

Ordinal methods for a characterization of evolving functional brain networks

Klaus Lehnertz^{a)}

¹⁾Department of Epileptology, University of Bonn Medical Centre, Venusberg Campus 1, 53127 Bonn, Germany

²⁾Helmholtz Institute for Radiation and Nuclear Physics, University of Bonn, Nussallee 14–16, 53115 Bonn, Germany

³⁾Interdisciplinary Center for Complex Systems, University of Bonn, Brühler Straße 7, 53175 Bonn, Germany

Ordinal time series analysis is based on the idea to map time series to ordinal patterns, i.e., order relations between the values of a time series and not the values themselves, as introduced in 2002 by C. Bandt and B. Pompe. Despite a resulting loss of information, this approach captures meaningful information about the temporal structure of the underlying system dynamics as well as about properties of interactions between coupled systems. This – together with its conceptual simplicity and robustness against measurement noise – makes ordinal time series analysis well suited to improve characterization of the still poorly understood spatial–temporal dynamics of the human brain. This minireview briefly summarizes the state-of-the-art of uni- and bivariate ordinal time-series-analysis techniques together with applications in the neurosciences. It will highlight current limitations to stimulate further developments which would be necessary to advance characterization of evolving functional brain networks.

Deriving evolving functional brain networks from observed, long-lasting, multivariate time series to improve characterization of various physiological and pathophysiological brain dynamics requires suitable and robust time-series-analysis techniques, that are capable of deciphering the multifaceted nature of the brain’s complex endogenous and exogenous interactions. I will recapitulate concepts of ordinal time series analysis, showcase its applications in the neurosciences, and will discuss limitations and necessary developments to improve characterization of the complex networked dynamics system human brain.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ordinal time series analysis is a special type of symbolic analysis^{1,2} which makes use of *symbols* that are ordinal patterns (also referred to as order patterns or permutation patterns) of length of at least 2. C. Bandt and B. Pompe introduced this concept in 2002 in their seminal paper³ together with permutation entropy as a natural complexity measure of time series. Let $x_i = x(i)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, denote a sequence of observations (or time series) from some system X . For a given, but otherwise arbitrary i , m amplitude values $X_i = \{x(i), x(i+l), \dots, x(i+(m-1)l)\}$ are arranged in an ascending order $\{x(i+(k_{i1}-1)l) \leq x(i+(k_{i2}-1)l) \leq \dots \leq x(i+(k_{im}-1)l)\}$, where l and m denote the appropriately chosen^{4–6} time delay and embedding dimension (cf. Takens’ embedding theorem^{7,8}). In case of equal amplitude values, one

can e.g. carry out the rearrangement according to the associated index k , i.e., for $x(i+(k_{i1}-1)l) = x(i+(k_{i2}-1)l)$ one can write $x(i+(k_{i1}-1)l) \leq x(i+(k_{i2}-1)l)$ if $k_{i1} < k_{i2}$ thereby ensuring that every X_i is uniquely mapped onto one of the $m!$ possible permutations. A permutation symbol – or ordinal pattern – is then defined as $s_i \equiv (k_{i1}, k_{i2}, \dots, k_{im})$ and captures qualitative information about the temporal structure of the underlying time series (see Fig 1).




FIG. 1. Possible outcomes for ordinal patterns (permutation symbols) s using embedding dimensions $m = 2$ and $m = 3$ and fixed embedding delay $l = 1$.

Ordinal time series analysis is conceptually simple, computationally fast and comparably robust against measurement noise. Compared to other symbolization techniques², the derivation of ordinal patterns does not require a priori knowledge about the data range, which rendered ordinal time series analysis beneficial for investigations of empirical data from various scientific domains^{9–19}. A large proportion of studies was concerned with problems such as distinguishing chaos from noise, improving the detection of determinism^{20–22} or of dynam-

^{a)}Electronic mail: klaus.lehnertz@ukbonn.de

ical changes²³, system identification²⁴, or quantifying time reversibility²⁵, thereby employing ordinal-pattern-derived quantifier for entropy^{16,17}, complexity¹², or combinations thereof²⁶.

In this minireview, we will concentrate on ordinal time-series-analysis techniques that aim at characterizing properties of interactions – strength, direction, and coupling function –, since these currently form the basis of complex-network-based studies in diverse scientific fields including geophysics, meteorology, and the neurosciences^{27–34}. With this ansatz, one assumes that a spatially extended complex system can be represented by a complex network which, however, requires identification of vertices and edges. In many cases, such an identification is straightforward, but it remains a challenging issue when investigating the system’s dynamics^{35–42}. Network vertices are usually assumed to represent distinct subsystems and edges represent interactions between them, and these vertices and edges constitute a functional (or interaction) network. In an evolving functional network, properties of edges (and/or vertices) are time-dependent⁴³. In case that a direct access to interactions and their time-dependencies is not possible (e.g. via probing), one usually resorts to linear and non-linear time-series-analysis techniques to quantify interaction properties from pairs of time series of appropriate system observables. These techniques originate from diverse fields such as statistics, synchronization theory, non-linear dynamics, information theory, statistical physics, and from the theory of stochastic processes^{44–56}, given that interactions can manifest themselves in various aspects of the dynamics. While the majority of studies on (evolving) functional networks is based on binary (an edge exists or not) or weighted networks (the weight of an edge is given by the strength of interaction), further improvements can be expected by considering weighted *and* directed networks, thereby including knowledge about coupling functions that contain detailed information about the functional mechanisms underlying an interaction and that prescribe the physical rule specifying how an interactions occurs⁵⁷.

II. ORDINAL METHODS FOR A CHARACTERIZATION OF INTERACTIONS

Current bivariate ordinal time-series-analysis techniques allow characterization of strength and direction of interactions; whether some of these techniques also allow for a characterization of coupling functions needs further investigations.

Estimators for the strength of interactions center around the phenomenon of synchronization and its various forms of appearance – from complete via phase and lag synchronization to generalized synchronization^{44,58}). In case of generalized synchronization, the relationship between two empirical time series can be characterized by an order parameter that is based on the consistent changing tendency of their permutation entropies⁵⁹ (see




FIG. 2. Schematic of time-resolved ordinal-pattern-based estimation of direction of interactions. Sequences of permutation symbols (here: A, B, C , and D) derived from successive segments of time series (moving-window technique). Direction of interactions can be quantified by estimating the differential flow of information between symbol sequences (from sequence 1 to sequence 2 and vice versa) via transition probabilities p between current and past states (black arrows).

Fig. 2). The value of the order parameter can be used to assess the strength of an interaction. In case of phase synchronization, the latter can be assessed with a metric (so-called ordinal synchronization) that is based on the dot product between two ordinal vectors⁶⁰. Analysis techniques based on transcripts⁶¹ as well as those based on conceptual extensions (so-called coupling complexity)^{62,63} allow one to detect and characterize various forms of synchronization and the strength of an interaction can be assessed with different derived estimators.

The majority of estimators for the direction of interactions are based on the information-theoretic functional conditional mutual information^{64,65} and need to be defined asymmetrically to allow detection of a directed flow of information (see Fig. 2). Among these estimators are directionality indices based on the so-called PI approach⁶⁶, on symbolic transfer entropy^{67–71}, on momentary information transfer⁷², on transcripts^{73,74}, on closeness mapping⁷⁵, on the ratio of the number of missing joint ordinal patterns⁷⁶, or on joined symbolic recurrences⁷⁷. Some of these estimators take into account coupling delays^{70,72}, which is of importance as it allows for improved physical interpretations. There are also extensions that enable the time-resolved investigation of directional relationships between coupled dynamical systems from short and transient noisy time series⁷¹. With respect to complex-network-based studies, an estimator for the direction of interactions should allow for distinguishing direct from indirect directional couplings, as this is a key to avoid severe misinterpretations of possible causal relationships. So far, only one of the aforementioned approaches (symbolic transfer entropy) has been extended using partialization analysis to allow for such a distinction^{78,79}. It remains to be investigated, however, whether these extensions suffer from limitations similar to the ones identified for other partialized estimators for the direction of interactions when investigating interac-

tions in larger networks (number of nodes $\gg 10$)⁸⁰.

I briefly mention complementary approach from the field of time series networks⁸¹, i.e., a transformation of a time series into the complex network domain, namely transition networks derived from ordinal patterns as well as cross and joint ordinal transition networks. These networks can then be investigated further to characterize strength and direction of interactions^{81–85}. There are, however, some issues that would need to be fully resolved to allow judging general applicability of these approaches.

III. TOWARDS CHARACTERIZING EVOLVING FUNCTIONAL BRAIN NETWORKS WITH ORDINAL METHODS

Ordinal methods appear to be ideally suited to improve characterization of the complex time-varying dynamics of the human brain⁸⁶ given its contrasting and, at times, complicated forms of appearance: oscillations at a variety of frequencies⁸⁷ coexisting with scale-free dynamics ($1/f^\alpha$ -like power spectrum (with $\alpha \in [1, 3]$) at many spatial-temporal scales^{88–93}). Indeed, a number of studies provided evidence for univariate ordinal time-series-analysis techniques to detect spatial-temporal changes of EEG data related to epileptic activity in a quantitative and efficient way that may provide helpful information for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes^{23,94–104}. Similar observations were made for other neurological and neurodevelopmental disorders such as traumatic brain injury¹⁰⁵, mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer’s disease¹⁰⁶, Parkinson’s disease¹⁰⁷ and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder¹⁰⁸, and all these disorders impose a high individual, medical, psychosocial and socioeconomic burden for those affected. The techniques were also shown to allow differentiating sleep states^{101,109–112} and various awake states (including different mental activities)^{113–115}, brain dynamics during resting states related to different age groups¹¹⁶, as well as brain states related to anesthesia^{117–120}.

Regardless of the success of univariate ordinal time-series-analysis techniques, one should keep in mind that the majority of physiological and pathophysiological changes in brain dynamics investigated so far are accompanied by distinct modifications of the respective brain dynamics’ frequency content which – in many cases – is visible to the naked eye. Future studies should thus demonstrate advantages of univariate ordinal time-series-analysis techniques over *classical* techniques^{121,122}, also to increase their acceptance for clinical applications.

In contrast to the aforementioned rather large number of possible applications of univariate ordinal time-series-analysis techniques, there are so far only a few studies that employed bivariate ordinal techniques to characterize interactions between various pairs of brain regions. Although mainly restricted to multichannel recordings from subjects with epilepsy, techniques allowed a comparably thorough characterization of strength⁵⁹ and di-

rection⁶⁷ of short- to long-ranged interactions between structurally identical and nonidentical coupled but not yet fully synchronized brain regions – covering lobes and hemispheres – from time-resolved analyses of multiday recordings that captured a large variety of physiological and pathophysiological brain states^{4,67,68,70,123,124}. These investigations also provided evidence for bivariate ordinal time-series-analysis techniques to allow an improved characterization of brain interaction dynamics that can be regarded predictive of an impending epileptic seizure¹²⁴, a prerequisite for the development of refined seizure prevention or control techniques¹²⁵. Nevertheless, these studies also identified potential limitations if confounding variables such as delayed interactions, asymmetric signal-to-noise ratios, number of interacting systems or connection densities are not taken into account. In general, these studies suggested to estimate both strength and direction of interactions in order to effectively distinguish various coupling regimes (uncoupled, weak to strong couplings) and to avoid misinterpretations when investigating directional interactions between complex dynamical systems¹²⁴.

Bivariate ordinal time-series-analysis techniques were also shown to reliably detect and characterize changes of transient (in the order of a few 100 milliseconds) directional interactions between brain regions associated with cognitive control⁷¹ as well as to identify topographical reorganizations of interactions between brain regions related to coma¹²⁶, stroke¹²⁷, or anesthesia-induced unconsciousness¹²⁸.

By now, investigations of evolving functional brain networks employing bivariate ordinal time-series-analysis techniques are rare and exclusively related to epilepsy^{129,130}. A highly time-resolved investigation of importance of vertices in evolving functional brain networks during a large number of seizures identified “hub”-like brain regions that appear to be of relevance for the complex spatial-temporal spreading dynamics¹²⁹. Interestingly, these brain regions only rarely coincided with the clinically defined seizure onset zone, which calls for revisiting the role of the latter in seizure generation^{130–133}. Eventually, a comparative study employed bivariate ordinal^{59,67} and phase-synchronization-based^{134,135} time-series-analysis techniques to characterize weighted and directed interactions in functional brain networks – that evolve over several days – from a large group of subjects with epilepsy¹³⁰. On a population-sample level and despite the heterogeneity of investigated cases, both approaches appeared to provide comparable information about the network characteristics. On the level of individual subjects, however, the approaches provided largely independent, non-redundant information but with a varying contrast. This can probably be related to the various concepts (different synchronization phenomena, information flow) from which time-series-analysis techniques were derived.

IV. THE NEXT STEPS

Summarizing the state-of-the-art of bivariate ordinal time-series-analysis techniques in use to characterize complex interactions, it can be noted that there are more estimators for the direction of an interaction than for the strength, notwithstanding the coupling function. While estimators for the strength of interactions were mainly designed to capture the various forms of synchronization, the majority of estimators for the direction are based on the information-theoretic functional conditional mutual information, for which many approximations are available. Given this imbalance, many studies in the neurosciences (as well as in other disciplines) employed ordinal time-series-analysis techniques to either estimate the direction or the strength of interactions, or estimated both but by employing ordinal techniques that were derived from different concepts. In the latter case, it is important to note that the techniques' efficiency may be influenced differently by a number of confounding factors: volume conduction effects^{136,137}, propagation delays and delayed couplings^{70,138,139}, asymmetric signal-to-noise ratios^{140–142} or eigenfrequency ratios^{141,143} (in case of oscillating (sub)systems), peculiarities of the recording^{144–150}, pre-processing steps such as filtering^{151,152}, the techniques' capability to distinguish between (apparent) interdependencies due to common sources and (true) interdependencies due to interacting (sub)systems^{141,147}, the techniques' capability to distinguish between direct and indirect interactions^{80,153–155}, or the techniques' different sensitivities for the various types of synchronization phenomena, to name just a few. Many confounding factors can be identified by investigating e.g. coupled paradigmatic model systems with well-known properties. The impact of such factors can be minimized by improving the techniques' robustness and by using surrogate concepts^{156–158}, but these are rarely used in the context of ordinal time-series-analysis techniques. More importantly, we still lack reliable surrogate concepts to probe for the direction of interactions.

An exception to the aforementioned conceptual mixture are transcripts-based estimators for strength and direction of interactions^{61,73}, which share a common conceptual base. So far, their general applicability and particularly for the neurosciences has been demonstrated only by way of example, and their susceptibility to the aforementioned (and other) confounding factors remains to be elucidated.

Future extensions and/or improvements of estimators for strength and direction of pairwise and higher-order¹⁵⁹ interactions, of coupling functions as well as of concepts underlying ordinal methods can be expected to further increase capability of ordinal time-series-analysis techniques to investigate time-evolving networks – in the neurosciences as well as in other scientific domains concerned with networked dynamical systems.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, I have briefly reviewed the state-of-the-art of univariate and bivariate ordinal time-series-analysis techniques thereby focusing on applications in the neurosciences. I also discussed current limitations to stimulate further developments which would be necessary to advance characterization of evolving functional brain networks during both physiological and pathophysiological conditions. Ordinal time series analysis carries the potential to improve characterization of the still poorly understood spatial–temporal dynamics of the human brain.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In memory of our esteemed colleague Karsten Keller, who unexpectedly passed away in April 2022.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

REFERENCES

- ¹B. L. Hao, *Elementary Symbolic Dynamics and Chaos in Dissipative Systems*. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989).
- ²C. Daw, C. Finney, and E. Tracy, “A review of symbolic analysis of experimental data.” *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **74**, 915–930 (2003).
- ³C. Bandt and B. Pompe, “Permutation entropy: A natural complexity measure for time series,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 174102 (2002).
- ⁴M. Staniek and K. Lehnertz, “Parameter selection in permutation entropy measurements,” *Int. J. Bifurcation Chaos Appl. Sci. Eng.* **17**, 3729 (2007).
- ⁵S. Berger, A. Kravtsov, G. Schneider, and D. Jordan, “Teaching ordinal patterns to a computer: Efficient encoding algorithms based on the Lehmer code,” *Entropy* **21**, 1023 (2019).
- ⁶A. Myers and F. A. Khasawneh, “On the automatic parameter selection for permutation entropy,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **30**, 033130 (2020).
- ⁷F. Takens, “Detecting strange attractors in turbulence,” in *Dynamical Systems and Turbulence (Warwick 1980)*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 898, edited by D. A. Rand and L.-S. Young (Springer, Berlin, 1981) pp. 366–381.
- ⁸T. Sauer, J. Yorke, and M. Casdagli, “Embedology,” *J. Stat. Phys.* **65**, 579–616 (1991).
- ⁹J. Amigó, *Permutation complexity in dynamical systems: ordinal patterns, permutation entropy and all that* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2010).
- ¹⁰M. Zanin, L. Zunino, O. A. Rosso, and D. Papo, “Permutation entropy and its main biomedical and econophysics applications: A review,” *Entropy* **14**, 1553–1577 (2012).
- ¹¹J. M. Amigó, K. Keller, and J. Kurths, “Recent progress in symbolic dynamic and permutation complexity: Ten years of permutation entropy,” *Eur. Phys. J. ST* **222** (2013).
- ¹²V. A. Unakafova and K. Keller, “Efficiently measuring complexity on the basis of real-world data,” *Entropy* **15**, 4392–4415 (2013).

- ¹³J. M. Amigó, K. Keller, and V. A. Unakafova, “Ordinal symbolic analysis and its application to biomedical recordings,” *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **373**, 20140091 (2015).
- ¹⁴K. Keller, T. Mangold, I. Stolz, and J. Werner, “Permutation entropy: New ideas and challenges,” *Entropy* **19**, 134 (2017).
- ¹⁵K. Keller, “Entropy measures for data analysis: theory, algorithms and applications,” *Entropy* **21**, 935 (2019).
- ¹⁶A. B. Piek, I. Stolz, and K. Keller, “Algorithmics, possibilities and limits of ordinal pattern based entropies,” *Entropy* **21**, 547 (2019).
- ¹⁷T. Gutjahr and K. Keller, “Ordinal pattern based entropies and the Kolmogorov–Sinai entropy: An update,” *Entropy* **22**, 63 (2020).
- ¹⁸M. Zanin and F. Olivares, “Ordinal patterns-based methodologies for distinguishing chaos from noise in discrete time series,” *Commun. Phys.* **4**, 190 (2021).
- ¹⁹I. Leyva, J. H. Martínez, C. Masoller, O. A. Rosso, and M. Zanin, “20 years of ordinal patterns: Perspectives and challenges,” *Europhysics Letters* **138**, 31001 (2022).
- ²⁰J. M. Amigó, S. Zambrano, and M. A. Sanjuán, “Detecting determinism in time series with ordinal patterns: a comparative study,” *Int. J. Bifurcation Chaos* **20**, 2915–2924 (2010).
- ²¹M. Small, M. McCullough, and K. Sakellariou, “Ordinal network measures—quantifying determinism in data,” in *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems (IS-CAS)* (IEEE, 2018) pp. 1–5.
- ²²Y. Hirata, M. Shiro, and J. M. Amigó, “Surrogate data preserving all the properties of ordinal patterns up to a certain length,” *Entropy* **21**, 713 (2019).
- ²³Y. Cao, W. Tung, J. B. Gao, V. A. Protopopescu, and L. M. Hively, “Detecting dynamical changes in time series using the permutation entropy,” *Phys. Rev. E* **70**, 046217 (2004).
- ²⁴U. Parlitz, H. Suetani, and S. Luther, “Identification of equivalent dynamics using ordinal pattern distributions,” *Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics* **222**, 553–568 (2013).
- ²⁵M. Zanin, A. Rodríguez-González, E. Menasalvas Ruiz, and D. Papo, “Assessing time series reversibility through permutation patterns,” *Entropy* **20**, 665 (2018).
- ²⁶O. A. Rosso, H. Larrondo, M. T. Martin, A. Plastino, and M. A. Fuentes, “Distinguishing noise from chaos,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 154102 (2007).
- ²⁷S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavez, and D.-U. Hwang, “Complex networks: Structure and dynamics,” *Phys. Rep.* **424**, 175–308 (2006).
- ²⁸A. Arenas, A. Díaz-Guilera, J. Kurths, Y. Moreno, and C. Zhou, “Synchronization in complex networks,” *Phys. Rep.* **469**, 93–153 (2008).
- ²⁹M. Barthélemy, “Spatial networks,” *Phys. Rep.* **499**, 1–101 (2011).
- ³⁰P. Holme and J. Saramäki, “Temporal networks,” *Phys. Rep.* **519**, 97–125 (2012).
- ³¹D. S. Bassett and O. Sporns, “Network neuroscience,” *Nat. Neurosci.* **20**, 353–364 (2017).
- ³²M. Gosak, R. Markovič, J. Dolenšek, M. S. Rupnik, M. Marhl, A. Stožer, and M. Perc, “Network science of biological systems at different scales: A review,” *Phys. Life Rev.* **24**, 118–135 (2018).
- ³³A. Halu, M. De Domenico, A. Arenas, and A. Sharma, “The multiplex network of human diseases,” *NPJ Syst. Biol. Appl.* **5**, 1–12 (2019).
- ³⁴P. Wang, “Network biology: Recent advances and challenges,” *Gene Protein Dis*, 101 (2022).
- ³⁵A. A. Ioannides, “Dynamic functional connectivity,” *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **17**, 161–170 (2007).
- ³⁶C. T. Butts, “Revisiting the foundations of network analysis,” *Science* **325**, 414–416 (2009).
- ³⁷S. Bialonski, M. Horstmann, and K. Lehnertz, “From brain to earth and climate systems: Small-world interaction networks or not?” *Chaos* **20**, 013134 (2010).
- ³⁸J. Hlinka, D. Hartman, and M. Paluš, “Small-world topology of functional connectivity in randomly connected dynamical systems,” *Chaos* **22**, 033107 (2012).
- ³⁹D. Papo, M. Zanin, J. H. Martínez, and J. M. Buldú, “Beware of the small-world neuroscientist!” *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* **10**, 96 (2016).
- ⁴⁰J. Hlinka, D. Hartman, N. Jajcay, D. Tomeček, J. Tintěra, and M. Paluš, “Small-world bias of correlation networks: From brain to climate,” *Chaos* **27**, 035812 (2017).
- ⁴¹O. Korhonen, M. Zanin, and D. Papo, “Principles and open questions in functional brain network reconstruction,” *Hum. Brain Mapp.* **42**, 3680–3711 (2021).
- ⁴²T. Rings, T. Bröhl, and K. Lehnertz, “Network structure from a characterization of interactions in complex systems,” *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 11742 (2022).
- ⁴³K. Lehnertz, G. Ansmann, S. Bialonski, H. Dickten, C. Geier, and S. Porz, “Evolving networks in the human epileptic brain,” *Physica D* **267**, 7–15 (2014).
- ⁴⁴A. S. Pikovsky, M. G. Rosenblum, and J. Kurths, *Synchronization: A universal concept in nonlinear sciences* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2001).
- ⁴⁵S. Boccaletti, J. Kurths, G. Osipov, D. L. Valladares, and C. S. Zhou, “The synchronization of chaotic systems,” *Phys. Rep.* **366**, 1–101 (2002).
- ⁴⁶H. Kantz and T. Schreiber, *Nonlinear Time Series Analysis*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2003).
- ⁴⁷E. Pereda, R. Quiñero, and J. Bhattacharya, “Nonlinear multivariate analysis of neurophysiological signals,” *Prog. Neurobiol.* **77**, 1–37 (2005).
- ⁴⁸K. Hlaváčková-Schindler, M. Paluš, M. Vejmelka, and J. Bhattacharya, “Causality detection based on information-theoretic approaches in time series analysis,” *Phys. Rep.* **441**, 1–46 (2007).
- ⁴⁹N. Marwan, M. C. Romano, M. Thiel, and J. Kurths, “Recurrence plots for the analysis of complex systems,” *Phys. Rep.* **438**, 237–329 (2007).
- ⁵⁰K. Lehnertz, “Assessing directed interactions from neurophysiological signals – an overview,” *Physiol. Meas.* **32**, 1715–1724 (2011).
- ⁵¹T. Stankovski, T. Pereira, P. V. E. McClintock, and A. Stefanovska, “Coupling functions: Universal insights into dynamical interaction mechanisms,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 045001 (2017).
- ⁵²J. Runge, “Causal network reconstruction from time series: From theoretical assumptions to practical estimation,” *Chaos* **28**, 075310 (2018).
- ⁵³L. Rydin Gorjão, J. Heysel, K. Lehnertz, and M. R. R. Tabar, “Analysis and data-driven reconstruction of bivariate jump-diffusion processes,” *Phys. Rev. E* **100**, 062127 (2019).
- ⁵⁴M. R. R. Tabar, *Analysis and Data-Based Reconstruction of Complex Dynamical Systems: Using the Methods of Stochastic Processes* (Springer, Cham-Switzerland, 2019).
- ⁵⁵A. Papana, “Connectivity analysis for multivariate time series: Correlation vs. causality,” *Entropy* **23**, 1570 (2021).
- ⁵⁶A. Papana, E. Siggiridou, and D. Kugiumtzis, “Detecting direct causality in multivariate time series: A comparative study,” *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.* **99**, 105797 (2021).
- ⁵⁷T. Stankovski, T. Pereira, P. V. E. McClintock, and A. Stefanovska, “Coupling functions: dynamical interaction mechanisms in the physical, biological and social sciences,” *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A* **377**, 20190039 (2019).
- ⁵⁸S. Boccaletti, A. N. Pisarchik, C. I. Del Genio, and A. Amann, *Synchronization: from coupled systems to complex networks* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2018).
- ⁵⁹Z. Liu, “Measuring the degree of synchronization from time series data,” *Europhys. Lett.* **68**, 19–25 (2004).
- ⁶⁰I. Echevoyen, V. Vera-Ávila, R. Sevilla-Escoboza, J. H. Martínez, and J. M. Buldú, “Ordinal synchronization: Using ordinal patterns to capture interdependencies between time series,” *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **119**, 8–18 (2019).
- ⁶¹R. Monetti, W. Bunk, T. Aschenbrenner, and F. Jamitzky, “Characterizing synchronization in time series using information

- measures extracted from symbolic representations,” *Phys. Rev. E* **79**, 046207 (2009).
- ⁶²J. M. Amigo, R. Monetti, T. Aschenbrenner, and W. Bunk, “Transcripts: An algebraic approach to coupled time series,” *Chaos* **22** (2012), 10.1063/1.3673238.
- ⁶³R. Monetti, J. M. Amigó, T. Aschenbrenner, and W. Bunk, “Permutation complexity of interacting dynamical systems,” *Eur. Phys. J.: ST* **222**, 421–436 (2013).
- ⁶⁴T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. (Jon Wiley and Sons, New York, 2006).
- ⁶⁵T. Bossomaier, L. Barnett, and M. Harré, *An Introduction to Transfer Entropy* (Springer Cham, Switzerland, 2016).
- ⁶⁶A. Bahraminasab, F. Ghasemi, A. Stefanovska, P. V. E. McClintock, and H. Kantz, “Direction of coupling from phases of interacting oscillators: A permutation information approach,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 084101 (2008).
- ⁶⁷M. Staniek and K. Lehnertz, “Symbolic transfer entropy,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 158101 (2008).
- ⁶⁸M. Staniek and K. Lehnertz, “Symbolic transfer entropy: inferring directionality in biosignals,” *Biomed. Tech.* **54**, 323–328 (2009).
- ⁶⁹D. Kugiumtzis, “Transfer entropy on rank vectors,” *J. Nonlinear Syst. Appl.* **3**, 73–81 (2012).
- ⁷⁰H. Dickten and K. Lehnertz, “Identifying delayed directional couplings with symbolic transfer entropy,” *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 062706 (2014).
- ⁷¹M. Martini, T. A. Kranz, T. Wagner, and K. Lehnertz, “Inferring directional interactions from transient signals with symbolic transfer entropy,” *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 011919 (2011).
- ⁷²B. Pompe and J. Runge, “Momentary information transfer as a coupling measure of time series,” *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 051122 (2011).
- ⁷³R. Monetti, W. Bunk, T. Aschenbrenner, S. Springer, and J. M. Amigó, “Information directionality in coupled time series using transcripts,” *Phys. Rev. E* **88**, 022911 (2013).
- ⁷⁴J. M. Amigo, R. Monetti, B. Graff, and G. Graff, “Computing algebraic transfer entropy and coupling directions via transcripts,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **26**, 113115 (2016).
- ⁷⁵J. M. Amigó and Y. Hirata, “Detecting directional couplings from multivariate flows by the joint distance distribution,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **28**, 075302 (2018).
- ⁷⁶Y. Yin, X. Wang, Q. Li, P. Shang, and F. Hou, “Quantifying interdependence using the missing joint ordinal patterns,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **29**, 073114 (2019).
- ⁷⁷M. Porfiri and M. Ruiz Marín, “Transfer entropy on symbolic recurrences,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **29**, 063123 (2019).
- ⁷⁸D. Kugiumtzis, “Partial transfer entropy on rank vectors,” *Eur. Phys. J.-Spec. Top.* **222**, 401–420 (2013).
- ⁷⁹A. Papan, C. Kyrtsov, D. Kugiumtzis, and C. Diks, “Detecting causality in non-stationary time series using partial symbolic transfer entropy: Evidence in financial data,” *Comput. Econ.* **47**, 341–365 (2016).
- ⁸⁰T. Rings and K. Lehnertz, “Distinguishing between direct and indirect directional couplings in large oscillator networks: partial or non-partial phase analyses?” *Chaos* **26**, 093106 (2016).
- ⁸¹Y. Zou, R. V. Donner, N. Marwan, J. F. Donges, and J. Kurths, “Complex network approaches to nonlinear time series analysis,” *Phys. Rep.* **787**, 1–97 (2019).
- ⁸²J. Zhang, J. Zhou, M. Tang, H. Guo, M. Small, and Y. Zou, “Constructing ordinal partition transition networks from multivariate time series,” *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 7795 (2017).
- ⁸³H. Guo, J.-Y. Zhang, Y. Zou, and S.-G. Guan, “Cross and joint ordinal partition transition networks for multivariate time series analysis,” *Front. Phys.* **13**, 130508 (2018).
- ⁸⁴Y. Ruan, R. V. Donner, S. Guan, and Y. Zou, “Ordinal partition transition network based complexity measures for inferring coupling direction and delay from time series,” *Chaos* **29**, 043111 (2019).
- ⁸⁵N. P. Subramaniam, R. Donner, V. D. Caron, G. Panuccio, and J. Hyttinen, “Causal coupling inference from multivariate time series based on ordinal partition transition networks,” *Nonlin. Dyn.* **105**, 555–578 (2021).
- ⁸⁶K. Lehnertz, C. Geier, T. Rings, and K. Stahn, “Capturing time-varying brain dynamics,” *EPJ Nonlin. Biomed. Phys.* **5**, 2 (2017).
- ⁸⁷E. Niedermeyer and F. Lopes da Silva, *Electroencephalography: Basic Principles, Clinical Applications, and Related Fields*, edited by E. Niedermeyer and F. Lopes da Silva (Lippincott Williams and Williams, Philadelphia, 2005).
- ⁸⁸T. Gisiger, “Scale invariance in biology: coincidence or footprint of a universal mechanism?” *Biological Reviews* **76**, 161–209 (2001).
- ⁸⁹C. Bédard, H. Kröger, and A. Destexhe, “Does the $1/f$ frequency scaling of brain signals reflect self-organized critical states?” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 118102 (2006).
- ⁹⁰S. Marom, “Neural timescales or lack thereof,” *Prog. Neurobiol.* **90**, 16–28 (2010).
- ⁹¹G. Werner, “Fractals in the nervous system: conceptual implications for theoretical neuroscience,” *Front. Psychol.* **1**, 15 (2010).
- ⁹²G. Buzsáki, C. A. Anastassiou, and C. Koch, “The origin of extracellular fields and currents—EEG, ECoG, LFP and spikes,” *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **13**, 407–420 (2012).
- ⁹³B. J. He, “Scale-free brain activity: past, present, and future,” *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **18**, 480–487 (2014).
- ⁹⁴K. Keller and H. Lauffer, “Symbolic analysis of high-dimensional time series,” *Int. J. Bifurcation Chaos* **13**, 2657–2668 (2003).
- ⁹⁵K. Keller and M. Sinn, “Ordinal analysis of time series,” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **356**, 114–120 (2005).
- ⁹⁶K. Keller, H. Lauffer, and M. Sinn, “Ordinal analysis of EEG time series,” *Chaos Complexity Lett.* **2**, 247–258 (2007).
- ⁹⁷G. Ouyang, C. Dang, D. A. Richards, and X. Li, “Ordinal pattern based similarity analysis for EEG recordings,” *Clin. Neurophysiol.* **121**, 694–703 (2010).
- ⁹⁸K. Schindler, H. Gast, L. Stieglitz, A. Stibal, M. Hauf, R. Wiest, L. Mariani, and C. Rummel, “Forbidden ordinal patterns of perictal intracranial EEG indicate deterministic dynamics in human epileptic seizures,” *Epilepsia* **52**, 1771–1780 (2011).
- ⁹⁹K. Schindler, H. Gast, M. Goodfellow, and C. Rummel, “On seeing the trees and the forest: Single-signal and multisignal analysis of perictal intracranial EEG,” *Epilepsia* **53**, 1658–1668 (2012).
- ¹⁰⁰C. Rummel, E. Abela, M. Hauf, R. Wiest, and K. Schindler, “Ordinal patterns in epileptic brains: Analysis of intracranial EEG and simultaneous EEG-fMRI,” *Eur. Phys. J.: Special Topics* **222**, 569–585 (2013).
- ¹⁰¹K. Keller, A. M. Unakafov, and V. A. Unakafova, “Ordinal patterns, entropy, and EEG,” *Entropy* **16**, 6212–6239 (2014).
- ¹⁰²F. O. Redelico, F. Traversaro, M. d. C. García, W. Silva, O. A. Rosso, and M. Risk, “Classification of normal and pre-ictal EEG signals using permutation entropies and a generalized linear model as a classifier,” *Entropy* **19**, 72 (2017).
- ¹⁰³K. Zeng, G. Ouyang, H. Chen, Y. Gu, X. Liu, and X. Li, “Characterizing dynamics of absence seizure EEG with spatial-temporal permutation entropy,” *Neurocomputing* **275**, 577–585 (2018).
- ¹⁰⁴M. Granado, S. Collavini, R. Baravalle, N. Martinez, M. A. Montemurro, O. A. Rosso, and F. Montani, “High-frequency oscillations in the ripple bands and amplitude information coding: Toward a biomarker of maximum entropy in the preictal signals,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **32**, 093151 (2022).
- ¹⁰⁵K. Kalpakis, S. Yang, P. F. Hu, C. F. Mackenzie, L. G. Stansbury, D. M. Stein, and T. M. Scalea, “Permutation entropy analysis of vital signs data for outcome prediction of patients with severe traumatic brain injury,” *Comp. Biol. Med.* **56**, 167–

- 174 (2015).
- ¹⁰⁶F. C. Morabito, D. Labate, F. L. Foresta, A. Bramanti, G. Morabito, and I. Palamara, “Multivariate multi-scale permutation entropy for complexity analysis of Alzheimer’s disease EEG,” *Entropy* **14**, 1186–1202 (2012).
- ¹⁰⁷G.-S. Yi, J. Wang, B. Deng, and X.-L. Wei, “Complexity of resting-state EEG activity in the patients with early-stage Parkinson’s disease,” *Cogn. Neurodyn.* **11**, 147–160 (2017).
- ¹⁰⁸J. Amigó, S. Zambrano, and M. Sanjuán, “Permutation complexity of spatiotemporal dynamics,” *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **90**, 10007 (2010).
- ¹⁰⁹N. Nicolaou and J. Georgiou, “The use of permutation entropy to characterize sleep electroencephalograms,” *Clin. EEG Neurosci.* **42**, 24–28 (2011).
- ¹¹⁰C. Bandt, “A new kind of permutation entropy used to classify sleep stages from invisible EEG microstructure,” *Entropy* **19**, 197 (2017).
- ¹¹¹J. González, M. Cavelli, A. Mondino, C. Pascovich, S. Castro-Zaballa, P. Torterolo, and N. Rubido, “Decreased electrocortical temporal complexity distinguishes sleep from wakefulness,” *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 18457 (2019).
- ¹¹²F. Hou, L. Zhang, B. Qin, G. Gaggioni, X. Liu, and G. Vandewalle, “Changes in EEG permutation entropy in the evening and in the transition from wake to sleep,” *Sleep* **44**, zsa226 (2021).
- ¹¹³S. I. Dimitriadis, N. A. Laskaris, V. Tsirka, S. Erimaki, M. Vourkas, S. Micheloyannis, and S. Fotopoulos, “A novel symbolization scheme for multichannel recordings with emphasis on phase information and its application to differentiate EEG activity from different mental tasks,” *Cogn. Neurodyn.* **6**, 107–113 (2012).
- ¹¹⁴S. Dimitriadis, Y. Sun, N. Laskaris, N. Thakor, and A. Bezerianos, “Revealing cross-frequency causal interactions during a mental arithmetic task through symbolic transfer entropy: A novel vector-quantization approach,” *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehab. Engin.* **24**, 1017–1028 (2016).
- ¹¹⁵C. Quintero-Quiroz, L. Montesano, A. J. Pons, M. C. Torrent, J. García-Ojalvo, and C. Masoller, “Differentiating resting brain states using ordinal symbolic analysis,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **28**, 106307 (2018).
- ¹¹⁶I. Kottlarz, S. Berg, D. Toscano-Tejeda, I. Steinmann, M. Bähr, S. Luther, M. Wilke, U. Parlitz, and A. Schlemmer, “Extracting robust biomarkers from multichannel EEG time series using nonlinear dimensionality reduction applied to ordinal pattern statistics and spectral quantities,” *Frontiers in physiology* **11**, 614565 (2021).
- ¹¹⁷D. Jordan, G. Stockmanns, E. F. Kochs, S. Pilge, and G. Schneider, “Electroencephalographic order pattern analysis for the separation of consciousness and unconsciousness: an analysis of approximate entropy, permutation entropy, recurrence rate, and phase coupling of order recurrence plots,” *Anesthesiology* **109**, 1014–1022 (2008).
- ¹¹⁸E. Olofsen, J. W. Sleigh, and A. Dahan, “Permutation entropy of the electroencephalogram: a measure of anaesthetic drug effect,” *Brit. J. Anaest.* **101**, 810–821 (2008).
- ¹¹⁹D. Li, X. Li, Z. Liang, L. J. Voss, and J. W. Sleigh, “Multi-scale permutation entropy analysis of EEG recordings during sevoflurane anesthesia,” *J. Neural Eng.* **7**, 046010 (2010).
- ¹²⁰S. Sarasso, A. G. Casali, S. Casarotto, M. Rosanova, C. Sinigaglia, M. Massimini, *et al.*, “Consciousness and complexity: a consilience of evidence,” *Neurosci. Conscious.* **7**, 1–24 (2021).
- ¹²¹S. Berger, G. Schneider, E. F. Kochs, and D. Jordan, “Permutation entropy: too complex a measure for EEG time series?” *Entropy* **19**, 692 (2017).
- ¹²²A. M. Yamashita Rios de Sousa and J. Hlinka, “Assessing serial dependence in ordinal patterns processes using chi-squared tests with application to EEG data analysis,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **32**, 073126 (2022).
- ¹²³H. Osterhage, F. Mormann, M. Staniek, and K. Lehnertz, “Measuring synchronization in the epileptic brain: A comparison of different approaches,” *Int. J. Bifurcation Chaos Appl. Sci. Eng.* **17**, 3539–3544 (2007).
- ¹²⁴K. Lehnertz and H. Dickten, “Assessing directionality and strength of coupling through symbolic analysis: an application to epilepsy patients,” *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **373**, 20140094 (2015).
- ¹²⁵L. Kuhlmann, K. Lehnertz, M. P. Richardson, B. Schelter, and H. P. Zaveri, “Seizure prediction – ready for a new era,” *Nat. Rev. Neurol.* **14**, 618–630 (2018).
- ¹²⁶F. Zubler, C. Koenig, A. Steimer, S. M. Jakob, K. A. Schindler, and H. Gast, “Prognostic and diagnostic value of EEG signal coupling measures in coma,” *Clin. Neurophysiol.* **127**, 2942–2952 (2016).
- ¹²⁷F. Zubler, A. Seiler, T. Horvath, C. Roth, S. Miano, C. Rummel, H. Gast, L. Nobili, K. A. Schindler, and C. L. Bassetti, “Stroke causes a transient imbalance of interhemispheric information flow in EEG during non-REM sleep,” *Clin. Neurophysiol.* **129**, 1418–1426 (2018).
- ¹²⁸H. Lee, Z. Huang, X. Liu, U. Lee, and A. G. Hudetz, “Topographic reconfiguration of local and shared information in anesthetic-induced unconsciousness,” *Entropy* **20**, 518 (2018).
- ¹²⁹F. Zubler, H. Gast, E. Abela, C. Rummel, M. Hauf, R. Wiest, C. Pollo, and K. Schindler, “Detecting functional hubs of ictogenic networks,” *Brain Topogr.* **28**, 305–317 (2015).
- ¹³⁰H. Dickten, S. Porz, C. E. Elger, and K. Lehnertz, “Weighted and directed interactions in evolving large-scale epileptic brain networks,” *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 34824 (2016).
- ¹³¹C. Geier, S. Bialonski, C. E. Elger, and K. Lehnertz, “How important is the seizure onset zone for seizure dynamics?” *Seizure* **25**, 160–166 (2015).
- ¹³²T. Rings, R. von Wrede, and K. Lehnertz, “Precursors of seizures due to specific spatial-temporal modifications of evolving large-scale epileptic brain networks,” *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 10623 (2019).
- ¹³³R. Fruengel, T. Bröhl, T. Rings, and K. Lehnertz, “Reconfiguration of human evolving large-scale epileptic brain networks prior to seizures: an evaluation with node centralities,” *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 21921 (2020).
- ¹³⁴F. Mormann, K. Lehnertz, P. David, and C. E. Elger, “Mean phase coherence as a measure for phase synchronization and its application to the EEG of epilepsy patients,” *Physica D* **144**, 358–369 (2000).
- ¹³⁵M. G. Rosenblum and A. S. Pikovsky, “Detecting direction of coupling in interacting oscillators,” *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 045202(R) (2001).
- ¹³⁶Z. Albo, G. V. Di Prisco, Y. Chen, G. Rangarajan, W. Truccolo, J. Feng, R. P. Vertes, and M. Ding, “Is partial coherence a viable technique for identifying generators of neural oscillations?” *Biol. Cybern.* **90**, 318–326 (2004).
- ¹³⁷M. Vinck, R. Oostenveld, M. van Wingerden, F. Battaglia, and C. M. A. Pennartz, “An improved index of phase-synchronization for electrophysiological data in the presence of volume-conduction, noise and sample-size bias,” *NeuroImage* **55**, 1548–1565 (2011).
- ¹³⁸A. N. Silchenko, I. Adamchic, N. Pawelczyk, C. Hauptmann, M. Maarouf, V. Sturm, and P. A. Tass, “Data-driven approach to the estimation of connectivity and time delays in the coupling of interacting neuronal subsystems,” *J. Neurosci. Methods* **191**, 32–44 (2010).
- ¹³⁹R. Govindan, J. Raethjen, K. Arning, F. Kopper, and G. Deuschl, “Time delay and partial coherence analyses to identify cortical connectivities,” *Biol. Cybern.* **94**, 262–275 (2006).
- ¹⁴⁰G. Nolte, O. Bai, L. Wheaton, Z. Mari, S. Vorbach, and M. Hallett, “Identifying true brain interaction from EEG data using the imaginary part of coherency,” *Clin. Neurophysiol.* **115**, 2292–2307 (2004).
- ¹⁴¹G. Nolte, A. Ziehe, V. V. Nikulin, A. Schlögl, N. Krämer, T. Brismar, and K.-R. Müller, “Robustly estimating the flow direction of information in complex physical systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 234101 (2008).

- ¹⁴²M. Vinck, L. Huurdeman, C. A. Bosman, P. Fries, F. P. Battaglia, C. M. Pennartz, and P. H. Tiesinga, “How to detect the Granger-causal flow direction in the presence of additive noise?” *Neuroimage* **108**, 301–318 (2015).
- ¹⁴³J. Wu, X. Liu, and J. Feng, “Detecting causality between different frequencies,” *J. Neurosci. Methods* **167**, 367–375 (2008).
- ¹⁴⁴R. Guevara, J. L. P. Velazquez, V. Nenadovic, R. Wennberg, G. Senjanovic, and L. G. Dominguez, “Phase synchronization measurements using electroencephalographic recordings. What can we really say about neuronal synchrony?” *Neuroinformatics* **3**, 301–314 (2005).
- ¹⁴⁵H. P. Zaveri, R. B. Duckrow, and S. S. Spencer, “On the use of bipolar montages for time-series analysis of intracranial electroencephalograms,” *Clin. Neurophysiol.* **117**, 2102–2108 (2006).
- ¹⁴⁶S. Hu, G. Dai, G. A. Worrell, Q. Dai, and H. Liang, “Causality analysis of neural connectivity: critical examination of existing methods and advances of new methods,” *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.* **22**, 829–844 (2011).
- ¹⁴⁷S. Porz, M. Kiel, and K. Lehnertz, “Can spurious indications for phase synchronization due to superimposed signals be avoided?” *Chaos* **24**, 033112 (2014).
- ¹⁴⁸A. Sanz-García, T. Rings, and K. Lehnertz, “Impact of type of intracranial EEG sensors on link strengths of evolving functional brain networks,” *Physiol. Meas.* **39**, 074003 (2018).
- ¹⁴⁹A. C. Snyder, D. Issar, and M. A. Smith, “What does scalp electroencephalogram coherence tell us about long-range cortical networks?” *Eur. J. Neurosci.* **48**, 2466–2481 (2018).
- ¹⁵⁰W. A. Ríos-Herrera, P. V. Olguín-Rodríguez, J. D. Arzate-Mena, M. Corsi-Cabrera, J. Escalona, A. Marín-García, J. Ramos-Loyo, A. L. Rivera, D. Rivera-López, J. F. Zapata-Berruecos, *et al.*, “The influence of EEG references on the analysis of spatio-temporal interrelation patterns,” *Front. Neurosci.* **13**, 941 (2019).
- ¹⁵¹E. Florin, J. Gross, J. Pfeifer, G. R. Fink, and L. Timmermann, “Reliability of multivariate causality measures for neural data,” *J. Neurosci. Methods* **198**, 344–358 (2011).
- ¹⁵²M. Gerster, G. Waterstraat, V. Litvak, K. Lehnertz, A. Schnitzler, E. Florin, G. Curio, and V. Nikulin, “Separating neural oscillations from aperiodic 1/f activity: challenges and recommendations,” *Neuroinformatics* **20**, 991–1012 (2022).
- ¹⁵³J. Nawrath, M. C. Romano, M. Thiel, I. Z. Kiss, M. Wickramasinghe, J. Timmer, J. Kurths, and B. Schelter, “Distinguishing direct from indirect interactions in oscillatory networks with multiple time scales,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 038701 (2010).
- ¹⁵⁴W. Mader, M. Mader, J. Timmer, M. Thiel, and B. Schelter, “Networks: On the relation of bi-and multivariate measures,” *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 10805 (2015).
- ¹⁵⁵J. Lu, R. V. Donner, D. Yin, S. Guan, and Y. Zou, “Partial event coincidence analysis for distinguishing direct and indirect coupling in functional network construction,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **32**, 063134 (2022).
- ¹⁵⁶T. Schreiber and A. Schmitz, “Surrogate time series,” *Physica D* **142**, 346–382 (2000).
- ¹⁵⁷G. Ansmann and K. Lehnertz, “Surrogate-assisted analysis of weighted functional brain networks,” *J. Neurosci. Methods* **208**, 165–172 (2012).
- ¹⁵⁸K. Stahn and K. Lehnertz, “Surrogate-assisted identification of influences of network construction on evolving weighted functional networks,” *Chaos* **27**, 123106 (2017).
- ¹⁵⁹F. Battiston, G. Cencetti, I. Iacopini, V. Latora, M. Lucas, A. Patania, J.-G. Young, and G. Petri, “Networks beyond pairwise interactions: structure and dynamics,” *Phys. Rep.* **874**, 1–92 (2020).