HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

J Affect Disord. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2016 March 26.

Published in final edited form as:

J Affect Disord. 2015 February 1; 172: 8–17. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2014.09.028.

A Systematic Review of Relations between Resting-State functional-MRI and Treatment Response in Major Depressive Disorder

Gabriel S. Dichter[1,*], **Devin Gibbs**[1], and **Moria J. Smoski**[2]

[1]Department of Psychiatry, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA

[2]Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Duke University Medical Center, Durham NC 27710, USA

Abstract

Background—Resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) is a promising predictor of treatment response in major depressive disorder (MDD).

Methods—A search for papers published in English was conducted using PubMed with the following words: depression, treatment, resting-state, connectivity, and fMRI. Findings from 21 studies of relations between resting-state fMRI and treatment response in MDD are presented, and common findings and themes are discussed.

Results—The use of resting-state fMRI in research on MDD treatment response has yielded a number of consistent findings that provide a basis for understanding the potential mechanisms of action of antidepressant treatment response. These included (1) associations between response to antidepressant medications and increased functional connectivity between frontal and limbic brain regions, possibly resulting in greater inhibitory control over neural circuits that process emotions; (2) connectivity of visual recognition circuits in studies that compared treatment resistant and treatment sensitive patients; (3) response to TMS was consistently predicted by subcallosal cortex connectivity; and (4) hyperconnectivity of the default mode network and hypoconnectivity of the cognitive control network differentiated treatment-resistant from treatment-sensitive MDD patients.

Limitations—There was also considerable variability between studies with respect to study designs and analytic strategies that made direct comparisons across all studies difficult.

Conclusions—Continued standardization of study designs and analytic strategies as well as aggregation of larger datasets will allow the field to better elucidate the potential mechanisms of

Correspondence: Dr. Gabriel S. Dichter, dichter@med.unc.edu, Department of Psychiatry, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Medicine, CB 7255, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7255, USA.

action of treatment response in patients with MDD to ultimately generate algorithms to predict which patients will response to which antidepressant treatments.

Keywords

Resting state; fMRI; Connectivity; Depression; Treatment; Default-mode

Introduction

Major depressive disorder (MDD) affects over 150 million people worldwide (WHO, 2008) and in 2004 was the third leading cause of global burden of disease. The lifetime prevalence rate of MDD is 16%, with an estimated 32 to 35 million US residents expected to develop the disorder during their lifetimes (Kessler et al., 2003). Brain imaging has proven to be a powerful tool to elucidate the pathophysiology and possible etiology of MDD, with numerous studies highlighting the critical role of dysfunction in an extended network that includes the medial prefrontal cortex and limbic, striatal, thalamic and basal forebrain structures involved in affect processing, mood regulation, and cognitive control (Diener et al., 2012; Pizzagalli, 2011; Price & Drevets, 2012). Though activation and connectivity in these networks differentiates those with MDD from controls, less is known about relations between functional brain connectivity and antidepressant treatment outcomes.

Though there are many effective interventions for MDD, there is significant variability in treatment response: over a third of patients with MDD will fail to respond to a given treatment (Fava & Davidson, 1996). One obstacle to improved treatment response rates is the lack of biomarkers to predict who will respond to a given treatment. Indeed, there has been relatively little progress improving the efficacy of established antidepressant treatments (Fournier et al., 2010; Undurraga & Baldessarini, 2012), with first-line FDA-approved treatments demonstrating average response rates of 54% versus 37% for placebo (Levkovitz, Tedeschini, & Papakostas, 2011). Too frequently, clinical practice involves a trial-and-error approach to identifying the right antidepressant treatment. Part of the challenge of improving antidepressant treatment response is the heterogeneity of MDD. The disorder is diagnosed on the basis of a polythetic criterion set and thus patients vary widely in the constellation of symptoms they express, suggesting that different patients likely manifest with different etiologies and disease processes.

A powerful method to investigate the pathophysiology of MDD and aid in the identification of biomarkers of treatment response is functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). Decades of task-based fMRI studies have identified brain circuits with altered functional activity while patients with MDD process affective stimuli. More recently, resting-state fMRI has become increasingly popular to study the pathophysiology of MDD. Resting-state fMRI allows for the identification of spontaneous neural activity that coincides temporally to form neural networks. Spontaneous neural activity (i.e., non-task related activity) represents the largest energy expenditure of the brain and is thus critical to understanding brain network dynamics (Fox & Raichle, 2007).

Resting-state brain activity is altered across a spectrum of psychiatric disorders, including MDD, schizophrenia, autism spectrum disorder, and anxiety disorders. MDD is increasingly

recognized as a disorder of dysregulated neural networks rather than as a disruption of single brain regions, and brain networks alterations have been identified in MDD, including the default mode network (DMN), the salience network (SN), the cognitive control network (CCN), the affective network (AN), and parts of the limbic system (for a review, see Wang, Hermens, Hickie, & Lagopoulos, 2012). For example, a number of studies have reported the DMN to be hyperactive in MDD (Nejad, Fossati, & Lemogne, 2013; Sheline, Price, Yan, & Mintun, 2010). The DMN is most active when the brain is not engaged in goal-directed tasks, and DMN hyperactivity is thought to underlie rumination states in MDD (Broyd et al., 2009). The salience network directs attention to important stimuli in the environment (Menon & Uddin, 2010), and dysregulation of this network in MDD may explain the negative interpretation bias common in MDD (J. P. Hamilton et al., 2012). The affective network, composed of the subgenual and pregenual cingulate and amygdala, is involved in appetite, libido and sleep, and hyperactivity of this network in MDD may account vegetative disturbances (Sheline et al., 2010).

There has recently been increased use of resting state fMRI in the context of studies addressing brain network dynamics involved in response to antidepressant treatments, both in terms of predicting response to treatment as well as understanding changes in functional brain connectivity after effective treatments. These studies have focused on medication and neurostimulation treatments for depression, and such studies have the potential to elucidate resting state biomarkers of treatment response. The goal of this review is to examine studies addressing linkages between resting state fMRI and treatment response in MDD to identify common patterns and themes both within and across antidepressant treatment modalities to guide future research in this area.

Methods

Studies were identified by searching PubMed using varying combinations of the following search terms: depression, treatment, resting-state, connectivity, and fMRI. Articles were excluded if they did not include a dedicated resting-state fMRI scan (i.e., studies examining psychophysiological interactions in the context of tasks were excluded), did not include a treatment component, or did not include patients with MDD. A total of 21 articles met these criteria and were included in this review.

Results

Experimental Designs

There were a variety of experimental designs in the articles reviewed. Seven studies (Guo, Liu, Chen, et al., 2012; Guo et al., 2013a, 2013b; Guo, Liu, Xue, et al., 2012; Lui et al., 2011; Ma et al., 2012; Wu et al., 2011) compared resting-state fMRI between participants with treatment resistant depression (TRD) and treatment sensitive depression (TSD), with treatment resistance defined as less than 50% reduction in the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (M. A. Hamilton, 1960) after at least two adequate trials of different classes of antidepressants, defined as appropriate dosage and compliance for at least 6 weeks. One study compared treatment responders to nonresponders but defined response as a ≥20%

decrease in Hamilton Depression Rating Scale scores after two weeks (Wang, Kuang, Xu, Lei, & Yang, 2014).

Studies also differed with respect to when resting-state fMRI scans were obtained. In eight studies (Abbott et al., 2013; Anand, Li, Wang, Gardner, & Lowe, 2007; Lai & Wu, 2012; Li et al., 2013; Liston et al., 2014; Posner et al., 2013; Salomons et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2014), participants were scanned before and after treatment, whereas in the remaining studies participants were scanned only prior to treatment. These two approaches are designed to answer different research questions: the former addresses changes in functional connectivity due to treatment, whereas the latter examines predictors of antidepressant treatment response from pre-treatment scans.

In four studies (Abbott et al., 2013; Li et al., 2013; Liston et al., 2014; Posner et al., 2013), the MDD group was scanned twice whereas the control group was scanned only once; in all other studies, the MDD and control groups were scanned the same number of times (once or twice). As reviewed elsewhere (Dichter, Sikich, Song, Voyvodic, & Bodfish, 2012), fully balanced designs are optimal to assess treatment effects with neuroimaging to model the effects of repeated scans and other non-treatment factors related to repeated scanning.

Resting State Analysis Methods

In addition to varieties in experimental designs, a number of different analysis methods were used. Here we provide a brief overview of each analytic method used in the reviewed studies.

Regional homogeneity—The amplitude of low frequency fluctuations (ALFF) evaluates the intensity of spontaneous changes in the blood oxygen level dependent (BOLD) signal in a given region (Zuo et al., 2010), whereas regional homogeneity (ReHo) methods use Kendall's Correlation Coefficient to measure how similar or synchronized a voxel is to its neighbors within a cluster of voxels (Zang, Jiang, Lu, He, & Tian, 2004). A larger ReHo value indicates higher synchronization of regional activation. Finally, coherence-based ReHo (Cohe-ReHo) has the added benefit of being insensitive to random noise in a time-series (Liu et al., 2010).

Seed-based analyses—Seed-based approach identify temporal correlations between an *a priori* region of interest (ROI) seed and other voxels. This approach allows for identification of networks linked to a hypothesized ROI, but will not detect network activity not associated with the ROI (Fox & Raichle, 2007). Betweeness Centrality (BC) is a graph theory approach that builds on the seed-based approach by looking at the entire topology of a network and measuring the number of shortest paths between all other points that pass through a given node (Barthélemy, 2004).

Independent component analysis—Independent component analysis (ICA) is a data-driven approach that uses algorithms to examine whole datasets and identify statistically independent components (Lee, Smyser, & Shimony, 2013). ICA does not require the *a priori* selection of a ROI seed region, but requires the researcher to distinguish noise from a true network.

Resting-state fMRI and Antidepressant Medication Response

Tables 1–3 summarize the reviewed studies on the basis of treatment modality, sample characteristics, study design, analytic method, scan parameters, primary findings, and conclusions. Studies are divided on the basis of treatment modality to aid in the identification of common findings within each type of treatment, though it should be noted that studies of a given treatment modality often used different analytic methods, making direct comparisons of findings challenging.

Fifteen of the articles reviewed examined response to antidepressant medication, including open-label trials of specific medications (duloxetine, escitalopram, sertraline) antidepressants within a specific class (SSRI), or multiple classes (TCA's, SSRI's, SNRI's), some including augmentation with benzodiazapines (Alexopoulos et al., 2012; Anand et al., 2007; Guo, Liu, Chen, et al., 2012; Guo et al., 2013a, 2013b; Guo, Liu, Xue, et al., 2012; Kozel et al., 2011; Lai & Wu, 2012; Li et al., 2013; Lui et al., 2011; Ma et al., 2012; Posner et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2011; Yang et al., 2014). One RCT compared response to duloxetine versus placebo (Posner et al., 2013). Among studies comparing treatment resistant depression (TRD) and treatment sensitive depression (TSD), altered connectivity of the caudate with frontal regions was seen in both TRD and TSD (Ma et al., 2012). Wu et al. (2011) found decreased ReHo in prefrontal cortical regions and increased ReHo in the temporo-limbic regions in TRD relative to TSD. Guo, Liu, Xue, and colleagues (2012) found higher ALFF in the DMN in TRD patients relative to TSD patients, and Ma and colleagues (2012) found TRD to have increased connectivity of the middle temporal gyrus to parts of the DMN relative to TSD, and Lui and colleagues (2011) found decreased connectivity within thalamocortical circuits in TRD relative to TSD.

Cerebellar connectivity was also implicated in a number of studies comparing TRD and TSD, however results were inconsistent (Guo, Liu, Chen, et al., 2012; Guo et al., 2013a; Guo, Liu, Xue, et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2014). Guo, Liu, Xue, and colleagues (2012) used different analytic methods to determine the role of the cerebellum in MDD, and found that TRD was associated with increased ALFF in the cerebellum relative to TSD. However, Guo, Liu, Chen, and colleagues (2012) reported that TRD was characterized by decreased Cohe-Reho in the cerebellum relative to TSD, whereas Guo and colleagues (2013a) found that TRD was characterized by decreased connectivity of the cerebellum with the DMN relative to TSD. Finally, Wang and colleagues (2014) reported that patients who did not respond to SSRI treatment within two weeks showed increased ALFF in the cerebellum.

Among studies comparing pre- and post-treatment scans, a number of studies found decreased activity (Lai & Wu, 2012; Wu et al., 2011) or connectivity (Alexopoulos et al., 2012; Lui et al., 2011) of frontal cortical brain regions. The CCN, composed of the dlPFC, ACC, and parts of the parietal lobe (Miller & Buschman, 2013) is another network important in the pathophysiology of MDD. Alexopoulos and colleagues (2012) found that lower CCN connectivity predicted poorer antidepressant outcomes in older adults, and Li and colleagues (2013) found that antidepressant medication normalized hyperconnectivity in the posterior DMN but not in the anterior DMN, possibly signaling the potential to relapse. Likewise, Posner and colleagues (2013) found that connectivity of the posterior cingulate cortex, part of the DMN, to the right lateral parietal cortex and right inferior temporal gyrus

normalized after duloxetine therapy. Additionally, successful treatment of MDD with panic disorder with duloxetine resulted in increased ReHo in the right superior frontal cortex and right medial frontal cortex and decreased ReHo in the right superior temporal cortex (Lai & Wu, 2012). Kozel and colleagues (2011) reported that the more negative the correlation of the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) with the subcallosal cortex (SCC), the better the treatment response, and Anand and colleagues (2007) found that six weeks of sertraline treatment resulted in increased connectivity between the ACC and limbic regions (thalamus, pallidostriatum, and amygdala). Likewise, Yang et al. (2014) found that open-label sertraline treatment resulted in increased FC between frontal and limbic brain regions, resulting in greater inhibitory control over emotion processing brain regions.

The visual recognition circuit containing the lingual gyrus, middle occipital gyrus, fusiform gyrus and cuneus, was implicated in several of the reviewed articles (Guo et al., 2013b; Guo, Liu, Xue, et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2014). Guo and colleagues (2012) reported that the visual recognition circuit exhibited decreased ALFF in TRD than TSD. Similarly, Wang and colleagues (2014) reported increased ALFF in the lingual gyrus in SSRI early responders compared to early nonresponders, and Guo and colleagues (2013b) reported that the calcarine sulcus exhibited decreased connectivity to the middle occipital gyrus, cuneus, insula, opposite calcarine, and inferior temporal gyrus and increased connectivity to the vermis in TRD relative to TSD.

Resting-state fMRI and TMS Response

Four of the reviewed articles examined response to TMS (Downar et al., 2013; Fox, Buckner, White, Greicius, & Pascual-Leone, 2012; Liston et al., 2014; Salomons et al., 2014), and results of these studies showed a relatively high degree of consistency with respect to SCC connectivity. Salomons and colleagues (2014) found that higher baseline SCC connectivity with the dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (dmPFC) and dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC) predicted greater reductions in MDD symptoms after TMS; additionally, those patients with lower baseline cortico-thalamic (dmPFC-medial dorsal thalamus), cortico-striatal (dmPFC-putamen), and cortico-limbic (SCC-amygdala and SCC-hippocampus) connectivity showed better treatment response, leading the authors to propose that TMS functions to increase the influence of cognitive control networks over thalamic and striatal regions, facilitating goal-directed behaviors.

Liston and colleagues (2014) reported that pre-treatment SCC hyperconnectivity to the DMN and CCN predicted greater clinical improvement after TMS, though the same study also found that TMS normalized SCC hyperconnectivity in the DMN, but not the CCN, and induced anticorrelated connectivity between the dlPFC and medial prefrontal DMN nodes. Fox and colleagues (2012) found that the most effective TMS target sites in the dlPFC were the most anticorrelated with the SCC. Downar and colleagues (2013) reported (1) differences in connectivity between TMS responders and nonresponders in dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) adjacent to the subgenual cortex, (2) that nonresponders demonstrated lower connectivity of the vmPFC to reward circuits, and (3) vmPFC connectivity with dorsolateral and dorsomedial prefrontal structures had an opposite pattern of lateralization in responders than nonresponders.

Resting-state fMRI and ECT Response

Only one of the reviewed articles investigated response to ECT treatment (Abbott et al., 2013). This study found that response to ECT involved an increase in functional network connectivity between the posterior default mode and left dlPFC, whereas this change in connectivity was absent in participants who did not respond to treatment.

Discussion

The use of resting-state fMRI in the context of MDD treatment studies is increasing, with the ultimate goals of improved understanding of the effects of treatments on neural networks related to the pathophysiology of the disorder as well as the identification of biomarkers of MDD treatment response. Despite the variability across reviewed studies with respect to study designs and analytic methods, a number of consistencies emerged.

One pattern that emerged, particularly in studies examining response to antidepressant medication treatment, is that treatment response is associated with increased connectivity between frontal and limbic brain regions, possibly resulting in greater inhibitory control over neural circuits that process emotions (Alexopoulos et al., 2012; Lai & Wu, 2012; Lui et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2011; Yang et al., 2014). This mechanistic account of treatment effects is highly consistent with prevailing neural models of MDD that highlight decreased modulatory control of prefrontal brain regions on limbic brain regions, particularly in the context of emotion processing and emotion regulation (Johnstone, van Reekum, Urry, Kalin, & Davidson, 2007; Joormann & Gotlib, 2010; Ray et al., 2005).

Another theme that emerged was that visual recognition circuits (i.e., containing the lingual gyrus, middle occipital gyrus, fusiform gyrus and cuneus) were implicated in several of the reviewed articles that compared TRD relative to TSD and in one study of early SSRI response (Guo et al., 2013b; Guo, Liu, Xue, et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2014). Although there is evidence of poor visual recall for social stimuli (e.g., facial identification and social scenes on standardized memory scales) in MDD that is related to cortical thickness and white matter volumes in the lateral surface of the right hemisphere (Peterson & Weissman, 2011), visual recognition circuits have not been a robust endophenotype in the MDD literature to date and thus this is a finding that warrants further research.

The subcallosal (or subgenual) cingulate cortex was implicated in MDD in studies of response to TMS and antidepressant medications (Downar et al., 2013; Fox et al., 2012; Kozel et al., 2011; Liston et al., 2014; Salomons et al., 2014). For example, Kozel and colleagues (2011) found that the connectivity of the SCC to the ACC was predictive of better antidepressants treatment outcomes whereas Liston and colleagues found that anticorrelations between the SCC and dlPFC was predictive of better TMS outcomes. These patterns are consistent with prior cross-sectional studies indicating hyperactivity of the SCC in MDD in a number of contexts (Berlim, McGirr, Van den Eynde, Fleck, & Giacobbe, 2014; Hamani et al., 2011), as well as evidence across studies that a variety of treatments exert their antidepressant effect via decreasing SCC activity (see Hamani et al., 2011 for a review). Additionally, the SCC is a common target site in deep brain stimulation for MDD

(Berlim et al., 2014), suggesting that normalized SCC activation and connectivity may be a common denominator across effective antidepressant treatments.

Other themes emerged, though not as consistently. Hyperconnectivity within the DMN and hyperconnectivity of the DMN to other structures in TRD compared to TSD was identified in two studies (Guo, Liu, Xue, et al., 2012; Ma et al., 2012), possibly suggesting that antidepressant medications are more effective for MDD patients with lower DMN connectivity. However, other studies suggest that antidepressant medications normalize the posterior portion of the DMN network (Li et al., 2013; Posner et al., 2013). Interestingly, the opposite trend was seen with TMS, where hyperconnectivity within the DMN predicted better treatment outcomes, as TMS effectively normalized hyperconnectivity between the SCC and the DMN (Liston et al., 2014). This suggests an explanation for why TMS may work as a second-line treatment for those who have not responded to antidepressant medications.

Alexopoulos and colleagues (2012) found that lower baseline connectivity within the CCN was correlated with worse medication treatment outcomes, and Wu and colleagues (2011) found increased activity in temporo-limbic regions in TRD relative to TSD. The dlPFC acts in an inhibitory manner over limbic structures during emotional regulation (Ochsner & Gross, 2008; Siegle, Carter, & Thase, 2006; Urry et al., 2006) and it is thus not surprising that CCN connectivity plays a critical role in antidepressant treatment response.

Conclusions, Limitations, and Future Directions

The use of resting-state fMRI to study treatment response in MDD is becoming more common. However, the extant literature reviewed here illustrates an array of design strategies and analytic methods that, taken together, impede efforts to aggregate findings across studies. This point is illustrated by the fact that three studies analyzed the same dataset with different methods producing different results (Guo, Liu, Chen, et al., 2012; Guo et al., 2013a; Guo, Liu, Xue, et al., 2012), suggesting that results are critically dependent on analytic methods. The same may be said for different experimental designs as well. Finally, the array of different treatments examined, including various classes of antidepressant medications with different dosing strategies and treatment durations, TMS, and electroconvulsive therapy contribute to the heterogeneity of findings.

Despite such heterogeneity, a few common themes emerged: (1) associations between response to antidepressant medications and increased connectivity between frontal and limbic brain regions, possibly resulting in greater inhibitory control over neural circuits that process emotions; (2) the implication of visual recognition circuits in studies that compared treatment responsive and treatment sensitive patients; (3) response to TMS was consistently predicted by SCC connectivity; and (4) hyperconnectivity of the default mode network and hypoconnectivity of the cognitive control network predicted response to antidepressant treatment.

Limitations of the reviewed studies include that fact that there were no studies that addressed brain connectivity predictors of response to psychotherapy. Brain activation (rather than connectivity) predictors of response to antidepressant medication and

psychotherapy are vastly divergent (Goldapple et al., 2004; Kennedy et al., 2007; Konarski et al., 2009). Comparisons across a range of treatment modalities are needed to determine whether biomarkers of response are specific to certain treatments. Additionally, studies predicting treatment response in pediatric or adolescent groups are needed to assess developmental profiles of connectivity predictors of treatment response. It is also well known that nonspecific treatment factors, such as therapeutic alliance and patient outcome expectancies, influence psychiatric treatment outcomes (Krupnick et al., 1996; Strupp & Hadley, 1979), and thus any systematic evaluation of predictors of antidepressant outcomes will need to consider such nonspecific factors. Finally, given that MDD most commonly presents as comorbid with other Axis I disorders (Kessler et al, 2003), studies including comorbid cases would increase the translational relevance of investigations of treatment response predictors.

Recommendations for future research include the standardization of data collection methods, including the length of resting-state scan, eyes-open vs. eyes-closed, the creation of data repositories to aggregate data from different research groups, and consistent data analysis strategies. The creation of data repositories in particular will be critical to accrue larger sample sizes needed to robustly evaluate brain connectivity predictors of antidepressant treatment response.

In conclusion, this is the first systematic review of studies addressing linkages between resting state functional brain connectivity and response to antidepressant treatment. Future research with larger samples as well as consistent study designs and analytic strategies will increase the pace of discovery of brain-connectivity-based biomarkers of response to treatment in MDD.

Abbreviations

↑	increased
↓	decreased
A_DM	anterior default mode
ALFF	amplitude of low-frequency fluctuations
b/w	between
BC	Betweeness centrality
CCN	Cognitive Control Network
DMPFC	Dorsomedial prefrontal cortex
DLPFC	Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex
DMN	Default Mode Network
END	early treatment nonresponsive major depressive disorder
ERD	early treatment responsive major depressive disorder
FC	Functional Connectivity

HC	healthy controls
IPL	Inferior parietal lobule
L_	left
NDD	Not treatment refractory depression
Pcu	precuneus
p_DM	Posterior default mode
PFG	Posterior fusiform gyrus
R_	right
ReHo	Regional Homogeneity
SCC	Subcallosal Cingulate Gyrus
SNRI	Serotonin-norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor
SSRI	selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor
TCA	tricyclic antidepressant
TR	repetition time
TRD	Treatment-resistant depression
TSD	Treatment-sensitive depression
Tx	Treatment
VMHC	Voxel mirrored homotopic connectivity

References

Abbott CC, Lemke NT, Gopal S, Thoma RJ, Bustillo J, Calhoun VD, Turner JA. Electroconvulsive therapy response in major depressive disorder: a pilot functional network connectivity resting state FMRI investigation. Front Psychiatry. 2013; 4:10.10.3389/fpsyt.2013.00010 [PubMed: 23459749]

Alexopoulos GS, Hoptman MJ, Kanellopoulos D, Murphy CF, Lim KO, Gunning FM. Functional connectivity in the cognitive control network and the default mode network in late-life depression. J Affect Disord. 2012; 139(1):56–65.10.1016/j.jad.2011.12.002 [PubMed: 22425432]

Anand A, Li Y, Wang Y, Gardner K, Lowe MJ. Reciprocal effects of antidepressant treatment on activity and connectivity of the mood regulating circuit: an FMRI study. J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci. 2007; 29(3):274–282.10.1176/appi.neuropsych.19.3.274 [PubMed: 17827412]

Barthélemy M. Betweenness centrality in large complex networks. The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems. 2004; 38(2):163–168.10.1140/epjb/e2004-00111-4

Berlim MT, McGirr A, Van den Eynde F, Fleck MP, Giacobbe P. Effectiveness and acceptability of deep brain stimulation (DBS) of the subgenual cingulate cortex for treatment-resistant depression: a systematic review and exploratory meta-analysis. J Affect Disord. 2014; 159:31–38.10.1016/j.jad.2014.02.016 [PubMed: 24679386]

Broyd SJ, Demanuele C, Debener S, Helps SK, James CJ, Sonuga-Barke EJ. Default-mode brain dysfunction in mental disorders: a systematic review. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2009; 33(3):279–296.10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.09.002 [PubMed: 18824195]

Dichter GS, Sikich L, Song A, Voyvodic J, Bodfish JW. Functional neuroimaging of treatment effects in psychiatry: methodological challenges and recommendations. Int J Neurosci. 2012; 122(9):483–493.10.3109/00207454.2012.678446 [PubMed: 22471393]

Diener C, Kuehner C, Brusniak W, Ubl B, Wessa M, Flor H. A meta-analysis of neurofunctional imaging studies of emotion and cognition in major depression. Neuroimage. 2012; 61(3):677–685.10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.04.005 [PubMed: 22521254]

Downar J, Geraci J, Salomons TV, Dunlop K, Wheeler S, McAndrews MP, Giacobbe P. Anhedonia and Reward-Circuit Connectivity Distinguish Nonresponders from Responders to Dorsomedial Prefrontal Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation in Major Depression. Biol Psychiatry. 2013 S0006-3223(13)01034-2 [pii]. 10.1016/j.biopsych.2013.10.026

Fava M, Davidson KG. Definition and epidemiology of treatment-resistant depression. Psychiatr Clin North Am. 1996; 19(2):179–200. [PubMed: 8827185]

Fournier JC, DeRubeis RJ, Hollon SD, Dimidjian S, Amsterdam JD, Shelton RC, Fawcett J. Antidepressant drug effects and depression severity: a patient-level meta-analysis. JAMA. 2010; 303(1):47–53. 303/1/47 [pii]. 10.1001/jama.2009.1943 [PubMed: 20051569]

Fox MD, Buckner RL, White MP, Greicius MD, Pascual-Leone A. Efficacy of transcranial magnetic stimulation targets for depression is related to intrinsic functional connectivity with the subgenual cingulate. Biol Psychiatry. 2012; 72(7):595–603.10.1016/j.biopsych.2012.04.028 [PubMed: 22658708]

Fox MD, Raichle ME. Spontaneous fluctuations in brain activity observed with functional magnetic resonance imaging. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2007; 8(9):700–711.10.1038/nrn2201 [PubMed: 17704812]

Goldapple K, Segal Z, Garson C, Lau M, Bieling P, Kennedy S, Mayberg H. Modulation of cortical-limbic pathways in major depression: treatment-specific effects of cognitive behavior therapy. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2004; 61(1):34–41. [PubMed: 14706942]

Guo WB, Liu F, Chen JD, Gao K, Xue ZM, Xu XJ, Zhao JP. Abnormal neural activity of brain regions in treatment-resistant and treatment-sensitive major depressive disorder: a resting-state fMRI study. J Psychiatr Res. 2012; 46(10):1366–1373.10.1016/j.jpsychires.2012.07.003 [PubMed: 22835912]

Guo WB, Liu F, Xue Z, Gao K, Liu Z, Xiao C, Zhao J. Abnormal resting-state cerebellar-cerebral functional connectivity in treatment-resistant depression and treatment sensitive depression. Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry. 2013a; 44:51–57.10.1016/j.pnpbp.2013.01.010 [PubMed: 23352887]

Guo WB, Liu F, Xue Z, Gao K, Liu Z, Xiao C, Zhao J. Decreased interhemispheric coordination in treatment-resistant depression: a resting-state fMRI study. PLoS One. 2013b; 8(8):e71368.10.1371/journal.pone.0071368 [PubMed: 23936504]

Guo WB, Liu F, Xue ZM, Xu XJ, Wu RR, Ma CQ, Zhao JP. Alterations of the amplitude of low-frequency fluctuations in treatment-resistant and treatment-response depression: a resting-state fMRI study. Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry. 2012; 37(1):153–160.10.1016/j.pnpbp.2012.01.011 [PubMed: 22306865]

Hamani C, Mayberg H, Stone S, Laxton A, Haber S, Lozano AM. The subcallosal cingulate gyrus in the context of major depression. Biol Psychiatry. 2011; 69(4):301–308.10.1016/j.biopsych.2010.09.034 [PubMed: 21145043]

Hamilton JP, Etkin A, Furman DJ, Lemus MG, Johnson RF, Gotlib IH. Functional neuroimaging of major depressive disorder: a meta-analysis and new integration of base line activation and neural response data. Am J Psychiatry. 2012; 169(7):693–703.10.1176/appi.ajp.2012.11071105 [PubMed: 22535198]

Hamilton MA. A rating scale for depression. Journal of Neurology and Neurosurgery in Psychiatry. 1960; 23:56–62.

Johnstone T, van Reekum CM, Urry HL, Kalin NH, Davidson RJ. Failure to regulate: counterproductive recruitment of top-down prefrontal-subcortical circuitry in major depression. J Neurosci. 2007; 27(33):8877–8884. [PubMed: 17699669]

Joormann J, Gotlib IH. Emotion regulation in depression: Relation to cognitive inhibition. Cognition & Emotion. 2010; 24(2):281–298.10.1080/02699930903407948 [PubMed: 20300538]

Kennedy SH, Konarski JZ, Segal ZV, Lau MA, Bieling PJ, McIntyre RS, Mayberg HS. Differences in brain glucose metabolism between responders to CBT and venlafaxine in a 16-week randomized controlled trial. Am J Psychiatry. 2007; 164(5):778–788.10.1176/appi.ajp.164.5.778 [PubMed: 17475737]

Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O, Jin R, Koretz D, Merikangas KR, Wang PS. The epidemiology of major depressive disorder: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCS-R). JAMA. 2003; 289(23):3095–3105. 289/23/3095 [pii]. 10.1001/jama.289.23.3095 [PubMed: 12813115]

Konarski JZ, Kennedy SH, Segal ZV, Lau MA, Bieling PJ, McIntyre RS, Mayberg HS. Predictors of nonresponse to cognitive behavioural therapy or venlafaxine using glucose metabolism in major depressive disorder. J Psychiatry Neurosci. 2009; 34(3):175–180. [PubMed: 19448846]

Kozel FA, Rao U, Lu H, Nakonezny PA, Grannemann B, McGregor T, Trivedi MH. Functional connectivity of brain structures correlates with treatment outcome in major depressive disorder. Front Psychiatry. 2011; 2:7.10.3389/fpsyt.2011.00007 [PubMed: 21556277]

Krupnick JL, Sotsky SM, Simmens S, Moyer J, Elkin I, Watkins J, Pilkonis PA. The role of the therapeutic alliance in psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy outcome: findings in the National Institute of Mental Health Treatment of Depression Collaborative Research Program. J Consult Clin Psychol. 1996; 64(3):532–539. [PubMed: 8698947]

Lai CH, Wu YT. Frontal regional homogeneity increased and temporal regional homogeneity decreased after remission of first-episode drug-naive major depressive disorder with panic disorder patients under duloxetine therapy for 6 weeks. J Affect Disord. 2012; 136(3):453–458.10.1016/j.jad.2011.11.004 [PubMed: 22137181]

Lee MH, Smyser CD, Shimony JS. Resting-state fMRI: a review of methods and clinical applications. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol. 2013; 34(10):1866–1872.10.3174/ajnr.A3263 [PubMed: 22936095]

Levkovitz Y, Tedeschini E, Papakostas GI. Efficacy of antidepressants for dysthymia: a meta-analysis of placebo-controlled randomized trials. J Clin Psychiatry. 2011; 72(4):509–514.10.4088/JCP.09m05949blu [PubMed: 21527126]

Li B, Liu L, Friston KJ, Shen H, Wang L, Zeng LL, Hu D. A treatment-resistant default mode subnetwork in major depression. Biol Psychiatry. 2013; 74(1):48–54.10.1016/j.biopsych.2012.11.007 [PubMed: 23273724]

Liston C, Chen AC, Zebley BD, Drysdale AT, Gordon R, Leuchter B, Dubin MJ. Default Mode Network Mechanisms of Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation in Depression. Biol Psychiatry. 201410.1016/j.biopsych.2014.01.023

Liu D, Yan C, Ren J, Yao L, Kiviniemi VJ, Zang Y. Using coherence to measure regional homogeneity of resting-state FMRI signal. Front Syst Neurosci. 2010; 4:24.10.3389/fnsys.2010.00024 [PubMed: 20589093]

Lui S, Wu Q, Qiu L, Yang X, Kuang W, Chan RC, Gong Q. Resting-state functional connectivity in treatment-resistant depression. Am J Psychiatry. 2011; 168(6):642–648.10.1176/appi.ajp.2010.10101419 [PubMed: 21362744]

Ma C, Ding J, Li J, Guo W, Long Z, Liu F, Chen H. Resting-state functional connectivity bias of middle temporal gyrus and caudate with altered gray matter volume in major depression. PLoS One. 2012; 7(9):e45263.10.1371/journal.pone.0045263 [PubMed: 23028892]

Menon V, Uddin LQ. Saliency, switching, attention and control: a network model of insula function. Brain Struct Fund. 2010; 214(5–6):655–667.10.1007/s00429-010-0262-0

Miller EK, Buschman TJ. Cortical circuits for the control of attention. Curr Opin Neurobiol. 2013; 23(2):216–222.10.1016/j.conb.2012.11.011 [PubMed: 23265963]

Nejad AB, Fossati P, Lemogne C. Self-referential processing, rumination, and cortical midline structures in major depression. Front Hum Neurosci. 2013; 7:666.10.3389/fnhum.2013.00666 [PubMed: 24124416]

Ochsner KN, Gross JJ. Cognitive emotion regulation: Insights from social cognitive and affective neuroscience. Current Directions in Psychological Science. 2008; 17:153–158. [PubMed: 25425765]

Peterson BS, Weissman MM. A brain-based endophenotype for major depressive disorder. Annu Rev Med. 2011; 62:461–474.10.1146/annurev-med-010510-095632 [PubMed: 21226617]

Pizzagalli DA. Frontocingulate dysfunction in depression: toward biomarkers of treatment response. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2011; 36(1):183–206.10.1038/npp.2010.166 [PubMed: 20861828]

Posner J, Hellerstein DJ, Gat I, Mechling A, Klahr K, Wang Z, Peterson BS. Antidepressants normalize the default mode network in patients with dysthymia. JAMA Psychiatry. 2013; 70(4): 373–382.10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.455 [PubMed: 23389382]

Price JL, Drevets WC. Neural circuits underlying the pathophysiology of mood disorders. Trends Cogn Sci. 2012; 16(1):61–71.10.1016/j.tics.2011.12.011 [PubMed: 22197477]

Ray RD, Ochsner KN, Cooper JC, Robertson ER, Gabrieli JD, Gross JJ. Individual differences in trait rumination and the neural systems supporting cognitive reappraisal. Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience. 2005; 5(2):156–168.

Salomons TV, Dunlop K, Kennedy SH, Flint A, Geraci J, Giacobbe P, Downar J. Resting-state cortico-thalamic-striatal connectivity predicts response to dorsomedial prefrontal rTMS in major depressive disorder. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2014; 39(2):488–498.10.1038/npp.2013.222 [PubMed: 24150516]

Sheline YI, Price JL, Yan Z, Mintun MA. Resting-state functional MRI in depression unmasks increased connectivity between networks via the dorsal nexus. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2010; 107(24):11020–11025. 1000446107 [pii]. 10.1073/pnas.1000446107 [PubMed: 20534464]

Siegle GJ, Carter CS, Thase ME. Use of FMRI to predict recovery from unipolar depression with cognitive behavior therapy. Am J Psychiatry. 2006; 163(4):735–738. [PubMed: 16585452]

Strupp HH, Hadley SW. Specific vs nonspecific factors in psychotherapy. A controlled study of outcome. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 1979; 36(10):1125–1136. [PubMed: 475546]

Undurraga J, Baldessarini RJ. Randomized, placebo-controlled trials of antidepressants for acute major depression: thirty-year meta-analytic review. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2012; 37(4):851–864. npp2011306 [pii]. 10.1038/npp.2011.306 [PubMed: 22169941]

Urry HL, van Reekum CM, Johnstone T, Kalin NH, Thurow ME, Schaefer HS, Davidson RJ. Amygdala and ventromedial prefrontal cortex are inversely coupled during regulation of negative affect and predict the diurnal pattern of Cortisol secretion among older adults. J Neurosci. 2006; 26:4415–4425. [PubMed: 16624961]

Wang L, Hermens DF, Hickie IB, Lagopoulos J. A systematic review of resting-state functional-MRI studies in major depression. J Affect Disord. 2012; 142(1–3):6–12.10.1016/j.jad.2012.04.013 [PubMed: 22858266]

Wang L, Kuang WH, Xu JJ, Lei D, Yang YC. Resting-state brain activation correlates with short-time antidepressant treatment outcome in drug-naive patients with major depressive disorder. J Int Med Res. 201410.1177/0300060514533524

WHO. The global burden of disease: 2004 update. Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2008.

Wu QZ, Li DM, Kuang WH, Zhang TJ, Lui S, Huang XQ, Gong QY. Abnormal regional spontaneous neural activity in treatment-refractory depression revealed by resting-state fMRI. Hum Brain Mapp. 2011; 32(8):1290–1299.10.1002/hbm.21108 [PubMed: 20665717]

Yang R, Zhang H, Wu X, Yang J, Ma M, Gao Y, Li S. Hypothalamus-anchored resting brain network changes before and after sertraline treatment in major depression. Biomed Res Int. 2014; 2014:915026.10.1155/2014/915026 [PubMed: 24772438]

Zang Y, Jiang T, Lu Y, He Y, Tian L. Regional homogeneity approach to fMRI data analysis. Neuroimage. 2004; 22(1):394–400.10.1016/j.neuroimage.2003.12.030 [PubMed: 15110032]

Zuo XN, Di Martino A, Kelly C, Shehzad ZE, Gee DG, Klein DF, Milham MP. The oscillating brain: complex and reliable. Neuroimage. 2010; 49(2):1432–1445.10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.09.037 [PubMed: 19782143]

Highlights

- Resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) is a promising predictor of treatment response in major depressive disorder (MDD).
- Associations were consistently reported between response to antidepressant medications and increased functional connectivity between frontal and limbic brain regions, possibly resulting in greater inhibitory control over neural circuits that process emotions.
- Connectivity of visual recognition circuits differentiated treatment resistant and treatment sensitive patients.
- Response to TMS was consistently predicted by subcallosal cortex connectivity;
- Hyperconnectivity of the default mode network and hypoconnectivity of the cognitive control network differentiated treatment-resistant from treatment-sensitive MDD patients.
- Continued standardization of study designs and analytic strategies as well as aggregation of larger datasets will allow the field to better elucidate the potential mechanisms of action of treatment response in patients with MDD to ultimately generate algorithms to predict which patients will response to which antidepressant treatments.

J Affect Disord. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2016 March 26.

Table 1

Studies of Antidepressant Medication

Study	Tx Modality	Sample Characteristics	Study Design	Analytic Method	RS Scan Details*	Principle Findings	Conclusions
(Alexopoulos et al., 2012)	Open-label escitalopram at mean dose of 16.25 mg (SD: 5.0, range 10–20) daily for 12 weeks following 2 week single-blind placebo	16 MDD, 69 ± 5.5 years 10 controls, 68.6 ± 7.0 years	MDD scanned once before tx. Controls scanned once.	Seed-based; Seeds: DMN (posterior cingulate cortex) and CCN (dorsal ACC and DLPFC)	Eyes closed, TR= 2000 ms	↑ FC in DMN didn't predict tx response, but associated with pessimism. ↓ FC in CCN associated with low remission rate and persistence of symptoms, associated with apathy and dysexecutive behavior.	Low CCN FC predicted poor antidepressant outcomes in older adults.
(Anand et al., 2007)	Open-label sertraline (6 weeks) 50 mg q.d. Dosage was ↑ to 100 mg after 1 week. After the first two weekly visits, sertraline was ↓ by 50 mg every 2 weeks to a max of 200 mg, depending on patient's response and tolerance.	12 MDD, 3/9 M/F, 30 ± 9 years; Medication free for 2 weeks. 11 controls, 3/8 M/F, 29 ± 8 years	MDD scanned before and after tx. Controls scanned twice.	Seed-based; Seed=pregenual ACC. Looked at FC b/w seed and limbic regions—amygdala, pallidostriatum and medial thalamus	Eyes closed, Time = 307 seconds, TR=400 ms	After 6 weeks of sertraline tx, ↑ FC b/w the ACC and limbic regions (thalamus, pallidostriatum, amygdala).	Antidepressant tx had reciprocal effects on corticolimbic FC.
(Guo, Liu, Xue, et al., 2012)	Open-label TCA, SSRI, or SNRI. Min. dose of 150 mg/day of imipramine equivalents for 6 wks given to tx-naïve after scan.	18 TRD, 11/7 M/F, 27.39 ± 7.74 years. 17 TSD, 10/7 M/F, 26.71 ± 7.73 years. 17 HC, 10/7 M/F, 24.24 ± 4.41 years.	MDD scanned before tx. Controls scanned once.	ALFF	Eyes closed, Time=360 seconds, TR=2000 ms	In TRD, posterior lobes of the cerebellum and default circuit (ACC and medial frontal gyrus) had ↑ ALFF, the visual recognition circuit (lingual gyrus and cuneus) had ↓ ALFF relative to TSD.	Differences in brain circuits b/w TRD and TSD were mainly in the cerebellum, the visual recognition circuit and the default circuit.
(Guo, Liu, Chen, et al., 2012)	Open-label TCA, SSRI, or SNRI. Min. dose of 150 mg/day of imipramine equivalents for 6 wks given to tx-naïve after scan.	23 TRD, 11/12 M/F, 27.35±7.26 years. 22 TSD, 12/10 M/F, 28.09 ± 9.91 years. 19 HC, 10/9 M/F, 24.37 ± 4.18 years.	MDD scanned before tx. Controls scanned once.	Cohe-ReHo	Eyes closed, Time=360 seconds, TR=2000 ms	↓ Cohe-Reho in TRD in bilateral superior frontal gyrus, left cerebellum. ↓ Cohe-Reho in TSD in bilateral superior frontal gyrus. TRD<TSD in bilateral cerebellum. TSD>TRD left fusiform gyrus. (−) correlation b/w Cohe-Reho in fusiform gyrus and duration.	↓ Cohe-ReHo in the cerebellum may differentiate TRD from TSD
(Guo et al., 2013a)	Open-label TCA, SSRI, or SNRI. Min. dose of 150 mg/day of imipramine equivalents for 6 wks given to tx-naïve after scan.	23 TRD, 11/12 M/F, 27.35±7.26 years. 22 TSD, 12/10 M/F, 28.09 ± 9.91 years. 19 HC, 10/9 M/F, 24.37 ± 4.18 years. **(Same data set as** (Guo, Liu, Chen, et al., 2012))	MDD scanned before tx. Controls scanned once.	Seed-based; Seeds= cerebellar regions. Seeds used to identify executive, DMN, affective-limbic, and motor networks in cerebellum, which had been demonstrated to	Eyes closed, Time=360 seconds, TR=2000 ms	Relative to HC, both patient groups showed significantly ↓ cerebellar–cerebral FC with the prefrontal cortex (superior, middle, and inferior frontal gyrus) and (DMN) [superior, middle, and inferior temporal gyrus, precuneus, and inferior parietal lobule], and ↑ FC with	Decreased FC b/w the cerebellum and regions within DMN may differentiate TRD from TSD

Study	Tx Modality	Sample Characteristics	Study Design	Analytic Method	RS Scan Details*	Principle Findings	Conclusions
				have cerebral–cerebellar FC have cerebral–cerebellar FC		visual recognition network (lingual gyrus, middle occipital gyrus, and fusiform) and parahippocampal gyrus. The TRD group exhibited a more ↓FC than the TSD group, mainly in connected regions within DMN [PCu, angular gyrus (AG) and IPL].	
(Guo et al., 2013b)	Open-label TCA, SSRI, or SNRI. minimum dose of 150 mg/day of imipramine equivalents for 6 weeks given to tx-naïve after scan.	23 TRD, 11/12 M/F, 27.35±7.26 years. 22 TSD, 12/10 M/F, 28.09 ± 9.91 years. 19 HC, 10/9 M/F, 24.37 ± 4.18 years. **(Same data set as** (Guo, Liu, Chen, et al., 2012))	MDD scanned before tx. Controls scanned once.	VMHC and seed-based; Seeds = right and left calcarine sulcus	Eyes closed, Time=360 seconds, TR=2000 ms	TRD VMHC<TSD in calcarine sulcus, fusiform gyrus, hippocampus, superior temporal gyrus, middle cingulum, precentral gyrus.	Lower VMHC values in TRD than TSD; calcarine cortex connectivity may differentiate TRD from TSD
(Kozel et al., 2011)	8 weeks of open-label antidepressant tx: 10 took bupropion SR 150 mg twice a day as part of a clinical trial, two took escitalopram 20 mg once a day, and one took aripiprazole 5 mg once a day	13 participants 3/10 M/F, 33.7 ± 7.4 years	MDD participants scanned before tx.	Seed-based; Seeds = left and right amygdala, hippocampus, anterior cingulate gyrus, posterior cingulate gyrus, medial frontal cortex, orbitofrontal cortex, middle frontal cortex, and subcallosal cortex	Eyes open, time= 502 ssecond, TR=2000 ms.	The magnitude of negative correlation b/w subcallosal cortex and the anterior cingulate cortex was associated with the degree of tx response. Of the 15 most significant correlations b/w structures (of 120 possible), 11 involved the subcallosal cortex (six left, five right hemisphere).	FC measures in several regions, especially the subcallosal cortex, were highly correlated with tx outcome.
(Lai & Wu, 2012)	Open-label duloxetine 60 mg/d for 6 weeks. The only approved psychotropic was alprazolam 1 mg/d for panic attacks.	15 first episode MDD with panic disorder, 5/10 M/F, 35.87±9.59 years 15 HC, 4/11 M/F, 34.30±9.87 years	MDD participants scanned before and after tx. Controls scanned twice within 6 weeks.	ReHo	Eyes closed, time =400 seconds, TR=2000 ms	ReHo ↑ in right superior frontal cortex, right medial frontal cortex and ↓ in right superior temporal cortex after remission of symptoms in these MDD patients within 6 weeks	Differential modulations inside the default mode network were associated with tx response.
(Li et al., 2013)	Either open-label alprazolam (20–60 mg/day), venlafaxine (75–225 mg/day), duloxetine (60–90 mg/day), or citalopram (20–40 mg/day) for 12 weeks. 7/33 patients also received benzodiazepine (lorazepam, .5–1.5 mg/day) during the first 2 weeks of tx	24 Pre-tx MDD, 8/16 M/F, 31.83 ± 11.11 years. 16 Post-tx MDD. 3/13 M/F, 32.6 ± 11.84 years. 29 HC, 9/20 M/F, 33.62 ± 10.29 years.	MDD participants scanned before and after tx. Controls scanned once.	ICA looking specifically for subnetworks in the DMN	Eyes closed, Time=650 seconds, TR_= 2000 ms	The anterior subnetwork and the posterior subnetwork showed ↑ FC in pre-tx MDD participants, relative to controls. Differences in the posterior subnetwork were normalized after antidepressant tx, while abnormal FC persisted within the anterior subnetwork.	Persistent abnormal FC within the anterior DMN subnetwork in recovered MDD may constitute a biomarker of asymptomatic MDD and potential for relapse.

Study	Tx Modality	Sample Characteristics	Study Design	Analytic Method	RS Scan Details*	Principle Findings	Conclusions
(Lui et al., 2011)	Open-label TCA, SSRI, or SNRI. Tx refractory and non-refractory groups separated after 2 tx trials. Tx trial defined as 6 weeks.	28 tx refractory, 18/10 M/F, 33±11 years. 32 tx nonrefractory, 21/11 M/F, 32±10 years. 48 HC, 31/17 M/F, 35±12 years.	MDD participants scanned before tx. Controls scanned once.	Seed-based; 13 seeds: left and right hippocampus, insula, dorsal lateral prefrontal areas, amygdala, putamen, and thalamus and anterior cingulate cortex	Eyes closed, 400 seconds, TR=2000 ms	MDD<HC: prefrontal-limbic-thalamic areas Nonrefractory >Refractory: more distributed ↓ in ACC, amygdala, hippocampus, insula Refractory: ↓ FC in prefrontal areas/thalamus FC of refractory>nonrefractory: l_amygdala with cingulate cortex, R_Insula with Cingulate cortex and precuneus	Refractory MDD associated with disrupted FC in thalamocortical circuits. Nonrefractory MDD associated with more distributed ↓ FC in limbic-striatal-pallidal-thalamic circuit
(Ma et al., 2012)	Open-label TCA, SNRI, or SSRI at a min. dose of 150 mg/day of imipramine equivalents for 6 weeks given to all patients.	18 TRD, 11/7 M/F, 27.39±7.74 years. 17 TSD, 10/7 M/F, 26.71±7.73 years. 17 HC, 10/7 M/F, 24.24±4.41 years	MDD participants scanned before tx. Controls scanned once.	Seed-based; Regions showing significantly altered gray matter volume defined as seed ROIs for subsequent FC analysis: right MTG and bilateral caudate	Eyes closed, Time=300 sec, TR=2000ms.	For R_MTG seed, TSD showed ↑ FC in the right superior temporal gyrus and ↓ FC in the right angular gyrus, rectus, precuneus, medial frontal gyrus and bilateral superior frontal gyrus relative to TRD. For the r_caudate seed, TRD had ↑FC in the right superior frontal gyrus and middle frontal gyrus, and ↓ FC in the right inferior frontal gyrus and corpus callosum compared to TSD.	TRD and TSD both showed altered MTG FC mainly in the DMN and altered r_caudate FC with frontal regions.
(Posner et al., 2013)	10-week prospective, double blind, placebo-controlled trial of duloxetine. Dosing began at 30 mg daily and could be ↑ to a max of 120 mg daily in the absence of sufficient response	41 dysthymic patients (DD), 37.8 ± 9.0 years, 24/17 M/F. 9 DD did not complete F/U scan. 25 HCs, 33.0 ± 11.9 years, 17/8 M/F.	MDD participants scanned before and after tx. Controls scanned once.	Seed-based; seed = PCC for DMN	Eyes closed, Time=two 5 min scans, TR=2200 ms	Patients had ↑ FC b/w the PCC and the mesial prefrontal cortex bilaterally, lateral parietal lobes bilaterally, and precuneus. The PCC–right lateral parietal cortex and PCC–right inferior temporal gyrus connections normalized after Duloxetine tx.	↑ FC within DMN implicated in MDD. Treatment resulted in normalization of DMN FC.
(Wang et al., 2014)	Open-label SSRIs at the min. effective dose (fluoxetine 20 mg/day, paroxetine 20 mg/day, sertraline 50 mg/day, citalopram 20 mg/day or escitalopram 10 mg/day. Classified as ERD/END at 2 weeks.	26 ERD, 16/10 M/F, 32.54 ± 11.23 years. 30 END, 17/13 M/F, 35.70± 9.39 years. 33 controls, 19/14 M/F, 31.45 ± 11.01 years. All MDD: first-episode, drug naïve	MDD participants scanned before tx. Controls scanned once.	ALFF	Time=350 seconds, TR=2000 ms	END>ERD cerebellum. ERD>END right lingual gyrus. ERD<Control PCC + R_cerebellum. END<control PCC. END>control mOFC, L_cerebellum,	ERD and END differentiated by ALLF in the lingual gyrus and cerebellum.
(Wu et al., 2011)	Open-label TCA, SNRI, or SSRI. TRD/NDD separated after 2 tx trials. Tx	22 TRD, 15/7 M/F, 35±13 years 22 NDD, 10/12 M/F, 35±13 years	MDD participants scanned before	ReHo	Eyes closed, Time=400 sec, TR=2000 ms	MDD>HC: ACC, mPFC, R_insula, R_parahippocampal gyrus.	TRD had more widely distributed regions with altered ReHo. Tx

Study	Tx Modality	Sample Characteristics	Study Design	Analytic Method	RS Scan Details*	Principle Findings	Conclusions
	trial defined as 6 weeks. trial defined as 6 weeks.	26 Controls, 16:10 M/F, 33±8 years	tx. Controls scanned once.			MDD<HC: L_PFG, L_inferior frontal area, L_IPL, L_caudate body, L_rectal gyrus TRD>NDD: R_mid temporal gyrus, R_insula, mid cingulate TRD<NDD: L_precuneus, L_inferior frontal gyrus. NDD>HC: mPFC, parahippocampal NDD<HC:L_PFG TRD>HC: ACC, mPFC, R_insula, R_transverse temporal gyrus, superior/mid temporal gyrus, L_posterior medial frontal gyrus TRD<HC: L_lateral inferior frontal gyrus, L_PFG, L_IPL, L_superior parietal lobule, L_precuneus.	refractoriness resulted from disruption of cortico-limbic networks.
(Yang et al., 2014)	Open-label sertraline in a fixed-dosing design over 8 weeks (50–100 mg/day)	12 MDD, 7/5 M/F, 34.91 ± 12.16 years	MDD participants scanned before and after tx.	Seed = hypothalamus	Eyes closed, TR=2500 ms	After 8 weeks of tx, MDD patients showed ↓ FC b/w the hypothalamus and DLPFC, OFC, ACC, insula, putamen, caudate, and claustrum. ↓ FC of the hypothalamus was primarily with the inferior frontal gyrus, medial frontal gyrus, cingulated gyrus, precuneus, thalamus, and cerebellum.	Sertraline tx caused ↑ FC b/w prefrontal-limbic-hypothalamus pathways.

* Note: Scan parameters (i.e. eyes open or closed, scan length, and TR) are included when reported.

J Affect Disord. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2016 March 26.

Table 2

Studies of TMS

Study	Tx Modality	Sample Characteristics	Study Design	Analytic Method	RS Scan Details*	Principle Findings	Conclusions
(Downar et al., 2013)	20 sessions of open-label magnetic resonance imaging-guided rTMS to the dmPFC, 3000 pulses of 10 Hz stimulation at 120% resting motor threshold were applied to the left then right hemisphere at each session.	47 consecutive medication resistant MDD patients 20/27 M/F, 42.2 ± 12.7 years, with either unipolar (n=38) or bipolar (n=9) MDD.	MDD participants scanned before tx	BC-mapping (a graph theoretic approach)	Eyes closed, Time=10 min, TR = 2000 ms	L_VMPFC showed higher BC in nonresponders than in responders. Compared with responders, nonresponders showed ↓FC to L_VMPFC in the ventral tegmental area, L_caudate nucleus, L_DMPFC, L_DLPFC, L_inferior parietal lobule, and L_anterior insula. Compared with responders, nonresponders showed ↑ FC to L_VMPFC in R_DMPFC, R_DLPFC, R_frontopolar cortex, and R_PCC	Results suggest distinct MDD subtypes, one with preserved hedonic function and responsive to dorsomedial rTMS and another with disrupted hedonic function, abnormally lateralized FC through ventromedial prefrontal cortex, and unresponsive to dorsomedial rTMS.
(Fox et al., 2012)	No TMS administered, but examined relations between different common left DLPFC TMS targets, FC, and antidepressant efficacy.	Two preexisting datasets. Validation Sample: 98 healthy participants 48/50 M/F, 22 ± 3.2 years. Test Sample: 13 MDD 3/10 M/F, mean age 40.2 years. 11 healthy subjects, 5/6 M/F, mean age 29 years.	Identified areas within DLPFC with highest FC anticorrelation with subgenual cingulate activity in the 98 healthy controls. Compared DLPFC target regions with clinical efficacy in MDD dataset.	Seed-based; Seeds = Subgenual region and left DLPFC	Validation Sample: Eyes open, 372 seconds, TR=3000 ms; Test Sample: Eyes closed, 600 seconds, TR=2000 ms	Clinical efficacy of TMS negatively correlated with L_DLPFC FC to subgenual cortex.	Using connectivity-based optimized TMS to identify DLPFC subregions that were anticorrelated with subgenual cingulate activity, TMS to the DLPFC may suppress subgenual cingulate activity.
(Liston et al., 2014)	25 sessions of open-label TMS to DLPFC consisting of 37.5 min (3000 pulses; 30-second duty cycle, 4 seconds on, 26 seconds off) of 10-Hz excitatory TMS daily for 25 days (Monday-Friday for a 5 week period)	17 MDD, 3/14 M/F, 42.3 ± 17.3 years 35 healthy controls, 12/23 M/F, 36 ± 16 years	MDD participants scanned before and after tx. Controls scanned once.	Seed-based; Seeds= left DLPFC and subgenual cingulate cortex and targets in the CEN and DMN	360 seconds, TR= 2000 ms	Before tx, FC in MDD was ↑ within the DMN and ↓ within the CEN, and FC b/w these two networks was altered. TMS normalized MDD-related subgenual hyperconnectivity in the DMN but did not alter connectivity in the CEN. TMS also induced anticorrelated FC b/w the DLPFC and medial prefrontal DMN nodes. Baseline subgenual FC predicted clinical improvement.	TMS selectively modulates FC both within and b/w the CEN and DMN, and modulation of subgenual cingulate FC may play an important mechanistic role in alleviating MDD
(Salomons et al., 2014)	20 sessions (4 weeks/5 sessions/ week) of open-label, add-on rTMS to the bilateral dmPFC.	25 patients, 10/15 M/F, mean 42.6 years) with either unipolar or bipolar illness (n=4; one type one, three type two) and a diagnosis of a	MDD participants scanned before and 1 week after tx	Seeds=DMPFC around the anterior midcingulate and the sgACC	Eyes closed, Time=600 second, TR=2000 ms	Patients with high baseline FC among cortical nodes involved in executive control and emotion regulation (dmPFC-sgACC and sgACC-dlPFC)	Positive outcomes were associated with the capacity for executive control over core emotional

Study	Tx Modality	Sample Characteristics	Study Design	Analytic Method	RS Scan Details*	Principle Findings	Conclusions
	120% resting motor threshold, 10 Hz, 5 seconds on, and 10 seconds off and for a mean of 6800 stimuli per session (34,000 stimuli per week)	major depressive episode, resistant to ≥2 medications, mild illness.				experienced a greater reduction in symptoms following rTMS. Patients with low baseline cortico-thalamic (dmPFC-mediodorsal thalamus), cortico-striatal (dmPFC-putamen), and cortico-limbic (sgACC-amygdala and sgACC-hippocampus) FC also experienced a greater tx response. Clinical improvement associated with an ↑ in dmPFC-thalamus FC and a ↓ in sgACCcaudate FC. Improvement was also associated with↓ in FC b/w dmPFC and insula, and b/w sgACC and a separate, more posterior region of midcingulate cortex.	functions. Potential mechanism of action of rTMS to dmPFC is ↑ influence of cognitive control networks over thalamic and striatal regions, possibly linked with improved facilitation of goal-directed behavior

*Note: Scan parameters (i.e. eyes open or closed, scan length, and TR) are included when reported.

Table 3

Studies of ECT

Study	Tx Modality	Sample Characteristics	Study Design	Analytic Method	RS Scan Details	Principle Findings	Conclusions
(Abbott et al., 2013)	Open-label ECT thrice weekly (11.17 ± 3.33 sessions in the series). Delivered a right unilateral (*n*=10) or bitemporal ECT(*n*=2) stimulus delivery with a constant-current, brief pulse (0.50ms).	12 tx-resistant MDD with clinical indication for ECT, 4/8 M/F, 66.42 ± 9.78 years. 12 healthy controls, 4/8 M/F, 67.58 ± 8.89 years.	MDD scanned before and at least 5 days after ECT (mean 21.13 ± 13.90 days after the last ECT tx). Controls scanned once.	ICA comparing functional network connectivity: Networks of interest include a_DM, SCC, DMPFC, p_DM, and r_DLPFC, l_DLPFC.	Eyes open, Time = minimum of 316 seconds, TR= 2000 ms.	Remission associated with ECT reverses the FNC relationship from negative to positive b/w the p_DM and two other networks: the DMPFC and l_DLPFC. Relative to controls, the FNC b/w the p_DM areas and the DMPFC normalizes with ECT response. A direct comparison b/w ECT remitters and non-remitters showed the pattern of ↑ FNC b/w the p_DM and l_DLPFC following ECT to be specific to those who responded to the tx.	The differences b/w ECT remitters and non-remitters suggest that this ↑ FC b/w p_DM areas and the l_DLPFC is a potential biomarker of recovery from MDD.