



**HAL**  
open science

# Interdependence patterns of multi-frequency oscillations predict visuomotor behavior

Jyotika Bahuguna, Antoine Schwey, Demian Battaglia, Nicole Malfait

► **To cite this version:**

Jyotika Bahuguna, Antoine Schwey, Demian Battaglia, Nicole Malfait. Interdependence patterns of multi-frequency oscillations predict visuomotor behavior. 2023. hal-04295983

**HAL Id: hal-04295983**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04295983v1>**

Preprint submitted on 20 Nov 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

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

# Interdependence patterns of multi-frequency oscillations predict visuomotor behavior

Jyotika Bahuguna<sup>1,2</sup>◇, Antoine Schwey<sup>3</sup>, Demian Battaglia<sup>2,4</sup>\*, Nicole Malfait<sup>3</sup>\*

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology & Neuroscience Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

<sup>2</sup> Aix-Marseille Université, Inserm, Institut de Neurosciences des Systèmes (UMR 1106),  
13005 Marseille, France

<sup>3</sup> Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, Institut de Neurosciences de la Timone (UMR 7289),  
13005 Marseille, France

<sup>4</sup> University of Strasbourg Institute for Advanced Studies (USIAS),  
67084 Strasbourg, France

◇ *First authorship*, \* *shared last authorship*

## Abstract

We show that sensorimotor behavior can be reliably predicted from single-trial EEG oscillations fluctuating in a coordinated manner across brain regions, frequency bands and movement time epochs. We define high-dimensional *oscillatory portraits* to capture the interdependence between basic *oscillatory elements*, quantifying oscillations occurring in single-trials at specific frequencies, locations and time epochs. We find that the general structure of the element-interdependence networks (effective connectivity) remains stable across task conditions, reflecting an intrinsic coordination architecture and responds to changes in task constraints by subtle but consistently distinct topological reorganizations. Trial categories are reliably and significantly better separated using oscillatory portraits, than from the information contained in individual oscillatory elements, suggesting an inter-element coordination-based encoding. Furthermore, single-trial oscillatory portrait fluctuations are predictive of fine trial-to-trial variations in movement kinematics. Remarkably, movement accuracy appears to be reflected in the capacity of the oscillatory coordination architecture to flexibly update as an effect of movement-error integration.

## 1 Introduction

2

3 Linking neural activity to sensory, motor or cognitive processes is an ongoing goal in Neuroscience.  
4 Particular attention has been devoted to the role of brain oscillations, ubiquitous in  
5 electrophysiological recordings of both human and non-human local field potentials and EEG (Varela  
6 2001, Buzsaki 2004). These oscillations are thought to mediate inter-regional communication (Fries  
7 2015) and to be markers of intrinsic brain states (Fries 2015; Mantini, 2007) and task-related activity.  
8 For instance, oscillatory sensorimotor activity has been associated with motor processes decades  
9 ago (Jasper and Penfield, 1949). Since then, numerous studies have described characteristic patterns  
10 of event-related desynchronization/synchronization (ERD/ERS), calculated by averaging across  
11 single-trial absolute power time-series. Movement initiation and execution are associated with a  
12 clear decrease in beta power (beta-band ERD), and beta power typically increases (beta-band ERS)  
13 following movement offset (for review, Kilavik et al., 2013). The same power averaging procedure  
14 has been used to scrutinize finer grained relationships and to try to associate oscillatory activity in  
15 specific brain areas, frequency bands and movement time epochs with specific aspects of movement  
16 control and adaptation (Tan et al., 2014; Torrecillos et al., 2015; Arrighi et al., 2016; Savoie et al.,  
17 2018; Alayrangues et al., 2019; Jahani et al., 2020). It has been shown that theta and beta activity in  
18 medial frontal cortex are both sensitive to performance feedback and reward (Cohen et al. 2007;  
19 Marco-Pallares et al. 2007), whereas consciously perceived movement error elicits theta and  
20 beta/alpha bands responses in different cortical regions (Torrecillos et al., 2014; Alayrangues et al.,  
21 2019). Beta-band activity during movement preparation and after movement is differently  
22 modulated by movement-execution error (Torrecillos et al., 2015). Furthermore, the role of  
23 oscillations in each frequency band is contingent on the brain area where they propagate. For  
24 example, beta-band activity in medial frontal areas is involved in cognitive control of movement,  
25 while beta-band activity in lateral sensorimotor areas is modulated in relation to implicit  
26 sensorimotor adaptation (Jahani, et al., 2020).

27

28 These findings offer a glimpse of the complexity of the overall picture, but also points to limitations  
29 intrinsic to several of the evoked studies. First, searching for univocal correspondences between  
30 specific sensory, motor or cognitive processes and specific space-frequency-time oscillatory activities  
31 may well be suboptimal, and will always give only fragmentary descriptions. Second, and perhaps  
32 even more fundamentally, interpretations regarding the specific functional roles of features  
33 identified in average data may be questionable because these features may not even exist in the  
34 individual trials. Typically, the slow fluctuations (ERD/ERS) visible in trial-averaged power profiles  
35 cannot be detected in individual trials (e.g. Tallon-Baudry & Bertrand, 1996; Naik et al., 2021); they  
36 do emerge as new and abstract features from smoothing out inter-trial fluctuations, treated as  
37 uninformative noise. But, concretely, behavior is performed in each individual trial, and also varies  
38 from trial to trial. Hence, variability in single trial oscillatory activity is not only mere noise, and its  
39 analysis may reveal neural mechanisms that are not apparent in cross-trial averages. Driven by this  
40 idea, previous studies could successfully correlate inter-trial behavioral and electrophysiological  
41 variations using linear models on single trial data (Cohen & Cavanagh, 2011; Torrecillos et al., 2018;  
42 Lofredi et al., 2019). However, these studies still suffer from the limitation we point out above, as  
43 they focus on oscillatory activity observed in a given brain region, frequency band and trial epoch,  
44 and thus offer fragmentary views. It is unlikely that sensory, motor or cognitive operations are

1 implemented and revealed by individual, wildly fluctuating oscillatory activity, localized in space,  
2 time and frequency.

3 Oscillations at different locations, times, and frequencies are likely to be comodulated by modes of  
4 system's level collective dynamics, rather than constituting collections of completely independent  
5 processes (Atasoy et al., 2016). It has been proposed, for instance, that oscillations can be used to  
6 selectively gate information transfer between neuronal populations even when they are irregular  
7 and stochastic, as long as their irregular fluctuations coordinate across time, space and frequency  
8 (Palmigiano et al., 2017). Such coordination arises in a self-organized manner, as the system is  
9 constrained by global structural and dynamical determinants to sample lower-dimensional manifolds  
10 within the high-dimensional space of configurations it could theoretically access if its parts were  
11 separately controlled (Bressler & Kelso, 2001; Pillai & Jirsa, 2017). Structured behavior along a task  
12 would thus just be associated to transient adaptations of system's ongoing trajectories on these  
13 manifolds, rather than to abrupt reconfigurations (Shine et al., 2019; Naik et al., 2021). These  
14 dynamical system views are akin to early proposals that evoked activity and networks are very  
15 similar to spontaneous fluctuation patterns (Kenet et al., 2003; Cole et al., 2014, Naik et al., 2021),  
16 possibly reflecting capability for probabilistic computations (Orban et al., 2016).

17 Here, we hypothesized that the fluctuations of single-trial oscillatory *elements* (power at a given  
18 space-frequency-time point) are tightly coordinated and that the structure of their interdependence  
19 network reflects an intrinsic coordination architecture that responds to changes in task constraints  
20 by subtle but nevertheless consistent topological reorganizations. To assess this idea, we analyzed  
21 EEG signals recorded during a motor adaptation task representative of the richness of possible  
22 oscillatory behaviors and functional mechanisms of cognitive and automatic movement control and  
23 monitoring (see Jahani et al., 2020). To capture the collective dynamics of the elements in a global  
24 state space, we defined high-dimensional single trial oscillatory *portraits* containing all individual  
25 oscillatory elements of a given trial. In agreement with our hypothesis, we found that each single-  
26 trial oscillatory element could reliably be predicted based on the knowledge of the other ones.  
27 Hence, the fitted models described a form of "effective connectivity" (EC; Friston, 1994; 2011)  
28 between the oscillatory elements, quantifying mutual directed influences, beyond simple  
29 correlations. These networks of interdependencies between oscillatory elements thus provide the  
30 ultimate description of the complex patterns of coordinated dynamics underlying the  
31 implementation of behavior.

32

33 We found that the EC between oscillatory elements had a general structure that remained stable  
34 across the different task conditions, likely to be intrinsic (Friston 1994) and reflect dynamical  
35 constraints imposed by structural connectivity (Mostame et al., 2021, Honey et al., 2007). However,  
36 the EC network exhibited fine adaptations in their detailed topology in response to changes in the  
37 task constraints, as a potential mechanism underlying rich and flexible task-condition-specific  
38 behavioral adjustments. Trials performed in the different task conditions could be reliably  
39 distinguished based on these specific EC network reorganizations, detectable through the  
40 observation of fluctuating single trials portraits. In addition, we found that these portrait fluctuations  
41 were also coupled with fine trial-to-trial variations in movement kinematics. For instance, movement  
42 error directly modulates the degree of interdependence between oscillatory elements. In other

1 words, the EC network is fine-tuned as an effect of integrating movement error information, with a  
2 deficit in this fine-tuning being associated with unsuccessful behavior.

3

4 Altogether, our findings suggest that visuomotor cognition and behavior are supported by collective  
5 brain states regulating the integrated dynamics of distributed sub-systems, rather than by a  
6 multitude of segregated oscillatory processes.

7

8

## 9 **Results**

10

### 11 **Capturing inter-trial variability of single-trial elements via oscillatory portraits**

12

13 EEG was recorded in volunteers performing a motor adaptation task in which they had to “shoot”,  
14 without stopping, a visual target, making ballistic reaching movements (Figure 1A). When successful,  
15 the target exploded making the sound of a bottle of champagne being uncorked. The target was  
16 small enough to make it not trivial to touch it, and participants indeed missed it about half of the  
17 time (this, under baseline usual conditions – *NR* trials). Moreover, making the task even more  
18 challenging, the visual feedback of the hand (a cursor) was rotated relative to its actual position for  
19 short series of 4 trials (Figure 1A). The visual rotation was unexpectedly (re)introduced, so that on  
20 the first trial (*Ct* trials) of each “rotation-trial-series” participants saw the cursor going in the wrong  
21 direction, and they systematically missed the target. Nevertheless, as soon as they knew that the  
22 visual rotation was turned on, they were able to counter it by applying a cognitive strategy. As a  
23 matter of fact, before the experimental session, we explained them in detail the nature of the visual  
24 perturbation, and how they could exactly compensate for it by aiming at a neighboring target (*RS*  
25 trials). Still during these trials, the discrepancy between the visual and proprioceptive information  
26 activated automatic updating of the sensorimotor map (implicit sensorimotor adaptation), which  
27 was testified by the slight movement deviations (“after-effects” in the direction opposite to the  
28 visual rotation) visible upon the removal of the perturbation (*AR* trials).

29

30 In our analyses, we distinguished between the trials in which participants successfully shot the target  
31 (*Hit*) from those in which they failed to do so (*Miss*). We considered the following 6 categories of  
32 trials: *Ct-Miss*, *RS-Miss*, *RS-Hit*, *AR-Miss*, *NR-Miss* and *NR-Hit*.

33

34 The signal recorded by an EEG electrode applied on the scalp is a mixture of multiple signals arising  
35 from different sources, neuronal or not. Here, we used temporal independent component analysis  
36 (ICA) as a blind source separation technique and identified in each participant four independent  
37 components (IC) capturing respectively oscillatory activity of the following four cortical areas: the  
38 frontal medial cortex (IC1), the parietal medial cortex (IC2), and the anterior and posterior banks of  
39 the central sulcus, left (IC3) and right (IC4). Each IC is characterized by a time-invariant topography  
40 (spatial filter) and an activation time-course. Figure 1C presents the topographies of the four ICs  
41 (obtained by averaging the topographies of the IC identified for each participant). The activation  
42 time-courses of the ICs can be subjected to the same analyses as usual EEG signals. Figure 1D  
43 presents group-average (across trials and participants) spectrograms of the time course of IC1  
44 (frontal medial region) for two different categories of trials, *RS-Miss* trials (right) in which  
45 participants applied the cognitive strategy to counter the visual rotation and *NR-Miss* trials (left) in

1 which they did not have to, as the visual display was not altered (see Figure 1A). Overlaid on the  
2 spectrograms, the horizontal and vertical dashed lines indicate respectively the frequency bands ( $\theta$ ,  
3  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ) and the movement periods (*Pre*, *During*, *Post*) of interest. We originally analyzed the present  
4 EEG data set using conventional trial averaging procedures (Jahani et al., 2020). We found that beta-  
5 band activity of the frontal medial cortex was selectively attenuated during movement planning  
6 when participants applied the re-aiming strategy. Figure 1E shows the group-average beta power  
7 profile of IC1 (frontal medial cortex) for the *RS-Miss* and *NR-Miss* trials. One can see that beta power  
8 is significantly decreased during the *Pre* trial-epoch for the *RS-Miss* trials, in which participants  
9 applied the cognitive strategy, relative to the *NR-Miss* trials, in which they did not have to, as there  
10 was no visual rotation. Similar analyses has been conducted for power at other possible  
11 combinations of brain location, frequency and time period (Tan et al., 2014; Torrecillos et al., 2015;  
12 Alayrangues et al., 2019).

13  
14 However, interpretations regarding the specific functional roles of features identified in averaged  
15 data may be questionable because these features may not even exist in the individual trials. Here,  
16 the slow fluctuations (ERD/ERS) clearly visible in trial-averaged time-frequency maps (Figure 1D) do  
17 not exist at the single trial level (Figure 2A); they are in fact subtended by short-lived oscillatory  
18 bursts (Murthy et al., 1992; Tallon-Baudry et al., 1996; Feingold et al., 2015) and do emerge as new  
19 features from smoothing out inter-trial fluctuations. We can provide a coarse-grained description of  
20 each of these single-trial spectrograms by averaging power over specified trial epochs (*Pre*, *During*  
21 and *Post* movement) and different frequency bands ( $\theta$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ). Each of these averages provides the  
22 value of what we call an *oscillatory element* of the trial, and quantifies power observed at one of the  
23 brain regions (IC1, IC2, IC3 or IC4), in one of the frequency bands ( $\theta$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ) and during one of the  
24 trial epochs (*Pre*, *During* and *Post*). This results in 48 oscillatory elements –one for each possible  
25 combination of space, frequency and time– for each trial (see Figure 2B).

26  
27 To capture the potential interdependence between the single-trial oscillatory elements, we  
28 combined them into 48-dimensional vectors providing synthetic and multivariate characterization of  
29 each trial, which we named *single-trial oscillatory portraits* (see Figure 2B). The values of the  
30 oscillatory elements associated with the illustrative trials in Figure 2A are represented within colored  
31 matrices (portrait chunks) next to the corresponding single-trial spectrograms. Even if the coarse-  
32 graining in time and frequency smooths out some of the variability, the wide intertrial differences  
33 are still visible from these element matrices. As a result of this variability, the ranges of values  
34 observed for a given oscillatory element in the different categories of trials largely overlap. We can  
35 precisely define this degree of overlap by evaluating the probability that single-trial values of a  
36 considered element also fall within a common reference range of fluctuation (*Pre*-period for success  
37 trials, see *Materials and Methods*). As shown by Figure S1, these overlaps were always above ~80%.  
38 How do these large overlaps in the distribution lead to statistically significant differences between  
39 trial categories at the level of average comparisons?

40  
41 To compute averages and compare them it is necessary to have access to many observations of  
42 fluctuating oscillatory elements, to sufficiently sample their distribution. However, the question we  
43 want to ask here is whether an observer having access to just *one* observation of an oscillatory  
44 element could successfully infer (or not) the category of the trial within which the considered  
45 element has been observed. Such an observer (that could represent, for instance, a machine

1 learning classifier attempting trial category discrimination, or even another reader neuronal  
2 population, analyzing oscillatory activity during actual behavior), to perform the inference, should  
3 compute the likelihood that the observed element comes from one or the other distribution,  
4 associated to different trial categories. However, these likelihoods would be very similar for most  
5 trial categories, as the probability overlap between distributions is so large. Because of these  
6 overlaps, the inverse problem of inferring which distribution the observed element was sampled  
7 from becomes thus extremely difficult, if not impossible, to solve.

8

9 We could however formulate the hypothesis that the fluctuations of individual oscillatory elements  
10 are not independent (as expected in a scenario in which collective system's dynamics is jointly  
11 comodulating many elements). In this case, fluctuations would not be suppressed but would occur  
12 over restricted manifolds of element interdependence and these manifolds may be slightly different  
13 for different categories of trials and behaviors. An observer could thus discriminate which type of  
14 behavior has occurred by decoding over which manifold the observed oscillatory portrait (fluctuating  
15 in many dimensions) is located. Individual elements could still fluctuate over overlapping ranges, as  
16 the different manifolds specific for different trial categories would have overlapping projections over  
17 the unique dimension of variation of each element. However, in the high-dimensional space of the  
18 entire oscillatory portraits, the different manifolds could still be distinguishable.

19

20 To investigate the plausibility of this hypothesis we proceeded in two steps. First, we verified that,  
21 indeed, elements were inter-dependent between them and that, therefore, the fluctuations of  
22 oscillatory portraits did occur on lower-dimensional subspaces of their overall 48-dimensional space  
23 (Figure 3). Second, we showed that the subspaces of co-fluctuation were not identical for different  
24 trial categories (Figure 4), so that a classifier can learn to distinguish them, when inspecting whole  
25 oscillatory portraits rather than individual oscillatory elements one at a time (Figure 5).

26

27

### 28 **Oscillatory elements within portraits are functionally and effectively connected**

29

30 As a first step, we studied the correlations between the fluctuations of the different oscillatory  
31 elements. Each single-trial oscillatory portrait was considered as a single point within a high-  
32 dimensional (48-D) space and we sought for structured covariances within the cloud of points  
33 formed by all of them. Figure 3A shows two representative scatter plots of one oscillatory element  
34 vs another one:  $\langle \text{IC3, Pre, } \alpha \rangle$  versus  $\langle \text{IC3, Pre, } \beta \rangle$  on the left, and  $\langle \text{IC1, Pre, } \alpha \rangle$  versus  $\langle \text{IC1, Pre, } \beta \rangle$   
35  $\rangle$  on the right. These two scatter plots display markedly positive linear correlations between alpha  
36 and beta powers in the left sensorimotor (IC3) and medial frontal (IC1) cortices during the pre-  
37 movement period (significant Pearson correlation values:  $\sim 0.4$ ,  $p = 0.0003$  for IC1 and  $\sim 0.6$  for IC3,  $p$   
38  $= 0.0001$ ). Figure 3B displays the complete correlation matrix between the 48 oscillatory elements.  
39 Besides the two examples of Figure 3A, many other pairs of elements were positively correlated  
40 (correlation matrix averaged over various bootstraps in Figure 3A - see Materials and Methods).  
41 Correlations between different frequency bands were particularly strong within brain regions (ICs)  
42 and trial epochs. Nevertheless, significant positive correlations (and a few rare negative correlations)  
43 were also found between elements of different ICs and trial epochs. The observed correlation matrix  
44 was thus rather dense, confirming that the different oscillatory elements are linked by a *functional*  
45 *connectivity (FC)*; that is, they fluctuate in a coordinated manner.

1

2 In a second step going beyond correlational observations, we attempted to predict the fluctuations  
3 of one oscillatory element based on the fluctuations of the others within the same portrait.  
4 Prediction requires the choice of a model; for the sake of simplicity, we chose simple Linear Mixed  
5 Models. Such a choice corresponds to modelling the manifolds of element covariation as  
6 hyperplanes within the 48-dimensional space of portraits. Such hyperplanes may be differently  
7 oriented for different trial categories. However, we initially studied the general element  
8 interdependence structure combining observation from trials of any type together. We thus  
9 performed multivariate regression to predict the values of each single-trial element based on those  
10 of the 47 other entries of the same single-trial oscillatory portrait (Figure 3C; see *Materials and*  
11 *Methods*). The resulting matrix of model coefficients is shown in Figure 3D. Such matrix of *effective*  
12 *connectivity* (EC) –as now directed and predictive (Friston, 1994)– revealed patterns of  
13 interdependence that are reminiscent of motifs within the correlational FC matrix of Figure 3B. The  
14 EC matrix was however much sparser.

15

16 We can adopt an alternative representation for these EC connections, in which each of the 48  
17 oscillatory elements corresponds to a network node. In Figure 3E, the nodes are colored according  
18 to the corresponding IC, with darker or lighter hues according to the trial epoch and are labeled  
19 according to the frequency band. Strong directed links of EC directed influence are represented by  
20 thick lines colored according to the source node, while weaker ones are shown in light gray. We  
21 evaluated how well the single-trial values of an element could be predicted based on the values of  
22 the other elements of the same single-trial portrait. We used a cross-validation approach in which  
23 prediction performance is assessed on data that were not used to fit the model (see *Materials and*  
24 *Methods*). Figure 3F summarizes the achieved performance for each of the 48 oscillatory elements,  
25 together with the scatter plots of the actual against the predicted values for two representative  
26 oscillatory elements. The cross-validated average values ranged from  $\sim 0.2$  (for element  $\langle \text{IC4, Dur, } \theta \rangle$ )  
27 up to  $\sim 0.7$  (for element  $\langle \text{IC3, Pre, } \beta \rangle$ ). These results support our intuition that oscillatory  
28 portraits are entities characterized by a strong internal interdependence from which individual  
29 element fluctuations can be reliably predicted.

30

31 Although the web of EC links was dense, the strongest connections formed characteristic clusters  
32 that tended particularly to link together oscillatory elements of the same region (IC), trial epoch and  
33 frequency-band. Such visual impression was confirmed by quantitative analyses of a network  
34 connectivity feature known as *homophily* (McPherson et al. 2001). A network is considered  
35 homophilic if nodes of a certain type tend to connect with nodes of a similar type with a probability  
36 greater than chance. In our network, every oscillatory element node had three types of labels: a  
37 space label (from which IC it was recorded); a time label (from which task epoch); and a frequency  
38 label (at which frequency band). Testing for homophily corresponds thus to verifying whether the  
39 strength of connections between nodes with a same (or different) label values is enhanced (or  
40 reduced) with respect to a null model in which labels have been shuffled across nodes but  
41 connectivity wiring was maintained (see *Materials and Methods*). We thus performed in Figure S2  
42 separate quantifications for the three types of space, time and frequency homophily. In Figure S2A,  
43 addressing space homophily, the two lines show the average weight with which an element  
44 measured at an IC is connected with elements at another IC (independent of the trial epoch and  
45 frequency band of the considered source and target elements), for the actual EC network and



1 surrogate space label-shuffled networks. Figure S2A reveals a marked spatial homophily (73% of the  
2 total weights are contained in spatially homophilic nodes), as there are peaks for connection  
3 strength between nodes within the same IC and, for connections between nodes at different ICs, the  
4 connectivity strength remains well below chance-level from the surrogate model. Similarly, time  
5 (85%) and frequency (62%) homophily was observed (Figure S2B and S2C respectively), even if  
6 frequency homophily was less precise, with the appearance of weaker peaks of enhanced cross-  
7 frequency connectivity, possibly reflecting cross-frequency couplings (Canolty et al., 2010).  
8 Therefore, the observed network of EC interdependency is neither homogeneous, with oscillatory  
9 elements equally connected independently from their labels, nor extremely specific with  
10 connections strictly confined with different regions, time epochs and frequency bands completely  
11 independent from each other. It is homophilic, a network configuration between complete order  
12 and complete disorder, indicative of the complexity of the oscillatory inter-dependence architecture  
13 (see *Discussion*).

14  
15

### 16 **Effective connectivity between oscillatory elements is similar yet unique for different trial** 17 **categories**

18

19 We have demonstrated that individual oscillatory elements fluctuate in a coordinated manner and  
20 identified the structure of the EC network estimated from the trials of all the different categories  
21 pooled together. The question that arises then is whether and how this pattern of interdependence  
22 (and the corresponding co-fluctuation hyperplane in the space of oscillatory portraits) is altered by  
23 changes in the task conditions. To investigate this question, we repeated the EC fitting and model-  
24 performance quantification steps described above, separately for each category of trials. Figure 4A  
25 presents the EC networks for the six trial categories, *NR-Hit*, *NR-Miss*, *RS-Hit*, *RS-Miss*, *Ct-Miss* and  
26 *AR-Miss*. The different networks were highly similar between them and with the general EC fitted  
27 over all trial categories pooled together, in that they all exhibited strong homophily, as shown by  
28 prominent clusters of strong connections between nodes of the same region (IC), frequency band  
29 and trial epoch (Figure 3E). We quantified the similarity between the networks by measuring the  
30 Pearson Correlation CC of their adjacency matrix with the one of the pooled EC. All these  
31 correlations were significant and of the order of  $CC \approx 0.7$  (*AR-Miss*: 0.69, *Ct-Miss*: 0.69, *NR-Miss*:  
32 0.68, *RS-Miss*: 0.67, *NR-Hit*: 0.67, *RS-Hit*: 0.72), denoting large overlap. Finally, we also compared  
33 relative variation in the three kinds of homophily  $\Delta H\%$  (see *Materials and Methods*) with trial  
34 categories as compared to the pooled EC. Interestingly, we found a decrease in spatial, spectral and  
35 temporal homophily for three *Miss* trial categories: *Ct-Miss*: (-9.05%, -4.01%, -9.67%); *NR-Miss*: (-  
36 3.59%, -6.24%, -5.29%) and *RS-Miss*: (-11.66%, -8.92%, -12.53%). However, in contrast, we find  
37 an increase in spatial, spectral and temporal homophily for the two *Hit* categories: *NR-Hit*:  
38 (8.2%, 11.16%, 0.26%) and *RS-Hit*: (13.24%, 9.86%, 8.23%). An increase in the homophily for  
39 successful trial categories may indicate an overall increase in structure, whereas decrease in the  
40 homophily may indicate an overall increase in randomness of the EC matrix. The *AR-Miss*  
41 however showed a mixed trend with an increase in spatial (+2.01%) and temporal (+17.1%)  
42 homophily but a decrease in spectral (-1.76%) homophily.

43

1 Are these subtle differences sufficiently distinctive to separate the specific manifold of element co-  
2 fluctuation for different trial categories? A model trained on trials of category A can be tested on  
3 trials of category B to assess how well its prediction performance generalizes from A to B (see  
4 *Materials and Methods*). The more similar the underlying statistical interdependence structure for  
5 trial categories A and B, the better the prediction generalizes. Such cross-training prediction  
6 approach is not dissimilar in spirit from *representational similarity analysis* (Kriegeskorte et al.,  
7 2008), an approach previously used to identify brain regions whose selectivity and coding properties  
8 are concordant or discordant depending on whether their response to a given set of stimuli is similar  
9 or dissimilar. Here, we apply a related similarity analysis not to the activity patterns themselves, but  
10 to the models that generate them and their co-fluctuations (see *Discussion*). The results of this cross-  
11 training prediction analysis are shown in Figure 4B, which gives the average prediction performance  
12 (correlation between actual and predicted values) for the different ordered pairs of trial categories:  
13 the classifier is trained on the first category and tested on the second one. As expected, the best  
14 cross-prediction performances were achieved when the training and the testing trial categories were  
15 the same (entries on the diagonal of the cross-training prediction matrix). However, despite a slight  
16 drop in performance, correlations between actual and predicted values remained significant for all  
17 other cross-prediction pairs (off-diagonal entries in Figure 4B).

18

19 Figure S3 presents how well the single-trial values of each individual element was predicted from the  
20 values of the others, for all trial categories confounded (top row), as well as for each category  
21 separately. As for all trial categories regrouped, the category-specific EC models achieved good  
22 prediction performances. The values of the cross-validated correlations between the actual and the  
23 predicted values and their patterns of variation over the different individual oscillatory elements  
24 were highly similar across trial categories.

25

26 In conclusion, all category-specific EC models could reliably predict single-trial fluctuations of the  
27 oscillatory elements for any other trial category, suggesting that they shared a backbone of common  
28 predictive links. Still, the best predictions were achieved when the training and the testing categories  
29 were the same, meaning that the category-specific EC networks and associate hyperplanes of co-  
30 fluctuation also presented distinguishing traits. In other words, the internal interdependence  
31 structure of the single-trial fluctuating oscillatory portraits was subtly and adeptly tuned in response  
32 to the changes in the task conditions.

33

34

### 35 **Oscillatory portraits reliably discriminate task conditions**

36

37 The EC networks computed for the different trial categories (Figure 4A) achieved the best (cross-  
38 validated) prediction when the training and the testing categories were the same, indicating trial  
39 category specific distinct features despite their similarities (Figure 4B). This suggests that single-trial  
40 portraits may include the fingerprints of different statistical generative models, through which trial  
41 categories can be discriminated from single-trial observations. As represented schematically in  
42 Figure 5A, we constructed supervised linear mixed models to pairwise discriminate between trial  
43 categories. We compared the cross-validated generalization performance achieved by classifiers  
44 using oscillatory portraits as input (left), with classifiers using oscillatory elements (right; see  
45 *Materials and Methods*).

1  
2 Linear classifiers output continuous-valued probabilities indicating the accuracy of the classification  
3 given the provided input information. To decide whether a trial belongs to either one of the  
4 categories, we compared the output probability with an arbitrary decision threshold. This situation is  
5 typical in pairwise-discrimination paradigms and is usually addressed by evaluating performance in  
6 terms of a *Receiver Operating Characteristic* (ROC) curve analysis (Green & Swets, 1966). In this  
7 analysis, the decision threshold is systematically varied from a minimum to a maximum value, and  
8 the corresponding fractions of misclassified false positives (FP) and correctly classified true positives  
9 (TP) trials are plotted as parametric curves. Random-like decisions lead to ROC curves sitting along  
10 the diagonal of the FP and TP rates plane (as if the decision was taken by tossing an unbiased coin).  
11 However, any significant displacement of the curve toward the upper left corner of the FP and TP  
12 rates indicates better-than-chance discrimination, so that the Area Under the ROC Curve (AUC) can  
13 be taken as an overall quantification of performance across the spectrum of possible decision  
14 thresholds (see *Material and Methods*).

15  
16 Figure 5B presents the AUC scores for trial-category separations achieved by classifiers based on  
17 oscillatory portraits (Figure 5A, left). Discrimination performance (AUC scores) varied across pairs of  
18 trial categories. Nevertheless, in all cases, linear classifiers operating on single-trial oscillatory  
19 portraits achieved above chance level discrimination (Figure 5B). We also assessed the trial-category  
20 discriminations performed by linear classifiers based on individual oscillatory elements vs classifiers  
21 based on oscillatory portraits (Figure 5A). The box plots in Figure 5B contrast the average AUC (over  
22 all pairwise separations) obtained based on oscillatory portraits versus individual oscillatory  
23 elements. The AUC for the portrait-based classifiers (median: 0.62) were significantly (two-sided  
24 sample t-test, 50.05,  $p < 0.0001$ ) higher than those for the individual element-based classifiers  
25 (median: 0.52). Figure 5C presents results for the discrimination between *NR-Miss* and *RS-Hit* trials,  
26 which was the best achieved pairwise trial-category separation. The performance by the portrait-  
27 based classifier is shown along with the one obtained with the model based on the most  
28 discriminative element  $\langle IC4, Dur, \beta \rangle$ . The ROC curves for the two classifiers can be compared to the  
29 chance-level ROC curves obtained when trial-category labels are shuffled.

30  
31 Figure 5 shows that trial-categories can be discriminated based on the information conveyed by  
32 oscillatory portraits but does not tell *how* the trained portrait-based classifiers manage to extract  
33 this information. One can get some insight by inspecting the coefficients of the trained classifiers.  
34 For a given pairwise discrimination case, different portrait elements will weigh differently; that is,  
35 their fluctuations will affect the classifier decision output differently. Furthermore, some of the  
36 coefficients are positive and other negative, indicating the direction of the influence on the  
37 fluctuations of each given element. The coefficients of all the fitted pairwise discrimination linear  
38 classifiers are summarized in Figure S4. These coefficients specify the orientation of a hyperplane  
39 separating the typical subspaces of fluctuation for portraits of the two trial categories to separate.  
40 The sign and magnitude of these coefficients provide some information on the importance of  
41 individual elements in inferring the trial category, and on the direction of their relative variation  
42 between the two discriminated conditions. For instance, element  $\langle IC4, Dur, \beta \rangle$  as also shown in Fig  
43 5C, had a strong negative coefficient for the classifier discriminating category *NR-Miss* and *RS-Hit*,  
44 corresponding to the fact that oscillation  $\langle IC4, Dur, \beta \rangle$  was smaller in trials of the *RS-Hit* type than of  
45 the *NR-Miss* type. Similarly,  $\langle IC1, Dur, \theta \rangle$  also showed a significant negative coefficient indicating

1 that frontal theta power during movement was lower for *RS-Hit* as compared *NR-Miss* as supported  
2 by literature that frontal theta increases with sensorimotor prediction and kinematic error (Arrighi et  
3 al., 2016). Consecutively,  $\langle IC1, Dur, \theta \rangle$  showed a strong positive coefficient for all comparisons  
4 against *Ct-Miss* suggesting that frontal theta power was higher for *Ct-Miss* compared to all trial  
5 categories and this is consistent with the observation that the subjects experienced the highest error  
6 in *Ct-Miss*. However, the interpretation of these coefficients was not always as easy, as coefficients  
7 themselves are degenerate. The same discrimination indeed could be performed by classifiers with  
8 different coefficients if they specify the same separation hyperplane. As previously shown,  
9 oscillatory elements were inter-dependent (Figures 3 and 4), therefore their values could be  
10 expressed as linear combinations of other elements. By replacing within the discriminating linear  
11 model an element variable by a corresponding linear combination of other elements variables, one  
12 would obtain by construction an equivalent classifier, but with different coefficients. This  
13 degeneration of classifier coefficients serves as a reminder that the discrimination between trial  
14 categories is always performed in terms of the entire high-dimensional oscillatory portrait, even  
15 when some individual coefficients are larger than others in a specific instance of implemented  
16 model.

17  
18

### 19 **Oscillatory portraits predict intertrial behavioral variations**

20

21 We have demonstrated that single-trial oscillatory portraits (in contrast to single-trial elements)  
22 carry information sufficient to discriminate trial categories reliably. Individual trials differed also in  
23 fine details of the movement kinematics, such as precise movement error and duration, since, even  
24 within a specific trial category, such features could fluctuate from trial-to-trial. We asked therefore  
25 whether fluctuations of oscillatory portraits could also predict these detailed fluctuations of  
26 behavioral features, beyond a discrimination between categories of behavior.

27

28 For this aim, we used linear mixed models (see *Materials and Methods*) receiving as input single-trial  
29 oscillatory portraits and producing as output continuous-valued estimates of trial-by-trial movement  
30 error or movement duration (Figure 6A; see *Materials and Methods* for exact definitions of the two  
31 behavioral features). Prediction performance was quantified by the Pearson's correlation between  
32 the actual and predicted values. Figure 6B presents the performances achieved for predicting  
33 movement error and duration for all trial categories confounded, whereas Figure 6C (top) provides  
34 the detail of the correlation values for the different trial categories separately. Figure 6C (bottom)  
35 shows representative scatter plots of predicted vs actual movement error and duration values for  
36 the trial category *NR-Hit*. For all categories of trials, the correlations between the actual and the  
37 predicted values were strongly significant and the mean squared error was significantly less as  
38 compared to their shuffled versions for both movement error and movement duration of all trial  
39 categories (all are listed in Table 1). The correlations were also higher than those obtained by using  
40 linear models based on individual oscillatory elements (Figure 6B). The best prediction for  
41 movement error was achieved for the *Ct-Miss* (0.51) and *RS-Hit* (0.47) trials, whereas the best  
42 prediction for movement duration for the *Ct-Miss* (0.39) and *RS-Hit* (0.39) trials.

43

44 The fact that portrait-based regression models achieved high and significant correlations for all trial  
45 categories taken separately demonstrates that the inter-trial behavioral fluctuations within each trial

1 category could be captured, and not only the broad average kinematics differences produced by the  
2 manipulation of the task condition. A possible explanation for this successful prediction is that a tight  
3 coupling exists between fluctuations of behavior, on one side, and fluctuations of oscillatory  
4 portraits over trial category-specific manifolds, on the other. To probe the plausibility of this  
5 hypothesis, EC networks must be extended to encompass influences from and to motor behavior  
6 itself.

7

8

9

10

11

12

### 13 **Widely distributed and dichotomous coupling between movement error/duration and oscillatory** 14 **portraits**

15

16 The observations we have just described suggest possible mutual directed influences between the  
17 oscillatory portraits and the movement kinematic features. We generalized therefore our EC analysis  
18 (so far applied to oscillatory elements only) by including behavioral measures (movement error and  
19 duration) as additional nodes in the EC networks. The behavior-augmented EC networks for the  
20 different trial categories are presented in Figure 7A. As in Figure 4, only strong (see *Materials and*  
21 *Methods*) links are shown and colored according to their source node. Various observations can be  
22 made about the organization of these networks.

23

24 First, the movement error node –and the movement duration node to the lesser extent– rather than  
25 being strongly coupled to only a few specialized hub nodes, sent diffuse coupling links to many  
26 oscillatory element nodes. For instance, as shown in Table S1, in the *RS-hit* condition, the movement  
27 error node sent one third of its connections to IC1 nodes, one third to IC3 nodes, and the remaining  
28 third to IC2 and IC4 nodes, displaying poor spatial preference. Analogously, in the *NR-hit* trials,  
29 movement error outgoing connections were spread across frequencies, with ~36% of them reaching  
30 theta nodes, ~27% alpha nodes and the remaining fraction equally split between beta and gamma  
31 nodes. Interestingly, both *Hit* trials showed poor spatial, spectral and temporal preferences, i.e.  
32 showed widespread connections across brain areas, frequencies and movement times.

33

34 Second, behavior-related nodes exhibit strong asymmetries between their outgoing and incoming  
35 connectivity. The movement error node influences the oscillatory portraits more than the oscillatory  
36 portrait influences the movement error, as revealed by a total out-strength (i.e. sum of all outgoing  
37 couplings; Figure 7B top) much larger than its total in-degree (i.e. sum of all incoming couplings;  
38 Figure 7B bottom, number of outgoing vs incoming connections are shown in Figure S5). The  
39 movement error node emanates the largest numbers of projections for *NR-Hit* and *RS-Hit* trial  
40 categories (Figure S5). The situation is inverted for the movement duration node, which is influenced  
41 by the oscillatory portraits more than vice versa, as revealed by an in-strength larger than the out-  
42 strength. The movement duration node receives most projections for *RS-Hit* and *AR-Miss* trial  
43 categories (Figure S5, T2).

44

1 Third, the connectivity of behavior-related nodes with oscillatory portraits is characteristically  
2 modulated by the trial category. Figure 7B shows in-strengths and out-strengths separated by trial  
3 categories (see the insets for all-trials pooled). During *Hit* trials (both *NR-Hit* and *RS-Hit* trials) the  
4 movement error maximally influences oscillatory portrait fluctuations (boosted out-degree) while  
5 the influence is substantially reduced during *Miss* trials, reaching a minimum for *RS-Miss* trials.  
6 Therefore, larger integration of information about movement error by the oscillatory element  
7 fluctuations is associated with successful behavior, which could possibly reveal, on the other side, a  
8 failure to integrate movement error information associated with unsuccessful behavior; *Miss* trials  
9 (see *Discussion*).

10

11 We also quantified the distribution of outgoing projections from the movement error node  
12 according to the spatial, temporal and spectral components (Table S1 and T2). Interestingly in *Ct-*  
13 *Miss* trial category which represents a large, unexpected kinematic error, movement error  
14 “regulates” predominantly the parietal and sensorimotor spatial component, notably, the  $\theta$   
15 spectral component in *Ct-Miss* in agreement with Arrighi et al. (2016). Another noteworthy  
16 observation was that the two *Hit* trial categories, *RS-Hit* and *NR-Hit*, not only had the highest  
17 number of outgoing projections (Tables S1 and S2), but also were more heterogeneous in their  
18 spatial and spectral targets, which supports our hypothesis that a successful behavior reflects  
19 greater integration of error information in the underlying network.

20

21

22

## 23 Discussion

24

25 Inter-trial power variability is not “just noise” but carries relevant information. This had already been  
26 shown by studies that successfully related behavioral and electrophysiological fluctuations at single-  
27 trial level (Cohen & Cavanagh 2011; Torrecillos et al., 2018; Lofredi et al., 2019). However, most of  
28 these studies focused on individual oscillatory processes at a time, with the aim of mapping what we  
29 called here “oscillatory elements” to specific computations. Here, we move from a different tenet,  
30 hypothesizing that oscillatory element in different brain regions, trial epochs and frequency bands  
31 do not occur independently from each other, but instead are closely and dynamically coordinated,  
32 and that studying them separately provides only fractionated views of the overall system’s operation  
33 in relation to the task performed.

34

35 By considering high-dimensional oscillatory portraits, instead of basic oscillatory elements, we  
36 significantly improved: (1) trial-category pairwise separation; and (2) prediction of single-trial  
37 movement kinematics (movement error and duration). We propose that this advancement is not  
38 only methodological; but also theoretical, as it is consistent with the idea that behavior is not  
39 controlled by a myriad of unrelated oscillatory processes, but instead by collective dynamical modes  
40 that manifest themselves exerting distributed co-modulations of oscillations at different locations  
41 (Atasoy et al., 2016; Kirst et al., 2016). We modeled here these inter-dependencies as networks of  
42 Effective Connectivity (EC) that were neither totally disconnected –revealing fully segregated  
43 oscillatory elements–, nor completely connected –revealing global integration–, but had a  
44 homophilic organization between order and disorder, providing a mixture of integration and  
45 segregation which has been denoted as “complexity” (Tononi et al., 1998) and which is necessary to

1 support rich system level emergent computation (Crutchfield, 2011). Such effective connectivity may  
2 in part stem from intrinsic constraints because of collective dynamics partially shaped by the  
3 underlying structural connectome (Honey et al., 2007), but not completely shaped by it because of  
4 nonlinearities and self-organization (Battaglia et al., 2012).

5  
6 The importance of anatomical structure in shaping the EC was confirmed by marked degree of  
7 spatial homophily, indicative of long-range correlations coexisting with stronger local interactions.  
8 Frequency and time homophily are above chance level as well. On one side, frequency homophily in  
9 EC reflects coordinated fluctuations at the same frequency across different regions and across all  
10 epochs and it may thus denote the coexistence of multiplexed communication-through-coherence  
11 channels (Vezoli et al., 2021). However, our EC measures statistical relations between power  
12 fluctuations rather than actual phase-coherence and hence we cannot confirm this hypothesis. On  
13 the other side, temporal homophily manifests a large degree of simultaneity in the fluctuations of all  
14 oscillatory elements in the same time-range, irrespective of their frequency and location. This may  
15 indicate that high broadband power boosting events tended to simultaneously occur across all  
16 regions, possibly linked to slow modulations by non-neural physiological processes (Yuan et al.,  
17 2013) or global activity patterns linked to fluctuating arousal (Raut et al., 2021). Another possible  
18 explanation of coordinated spectral changes across all frequencies is that the spectrum was globally  
19 modified, in all its aperiodic and periodic components, by physiological processes as alterations of  
20 the E-I (excitation-inhibition) balance (Gao et. al, 2017). Space, frequency and time homophilic  
21 connections did not represent however 100% of total connections, i.e. some non-homophilic  
22 connections still existed. Nonlinear dynamics indeed can coordinate activity of very distant regions,  
23 especially when correlation lengths and susceptibility diverge in proximity of a critical point (Byrne et  
24 al., 2022) thus reducing space specificity. Furthermore, it can smooth frequency specificity by  
25 mediating cross-frequency influences (Breakspear & Terry, 2002; Kasatkin et al., 2017; Dellavale et  
26 al., 2020). Finally, baseline fluctuations can interact with presented stimuli in a non-additive way (He,  
27 2013; Wainio-Theberge et al., 2021) so to affect the fluctuations of activity in temporally consecutive  
28 epochs and blur time-specificity of EC.

29

30 We did not explore here intrinsic connectivity in the resting state, but other studies have shown  
31 that, even at rest, oscillatory elements are widely coordinated (Mostame et al., 2021). Nevertheless,  
32 we revealed substantial similarity between EC networks across different trial categories, hinting at a  
33 possible intrinsic origin of the skeleton of homophilic connections that all these EC network share.  
34 We also propose that the detailed topology of EC was flexibly adapted around this shared scaffold to  
35 fine-tune to different behavioral demands (Figure 4) and as an effect of the integration of movement  
36 error information (Figure 7). Another possibility is that EC is preserved identically across all trial  
37 categories and that the trial-category specificity visible in Figure 4 was just a manifestation of  
38 overfitting. This is unlikely, however, as we determined our EC models using a cross-validation  
39 procedure that was robust against overfitting. Therefore, the observed EC and its modulations by  
40 the task constraints may reflect the fact that neural activity fluctuations are constrained to sample  
41 lower-dimensional manifolds within the higher-dimensional space of possible dynamic  
42 configurations (Gao & Ganguli, 2015; Gallego et al., 2017; Chauduri et al., 2019; Queralt et al., 2021),  
43 as an effect of dynamic and structural constraints, and that these manifolds are slightly deformed by  
44 behavior-related steering inputs. The manifold notion provides a geometric interpretation for the  
45 emergence of interdependence constraints. A point bound to move on a circle in a 2D plane, cannot

1 perform independent excursions along the horizontal or the vertical axes, as the need to remain  
2 tangent to the circular contour entails correlations in the vertical and horizontal displacements.  
3 Analogously, the fluctuations of two oscillatory elements (e.g. the betas in two different regions) will  
4 be correlated by the need to sample a manifold prescribed by the current dynamical mode. The  
5 manifolds constraining the co-fluctuations of oscillatory elements may be slightly morphed by  
6 sensory or endogenous biasing inputs steering the system's configuration as a whole, rather than  
7 individual elements so to distort the manifolds over which system's trajectories unroll. The  
8 directions locally tangent to the dynamic manifold would be thus different for different trial  
9 categories, and a classifier could learn to discriminate them, as we showed in Figure 5.

10

11 Beyond clear behavioral differences between trial categories, we also found that fine fluctuations of  
12 portraits on top of their trial category specific manifold were inter-related with fine trial-to-trial  
13 fluctuations in behavior itself. Indeed, even within a same category of trials, different trials may  
14 differ in their exact values of movement error and movement duration, and we showed that these  
15 fine variations as well could be predicted significantly from portraits (Figure 6). By augmenting EC  
16 networks to encompass as well directed influences from and to these behavioral features, we could  
17 identify very distinct dominant directions of coupling for movement error and duration. The  
18 duration-node was mostly subjected as a target of influences from the oscillatory elements, whereas  
19 the error-node acted mostly as a source of influence on the oscillatory elements. The dominant  
20 direction of the EC between movement error and the oscillatory elements fits with the idea that  
21 coordinated oscillations implement a movement monitoring system. Interestingly, the EC from the  
22 error movement node toward the oscillatory portraits was the strongest in the trials in which  
23 participants moved accurately enough to successfully shoot the target (*NR-Hit* or *RS-Hit* trials). In  
24 these trial categories, the projections from movement error to the oscillatory portraits were also  
25 more heterogenous across spatial and spectral components. This finding may reflect that, in these  
26 categories of trials, oscillatory fluctuations were more precisely modulated by error leading thus to  
27 more accurate movement. In contrast, this influence was considerably weaker in trials that were  
28 performed in the same conditions (no or an expected visual rotation), but in which participants  
29 missed the target (*NR-Miss* and *RS-Miss*). This may suggest that failure to integrate movement error  
30 information may cause –rather than just correlate with– movement trajectories missing the target.

31

32 The behavioral feature that is monitored depends on the experimental paradigm. Our task was  
33 designed so that slight deviations in movement direction were enough to miss the target, and the  
34 subject were instructed to focus on meeting the target. This may explain why lower prediction  
35 accuracy was observed for movement duration than for movement-direction error. Also, with our  
36 task design, movement duration was extremely controlled and was relatively less fluctuating than  
37 movement error. It would be interesting to conduct the same network analyses on data collected  
38 using an experimental paradigm where movement duration, and not movement error, is the critical  
39 kinematic parameter for task success. We may, in this case, observe similar monitoring connections  
40 for movement duration.

41

42 The influence of the movement-error node could spread over a multiplicity of different elements;  
43 the oscillatory coordination manifold itself –and thus the EC network as a whole– was modulated by  
44 the injection of information about movement error. The fact that the integration of behavior-related  
45 information shapes a manifold of oscillatory coordination rather than steering individual oscillatory



1 elements may have an important advantage: the system's dynamics remain, at least in part,  
2 unconstrained, if specific co-fluctuation patterns are respected. As such, the large residual variability  
3 of system's instantaneous configuration may serve as the device through which statistical inferences  
4 underlying sensorimotor control are neurally implemented, under the joint influence of prior  
5 expectations –encoded in baseline fluctuating activity– and external evidence (Körding & Wolpert,  
6 2006). Future studies could test this hypothesis by observing how the EC between portraits and  
7 behavioral features evolve to get progressively more structured through learning.

8

9 Finally, our “effective connectivity” approach has several limitations. A variety of effective  
10 connectivity notions have already been proposed in the literature, with various alternative  
11 definitions, ranging from generic directed forms of functional connectivity (Sporns, 2007; Battaglia et  
12 al., 2012) to descriptions of causal inter-relations based on models of varying complexity and  
13 degrees of abstraction (Aertsen et al., 1989; Friston et al., 1994; Gilson et al., 2020). The EC notion  
14 we propose here is based on a simple and completely linear mixed model formulation. Unlike more  
15 usual EC frameworks which do fit models directly on time-series of neural activity, we chose here to  
16 operate directly on tables of band-integrated power values. Our aim indeed was not so much to  
17 identify causal influences between distinct neural populations and brain regions, as in classic  
18 formulations of EC, but rather to highlight statistical interdependencies between neural features  
19 usually studied as if they were independent.

20

21 A second limitation is linked to the fact that we define oscillatory components averaging power over  
22 broad generic bands rather than tailoring the bands to subject-specific peaks. However, using broad  
23 bands guarantees that these subject-specific peaks are included in the integration range,  
24 irrespectively from their exact location. Furthermore, we allow ourselves to capture as well  
25 information from aperiodic components of the spectrum, which, although far from the main spectral  
26 peaks, still convey a great lore of physiologically relevant information useful to determine system's  
27 state (Donoghue et al., 2020). Finally, instantaneous frequencies can fluctuate stochastically across  
28 time and trials (Xing et al., 2012, Feingold et al., 2015), so that focusing on excessively narrow  
29 frequency bands may lead to excluding out-of-peak oscillatory events from the analysis which may  
30 be weaker but still carry relevant information about behavior (Douchamps et al., 2022). It is possible  
31 that superior predictive performance could be achieved by a better characterization of fluctuating  
32 oscillatory bursts beyond simply broadly integrating over them.

33

34 A third limitation of our approach could be then its linearity, approximating manifolds of covariance  
35 as simple hyperplanes, while they could be generally non-linear and curved. In the future,  
36 topological data analyses approaches could be used to extract the more general topological  
37 structure of the observed point-clouds (Carlsson et al., 2005) in oscillatory portraits space and  
38 attempt superior prediction and discrimination based on robust and invariant metrics of topological  
39 differences.

40

41 To conclude, why do predictions based on portraits outperform predictions based on individual  
42 elements? We propose here that this superior performance stems from the fact that oscillatory  
43 elements are parts of a distributed oscillating neural system which is internally coordinated and  
44 collectively monitors and controls behavior. Future extensions of this work could explore this  
45 hypothesis further to check whether the superior performance is due to the combination of *unique*

1 information that oscillatory elements separately convey; or to *redundancy* between elements,  
2 allowing to better separate signal from noise; or, yet, to their *synergy*, i.e. capacity to convey jointly  
3 information beyond the sum of the parts (Wibral et al., 2017). Detecting such synergies may provide  
4 indeed even stronger arguments in favor of a genuinely collective functioning of sensorimotor  
5 control systems.  
6

## 1 **Materials and methods**

2

3 **Participants:** A total of 24 healthy adults (8 females) aged 26.5 years (range 20-32 years) took part  
4 in the study. All participants were right-handed, as assessed by the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory  
5 (Oldfield RC, 1971) and all had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. All participants were free of  
6 known neurological or psychiatric disorders and gave informed consent according to a protocol  
7 approved by the Ethics Board of the Aix-Marseille University. They received monetary compensation  
8 for their participation.

9 **Experimental setup:** The experiment was performed using a robotic exoskeleton (KINARM, BKIN  
10 Technologies) that allows recording flexion and extension movements of the elbow and shoulder  
11 joints in the horizontal plane. The rotation of the visual feedback of the hand was applied using a  
12 semi-silvered mirror preventing direct vision of the hand. A cursor representing participants' index  
13 fingertip and the visual display were projected onto the same plane as the (invisible) hand.

14

15 **Task:** The task and the experimental protocol has been already described in detail by Jahani et al.  
16 (2020), who presented other results on the data recorded during the same experiment. Participants  
17 were required to make ballistic movements with no on-line corrections. The starting position was  
18 indicated by a 0.75cm diameter white circle located at the center of a large concentric blue ring (10  
19 and 14cm radius for the inner and outer contour, respectively). Throughout the experiment, three  
20 possible targets located 5cm away from the starting position were indicated as 0.3cm diameter dark  
21 gray circles: 50°, 80° or 110° from the 0° straight-ahead direction (Figure 1A). To initiate a trial,  
22 participants had to maintain their index finger in the start circle for 2000ms, after which they were  
23 warned to get ready (*Ready* signal): the start circle disappeared, and the target was indicated (one of  
24 the three targets turned from a gray to a white circle). Following a 1500ms delay, the target was  
25 filled in white ("turned on") indicating that the movement could be initiated (*Go* signal). Importantly,  
26 participants were clearly informed that they were not performing a reaction-time task and that they  
27 should take all the time they needed to prepare their movement. They were instructed to move  
28 through ("shoot") the target without stopping and to end their movement between the inner and  
29 the outer contour of the concentric ring. They were also required to move fast enough so that their  
30 hand moved 5cm away from the start position within 250ms, computed from the time when its  
31 speed exceeded 5cm/s. Participants received visual feedback about their performance at the time  
32 the finger-tip cursor reached 5cm away from the starting position, hitting or missing the target: (1)  
33 the target exploded when the movement was fast and accurate enough (target hit); (2) the target  
34 turned red when the movement was fast enough but not accurate enough (target miss); (3) the  
35 target turned green when the movement was too slow, independent of its accuracy. According to  
36 their verbal reports, participants enjoyed the explosion of the target, which was experienced as  
37 rewarding. In order to avoid on-line movement corrections, the finger-tip cursor was turned off  
38 when the hand crossed the 10cm radius inner contour of the ring. Upon movement end, the arm  
39 was passively brought back by the robot to the start position. The finger-tip cursor and the starting-  
40 position circle reappeared only when the hand was back in its initial position. Each trial lasted about  
41 7sec. Participants were asked to keep their eyes fixed on the aimed target throughout each trial.

42 **Experimental protocol:** The experiment was made up of two sessions (familiarization and  
43 experimental) run on two different days, during which participants performed two categories of

1 blocks: *Baseline* blocks comprising only unperturbed (no-rotation) trials and *Mixed* blocks in which a  
2 visual rotation (+30° or -30°) was applied in selected trials. In the *Mixed* blocks, short series of  
3 rotation trials alternated with no-rotation trials. The rotation-trial series counted 4 movements to  
4 the same target, whereas the number and targets of the no-rotation trials (*NR* trials) interleaved in  
5 between varied pseudo-randomly (at least 4 successive no-rotation trials) (Figure 1A). That is,  
6 participants could not predict when the rotation would be introduced. As a result, their hand  
7 trajectories were always clearly deviated and the target largely missed in the first trials of the  
8 rotation-trial series (*Ct* trials in Figure 1B). However, participants were informed (during the  
9 familiarization session) about the properties of the 4-rotation-trial series; that is, they knew the  
10 visual rotation would be applied in the three following trials as well (*RS* trials). Participants also knew  
11 that the rotation would be removed after 4 trials; that is, in the trials immediately following a 4-  
12 rotation-trial series (*AR* trials), they would have to quit the strategy and aim again directly at the  
13 target that was illuminated.

14 Each *Mixed* block comprised 18 rotation-trial series, and 96 no-rotation trials pseudo-randomly  
15 distributed in between, for a total of 168 trials. The direction of the rotation, clockwise (30°CW) or  
16 counterclockwise (30°CCW), applied in the rotation-trial series was kept constant throughout each  
17 *Mixed* block, but reversed for each new *Mixed* block. Half of the participants started with a 30°CW  
18 *Mixed* block, the other half with a 30°CCW *Mixed* block.

19 During the familiarization session, participants received verbal instructions about the general task  
20 requirements. They performed at least 4 blocks of 20 trials with no visual rotation, followed by a  
21 block in which, after 4 no rotation trials, the visual rotation (clockwise or counterclockwise,  
22 counterbalanced across participants) was unexpectedly introduced for 5 trials. After participants had  
23 experienced the visual rotation, the experimenter explained in detail the nature of the perturbation  
24 and how they could counter it by a strategy consisting in aiming at the (clockwise or  
25 counterclockwise) neighboring target (see Jahani et al., 2020). They performed two *Mixed* blocks,  
26 each followed by a 32-trial *Baseline* block (400 trials in total). EEG signals were not recorded during  
27 this session. During the experimental session, after a 64-trial *Baseline* block, participants performed  
28 four *Mixed* blocks, each followed by a 32-trial *Baseline* block (864 trials in total). EEG signals were  
29 recorded throughout the session. Between each block of trials (*Mixed* and *Baseline*) and after the  
30 84<sup>th</sup> trial of each *Mixed* block, a ~2min break was allocated. The preliminary session lasted about  
31 1h30min in total (including robot calibration) and the experimentation session (including EEG-  
32 electrode placement and location recording) lasted about 3h in total.

33 **Behavioral data recording:** Angular position and velocity data of the motor resolvers were collected  
34 at 1000Hz. Signals were down-sampled offline to 100Hz, and then filtered with a 2nd order zero-  
35 phase-shift low-pass Butterworth filter (cut-off frequency of 10Hz). Hand position and velocity were  
36 calculated from these angular data. Kinematic data were analyzed using custom routines written in  
37 MATLAB (MathWorks). Trials in which the hand was not maintained stable enough in the start-  
38 position during the delay between the Ready and Go signals (tangential velocity > 6cm/s), or in  
39 which the movement was initiated before the Go signal, were excluded from the analyses (~1% of  
40 trials). Movement onset was defined as the time when the tangential velocity exceeded 5cm/s. The  
41 movement offset corresponded to the time when tangential velocity fell below 5cm/s and remained  
42 below this value for at least 1500ms. To quantify kinematic errors, we computed the perpendicular

1 deviation, from the straight line that connects the starting position to the target, at maximum  
2 velocity. This measure quantifies error in initial movement-direction (feedforward component). To  
3 collapse data from different Mixed blocks, with opposite visual rotations (30°CW vs 30°CCW), we set  
4 the signs of the PD-vel values so that hand-path deviations in the direction of the visual rotation  
5 corresponded to positive values. Previously, we conducted preliminary analyses to test for  
6 differences between the movement errors induced by the two rotation directions. Movement  
7 duration was also calculated. Trials that were performed too slowly (~4%) were excluded from the  
8 analyses.

9 Note that, in our task, success was conditioned by accuracy in movement direction, and not in  
10 movement duration. Hence, in the current context, variations in movement direction constitute  
11 movement errors, whereas fluctuations in movement durations are not detrimental. Hence, we use  
12 “movement error” interchangeably with “movement-direction error”, unless specified.

13 **EEG data recording and preprocessing:** EEG activity was recorded continuously at 1024Hz using a  
14 64-channel Biosemi ActiveTwo system (BioSemi) referenced to the Common Mode Sense / Drive  
15 Right Leg (CMS/DRL) contact. Electrodes were embedded into an elastic cap and distributed over the  
16 scalp according to the extended 10-20 EEG system. The electrode offsets, the voltage differences  
17 between the CMS and each active electrode, were monitored to remain within  $\pm 20 \mu\text{V}$ . For each  
18 participant, electrode locations and nasion and preauricular points were recorded by an infrared  
19 camera (Rogue Research). Electro-oculographic (EOG) activity was recorded with surface electrodes  
20 placed near both outer canthi (saccades) as well as under and above the right orbit (blinks). EEG  
21 continuous signals were re-referenced to the average of all electrodes, filtered between 2-70Hz  
22 (Butterworth order 2) and down-sampled to 256Hz. Non-stereotypical artifacts (that cannot be  
23 captured by ICA; cf. Makeig et al., 1997; Delorme et al., 2007) were identified and rejected upon  
24 visual data screening. Further analyzes were run using the free and open-source software Fieldtrip  
25 (Oostenveld et al. 2011).

26 **Independent Components (ICs) identification:** The preprocessed EEG signals were cut into time-  
27 segments extending from -3.5 to +3.5ms with respect to outcome feedback, which covered  
28 approximately the complete trials, slightly variable in duration. The epoched EEG data were then  
29 submitted to ICA (*runica* algorithm). Time-frequency analyses were performed on the time-courses  
30 of the independent components (ICs). Single-trial signals were transformed in the time-frequency  
31 domain by convolution with the complex Morlet’s wavelets characterized by the ratio  $f_0/\sigma_f = 7$ , with  
32  $f_0$  ranging from 2 to 50Hz by steps of 0.5Hz. In order to calculate the event-related changes in beta  
33 power, the raw power data was log-transformed and then normalized relative to the average power  
34 calculated over all trials, as no clear baseline period could be defined during our task (Tan et al.  
35 2014, Torrecillos et al. 2015). For each participant and each time point (50ms bin), power was  
36 averaged over trials within a specific beta frequency band (individually selected; see below) and  
37 smoothed using a Gaussian Kernel with 7-time points (350ms) full-width at half maximum. Our goal  
38 was to identify for each participant four different ICs that would capture oscillatory activities from  
39 four functionally distinct cortical regions. First (IC1), the medial frontal cortex whose oscillatory  
40 activity is known to be sensitive to error and reward (ref.). Second (IC2), the medial parietal cortex,  
41 involved namely in high cognitive processes (ref.). Last (IC3 and IC4), the left and right sensorimotor  
42 cortices.

1 For the ICs selection, we proceeded in two steps (Alayrangues et al. 2019). First, we pre-selected ICs  
2 based on their topographies. For this step, we defined spatial regions of interest (ROIs); ICs that  
3 exhibited the largest weighting within one of these ROIs were pre-selected. To capture activity of the  
4 medial frontal cortex, we considered an ROI including electrodes F1-Fz-F2-FC1-FCz-FC2-C1-Cz-C2, for  
5 activity in the parietal medial region, we used an ROI encompassing electrodes C1-Cz-C2-CP1-CPz-  
6 CP2-P1-Pz-P2, and for the left and right sensorimotor regions, we used two ROI including electrodes  
7 C3-C5-CP1-CP3-CP5-P1-P3-P5 and C3-C5-CP1-CP3-CP5-P1-P3-P5, respectively. (For one participant,  
8 we selected an IC with maximum weighting at electrode FC3.) Then, in a second step, we examined  
9 the time-frequency representation of the time-courses of the pre-selected ICs to retain for each  
10 participant one IC of each category. For this step, within the trial-period going from 0 to 2.5 sec  
11 relative to outcome feedback, we examined the time-frequency representations of the time-courses  
12 of the pre-selected ICs computed over all trials. For each individual and category of ICs, we selected  
13 the IC (most of the time, only one IC per participant was preselected) exhibiting the largest power  
14 variance between 17 and 40 Hz.

15

16 **Oscillatory portraits:** Oscillatory portraits were defined as triplets of average power over frequency  
17 bands, cortical regions and time windows. That is, average power in each trial was defined as a  
18 vector of 48 values – each representing one of  $4 \times 4 \times 3$  triplets e.g. (f,r,t), where f = frequency band,  
19 r = cortical region and t = movement phase (Figure 2B).

20 The fixed frequency bands were defined over ranges commonly used in the literature a) theta (4-  
21 8Hz) b) alpha (9-12Hz) c) beta (13-35Hz) d) gamma (36-60Hz)

22

23 Cortical regions: The independent components of four EEG hotspots were considered for analysis:  
24 IC1, corresponding to medial frontal; IC2, corresponding to medial parietal; IC3, corresponding to  
25 contralateral (left) sensorimotor cortex; and IC4, corresponding to ipsilateral (right) sensorimotor  
26 cortex (see Alayrangues et al. 2019; Jahani et al.).

27

28 Movement phases:

29 The average power was measured at three phases of movement:

- 30 • Pre-movement (-1.5 seconds before the movement onset). This phase represents the planning of  
31 the movement.  
32 • During-movement. In trials locked to the hand movement, this phase lasts from 0 to trial and  
33 subject dependent movement duration and represents the movement execution.  
34 • Post-movement. In trials locked to the hand movement, this phase lasts from the end of the  
35 movement duration to 1.5 seconds after the movement offset. Post-movement phase is said to be  
36 relevant for indicating prediction errors for motor learning.

37

38 **Linear mixed models:** The trial-by-trial analysis was done by converting average power in every trial  
39 to oscillatory portraits as described in section *Oscillatory portraits*. These oscillatory portraits formed  
40 the predictor variables of the linear mixed model. The random effects were modeled as intercept  
41 with subject as categories i.e, every subject was fitted with a different estimate of intercept (random  
42 intercept model).

43

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{ij} + u_j + e_{ij}$$

$$e_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$$

1  
2

3 Where:  $Y_{ij}$  represented the predicted variable for subject  $j$  and trial number  $i$ ;  $\beta_0$  the common  
4 intercept and  $\beta_1$  the common slope for all subjects;  $X_{ij}$  the matrix of  $k$  components for subject  $j$  and  
5 trial  $i$ ;  $u_j$  the individual intercept for every subject; and  $e_{ij}$  the residual.

6 The package statsmodels was used to implement linear mixed models in python. The linear mixed  
7 model framework was used for the following analyses: deduce the effective connectivity network  
8 among the components and behavioral features; and pairwise separation of the trial categories.

9  
10  
11

12 **Pairwise separation of the trial categories:** Within each trial category defined by the experimental  
13 protocol (NR, Ct, RS and AR trials - see Figure 1A) we distinguished between the trials in which  
14 participants successfully shot the target (Hit) from those in which they failed to do so (Miss).  
15 Participants missed the target in all Ct trials and in the vast majority of the AR trials. Thus, for our  
16 analyses, we considered the following 6 categories of trials: NR-Miss, NR-Hit, RS-Miss, RS-Hit, Ct-  
17 Miss, AR-Miss.

18

19 Linear mixed models were used to check if pairwise classification of the trial categories can be  
20 performed reliably using the oscillatory portraits. In order to check this, for all pairwise comparisons  
21 (15), the trial category label was the predicted variable i.e in the equation (1),  $Y_{ij}$  represented the  
22 trial category labels for a given trial category pair. The prediction was trained over 100 bootstrapped  
23 iterations of training and testing sets using a stratified shuffle split (sklearn). The measure used to  
24 gauge the accuracy of prediction was area under the curve (AUC) for region operating curves (ROC).  
25 In order to check if the accuracy of the prediction was above the chance level, the same experiment  
26 was repeated with shuffled trial category labels.

27 To compare the efficacy of using portraits vs individual components in pairwise separation of the  
28 trial categories, separate classifiers were trained and tested either with portraits or an individual  
29 component. The accuracy distributions for all the task categories were pooled together and  
30 compared with a Mann-Whitney test.

31

32 **Cross training and testing paradigm:** The cross training and testing paradigm consisted in: first,  
33 training the classifier for a trial category  $X$ ; and, second, testing the performance of the classifier on  
34 all the other trial categories as well. The performance of the classifier trained and tested for the  
35 same trial category indicated how well a classifier captured the specificity of the trial category. The  
36 performance was measured as Pearson's correlation coefficient between the actual and predicted  
37 values of the dependent variable (effective connectivity). The performance of the classifier trained  
38 for a trial category  $X$  but tested for the trial category  $Y$  indicated how well the classifier generalized  
39 over the trial categories  $X$  and  $Y$ , which was also an indirect measure of how similar the trial  
40 categories are.

41 The cross-training paradigm was used to quantify the generalization of the effective network across  
42 the task categories. The classifier was trained for a given task category and tested for the same as

1 well as other task categories. The cross predictability was measured as the average Pearson's  
2 correlation over the 48 components.

3

4 **Predict behavioral features:** Generalized Linear Models (GLMs) were used to predict behavioral  
5 features such as movement duration and error, i.e. the predicted variable  $Y_{ij}$  represented the  
6 movement error/duration for the considered trial. The accuracy of prediction was measured as  
7 Pearson correlation between predicted and actual values as well as mean square error between the  
8 actual and predicted values. The prediction was done on 20 folds with 75% of data as training  
9 whereas 25% of data as testing data. The Pearson correlations and mean squared error were pooled  
10 for 20 folds and compared against the distributions for their shuffled counterparts (where the  $Y_{ij}$  was  
11 shuffled for training data).

12

13

14 **Correlation Matrix:** Pairwise Pearson's correlation coefficient between the oscillatory portraits (48  
15 in number) was calculated for multiple bootstrapping iterations (50), consisting of randomly picked  
16 75% of the data, and then averaged over these replicas. The mean correlation matrix is shown in Fig  
17 3A.

18

19 **Effective connectivity:** Linear mixed models were used to check if oscillatory portraits can be  
20 predicted from each other, i.e the predicted variable  $Y_{ij}$  represents one of the 48 oscillatory portraits  
21 and the rest 47 are the predictor variables. This analysis yielded an effective connectivity matrix  
22 among the oscillatory portraits and was done for all trial categories pooled together as well as  
23 separately. The effective connectivity matrices were calculated for multiple bootstrapping iterations  
24 (50), each time from 75% of the data randomly sampled. The effective connectivity was then  
25 averaged over the bootstrap replicas. The analysis was done for two versions. In a first one, the  
26 dependence analysis was restricted to oscillatory portraits only (without behavioral features). In a  
27 second one, the analysis was extended to include two behavioral features (movement error and  
28 duration) as a prediction targets as well as predictor variables. That is, we sought for the oscillatory  
29 portraits that significantly modulate the behavioral features and, as well, for the behavioral features  
30 that modulate the oscillatory portraits (with behavioral features). The accuracy of the prediction was  
31 measured by Pearson's correlation between the predicted and the actual values.

32

33 **Graph representation:** The effective connectivity network of oscillatory portraits from the section  
34 *Deduce effective connectivity* were converted into graphs for the ease of analysis and visual  
35 representation. Every oscillatory portrait/behavioral feature represented a node in the graph and  
36 dependence between the two portraits represents an edge. The graph representations were made  
37 using the python library networkx. The nodes and edges were arranged using a force directed spring  
38 algorithm (Fruchterman-Reingold), which arranges strongly connected nodes closer together than  
39 weakly connected nodes. However, for the ease of comparison, the arrangement of the spring  
40 algorithm was fixed for all trial categories, for a swifter visual comparison. The weights for all trial  
41 categories were pooled together to determine the threshold for "strong" vs "weak" connections.  
42 Only the weights larger than 97% percentile of the pooled weight distributions were shown as  
43 colored edges (strong) for visual clarity, whereas the rest are shown as gray edges (weak). We don't  
44 represent edge weight via a different thickness of the plotted edge, i.e. all edges have the same  
45 thickness in the graphical representation. This explains why integrated strengths can sometimes be



1 larger for graphs displaying visually fewer edge lines: there may be fewer significant edges, but they  
2 are stronger in weight (e.g. concerning the out-strengths of NR- and RS-hit EC graphs in Figure 7).

3  
4

5 **Weighted Homophily:** Homophily in a graph was defined as the probability to form a connection  
6 between two nodes sharing a similar feature, as compared to connections with other nodes having  
7 different values of the considered feature. The effective connectivity networks we investigated were  
8 weighted networks hence we estimated the average weight with which nodes connect with other  
9 nodes sharing a common label, of the temporal (movement phase), spectral (frequency) or spatial  
10 (brain areas) types, compared to the shuffled versions of the graphs, where the labels were  
11 randomly permuted across nodes. Such shuffling preserved the structure of the graph but disrupted  
12 the correlation of the temporal, spectral and spatial labels with the underlying connectivity.

13

14 The average spatial, spectral and temporal homophily was quantified as the relative percent ratio of  
15 the total weight of homophilic connections as compared to the total weight, i.e.

16

17

$$H_{\text{spectral}} = \frac{\sum W_{f-f}}{\sum W_{\text{tot}}}$$

18

19

20

$$H_{\text{temporal}} = \frac{\sum W_{t-t}}{\sum W_{\text{tot}}}$$

21

22

23

24

$$H_{\text{spatial}} = \frac{\sum W_{s-s}}{\sum W_{\text{tot}}}$$

25

26

27 where  $W_{f-f}$  represents weights of spectrally homophilic links (such as theta-theta, alpha-alpha, beta-  
28 beta and gamma-gamma connections),  $W_{t-t}$  rweights of temporally homophilic node pairs (such as  
29 Pre-Pre, During-During and Post-Post),  $W_{s-s}$  represents weights of spatially homophilic node pairs  
30 (such as IC1-IC1, IC2-IC2, IC3-IC3 and IC4-IC4) and  $\sum W_{\text{tot}}$  represents the total of all weights in the  
31 network.

32

33 Homophily was then defined, for each EC network, as a triplet consisting of the three homophily  
34 ratios:

35

36

$$H = \langle H_{\text{spatial}}, H_{\text{spectral}}, H_{\text{temporal}} \rangle$$

37

38

39 The % change in homophily  $\Delta H$  for a trial category with respect to the others was calculated as a  
40 percentage change in the spatial, temporal and spectral homophily ratios for a trial category as  
41 compared to the values when all trials were pooled together.

42

43

$$\Delta H = \langle \Delta H_{\text{spatial}}, \Delta H_{\text{spectral}}, \Delta H_{\text{temporal}} \rangle$$

44

1 **Overlap between the distributions:** Similarity between the distributions was calculated as a measure  
2 of distance in terms of Bhattacharya coefficient. The Bhattacharya coefficient between two  
3 probability distributions P and Q over the same data X is given as by:

$$BC(P, Q) = \sum_{x \in X} \sqrt{P(x)Q(x)}$$

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 **Crossvalidation:** Crossvalidation was performed by training the model for a section of data (training  
10 data) and then testing the model for the rest of the data (testing data), that the model did not  
11 encounter during the training session. The results for the testing data were then pooled over  
12 multiple iterations and an average performance was reported. Crossvalidation ensured that the  
13 results are not heavily influenced by outliers and represents consistent patterns over different  
14 sections of data. The crossvalidation was performed for all analyses, whenever possible, i.e.: when  
15 separating task categories (average performance); calculating effective connectivity; and, predicting  
16 behavioral features from the oscillatory portraits.

17  
18 **Similarity of task categories to the pooled effective connectivity network:** The similarity of the task  
19 categories to the pooled effective connectivity network (“all”) or to other trial-specific EC networks  
20 was calculated as Pearson’s correlation coefficient between their weighed adjacency matrices  
21 flattened in vectors.

22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 References

27

- 28 Aertsen AM, Gerstein GL, Habib MK, Palm G. 1989. Dynamics of neuronal firing correlation:  
29 modulation of “effective connectivity”. *J Neurophysiol* 61:900–917. doi: 10.1152/jn.1989.61.5.900
- 30 Atasoy S, Donnelly I, Pearson J. 2016. Human brain networks function in connectome-specific  
31 harmonic waves. *Nat Comms* 7: 10340. doi: 10.1038/ncomms10340
- 32 Battaglia D, Witt A, Wolf F, Geisel T. 2012. Dynamic Effective Connectivity of Inter-Areal Brain  
33 Circuits. 8:e1002438. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002438
- 34 Berkes P, Orban G, Lengyel M, Fiser J. 2011 Spontaneous Cortical Activity Reveals Hallmarks of an  
35 Optimal Internal Model of the Environment. *Science* 331:83–87. doi: 10.1126/science.1195870
- 36 Breakspear M, Terry JR. 2002. Topographic Organization of Nonlinear Interdependence in  
37 Multichannel Human EEG. *NeuroImage* 16:822–835. doi: 10.1006/nimg.2002.1106
- 38 Bressler SL, Kelso J. 2001. Cortical coordination dynamics and cognition. *Trends Cogn Sci.* 5:26–36.  
39 doi: 10.1016/s1364-6613(00)01564-3
- 40 Buzsáki G, Draguhn A. 2004. Neuronal oscillations in cortical networks. *Science (New York, NY)*  
41 304:1926–1929. doi: 10.1126/science.1099745
- 42 Canolty RT, Knight R. 2010. The functional role of cross-frequency coupling. *Trends Cogn Sci.* 14:506–  
43 515. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2010.09.001

- 1 Zomorodian A, Carlsson G. 2005. Computing persistent homology. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 33:249 –  
2 274. doi: 10.1007/s00454-004-1146-y
- 3 Chaudhuri R, Gerçek B, Pandey B, Peyrache A, Fiete I. 2019. The intrinsic attractor manifold and  
4 population dynamics of a canonical cognitive circuit across waking and sleep. *Nat Neurosci* 22:  
5 1512–1520 doi: 10.1038/s41593-019-0460-x
- 6 Cole MW, Bassett DS, Power JD, Braver TS, Petersen SE. 2014. Intrinsic and task-evoked network  
7 architectures of the human brain. *Neuron* 83:238–251. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2014.05.014
- 8 Crutchfield JP (2011) Between order and chaos. *Nat Phys* 8:17–24. doi: 10.1038/nphys2190
- 9 Deco G, Jirsa VK. 2012. Ongoing cortical activity at rest: criticality, multistability, and ghost attractors.  
10 *Journal of Neuroscience* 32:3366–3375. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2523-11.2012
- 11 Deco G, Jirsa VK, McIntosh AR. 2011. Emerging concepts for the dynamical organization of resting-  
12 state activity in the brain. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 12:43–56. doi: 10.1038/nrn2961
- 13 Dellavale D, Velarde OM, Mato G, Urdapilleta E. 2020. Complex interplay between spectral  
14 harmonicity and different types of cross-frequency couplings in nonlinear oscillators and  
15 biologically plausible neural network models. *Phys Rev E* 102, 062401. doi:  
16 10.1103/PhysRevE.102.062401
- 17 Donoghue T, Haller M, Peterson EJ, Varma P, Sebastian P, Gao R, Noto T, Lara AH, Wallis JD, Knight  
18 RT, Shestyuk A, Voytek B. 2020. Parameterizing neural power spectra into periodic and aperiodic  
19 components. *Nat Neurosci* 23:1655–1665. doi: 10.1038/s41593-020-00744-x
- 20 Douchamps V, di Volo M, Torcini A, Battaglia D, Goutagny R. 2022 Hippocampal gamma oscillations  
21 form complex ensembles modulated by behavior and learning. *bioRxiv:2022.10.17.512498*.
- 22 Feingold J, Gibson DJ, DePasquale B, Graybiel AM. 2015. Bursts of beta oscillation differentiate  
23 postperformance activity in the striatum and motor cortex of monkeys performing movement  
24 tasks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 112:13687–13692, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1517629112
- 25 Fries P. 2015. Rhythms for Cognition: Communication through Coherence. *Neuron* 88:220–235, doi:  
26 10.1016/j.neuron.2015.09.034
- 27 Friston KJ. 1994. Functional and Effective Connectivity in Neuroimaging: A Synthesis. *Human Brain*  
28 *Mapping* 2:56–78, doi: 10.1002/hbm.460020107
- 29 Friston KJ. 2011. Functional and Effective Connectivity: A Review. *Brain Connectivity* 1:13–36, doi:  
30 10.1089/brain.2011.0008
- 31 Gallego JA, Perich MG, Miller LE, Solla SA. 2017. Neural Manifolds for the Control of Movement.  
32 *Neuron* 94:978–984, doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2017.05.025
- 33 Gao P, Ganguli S. 2015. On simplicity and complexity in the brave new world of large-scale  
34 neuroscience. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 32:148–155, doi: 10.1016/j.conb.2015.04.003
- 35 Gao R, Peterson EJ, Voytek B. 2017. Inferring synaptic excitation/inhibition balance from field  
36 potentials. *NeuroImage* 158:70–78, doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.06.078
- 37 Gilson M, Zamora-López G, Pallarés V, Adhikari MH, Senden M, Campo AT, Mantini D, Corbetta M,  
38 Deco G, Insabato A. 2020. Model-based whole-brain effective connectivity to study distributed  
39 cognition in health and disease. *Netw Neurosci* 4:338–373. doi: 10.1162/netn\_a\_00117
- 40 Green D, Swets J. 1966. Signal detection theory and psychophysics. New York: Wiley, doi:  
41 10.1016/0022-460X(67)90197-6

- 1 Hansen ECA, Battaglia D, Spiegler A, Deco G, Jirsa VK. 2015. Functional connectivity dynamics:  
2 modeling the switching behavior of the resting state. *NeuroImage* 105:525–535, doi:  
3 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.11.001
- 4 He BJ. 2013. Spontaneous and task-evoked brain activity negatively interact. *J Neurosci* 33:4672–  
5 4682, doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2922-12.2013
- 6 Honey CJ, Kötter R, Breakspear M, Sporns O. 2007. Network structure of cerebral cortex shapes  
7 functional connectivity on multiple time scales. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 104:10240–10245, doi:  
8 10.1073/pnas.0701519104
- 9 Kasatkin DV, Yanchuk S, Schöll E, Nekorkin VI. 2017. Self-organized emergence of multilayer  
10 structure and chimera states in dynamical networks with adaptive couplings. *Phys Rev E*  
11 96:062211, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.96.062211
- 12 Kenet T, Bibitchkov D, Tsodyks M, Grinvald A, Arieli A. 2003. Spontaneously emerging cortical  
13 representations of visual attributes. *Nature* 425:954–956, doi: 10.1038/nature02078
- 14 Kirst C, Timme M, Battaglia D. 2016. Dynamic information routing in complex networks. *Nat Comms*  
15 7:11061, doi: 10.1038/ncomms11061
- 16 Mantini D, Perrucci MG, Del Gratta C, Romani GL, Corbetta M. 2007. Electrophysiological signatures  
17 of resting state networks in the human brain. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 104:13170–13175, doi:  
18 10.1073/pnas.0700668104
- 19 McPherson M, Smith-Lovin L, Cook JM. 2001. Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks.  
20 *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:415–444, doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.415
- 21 Mostame P, Sadaghiani S. 2021. Oscillation-Based Connectivity Architecture Is Dominated by an  
22 Intrinsic Spatial Organization, Not Cognitive State or Frequency. *J Neurosci* 41:179–192, doi:  
23 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2155-20.2020
- 24 Murthy VN, Fetz EE. 1992. Coherent 25- to 35-Hz oscillations in the sensorimotor cortex of behaving  
25 monkeys. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 89:5670–5674, doi: 10.1073/pnas.89.12.5670
- 26 Naik S, Adibpour P, Dubois J, Dehaene-Lambertz G, Battaglia D. 2021. Event-Related Variability is  
27 modulated by Task and Development. *bioRxiv*:2021.03.07.434162.
- 28 O'Byrne J, Jerbi K. 2022. How critical is brain criticality? *Trends Neurosci* 45:820–837, doi:  
29 10.1016/j.tins.2022.08.007
- 30 Orbán G, Berkes P, Fiser J, Lengyel M. 2016. Neural Variability and Sampling-Based Probabilistic  
31 Representations in the Visual Cortex. *Neuron* 92: 530–543, doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2016.09.038
- 32 Palmigiano A, Geisel T, Wolf F, Battaglia D. 2017. Flexible information routing by transient synchrony.  
33 *Nat Neurosci* 20:1014–1022, doi: 10.1038/nn.4569
- 34 Pillai AS, Jirsa VK. 2017. Symmetry Breaking in Space-Time Hierarchies Shapes Brain Dynamics and  
35 Behavior. *Neuron* 94:1010–1026, doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2017.05.013
- 36 Raut RV, Snyder AZ, Mitra A, Yellin D, Fujii N, Malach R, Raichle ME. 2021. Global waves synchronize  
37 the brain's functional systems with fluctuating arousal. *Sci Adv* 7:eabf2709 doi:  
38 10.1126/sciadv.abf2709.
- 39 Rué-Queralt J, Stevner A, Tagliazucchi E, Laufs H, Kringelbach ML, Deco G, Atasoy S. 2021. Decoding  
40 brain states on the intrinsic manifold of human brain dynamics across wakefulness and sleep.  
41 *Commun Biol* 4:854–11, doi: 10.1038/s42003-021-02369-7
- 42 Shine JM, Breakspear M, Bell PT, Ehgoetz Martens KA, Shine R, Koyejo O, Sporns O, Poldrack RA.  
43 2019. Human cognition involves the dynamic integration of neural activity and neuromodulatory  
44 systems. *PLoS Biol* 17:e2005522, doi: 10.1038/s41593-019-0347-x


- 1 Sporns O. 2007. Brain connectivity. *Scholarpedia*, 2:4695
- 2 Tallon-Baudry C , Bertrand O, C Delpuech C, J Pernier J. 1996. Stimulus specificity of phase-locked  
3 and non-phase-locked 40 Hz visual responses in human. *J Neurosci* 16:4240-9, doi:  
4 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.16-13-04240.1996.
- 5 Tononi G, Edelman GM, Sporns O. 1998. Complexity and coherency: integrating information in the  
6 brain. *Trends Cogn Sci* 2:474-484, doi: 10.1016/s1364-6613(98)01259-5
- 7 Varela F, Lachaux J-P, Rodriguez E, Martinerie J. 2001. The brainweb: phase synchronization and  
8 large-scale integration. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2:229-239, doi: 10.1038/35067550
- 9 Vezoli J, Vinck M, Bosman CA, Bastos AM, Lewis CM, Kennedy H, Fries P. 2021. Brain rhythms define  
10 distinct interaction networks with differential dependence on anatomy. *Neuron* 109:3862-  
11 3878.e5, doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2021.09.052
- 12 Wainio-Theberge S, Wolff A, Northoff G. 2021. Dynamic relationships between spontaneous and  
13 evoked electrophysiological activity. *Commun Biol* 4:741 doi: 10.1038/s42003-021-02240-9
- 14 Xing D, Shen Y, Burns S, Yeh C-I, Shapley R, Li W. 2012. Stochastic generation of gamma-band activity  
15 in primary visual cortex of awake and anesthetized monkeys. *Journal of Neuroscience* 32:13873-  
16 80a, doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5644-11.2012
- 17 Yuan H, Zotev V, Phillips R, Bodurka J. 2013. Correlated slow fluctuations in respiration, EEG, and  
18 BOLD fMRI. *NeuroImage* 79:81-93, doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.04.068

## Tables


**Table 1:** Pearson's correlation between actual and predicted values for movement error and duration in Figure 6C. All correlations are significant ( $p < 0.0001$ ), given values are averages over 20 folds with 75% as training and 25% as testing data.

Trial category	Behavioral feature	
	Movement error	Movement duration
	Pearson's correlation	Pearson's correlation
NR-Hit	0.42	0.28
NR-Miss	0.3	0.37
RS-Hit	0.47	0.39
RS-Miss	0.38	0.2
Ct-Miss	0.51	0.39
AR-Miss	0.35	0.35

## Figures




**Figure 1:** Analyzed data: independent component (IC) time-courses. **A)** EEG was recorded in healthy participants instructed to “shoot,” without stopping, one of three possible visual targets. In Ct (red) and RS (green) trials, the cursor representing the index fingertip was displayed rotated by 30° relative to its real position. In the Ct trials the rotation was unexpectedly introduced and thus produced large kinematic errors. In contrast, in the RS trials, participants applied a strategy to counter it. These rotation trials were separated by trials without visual rotation: one AR (blue) trial and a variable number of NR (gray) trials. **B)** Trials were further divided into Hit and Miss, as illustrated by individual hand paths by one participant. **C)** Group average topographies of the four ICs of interest, capturing respectively activity in the frontal medial cortex (IC1), the parietal medial cortex (IC2), and the anterior and posterior banks of the central sulcus, left (IC3) and right (IC4). **D)** Group average time-frequency representations of the activity of IC1 in the NR-Miss (left) and the RS-Miss (right) trials. IC time-courses are aligned to movement onset. The different trial epochs (Pre, Dur, Post) are indicated by the vertical dashed lines. The different frequency bands ( $\theta$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ) are indicated by the horizontal dashed lines. **E)** Group average beta-power profiles for IC1 aligned to movement onset, for the NR-Miss (gray) and the RS-Miss (green) trials respectively. The black dots indicate the period during which beta-power was significantly lower in RS-Miss trials relative to NR-Miss trials.




**Figure 2: Oscillatory elements and portraits. A)** Single-trial activity of IC1 (frontal medial cortex) in the NR-Miss and the RS-Miss trial categories. From each single-trial time-frequency map (center columns), oscillatory elements are obtained by averaging power within each trial epochs and frequency bands (left and right columns). **B)** Each oscillatory element quantifies single-trial power at a given brain location (IC1, IC2, IC3, IC4), trial epoch (Pre, During and Post movement) and frequency band ( $\theta$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ). Single-trial portraits are composed of all 48 (4 ICs  $\times$  3 trial epochs  $\times$  4 frequency bands) single-trial elements.






**Figure 3: Effective connectivity between oscillatory elements.** **A)** Individual spatio-temporo-spectral oscillatory elements may show strong covariation. Illustrative scatter plots for two pairs of oscillatory elements ( $\langle IC1, Pre, \alpha \rangle$  vs  $\langle IC1, Pre, \beta \rangle$  and  $\langle IC3, Pre, \alpha \rangle$  vs  $\langle IC3, Pre, \beta \rangle$ ) showing significant covariation. **B)** The correlation matrix (functional connectivity) reveals mostly positive values. **C)** To quantify effective connectivity, multivariate linear regression was performed to predict the values of each single-trial element based on those of the 47 other entries of the same single-trial oscillatory portrait. **D)** The effective connectivity (EC) matrix is sparser than the correlation matrix, but still shows dependence across all spatial locations. **E)** Graph representation of the effective connectivity matrix in D. The nodes represent individual oscillatory elements and the edges figure the effective connectivity links between them. The spatial locations (ICs) are indicated by colors and trial epochs by color shades. The nodes are labeled according to the frequency band. Strong connections are shown as thick lines colored according to the source nodes. Thin gray lines show weak connections. **F)** The single-trial oscillatory elements could be predicted from others with varying degrees of accuracy. Scatterplots of actual against predicted values are presented for two elements,  $\langle IC1, Pre, \theta \rangle$  and  $\langle IC3, Pre, \beta \rangle$ , for which average Pearson's correlation  $\sim 0.2$  and  $\sim 0.6$ , respectively.


## A Effective connectivity networks




## B Cross-prediction of elements




**Figure 4:** Similar but distinct effective connectivity (EC) networks for the different trial categories. **A)** Graph representations of the EC for each of the 6 trial categories separately. The nodes represent individual oscillatory elements and the edges figure the effective connectivity links between them. The spatial locations (ICs) are indicated by colors and the trial epochs by color shades. The nodes are labeled according to the frequency. Strong connections are shown as thick lines colored according to their source nodes. Weak connections are not shown. **B)** The similarities between the EC networks specific to the different trial categories were quantified by the achieved cross-prediction performances (see Material and Methods); that is, how well a classifier trained on trials of one given category predicts the values of the single-trial oscillatory elements of trials of a different category. Prediction performance was measured by the average Pearson's correlations between the actual and the predicted values of the oscillatory elements. The lowest Pearson's correlations were around 0.3



**Figure 5:** Trial categories are reliably separated by classifiers trained on full portraits. **A)** We compared the accuracy of category pairwise separations achieved by portrait-based and element-based classifiers. **B)** Separation performance was measured by the area under the curve (AUC) for ROC curves. On average (boxplots) portrait-based classifiers performed with > 60% accuracy, whereas element-based classifiers yielded marginally above chance level (0.52 vs 0.5, two-sided sample t-test: 69.9,  $p=0.0$ ) performances. Matrix summarizing the average AUC for each trial-category pairwise-separation achieved by portrait-based classifiers; in all cases, AUC was significantly above chance level (0.5). **C)** For illustration, ROC curves for the separation of the NR-Miss and RS-Hit trials by classifiers trained on full portraits versus single elements and shuffled data labels. The classifier trained on full portrait outperforms ( $0.71 \pm 0.03$ ) the classifier trained on the most predictive single element < IC4, Dur,  $\beta$  > ( $0.59 \pm 0.02$ ).



**Figure 6:** Inter-trial fluctuations in movement kinematics are reliably predicted from oscillatory portraits. **A)** Classifiers based on oscillatory portraits vs individual elements were trained to predict single-trial values of movement error or duration. **B)** Prediction performances are measured as the Pearson's correlations between the actual and predicted values. The results are shown for all trial categories pooled together. The portrait-based classifiers outperformed the element-based classifiers for both movement error and duration. **C)** Pearson's correlations between actual and predicted movement error and duration for each trial category. For the example trial category (NR-Hit), scatter plots of actual vs predicted values of movement duration or error. The colors of the scatter plots correspond to the correlation colormap in (C). The insets show the Pearson correlation and mean squared error over multiple folds between actual and shuffled versions of the data.



**Figure 7:** Effective connectivity networks ascribed movement error and duration as bottom-up and top-down features, respectively. **A)** Graph representation of effective connectivity integrating movement kinematics measures as additional nodes. The error and duration nodes are represented in black and brown, respectively. Only significant links are presented and colored according to their source node. **B)** Total in- and out-strengths of effective connectivity originating from behavior-related nodes (i.e. some of weights of EC connections) for all trial categories pooled together. The insets show the results for all trial categories pooled together. Caps mark the 95% CI of the distributions. Top, outgoing projections from the error node are significantly stronger than those from the duration node. Bottom, incoming projections from the oscillatory elements to the duration node are significantly higher than those to the error node.

## Supplementary tables


**Table S1:** Break-up of outgoing connections from the movement error node to the oscillatory portraits.

Trial category	Total number of outgoing connections (from Mvt. Error)	Spatial				Spectral				Temporal		
		IC1	IC2	IC3	IC4	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	Pre	During	Post
AR-Miss	2	50%	50%	-	-	50%	-	50%	-	-	50%	50%
Ct-Miss	2	-	50%	50%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	-
NR-Hit	12	18.2%	36.4%	18.2%	27.3%	36.4%	27.3%	18.2%	18.2%	18.2%	72.7%	9.1%
RS-Hit	13	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	8.3%	33.3%	25%	50%	25%


**Table S2:** Break-up of incoming connections to the movement duration node from the oscillatory portraits.

Trial category	Total number of incoming connections (to Mvt. Duration)	Spatial				Spectral				Temporal		
		IC1	IC2	IC3	IC4	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	Pre	During	Post
AR-Miss	6	50%	-	33.3%	16.7%	50%	-	33.3%	16.7%	66.7%	-	33.3%
Ct-Miss	3	33.3%	-	66.7%	-	33.3%	-	66.7%	-	-	33.3%	66.7%
NR-Hit	4	33.3%	-	66.7%	-	-	66.7%	33.3%	-	66.7%	-	33.3%
NR-Miss	3	100%	-	-	-	33.3%	-	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
RS-Hit	10	22.2%	22.2%	33.3%	22.2%	-	11.1%	44.4%	44.4%	44.4%	11.1%	44.4%

## Supplementary figures




**Figure S1:** The distributions of the single-trial oscillatory element largely overlapped across the different trial categories. Element  $\langle \text{IC1, Pre, } \theta \rangle$  (top left cell) serves here as a reference and the density range overlap is measured as the Bhattacharya distance between the distributions.




**Figure S2:** The effective connectivity (EC) network was highly homophilic. **A-C)** Average weight in the spatial, temporal and frequency homophily ratios, respectively. The combinations of node pairs are indicated on the x-axis. The average weights are plotted for the actual effective connectivity networks (blue) and their shuffled versions (orange). All the networks for all trials and subjects were pooled together. The spatial node pairs belonging to the same brain area (e.g IC1  $\leftrightarrow$  IC1) show increased average weight, which indicates that stronger effective connectivity between same spatial nodes irrespective of their temporal and spectral features. The shuffled version of the network shows no pattern with respect to spatial node pairs. We quantify the total degree of homophily as the ratio between the average of homophilic weights (i.e. the weights of links between nodes with same values of the considered label type) and the total weight. The degree of spatial homophily is thus evaluated to 73%. B and C) Same as A) but for temporal (85%) and spectral (62%) homophily ratios, respectively.






**Figure S3:** To generate effective connectivity (EC) networks, single-trial values of each individual oscillatory element were predicted from the values of the others. For each oscillatory element, the prediction performance was measured using Pearson's correlation between the actual and the predicted values. This was performed for all the trial categories confounded (top row), as well as for the different trial categories separately.



**Figure S4:** Coefficients of each oscillatory element for pairwise separation between the trial categories. The coefficients can take positive/negative values as indicated by the colors (warm = positive, cool = negative). Significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) coefficients are marked with '\*'. Negative(positive) values indicate that the considered element has smaller(larger) power for trials of the category in the row than for trials of the category in the column.



**Figure S5:** **A)** Number of outgoing connections from Movement Duration and Movement Error nodes in a thresholded network (only connections stronger than 94 percentile of weight distribution pooled over all trial categories were considered). Movement error, especially RS-Hit and NR-Hit have high number of outgoing connections. **B)** Movement error in any trial category had any strong incoming projections. Whereas Movement duration nodes have high number of incoming projections, especially for RS-Hit and AR-Miss. The breakdown of these connections are listed in Table S1 and S2.