terms of age ( $t = .60$ ,  $p = .56$ ), sex ( $t = 1.89$ ,  $p = .08$ ), depression severity as indexed by baseline HAM-D scores ( $t = 1.48$ ,  $p = .16$ ), or treatment refractoriness as indexed by lifetime number of failed antidepressant trials ( $t = .69$ ,

$p = .50$ ). Together, these findings indicate that baseline hyperconnectivity between the sgACC and multiple areas of the DMN and CEN are independently predictive of greater clinical improvements after TMS.

## Discussion

This was the first study to investigate how left dorsolateral prefrontal TMS affects functional connectivity in patients undergoing treatment for depression using pretreatment and posttreatment rs-fMRI scans. We found that TMS selectively attenuates abnormal sgACC hyperconnectivity and modulates interactions between the DMN and CEN. The degree of sgACC hyperconnectivity at baseline was also predictive of subsequent clinical improvement after TMS. However, our results indicate that depression is also associated with widespread functional connectivity abnormalities that tend to persist after TMS, especially




**Figure 2.** Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) attenuates depression-related hyperconnectivity within the default mode network. **(A)** Compared with healthy control subjects, depressed patients exhibited increased functional connectivity between the subgenual anterior cingulate cortex (sgACC) and multiple nodes of the default mode network, including the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC), pregenual anterior cingulate cortex (pgACC), thalamus, and precuneus. Images depict *t* statistics for the contrast of patients pretreatment versus healthy control subjects. **(B)** All areas of sgACC hyperconnectivity normalized after TMS, except within the thalamus. **(C)** Repeated measures analysis of covariance revealed significant effects of TMS on sgACC connectivity with the vmPFC and pgACC. Hyperconnectivity with the precuneus tended to normalize after treatment, but this effect did not reach significance after correcting for multiple comparisons. **(D)** Quantification of data extracted from the coordinates of the peak *t* statistic from each of the areas labeled in panels **(A–C)**. For coordinates and statistics, see Table S5 in Supplement 1. Error bars = SEM. \**p* < .05, corrected for multiple comparisons. †*p* < .01, uncorrected, but not significant after correcting for multiple comparisons. BA, Brodmann area; MDD, major depressive disorder; NS, not significant; rTMS, repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation.

within the CEN. These findings have implications for our understanding of depression pathophysiology, as well as for future efforts to optimize treatment protocols and enhance response rates.

By comparing healthy control subjects with depressed patients before initiating TMS, we identified contrasting patterns of abnormal connectivity in the DMN and CEN that have


implications for understanding pathophysiological processes in depression. In the DMN, we observed a pattern of widespread hyperconnectivity with the subgenual cingulate cortex. This observation adds to a rapidly growing body of studies that have reported consistent differences in morphology, cerebral glucose metabolism, and neuronal activity level within the sgACC and other DMN structures (16,17,24,26,33–36), as well as several



**Figure 3.** Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) modulates interactions between the default mode network (DMN) and central executive network. **(A)** Compared with healthy control subjects, functional connectivity between the subgenual anterior cingulate cortex (sgACC) and the central executive network was abnormally elevated in depressed patients. Affected areas included the right caudate nucleus and bilateral posterior parietal cortex (PPC) (Brodmann area [BA] 40). Images depict  $t$  statistics for the contrast of patients before treatment versus healthy control subjects. **(B)** Quantification of the data depicted in panel (A). Hyperconnectivity with the right caudate, left (L) posterior parietal cortex, and right (R) posterior parietal cortex (data not shown, see Figure S10 in Supplement 1) persisted after treatment, and there were no significant effects of TMS. Error bars = SEM. \* $p < .05$ , corrected for multiple comparisons. **(C)** In contrast, depressed patients exhibited decreased functional connectivity between the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) and a right parahippocampal area (PHC) of the DMN. **(D)** Hypoconnectivity between the DLPFC and the DMN either persisted or increased after TMS. Affected areas included ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC), bilateral parahippocampal cortex, and posterior cingulate cortex (PCC). **(E)** Repeated measures analysis of covariance identified significant effects of TMS on functional connectivity between the DLPFC and two medial prefrontal areas of the DMN. The vmPFC cluster overlapped with the cluster in panel (D). In both areas, connectivity was reduced, and neither area differed from control subjects before treatment. **(F)** Quantification of data extracted from the coordinates of the peak  $t$  statistic from each of the areas labeled in panels (C–E). For coordinates and statistics, see Table S6 in Supplement 1. Error bars = SEM. \* $p < .05$ , corrected for multiple comparisons. † $p < .01$ , uncorrected, but not significant after correcting for multiple comparisons. dmPFC, dorsomedial prefrontal cortex; MDD, major depressive disorder; NS, not significant.

previous rs-fMRI functional connectivity studies highlighting hyperconnectivity within the DMN (24,26,33–36). It has been suggested that abnormalities in DMN connectivity may be related to rumination and deficits in emotion regulation (52).

In addition to these DMN findings, we also observed a pattern of widespread hypoconnectivity within the central executive network that has not, to our knowledge, been reported in prior rs-fMRI studies but is consistent with previous findings of decreased activity



**Figure 4.** Baseline subgenual cingulate connectivity predicts treatment response. **(A)** To test the hypothesis that individual differences in default mode network and central executive network connectivity may influence patients' response to transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS), we compared the pretreatment functional connectivity maps for patients who subsequently showed a stronger response to treatment versus those who showed a weaker response to treatment, based on a median split of patients' percent change in Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression scores. Before treatment, patients who subsequently showed larger clinical benefits had higher subgenual anterior cingulate cortex (sgACC) connectivity with multiple nodes of the default mode network, including the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) and dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (dmPFC), pregenual anterior cingulate (pgACC), and medial orbitofrontal cortex (mOFC). **(B)** Quantification of data extracted from the coordinates of the peak *t* statistic from each of the areas labeled in panel **(A)**. **(C)** Patients who showed a stronger response to TMS also exhibited higher functional connectivity between sgACC, right (R) dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC), and bilateral posterior parietal cortex (PPC) areas of the central executive network. **(D)** Quantification of data extracted from the coordinates of the peak *t* statistic from each of the areas labeled in panel **(C)**. For coordinates and statistics, see Table S7 in Supplement 1. Quantification of the data depicted in panel **(C)**. Error bars = SEM. \**p* < .05, corrected for multiple comparisons. †*p* < .01, uncorrected, but not significant after correcting for multiple comparisons. BA, Brodmann area; L, left; MDD, major depressive disorder.

during various cognitive tasks (53,54). Altered functional connectivity in the CEN may contribute to deficits in memory and attention and other cognitive symptoms in depression. In a previous study (55), a remarkably similar pattern of deficits was identified in healthy human subjects that were exposed to chronic stress. However, in the chronic stress study, these deficits were reversible after cessation of the stressor, whereas in this study, most CEN abnormalities tended to persist after treatment. This finding raises the possibility that abnormal connectivity in the CEN may reflect a susceptibility to recurrent depression that persists independent of mood state. Future work tracking functional connectivity changes longitudinally for longer intervals and in larger cohorts of patients will be required to test this hypothesis.

Our study also has several implications for understanding the antidepressant mechanism of action of TMS. First, the results are consistent with our hypothesis that TMS acts by modulating functional connectivity within cortical networks. Second, they show that TMS effects are neuroanatomically specific: DMN hyperconnectivity was reduced but CEN hypoconnectivity was unaffected. The underlying mechanisms that generate these specific effects on connectivity are unclear. Prior studies have shown that high-frequency TMS enhances cortical excitability at the target site (14,15) and may modulate synaptic strength through long-term potentiation-like mechanisms (15,56). Positron emission tomography studies indicate that TMS also modulates activity in remote cortical sites, inducing activity changes in the



medial prefrontal cortex and other DMN targets after left DLPFC stimulation (17,57–59). Accordingly, electroencephalography (EEG) studies have shown that TMS modulates connectivity between the target site and distal cortical areas (60–64). These neuroanatomically distributed effects may arise through direct projections to and from the stimulation target. Consistent with the effects on DMN connectivity that we observed here, retrograde tracer studies in nonhuman primates indicate that the DLPFC has dense, reciprocal connections with multiple nodes of the DMN, including the sgACC and medial prefrontal cortex (37–41). Thus, TMS may attenuate hyperconnectivity within medial prefrontal areas of the DMN through effects on direct projections to and from the stimulation site.

It is less clear why TMS does not also modulate hypoconnectivity within the CEN, as there are also dense reciprocal connections between the DLPFC and posterior parietal and lateral prefrontal nodes in this network (40,65,66). However, several other factors may explain this specific pattern of regional variability. First, projections from the DLPFC stimulation site may terminate on either excitatory pyramidal cells or inhibitory interneurons, and regional differences in these projections may lead to increases or decreases in synaptic strength (67). Second, EEG and fMRI studies have shown that TMS effects on a given region of cortex are modulated by its pre-existing activity state and that TMS effects on connectivity vary with the pre-existing strength of the projection (60,67–70). Third, therapeutic repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for depression may act primarily by reducing abnormally elevated connectivity but not by strengthening weak connections, which would explain the absence of an effect on hypoconnectivity in the CEN. In most EEG studies (61,63,64,69) and at least one fMRI study (71), high-frequency TMS was found primarily to decrease functional connectivity, especially for oscillations in the low-frequency alpha band, to which rs-fMRI may be most sensitive. It is likely that a combination of these factors contributed to the specificity of the results we observed, which provide additional convergent evidence implicating the importance of subgenual cingulate hyperactivity and DMN hyperconnectivity in the pathophysiology of depression and the response to treatment (33,34,45–49).

Furthermore, our results indicate that TMS may act not only by normalizing connectivity within the DMN but also by modulating interactions between the DMN and CEN. Indeed, we found that TMS induced an anticorrelated pattern of connectivity between the DLPFC and medial prefrontal areas of the DMN that was absent before treatment (Figure 3D–F). We observed similar results in a recent concurrent TMS/fMRI study, in which DLPFC stimulation induced anticorrelated functional connectivity with medial prefrontal areas acutely (44). Interactions between the DMN and CEN are thought to be critical for regulating internally oriented versus externally oriented processing and optimizing cognition (18,19,72,73). Thus, the antidepressant mechanism of TMS may act, in part, at the level of network interactions. Optimizing TMS treatment through these neural mechanisms will require a more thorough understanding of the specific causal mechanisms that govern CEN/DMN interactions, by extending concurrent TMS/fMRI methods to patients undergoing treatment for depression.

The relatively modest patient sample size and the lack of a sham-treated control arm are limitations of our study, and we cannot rule out the possibility that some of the changes we observed after TMS were not causally related to the treatment. Some effects may have been placebo-related or may have resulted, in part, from a spontaneous regression to the mean.

Arguing against this interpretation, however, is the fact that the effects of TMS were selective and specific: many abnormalities persisted (or even increased) after treatment, and TMS tended to modulate connectivity primarily in DMN (but not CEN) target areas.

Finally, our findings may inform future efforts to optimize TMS treatment protocols and enhance response rates. Hyperconnectivity between the sgACC and areas of the DMN and CEN was associated with a stronger response to treatment. This result is consistent with a recent rs-fMRI study that investigated whether medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) connectivity was associated with response to an experimental TMS protocol targeting dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (74). Clinical improvements were associated with higher baseline connectivity between the DLPFC, sgACC, and other areas of the mPFC. Others have reported associations between baseline mPFC connectivity and response to psychopharmacologic antidepressants (75,76). Together, these results suggest that rs-fMRI scans obtained before treatment have the potential for applications in predicting treatment response. Our results may also inform investigations of alternative TMS target sites. In a prior report (10), dorsolateral prefrontal TMS targets that yielded larger clinical effects were associated with greater DLPFC–sgACC connectivity, suggesting that response rates could be enhanced by selecting targets based on their connectivity with sgACC. Our findings provide direct support for this hypothesis and for systematic efforts to investigate TMS targets based on rs-fMRI measures of functional connectivity.

*This work was supported by grants from the Brain and Behavior Research Foundation (National Alliance for Research on Schizophrenia and Depression Young Investigator Award) and Neuronetics, Inc., to MJD and by funds from the Department of Psychiatry at Weill Cornell Medical College. CL was supported by grants from the National Institutes of Health (K99 MH097822) and the DeWitt Wallace Reader's Digest Foundation at Weill Cornell. AE was supported by a grant from the Dana Foundation. BJC was supported by a grant from the National Institutes of Health (P50-MH079513). MJD was supported by research grants from Neuronetics, Inc. All other authors reported no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest.*

*Supplementary material cited in this article is available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.01.023>.*

1. Pascual-Leone A, Rubio B, Pallardo F, Catala MD (1996): Rapid-rate transcranial magnetic stimulation of left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex in drug-resistant depression. *Lancet* 348:233–237.
2. Rossi S, Hallett M, Rossini PM, Pascual-Leone A (2009): Safety, ethical considerations, and application guidelines for the use of transcranial magnetic stimulation in clinical practice and research. *Clin Neurophysiol* 120:2008–2039.
3. George MS, Lisanby SH, Avery D, McDonald WM, Durkalski V, Pavlicova M, *et al.* (2010): Daily left prefrontal transcranial magnetic stimulation therapy for major depressive disorder: A sham-controlled randomized trial. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 67:507–516.
4. Rush AJ, Trivedi MH, Wisniewski SR, Nierenberg AA, Stewart JW, Warden D, *et al.* (2006): Acute and longer-term outcomes in depressed outpatients requiring one or several treatment steps: A STAR\*D report. *Am J Psychiatry* 163:1905–1917.
5. Trivedi MH, Rush AJ, Wisniewski SR, Nierenberg AA, Warden D, Ritz L, *et al.* (2006): Evaluation of outcomes with citalopram for depression using measurement-based care in STAR\*D: Implications for clinical practice. *Am J Psychiatry* 163:28–40.
6. Nelson JC (2006): The STAR\*D study: A four-course meal that leaves us wanting more. *Am J Psychiatry* 163:1864–1866.



7. Burt T, Lisanby SH, Sackeim HA (2002): Neuropsychiatric applications of transcranial magnetic stimulation: A meta analysis. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 5:73–103.
8. Schutter D (2009): Antidepressant efficacy of high-frequency transcranial magnetic stimulation over the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex in double-blind sham-controlled designs: A meta-analysis. *Psychol Med* 39:65–75.
9. Slotema C, Blom J, Hoek H, Sommer I (2010): Should we expand the toolbox of psychiatric treatment methods to include Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (rTMS)? A meta-analysis of the efficacy of rTMS in psychiatric disorders. *J Clin Psychiatry* 71:874–885.
10. Fox MD, Buckner RL, White MP, Greicius MD, Pascual-Leone A (2012): Efficacy of transcranial magnetic stimulation targets for depression is related to intrinsic functional connectivity with the subgenual cingulate. *Biol Psychiatry* 72:595–603.
11. Barker AT, Jalinous R, Freeston IL (1985): Non-invasive magnetic stimulation of human motor cortex. *Lancet* 1:1106–1107.
12. Ruff CC, Blankenburg F, Bjoertomt O, Bestmann S, Freeman E, Haynes JD, *et al.* (2006): Concurrent TMS-fMRI and psychophysics reveal frontal influences on human retinotopic visual cortex. *Curr Biol* 16: 1479–1488.
13. Driver J, Blankenburg F, Bestmann S, Vanduffel W, Ruff CC (2009): Concurrent brain-stimulation and neuroimaging for studies of cognition. *Trends Cogn Sci* 13:319–327.
14. Huang YZ, Edwards MJ, Rounis E, Bhatia KP, Rothwell JC (2005): Theta burst stimulation of the human motor cortex. *Neuron* 45:201–206.
15. Huang Y-Z, Rothwell JC, Edwards MJ, Chen R-S (2008): Effect of physiological activity on an NMDA-dependent form of cortical plasticity in human. *Cereb Cortex* 18:563–570.
16. Kimbrell TA, Liddle JT, Dunn RT, Frye MA, Greenberg BD, Wassermann EM, *et al.* (1999): Frequency dependence of antidepressant response to left prefrontal repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) as a function of baseline cerebral glucose metabolism. *Biol Psychiatry* 46: 1603–1613.
17. Speer AM, Kimbrell TA, Wassermann EM, Repella JD, Willis MW, Herscovitch P, Post RM (2000): Opposite effects of high and low frequency rTMS on regional brain activity in depressed patients. *Biol Psychiatry* 48:1133–1141.
18. Fox MD, Snyder AZ, Vincent JL, Corbetta M, Van Essen DC, Raichle ME (2005): The human brain is intrinsically organized into dynamic, anticorrelated functional networks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 102: 9673–9678.
19. Deco G, Jirsa VK, McIntosh AR (2011): Emerging concepts for the dynamical organization of resting-state activity in the brain. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 12:43–56.
20. Shirer WR, Ryali S, Rykhlevskaia E, Menon V, Greicius MD (2012): Decoding subject-driven cognitive states with whole-brain connectivity patterns. *Cereb Cortex* 22:158–165.
21. Fox MD, Raichle ME (2007): Spontaneous fluctuations in brain activity observed with functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 8:700–711.
22. Gusnard DA, Akbudak E, Shulman GL, Raichle ME (2001): Medial prefrontal cortex and self-referential mental activity: Relation to a default mode of brain function. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 98: 4259–4264.
23. Raichle ME, MacLeod AM, Snyder AZ, Powers WJ, Gusnard DA, Shulman GL (2001): A default mode of brain function. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 98:676–682.
24. Sheline YI, Price JL, Yan Z, Mintun MA (2010): Resting-state functional MRI in depression unmasks increased connectivity between networks via the dorsal nexus. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 107:11020–11025.
25. Sheline YI, Barch DM, Price JL, Rundle MM, Vaishnavi SN, Snyder AZ, *et al.* (2009): The default mode network and self-referential processes in depression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 106:1942–1947.
26. Greicius MD, Flores BH, Menon V, Glover GH, Solvason HB, Kenna H, *et al.* (2007): Resting-state functional connectivity in major depression: Abnormally increased contributions from subgenual cingulate cortex and thalamus. *Biol Psychiatry* 62:429–437.
27. Miller EK, Cohen JD (2001): An integrative theory of prefrontal cortex function. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 24:167–202.
28. George MS, Wassermann EM, Williams WA, Callahan A, Ketter TA, Basser P, *et al.* (1995): Daily repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) improves mood in depression. *Neuroreport* 6:1853–1856.
29. Pascual-Leone A, Catala MD, Pascual APL (1996): Lateralized effect of rapid-rate transcranial magnetic stimulation of the prefrontal cortex on mood. *Neurology* 46:499–502.
30. Davidson RJ, Pizzagalli D, Nitschke JB, Putnam K (2002): Depression: Perspectives from affective neuroscience. *Annu Rev Psychol* 53: 545–574.
31. Bench CJ, Friston KJ, Brown RG, Scott LC, Frackowiak RSJ, Dolan RJ (1992): The anatomy of melancholia—focal abnormalities of cerebral blood-flow in major depression. *Psychol Med* 22:607–615.
32. Baxter LR Jr, Schwartz JM, Phelps ME, Mazziotta JC, Guze BH, Selin CE, *et al.* (1989): Reduction of prefrontal cortex glucose-metabolism common to three types of depression. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 46:243–250.
33. Mayberg HS, Lozano AM, Voon V, McNeely HE, Seminowicz D, Hamani C, *et al.* (2005): Deep brain stimulation for treatment-resistant depression. *Neuron* 45:651–660.
34. Mayberg HS, Brannan SK, Tekell JL, Silva JA, Mahurin RK, McGinnis S, *et al.* (2000): Regional metabolic effects of fluoxetine in major depression: Serial changes and relationship to clinical response. *Biol Psychiatry* 48:830–843.
35. Anand A, Li Y, Wang Y, Wu JW, Gao SJ, Bukhari L, *et al.* (2005): Activity and connectivity of brain mood regulating circuit in depression: A functional magnetic resonance study. *Biol Psychiatry* 57:1079–1088.
36. Broyd SJ, Demanuele C, Debener S, Helps SK, James CJ, Sonuga-Barke EJ (2009): Default-mode brain dysfunction in mental disorders: A systematic review. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 33:279–296.
37. Vogt BA, Pandya DN (1987): Cingulate cortex of the rhesus-monkey: II. Cortical afferents. *J Comp Neurol* 262:271–289.
38. Petrides M, Pandya DN (1999): Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex: Comparative cytoarchitectonic analysis in the human and the macaque brain and corticocortical connection patterns. *Eur J Neurosci* 11: 1011–1036.
39. Lu MT, Preston JB, Strick PL (1994): Interconnections between the prefrontal cortex and the premotor areas in the frontal lobe. *J Comp Neurol* 341:375–392.
40. Selemon LD, Goldman-Rakic PS (1988): Common cortical and subcortical targets of the dorsolateral prefrontal and posterior parietal cortices in the rhesus-monkey: Evidence for a distributed neural network subserving spatially guided behavior. *J Neurosci* 8:4049–4068.
41. Badre D, D'Esposito M (2009): Is the rostro-caudal axis of the frontal lobe hierarchical? *Nat Rev Neurosci* 10:659–669.
42. Chang CE, Glover GH (2009): Effects of model-based physiological noise correction on default mode network anti-correlations and correlations. *Neuroimage* 47:1448–1459.
43. Shulman GL, Fiez JA, Corbetta M, Buckner RL, Miezin FM, Raichle ME, Petersen SE (1997): Common blood flow changes across visual tasks: II. Decreases in cerebral cortex. *J Cogn Neurosci* 9:648–663.
44. Chen AC, Oathes DJ, Chang C, Bradley T, Zhou ZW, Williams LM, *et al.* (2013): Causal interactions between fronto-parietal central executive and default-mode networks in humans. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 110: 19944–19949.
45. Drevets WC, Bogers W, Raichle ME (2002): Functional anatomical correlates of antidepressant drug treatment assessed using PET measures of regional glucose metabolism. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 12:527–544.
46. Kito S, Fujita K, Koga Y (2008): Regional cerebral blood flow changes after low-frequency transcranial magnetic stimulation of the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex in treatment-resistant depression. *Neuropsychobiology* 58:29–36.
47. Nahas Z, Teneback C, Chae J-H, Mu Q, Molnar C, Kozel FA, *et al.* (2007): Serial vagus nerve stimulation functional MRI in treatment-resistant depression. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 32:1649–1660.
48. Wu J, Buchsbaum MS, Gillin JC, Tang C, Cadwell S, Wiegand M, *et al.* (1999): Prediction of antidepressant effects of sleep deprivation by metabolic rates in the ventral anterior cingulate and medial prefrontal cortex. *Am J Psychiatry* 156:1149–1158.
49. Kito S, Hasegawa T, Koga Y (2011): Neuroanatomical correlates of therapeutic efficacy of low-frequency right prefrontal transcranial magnetic stimulation in treatment-resistant depression. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci* 65:175–182.
50. Mayberg HS, Liotti M, Brannan SK, McGinnis S, Mahurin RK, Jerabek PA, *et al.* (1999): Reciprocal limbic-cortical function and negative mood: Converging PET findings in depression and normal sadness. *Am J Psychiatry* 156:675–682.

51. Forman SD, Cohen JD, Fitzgerald M, Eddy WF, Mintun MA, Noll DC (1995): Improved assessment of significant activation in functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI): Use of a cluster-size threshold. *Magn Reson Med* 33:636–647.
52. Sheline YI, Barch DM, Price JL, Rundle MM, Vaishnavi SN, Snyder AZ, *et al.* (2009): The default mode network and self-referential processes in depression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 106:1942–1947.
53. Fitzgerald PB, Oxley TJ, Laird AR, Kulkarni J, Egan GF, Daskalakis ZJ (2006): An analysis of functional neuroimaging studies of dorsolateral prefrontal cortical activity in depression. *Psychiatry Res* 148:33–45.
54. Siegle GJ, Thompson W, Carter CS, Steinhauer SR, Thase ME (2007): Increased amygdala and decreased dorsolateral prefrontal BOLD responses in unipolar depression: Related and independent features. *Biol Psychiatry* 61:198–209.
55. Liston C, McEwen BS, Casey BJ (2009): Psychosocial stress reversibly disrupts prefrontal processing and attentional control. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 106:912–917.
56. Wassermann EM, Lisanby SH (2001): Therapeutic application of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation: A review. *Clin Neurophysiol* 112:1367–1377.
57. Paus T, Castro-Alamancos MA, Petrides M (2001): Cortico-cortical connectivity of the human mid-dorsolateral frontal cortex and its modulation by repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Eur J Neurosci* 14:1405–1411.
58. Speer AM, Willis MW, Herscovitch P, Daube-Witherspoon M, Shelton JR, Benson BE, *et al.* (2003): Intensity-dependent regional cerebral blood flow during 1-Hz repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) in healthy volunteers studied with (H<sub>2</sub>O)-O-15 positron emission tomography: II. Effects of prefrontal cortex rTMS. *Biol Psychiatry* 54:826–832.
59. Kimbrell TA, Dunn RT, George MS, Danielson AL, Willis MW, Repella JD, *et al.* (2002): Left prefrontal-repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) and regional cerebral glucose metabolism in normal volunteers. *Psychiatry Res* 115:101–113.
60. Strens LHA, Oliviero A, Bloem BR, Gerschlagel W, Rothwell JC, Brown P (2002): The effects of subthreshold 1 Hz repetitive TMS on cortico-cortical and interhemispheric coherence. *Clin Neurophysiol* 113:1279–1285.
61. Oliviero A, Strens LHA, Lazzaro V, Tonalì PA, Brown P (2003): Persistent effects of high frequency repetitive TMS on the coupling between motor areas in the human. *Exp Brain Res* 149:107–113.
62. Jing HK, Takigawa M (2000): Observation of EEG coherence after repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol* 111: 1620–1631.
63. Serrien DJ, Strens LHA, Oliviero A, Brown P (2002): Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of the supplementary motor area (SMA) degrades bimanual movement control in humans. *Neurosci Lett* 328: 89–92.
64. Chen WH, Mima T, Siebner HR, Oga T, Hara H, Satow T, *et al.* (2003): Low-frequency rTMS over lateral premotor cortex induces lasting changes in regional activation and functional coupling of cortical motor areas. *Clin Neurophysiol* 114:1628–1637.
65. Cavada C, Goldman-Rakic PS (1989): Posterior parietal cortex in rhesus-monkey: II. Evidence for segregated corticocortical networks linking sensory and limbic areas with the frontal lobe. *J Comp Neurol* 287:422–445.
66. Cavada C, Goldman-Rakic PS (1989): Posterior parietal cortex in rhesus-monkey: I. Parcellation of areas based on distinctive limbic and sensory corticocortical connections. *J Comp Neurol* 287:393–421.
67. Bestmann S, Ruff CC, Blankenburg F, Weiskopf N, Driver J, Rothwell JC (2008): Mapping causal interregional influences with concurrent TMS-fMRI. *Exp Brain Res* 191:383–402.
68. Bestmann S, Swayne O, Blankenburg F, Ruff CC, Haggard P, Weiskopf N, *et al.* (2008): Dorsal premotor cortex exerts state-dependent causal influences on activity in contralateral primary motor and dorsal premotor cortex. *Cereb Cortex* 18:1281–1291.
69. Shafit MM, Westover MB, Oberman L, Cash SS, Pascual-Leone A (2014): Modulation of EEG functional connectivity networks in subjects undergoing repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Brain Topogr* 27:172–191.
70. Ridding MC, Taylor JL, Rothwell JC (1995): The effect of voluntary contraction on cortico-cortical inhibition in human motor cortex. *J Physiol* 487:541–548.
71. Eldaief MC, Halko MA, Buckner RL, Pascua-Leone A (2011): Transcranial magnetic stimulation modulates the brain's intrinsic activity in a frequency-dependent manner. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 108: 21229–21234.
72. Sonuga-Barke EJS, Castellanos FX (2007): Spontaneous attentional fluctuations in impaired states and pathological conditions: A neurobiological hypothesis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 31:977–986.
73. Anticevic A, Cole MW, Murray JD, Corlett PR, Wang XJ, Krystal JH (2012): The role of default network deactivation in cognition and disease. *Trends Cogn Sci* 16:584–592.
74. Salomons TV, Dunlop K, Kennedy SH, Flint A, Geraci J, Giacobbe P, Downar J (2014): Resting-state cortico-thalamic-striatal connectivity predicts response to dorsomedial prefrontal rTMS in major depressive disorder. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 39:488–498.
75. Kozel FA, Rao U, Lu H, Nakonezny PA, Grannemann B, McGregor T, *et al.* (2011): Functional connectivity of brain structures correlates with treatment outcome in major depressive disorder. *Front Psychiatry* 2:7.
76. Van Wingen GA, Tendolkar I, Urner M, Van Marle H, Denys D, Verkes RJ, Fernández G (2013): Short-term antidepressant administration reduces default mode and task-positive network connectivity in healthy individuals during rest. *Neuroimage* 88C:47–53.