

SAD-TIME: a Spatiotemporal-fused network for depression detection with Automated multi-scale  
Depth-wise and TIME-interval-related common feature extractor

Han-Guang Wang, Hui-Rang Hou, Li-Cheng Jin, Chen-Yang Xu, Zhong-Yi Zhang, and Qing-Hao Meng\*

Tianjin Key Laboratory of Process Measurement and Control, Institute of Robotics and Autonomous Systems, School of  
Electrical and Information Engineering, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, P. R. China

E-mails: [one\\_whg@tju.edu.cn](mailto:one_whg@tju.edu.cn) (Han-Guang Wang), [hohuirang@tju.edu.cn](mailto:hohuirang@tju.edu.cn) (Hui-Rang Hou), [jinlc@tju.edu.cn](mailto:jinlc@tju.edu.cn) (Li-Cheng  
Jin), [xuchenyang@tju.edu.cn](mailto:xuchenyang@tju.edu.cn) (Chen-Yang Xu), [zy\\_zhang\\_auto@tju.edu.cn](mailto:zy_zhang_auto@tju.edu.cn) (Zhong-Yi Zhang), [qh\\_meng@tju.edu.cn](mailto:qh_meng@tju.edu.cn)

(Qing-Hao Meng, corresponding author\*)

## Abstract

Depression is a severe mental disorder, and accurate diagnosis is pivotal to the cure and rehabilitation of people with depression. However, the current questionnaire-based diagnostic methods could bring subjective biases and may be denied by subjects. In search of a more objective means of diagnosis, researchers have begun to experiment with deep learning-based methods for identifying depressive disorders in recent years. In this study, a novel Spatiotemporal-fused network with Automated multi-scale Depth-wise and TIME-interval-related common feature extractor (SAD-TIME) is proposed. SAD-TIME incorporates an automated nodes' common features extractor (CFE), a spatial sector (SpS), a modified temporal sector (TeS), and a domain adversarial learner (DAL). The CFE includes a multi-scale depth-wise 1D-convolutional neural network and a time-interval embedding generator, where the unique information of each channel is preserved. The SpS fuses the functional connectivity with the distance-based connectivity containing spatial position of EEG electrodes. A multi-head-attention graph convolutional network is also applied in the SpS to fuse the features from different EEG channels. The TeS is based on long short-term memory and graph transformer networks, where the temporal information of different time-windows is fused. Moreover, the DAL is used after the SpS to obtain the domain-invariant feature. Experimental results performed on two datasets under tenfold cross-validation show that the proposed SAD-TIME method achieves remarkable results in cross-subject mode.

## Keywords

EEG, Depression Detection, Spatiotemporal Network, Automated Feature Generation

## 1. Introduction

Depression is a common but severe mental disorder, which is characterized by persistent sadness and a lack of interest or pleasure in previously rewarding or enjoyable activities, according to the World Health Organization. In 2019, 280 million people were living with depression, including 23 million children and adolescents [1]. As a consequence, the diagnosis of depression is indispensable. Several questionnaire-based diagnostic methods have been used, including Beck depression inventor (BDI) [2], the patient health questionnaire [3], diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders [4] and the Hamilton depression rating scale [5]. However, questionnaire-based diagnoses will bring subjective biases and may be denied by subjects [6]. Therefore, the alternate, objective and accurate approaches are pivotal.

Electroencephalogram (EEG) data, as one production of sensor-technology development, have been widely used in the depression-detection field. It can be combined with machine learning or deep learning methods, which is considered to be an appropriate alternate approach to fulfill the depression diagnosis task [7].

Multiple manual features, obtained from prior knowledge, are required when integrating EEG data with traditional machine learning algorithms, such as support vector machine (SVM), K-nearest neighbor (KNN), decision tree, and radial basis function network. Mohammadi et al. [8] selected features from fuzzy entropy, Katz fractal dimension, and fuzzy fractal dimension using a Gustafson-Kessel clustering fuzzy algorithm and combined the selected features with a multilayer perceptron neural network to distinguish depressed subjects and healthy control group. Zhao et al. [9] used four EEG microstates with features including corresponding temporal parameters (i.e., duration, occurrence, and coverage) and complexity (i.e., sample entropy and Lempel-Ziv complexity) and incorporated these features with an SVM classifier to distinguish depressed, first-episode, drug-naïve adolescent from non-depressed controls. Cai et al. [10] utilized the combination of linear and nonlinear features extracted from the EEG signal under different emotional modalities as manual features to assist with the detection of depressive subjects. However, firstly, the manual features depend more on prior knowledge. Secondly, the spatial and temporal features are not further extracted when utilizing the traditional machine learning methods just with the time-domain, frequency-domain, or time-frequency-domain features, considering the multiple channels and the sequence-signal attributes of EEG data.

Applying the spatial information of the electrodes or the brain connectivity (including functional and effective

connectivity) is a valid method to extract the innate spatial features from the EEG data, which has been extensively applied to emotion [11], Alzheimer [12], consciousness disorders [13] and depression recognition [14], [15], [16], [17]. Liu et al. [14] and Li et al. [15] all utilized the azimuthal equidistant projection method to project the 3D-electrode positions onto a 2D surface to get the spatial information of those electrodes. Furthermore, Liu et al. [14] and Li et al. [15] combined the spectrograms and power values obtained from theta, alpha, and beta bands with the 2D spatial map to get new maps, which will be the input of their models. Li et al. [16] used coherence analysis, correlation analysis, phase locking value analysis, and phase lag index analysis to get four kinds of functional connectivity maps from delta (1–4 Hz), theta (4–8 Hz), alpha (8–13 Hz), beta (13–30 Hz), and gamma (30–70 Hz) bands. The upper triangle data of those maps were reshaped, and the three maps with the highest classification rate were adopted for the latter network. Saeedi et al. [17] exploited generalized partial directed coherence and direct directed transfer functions to obtain effective connectivity maps as the input of its networks. Nevertheless, the spatial electrode-information and the brain connectivity are not considered simultaneously.

Some deep learning methods are also utilized to further extract the spatial and/or temporal features in depression detection tasks. In [16], a convolutional neural network (CNN) layer was used to further extract spatial features from the connectivity maps. Xu et al. [18] utilized a graph convolutional network (GCN) to extract the innate spatial feature of the EEG signals and used a CNN to further weight the feature maps. Wan et al. [19] proposed a deep learning method using two kinds of CNN kernels to extract the synchronous and regional features from the EEG data, which, to some extent extracted the spatial and temporal features respectively. In addition, derived structures from the recurrent neural network are incorporated. Ay et al. [20] exploited a combination of CNN and long short-term memory (LSTM) to obtain spatial and temporal features separately. In [14], the obtained connectivity maps were first input into the 2D-CNN layers and then passed to the gated recurrent unit (GRU) to extract the spatiotemporal features. Yan et al. [21] used multiple 1D convolutional filters with different scales in CNN layers to extract spatial features from the EEG data and then exploited the GRU to further extract temporal features. However, firstly, the relationship contained in different EEG channels are deteriorated when using the EEG channels as the input channels of a CNN layer. Secondly, the temporal part is directly linked to the spatial part, which is rigid.

In some works, the overlapping technique was used to augment the original data and enhance the correlation between two overlapped time windows (slices), which may have a good effect on the transition of passing those time windows processed after the spatial-feature extraction to the temporal-feature extraction process. The overlapping technique is frequently used in the traditional feature-extraction process [22], [23], or just in the preprocessing stage of a deep learning model [24], where more availability still exists like working as one kind of time pattern in discrete-time-dynamic-graph-learning problem [25].

In this study, a Spatiotemporal-fused network with Automated multi-scale Depth-wise and TIME-interval-related common feature extractor (SAD-TIME) is proposed. The SAD-TIME network combines a spatiotemporal features learner, a domain adversarial learner and a common feature extractor (CFE) that extracts features from the original EEG data automatically. First, the EEG data from both the source domain and target domain are mapped into a common feature space through the common feature extractor. Then, the spatial sector (SpS) of the spatiotemporal network is used to obtain domain-invariant representation, which also contains the innate spatial information of EEG, from the common feature. After that, one route of the model goes from the domain-invariant representation into the temporal sector (TeS) of the spatiotemporal network to obtain the depression classification result. Meanwhile, another route from the domain-invariant representation goes into the domain adversarial learner (DAL), which, however, is just used during the training process. The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- (1). A novel common feature extractor is proposed to obtain the common feature automatically without using the prior knowledge. The common feature extractor can be divided into a novel multi-scale depth-wise convolution sector (DwCS) and a novel time-interval sector (TiS). The DwCS is proposed to avoid destructing the underlying relation of different EEG channels by using a depth-wise 1D-CNN. The TiS is inspired by the overlapping technique and is proposed to build an interval area containing the information between two time-windows to alleviate the rigidity when directly connecting the SpS and the TeS, which simultaneously offers one kind of time pattern when using multiple time-windows.

- (2). A  $\lambda$ -mask matrix based on distance-based connectivity map is proposed to combine with the functional

connectivity matrix that will be automatically generated in the SpS using a multi-head self-attention mechanism. The combination ensures that both spatial electrode-position information and functional connectivity information are considered simultaneously.

(3). A novel framework incorporating a layernorm-LSTM and a modified graph Transformer is proposed in the TeS to further lubricate the connection from SpS to TeS and fuse the temporal information from multiple time-windows.


(4). Extensive experiments are conducted on two depression datasets focused on major depressive disorder (MDD), which is one form of depression. Furthermore, the experiments are based on cross-subject mode, and the domain adaption method is accordingly exploited.

The remainder of the study is organized as follows: Section 2 details the methodologies used in the SAD-TIME network. Section 3 presents the experimental settings on two datasets. Experimental results and evaluations are presented in Section 4. In Section 5, the main findings are summarized.

## 2. Methodologies

To automatically obtain common features without using prior knowledge, while exploiting spatial information and functional connectivity, and to soften the rigid connection from SpS (Spatial Sector) to TeS (Temporal Sector), we propose SAD-TIME, a Spatiotemporal-fused network for depression detection with Automated multi-scale Depth-wise and TIME-interval-related common feature extractor, as outlined in Fig. 1. SAD-TIME consists of four parts, i.e., (1) CFE (Common Feature Extractor), which processes  $T$  time windows obtained from original EEG data of one subject and can be further divided into a DwCS and a TiS. (2) SpS, where the functional connectivity matrix is obtained and then fused with the distance-based connectivity matrix to conduct graph convolution. (3) TeS, where the multiple time windows are fused together by using a layernorm-LSTM and a modified GTN (Graph Transformer Network), and the class prediction is conducted. (4) DAL, where GRL (gradient reversal layer) [26] is used, and the domain classification result is obtained.

The data input of this framework is  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times V \times \text{len}}$ , where  $B$  is the batch size,  $T$  indicates the number of time windows divided from the original EEG data,  $V$  represents the number of EEG channels that correspond to EEG electrodes, and  $\text{len}$  denotes the data length of one time-window after division.



## 2.1 Common Feature Extractor (CFE)

The DwCS of CFE is applied to each time window, considering that it does not destroy the underlying relation among the multiple channels of  $\mathbf{X}$  and explores the hidden information of each EEG channel, rather than using a normal 1D-CNN or 2D-CNN with the EEG channels as the input channels. The depth-wise 1D-CNN kernels on a single scale are summarized as  $\mathbf{CK} \in \mathbb{R}^{(V*kd) \times 1 \times ks}$ , where the number of input channels is  $V$ , and  $ks$  and  $kd$  indicate the size of the kernel and the output dimension of the kernel, respectively. Multiple 1D-CNN layers are used, and in the first layer of the depth-wise convolutional network, for each time window  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times V \times len}$  ( $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ ), a specific 1D-CNN kernel with the channel dimension of  $kd$  is used at one EEG channel to control the channel dimension of output, which is similar to using multiple kernels in 2D-CNN to control the channel dimension of the output. However, when using the depth-wise method, the results are different from the normal 1D-CNN or 2D-CNN because each channel is processed separately and specifically. For the  $kd$ -dimension kernels of each input channel, the results are not added together but concatenated instead. At one EEG channel, the feature dimension is  $l' * kd$ , where  $l'$  is the length of the signal following convolution with a kernel of size  $ks$ . Furthermore, a multi-scale method is adopted, which means 1D-CNN kernels with different  $ks$  are used for each layer. In this study, three-types 1D-CNN kernels are exploited and the detailed information of different depth-wise convolutional layers is shown in Table 1. The final feature from this sector is represented as  $\mathbf{f}_{depth} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times V \times (kd * \sum_{i=1}^3 fl_i)}$ , where  $fl_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) represents the feature length after the processing of three different-scales kernels.

Apart from the DwCS, TiS is used to automatically generate another part of common features by using the embedding of the time interval between two time-windows, where the time intervals work as one kind of time patterns containing the temporal information along different time-windows. As shown in Fig.2, the time interval is derived by combing the time-slice cutting at the end of the former time-window and the cutting at the start of the latter time-window. For example, time-interval<sub>1</sub> is obtained by concatenating End<sub>1</sub> and Start<sub>2</sub>. The process of generating time-intervals is similar to using an overlapping area between two time-windows. T-1 time-intervals  $\mathbf{Ti}$  can be obtained from  $\mathbf{X}$  ( $\mathbf{Ti} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times (T-1) \times V \times (2*ts)}$ , where  $ts$  is the time-slice length of one start/end slice). However, the start cutting of the first time-window and the end of the T-th time-window have no pair. As a consequence, the embedding of these two special slices is processed separately.

The process of TiS is summarized in Fig. 2, where TiS is further divided into two fractions. The first fraction generates the embeddings of the separate first start and last end slices by using two different linear layers, whose outputs have twice

Table 1. Detailed information of different layers of depth-wise convolution using 1D-CNN. ( $V$  is the number of EEG channels,  $kd$  is the output dimension of one single channel.) The output of the kernel in a size of 64 in layer 1 is the input of the kernel in a size of 16 in layer 2 and the rest is in a same way, which is line-to-line and in order.

Layer number	Input channels	Kernel size (ks)	Output channels	Stride	Padding
1	V	64	V*kd	8	valid
		32		4	
		16		2	
Batchnormalization, Activation: Relu, Maxpooling: 2					
2	V*kd	16	V*kd	2	valid
		8			
		4			
Batchnormalization, Activation: Relu, Maxpooling: 4					
3	V*kd	4	V*kd	1	same
		4			
		4			
4	V*kd	8	V*kd	1	same
		8			
		8			
Batchnormalization, Activation: Relu, Maxpooling: 4					




Figure 2. An overview of the TiS (time-interval sector) in the common feature extractor. The TiS can be divided into two fractions. The first fraction contains two different linear layers, where  $\mathbf{f}_{end}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{start}$  are obtained. Another fraction is used to process the time-intervals, where the last dimensions of the time-intervals are first projected to half of its original dimensions and then passed to a two-way autoencoder to obtain the embeddings of time-intervals  $\mathbf{f}_{interval}^i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, T-1$ ).

the feature dimension of the input and the same feature dimension as the last dimension of  $\mathbf{Ti}$ . The outputs are separately  $\mathbf{f}_{start}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{end} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times 1 \times V \times (2 * ts)}$ . The second fraction is used to obtain the embeddings of  $\mathbf{Ti}$ . A two-way autoencoder (TWAE) is applied to the input data whose last dimensions have been halved to 'ts' from the  $(2 * ts)$  of each  $\mathbf{Ti}$ . One way of TWAE contains an internal layer expanding the feature dimension, and the other contains an internal layer descending the feature dimension. The last dimensions of the final outputs of two ways return to 'ts' and are concatenated together to get the embeddings  $\mathbf{f}_{interval}^i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, T-1$ ).

The output of each time window after applying the CFE consists of features from DwCS and the embedding of each time interval or first-start/last-end slice, which is depicted in Eq. (1).

$$\mathbf{f}_{common}^t = \begin{cases} \text{concat } \mathbf{f}_{depth}^t, \mathbf{f}_{start}^t, \mathbf{f}_{interval}^t & \text{if } t = 1 \\ \text{concat } \mathbf{f}_{depth}^t, \mathbf{f}_{interval}^{t-1}, \mathbf{f}_{interval}^t & \text{if } 1 < t \leq T-1, \\ \text{concat } \mathbf{f}_{depth}^t, \mathbf{f}_{interval}^{t-1}, \mathbf{f}_{end} & \text{if } t = T \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{f}_{depth}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times V \times FE}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{common}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times V \times FE}$  are the outputs of DwCS and CFE under each time-window ( $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ ), respectively. In  $\mathbf{f}_{common}^t$ , 'FE' equals  $kd * \sum_{i=1}^3 fl_i + 4 * ts$ .  $\mathbf{f}_{common} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times V \times FE}$  is the final output common feature of the CFE.

## 2.2 The Spatial Sector (SpS) of The Spatiotemporal Network

In the SpS, the graph theory is utilized, where a notion of the node is introduced, and each node corresponds to an EEG channel. When applying the graph-theory network on the  $\mathbf{f}_{common}$ , the feature of each node  $\mathbf{f}_v \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times FE}$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, V$ ) on multiple time-windows is obtained from it. Furthermore, the statistical relationships between nodes establish a connectivity map, which is also the adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times V \times V}$ .

In the proposed model, a distance-based connectivity map  $\mathbf{A}_{Db} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times V \times V}$  containing the spatial-position information of electrodes is used, as shown in Fig. 3, where Fig. 3(a) is provided by [27]. The connected state of  $\mathbf{A}_{Db}$  is either connected or disconnected, which is respectively represented by 0 or 1. The  $\lambda$ -mask matrix  $\mathbf{A}_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times V \times V}$  is obtained by substituting the elements in  $\mathbf{A}_{Db}$  whose values are 1 with  $1 + \lambda$  and 0 with  $1 - \lambda$ . The  $\mathbf{A}_\lambda$  is introduced to fuse the  $\mathbf{A}_{Db}$

with the functional connectivity map.

The functional connectivity map  $\mathbf{A}_{FC} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times V \times V}$  is derived using a multi-head-attention mechanism, which was first proposed in TRANSFORMER and utilized to aggregate nodes' features in graph attention networks [28]. The detailed exploitation in this study is represented in Eq. (2).

$$\mathbf{A}_{F_{ij}}^{t,h} = \frac{\exp\left(\text{LeakyRelu}\left(\left|\Phi^h(\mathbf{f}_{v_i}^t) - \Phi^h(\mathbf{f}_{v_j}^t)\right|\mathbf{a}\right)\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^V \exp\left(\text{LeakyRelu}\left(\left|\Phi^h(\mathbf{f}_{v_i}^t) - \Phi^h(\mathbf{f}_{v_j}^t)\right|\mathbf{a}\right)\right)}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_{F_{ij}}^{t,h} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times 1}$  means the value of the functional connectivity between two nodes  $i$  and  $j$  at  $t$ -th time-window under  $h$ -th head, and  $\mathbf{f}_{v_i}^t$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{v_j}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times FE}$  denote the common features of node  $i$  and  $j$  at  $t$ -th time-window, respectively.  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{FE \times 1}$  is a shared parameter in multi-head attention mechanism, H is the head number,  $\Phi^h(\cdot)$  indicates the  $h$ -th linear layer ( $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$ ), whose projection does not change the last dimension of common feature (from 'FE' to 'FE'). Moreover, 'exp' represents the exponential function under the Napierian base, and the *LeakyRelu* means using the leakyrelu activation, where the negative slope is 0.2. After integrating the data of each dimension of  $\mathbf{A}_{F_{ij}}^{t,h}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_F \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times V \times V \times H}$  is obtained.

The functional connectivity map at multiple time-windows  $\mathbf{A}_{FC}$  is derived from incorporating the connectivity maps at different heads, as shown in Eq. (3).

$$\mathbf{A}_{FC} = \text{mean}_{h=1,2,\dots,H} \mathbf{A}_F^h. \quad (3)$$

The adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is obtained by fusing  $\mathbf{A}_\lambda$  and  $\mathbf{A}_{FC}$  using a Hadamard production  $\otimes$  at each time-window in Eq. (4).

$$\mathbf{A}^t = \mathbf{A}_\lambda \otimes \mathbf{A}_{FC}^t, \mathbf{A} = \text{concat}_{t=1,2,\dots,T} \mathbf{A}^t. \quad (4)$$

The GCN is then exploited upon  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{common}$  to aggregate the feature of each node and its neighbor nodes. Meanwhile, the further spatial feature is extracted, and a simplified GCN, named Chebyshev GCN, is introduced to reduce the computational complexity in this process, which is shown in Eq. (5).

$$\mathbf{g}_\theta *_G \mathbf{f}_{common} = \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbf{P}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{L}}) \mathbf{f}_{common} \theta_k, \quad (5)$$

where  $*_G$  represents graph convolution, the GCN aggregates the features of the nodes that are  $i$ -hop away from one center node ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, K$ ), and the center node aggregates the feature of itself when  $i$  equals 0.  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{(K+1) \times FE \times FS}$  is a vector of




Figure 3. (a). The electrodes layout position (proposed in [27]) that was used in the MODMA (multi-modal open dataset for mental-disorder analysis) dataset, which is in 10-10 equivalent standard. The dark-blue points in (a) are in 10-20 equivalent standard, which are utilized in this study for the PRED+CT (patient repository for EEG data and computational tools) dataset to generate the distance-based adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A}_{Db}$ . (b). The adjacency matrices  $\mathbf{A}_{Db}$  derived from (a) for two datasets. The  $\lambda$ -mask matrices are then generated from these adjacency matrices.

the Chebyshev coefficients and a linear projection is also contained here (from ‘FE’ to ‘FS’) when aggregating the features of  $k$ -hops-away nodes and  $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{V}} = \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}$  is the Laplacian matrix,  $\mathbf{D}_{ij} = \sum_j \mathbf{A}_{ij}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{L}} = 2\mathbf{L}/\mu_{\max} - \mathbf{I}$ , where  $\mu_{\max}$  is the max eigenvalue of matrix  $\mathbf{L}$ , here simplified to 2, and  $\mathbf{I}$  is an identity matrix. Moreover,  $\mathbf{P}(\bullet)$  is the Chebyshev polynomials and its function is shown in Eq. (6).

$$\mathbf{P}_k(m) = \begin{cases} 1 & k = 0 \\ m & k = 1 \\ 2m\mathbf{P}_{k-1}(m) - \mathbf{P}_{k-2}(m) & k \geq 2 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The output of the SpS  $\mathbf{f}_{SpS} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{FS}}$  is obtained after the Chebyshev GCN. It contains further innate spatial features under the fused connectivity. It is also domain-invariant feature when applying the domain adaption method in this study.

### 2.3 The Temporal Sector (TeS) of The Spatiotemporal Network

The TeS is mainly used to further extract the innately temporal features from the SpS  $\mathbf{f}_{SpS}$  and fuse those time-windows processed after the SpS along time-window axis, which may benefit obtaining the smooth connection from the SpS to TeS. The domain-invariant features derived from the source-domain and the target-domain subjects are input into the TeS separately at the training and testing stage, and the TeS can be further divided into three fractions.

The first fraction of the TeS is a layernorm-LSTM, where a layernormalization-layer is used between two LSTM units. The final output is the hidden state at the last timestep, and each time-window corresponds to each timestep. The last hidden state contains the information of the former time-windows, which helps to fuse those time-windows together into one feature map  $\mathbf{f}_{LL} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{FL}}$  (‘FL’ is the output-feature dimension). The process is shown in Eq. (7).

$$\mathbf{f}_{LL} = Relu\left(\Psi\left(\mathbf{f}_{SpS}\right)\right) \quad (7)$$

where  $\Psi(\bullet)$  is the sub-network function of layernorm-LSTM and the *Relu* represents the relu-activation function.

The second fraction is a modified GTN. The GTN [29] is used to construct a new connectivity matrix with the meta-paths extracted from the heterogeneous graph and then obtain the new node feature based on the newly generated connectivity matrix. The heterogeneous graph can be represented by an adjacency-matrix set  $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}_T\}$ , where the adjacency matrix of each time-window  $\mathbf{A}_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, T$ ) is utilized and is homogeneous.

GTN consists of multiple graph transformer (GT) layers. Each GT layer generates a two-order meta-path, representing that a one-more-hop-connected connectivity matrix is generated from the  $\mathcal{A}$ . In the process of GTN, an intermediate adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{Q}$  is introduced and is derived using Eq. (8).

$$\mathbf{Q}_l = \phi\left(\mathcal{A}, softmax\left(\mathbf{W}_{\phi_l}\right)\right). \quad (8)$$

$\mathbf{Q}_l \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{V}}$  is the output of the  $l$ -th GT layer,  $\phi(\bullet)$  represents the multi-channel  $1 \times 1$  convolution,  $\mathbf{W}_{\phi_l} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 1 \times \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{T}}$  denotes learnable parameters of  $\phi(\bullet)$ ,  $\mathbf{C}$  stands for the channel dimension of the output, and *softmax* means using the softmax activation function. However, the first GT layer is an exception, where two  $\mathbf{Q}$  matrices  $\mathbf{Q}_{1,1}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_{1,2}$  are generated at this layer using two kernels  $\mathbf{W}_{\phi_{1,1}}$  and  $\mathbf{W}_{\phi_{1,2}}$ .

The meta-paths  $\mathbf{Mp}_l \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{V}}$  are generated using  $\mathbf{Q}_l$  ( $l = 1, 2, \dots, \text{GL}$ ). Formally,  $\mathbf{Mp}_1 = \mathbf{Q}_{1,1}\mathbf{Q}_{1,2}$  ( $l = 1$ ) and  $\mathbf{Mp}_l = \mathbf{Q}_l\mathbf{Mp}_{l-1}$  ( $l \neq 1$ ). Furthermore,  $\mathbf{Mp}_l$  is normalized by its degree matrix as  $\mathbf{Mp}_l = \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{Mp}}^{-1}\mathbf{Mp}_l$ . In this study, the final connectivity matrix obtained after using ‘GL’ GT layers is a GL-hop-connected new connectivity matrix  $\mathbf{Mp}_{GL} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{V}}$ .

Then, a normal GCN is applied on the  $\mathbf{Mp}_{GL}$ . However, the channel dimension of the feature input  $\mathbf{f}_{SpS}$  is  $\mathbf{T}$ , which cannot be combined with a connectivity matrix in a channel-dimension  $\mathbf{C}$ . Therefore, the convolutional kernels of GT layers



are also applied on the  $\mathbf{f}_{SpS}$  to generate a set of feature maps  $\mathbf{f}_{gt}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times C \times V \times FS}$  ( $l = 2, \dots, GL$ ) and for the first layer, two feature maps  $\mathbf{f}_{gt}^{(1,1)}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{gt}^{(1,2)}$  are generated. Those feature maps are then fused together utilizing a weighted vector  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{(GL+1) \times 1}$  to obtain  $\mathbf{f}_{GT} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times C \times V \times FS}$ . Formally,  $\mathbf{f}_{GT} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 \mathbf{f}_{gt}^{(1,1)} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2 \mathbf{f}_{gt}^{(1,2)} + \sum_{l=3}^{GL+1} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l \mathbf{f}_{gt}^{(l)}$ . The final output of the modified GTN  $\mathbf{f}_{GTN} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times V \times FG}$  is derived in Eq. (9).

$$\mathbf{f}_{GTN} = Relu \left( \sum_{i=1}^C LeakyRelu \left( \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathbf{M}} \mathbf{p}_{GL}^i \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{f}_{GL}^i \mathbf{W} \right) \right), \quad (9)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{M}} \mathbf{p}_{GL} = \mathbf{M} \mathbf{p}_{GL} + \mathbf{I}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$  is its degree matrix.  $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{FS \times FG}$  indicates a weighted matrix, and the negative slope of the leakyrelu-activation function used here has a default value of 0.01.

The final feature map  $\mathbf{f}_{TeS} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times V \times FT}$ , containing innate temporal information after fusing time-windows, is derived by concatenating  $\mathbf{f}_{LL}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{GTN}$  along the last feature dimension. ( $FT = FL + FG$ )

After that, the  $\mathbf{f}_{TeS}$  input is put into a fully connected layer (FCN) and a softmax layer to obtain the predicted class labels. The constitution of the FCN and softmax is one flatten layer, one linear layer projecting the flattened dimension from  $V \times FT$  to 64, one relu-activation layer, one dropout layer with a drop rate of 0.5, and one softmax layer.

In the testing stage, the prediction results of the target-domain subjects (test-set) are then derived after passing the  $\mathbf{f}_{TeS}$ -s of the subjects to the FCN and softmax. While in the training stage, a cross-entropy loss is used to update the network just using the  $\mathbf{f}_{TeS}$ -s from the source-domain subjects, as shown in Eq. (10).

$$Loss_c = -\frac{1}{S} \sum_{i=1}^S \sum_{g=1}^G y_{i,g} \log \hat{y}_{i,g}, \quad (10)$$

where  $S$  denotes the number of subjects in the source domain while training in one batch,  $G$  represents the number of classes and  $y_{i,g}$  and  $\hat{y}_{i,g}$  are the true label and the predicted class label (depression, non-depression) of the source-domain subjects, respectively.

## 2.4 Domain Adversarial Learner (DAL)

The DAL is composed of the domain adversarial neural network (DANN) [30] and assists in obtaining the domain-invariant features  $\mathbf{f}_{SpS} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times V \times FS}$ , which benefits in aligning the domain distribution [31]. Moreover, the DAL is just used in the training stage, which subsumes a GRL inserted between the SpS and the DAL. The FCN and softmax layer contained in the DAL consists of one flatten layer, one linear layer projecting the flattened dimension from  $V \times FS$  to 128, one relu-activation layer, one batchnormalization layer, and one softmax layer. After the FCN and softmax, the predicted domain labels of  $T$  time windows are obtained. A cross-entropy loss is used to update the domain classifier, as shown in Eq. (11).

$$Loss_d = -\frac{1}{L \times T} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{r=1}^R \mathcal{D}_{i,t,r} \log \hat{\mathcal{D}}_{i,t,r}, \quad (11)$$

where  $L$  denotes the number of subjects in the source domain and target domain while training in one batch,  $T$  indicates that  $T$  time-windows are separately given the predicted labels,  $R$  represents the number of classes and  $\mathcal{D}_{i,t,r}$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{i,t,r}$  are the true domain-label and the predicted domain-label (source-domain or target-domain), respectively.

In the training and updating process, both the depression classifier and domain classifier want to obtain an accurate classification result. However, when using the GRL, the gradient at the input of DAL is reversed while backpropagation and the whole loss function for the network is equivalent to Eq. (12).

$$Loss = Loss_c - Loss_d, \quad (12)$$

where an expected result is obtained that the domain classifier is unable to discriminate the domain of one subject from the  $\mathbf{f}_{SpS}$ , but the depression classifier is able to find out the right depression classification result. Thus, the  $\mathbf{f}_{SpS}$  is the domain-

invariant feature, which is commonly owned by the subjects of both domains.

### 3. Experimental Settings

#### 3.1 Depression Dataset

##### 3.1.1 PRED+CT Dataset

The first dataset used in this study is the patient repository for EEG data and computational tools (PRED+CT) [32]. The subjects tested in this dataset were labeled in BDI scores. One subject is labeled in the control group when their BDI scores remain below seven and in the depressed group when the BDI scores are equal to or greater than 13. As a result, 75 subjects were allocated in the non-depressed control group, and 46 subjects were allocated in the depressed group. The EEG data of these subjects were collected—during resting state and with a frequency of 500 Hz—according to the 10-20 standard EEG recording system using 64 Ag/AgCl electrodes and two electrooculogram electrodes. However, an electrocardiogram signal was collected as the 67th channel signal for several subjects and was removed while used in this study. Furthermore, the time length of the EEG data for each subject is different, ranging from 320 s to 500 s. As a consequence, only the EEG data from 52 subjects (including 32 non-depressed subjects in the control group and 20 depressed subjects)—with the full 500 s recording—were used in this study.

The PRED+CT dataset has been well-preprocessed by its builders in the following steps. A second-order Butterworth filter with band-pass filtered (0.5–50 Hz) were initially applied on all EEG channels. “Cerebellar” leads were then removed from the data structure, leaving a total of 60 EEG channels and two mastoids for further preprocessing. Bad channels and bad epochs were subsequently interpolated and rejected. After that, eye-movement artifacts were removed using independent component analysis, and the data referred to average mastoids.

##### 3.1.2 MODMA Dataset

The second dataset used in this study is the resting-state EEG records of the multi-modal open dataset for mental-disorder analysis (MODMA) [33]. The data of 29 non-depressed subjects as the control group and 24 depressed subjects are contained in the dataset, where the builders have allocated the labels. The continuous EEG data in resting state, in this dataset, were collected in a period of five minutes with the subjects’ eyes closed, and a 128-channel HydroCel Geodesic Sensor Net with a sampling frequency of 250 Hz was used. All raw electrode signals were referenced to the Cz electrode. To ensure good contact, the impedance of each electrode was tested prior to collection, ensuring that it was below 50 kOhm. However, the builders of this dataset only mentioned that they had experimentally preprocessed the raw public data and ensured data quality, but no detailed information on how the preprocessing steps were accomplished was provided.

##### 3.1.3 Data Division

The classification results are based on individuals (trial-wise), which means that the proposed model for each subject aims at his/her entire data to derive one corresponding binary classification result. Furthermore, for the experiments in this study, a tenfold cross-validation in cross-subject mode was adopted, and the data for the two datasets were divided in the following way.

Firstly, for both datasets, the input  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times V \times \text{len}}$  of the model was obtained by cutting the original EEG data into  $T$  non-overlapping time-windows and distributing the time-windows along a new time-dimension. The ‘len’ equals 500 (s) /  $T \times 500$  (Hz) and 300 (s) /  $T \times 250$  (Hz) for the PRED+CT and MODMA dataset, respectively. Secondly, when using tenfold cross-validation in cross-subject mode, the subjects were randomly divided into ten groups, and the number of subjects was even. However, considering that 52 subjects and 53 subjects were included in the PRED+CT dataset and MODMA dataset, respectively, two ( $2 = 52 \bmod 10$ ) groups of the PRED+CT dataset and three ( $3 = 53 \bmod 10$ ) groups of the MODMA dataset were randomly chosen to include one more subject in the tenfold cross-validation. The data of one group were

treated as the test-set (target-domain) while the data of the other groups were treated as the training-set (source-domain).

## 3.2 Experiments

The proposed SAD-TIME model was run on PyTorch 1.11.0 based on Python 3.8 under the NVIDIA GeForce GTX 3090 GPU. Furthermore, the SGD optimizer was used to train the model, and the hyperparameters of the model are shown in Table 2.

### 3.2.1 Experiments on Domain-Related Structure

The domain-invariant feature is an indispensable constitution of the proposed SAD-TIME model. Therefore, several experiments were conducted based on the domain adaption methods: DANN or multisource domain adversarial networks (MDAN) [34] and on the choice of domain-invariant feature: regarding the common feature  $\mathbf{f}_{common}$  (CF-way) or the spatial feature  $\mathbf{f}_{SpS}$  as the domain-invariant feature (SpS-way). The SpS-way is exhibited in Fig. 1, where the depression-classification route and domain-classification route diverge after the SpS. Accordingly, in the CF-way, the two routes diverge after the CFE and the SpS is included in the depression classification route. As a consequence, four types of depression classification results are evaluated, which are (1) DANN+CF-way, (2) MDAN+CF-way, (3) DANN+SpS-way and (4) MDAN+SpS-way.

### 3.2.2 Ablation Study

A set of ablation studies was conducted to investigate the effectiveness of the components in the proposed SAD-TIME model. The following components are deleted in turn while in the ablation studies: (1) the TiS of the CFE (delete TiS), (2) the  $\lambda$ -mask matrix  $\mathbf{A}_\lambda$  of the SpS (delete  $\lambda$ -mask), (3) the layernorm-LSTM and modified GTN of the TeS (delete TeS), (4) only the layernorm-LSTM (delete LSTM) of the TeS, (5) only the modified GTN of the TeS (delete GTN).

### 3.2.3 Comparisons with the State-of-Art Models

A comparison experiment with state-of-the-art methods was conducted. However, the dearth of studies that used the same experimental settings as were used in the present study still exist. Several studies are referred to directly, considering the results of this studies were based on tenfold cross-validation on corresponding dataset. Furthermore, several studies in

Hyperparameters	Value (PRED+CT/MODMA)
Batchsize (B)	2
Learning rate	0.0001
Epoch	50
Number of time-windows T	20
Number of EEG channels (V)	66/128
1DCNN-kernels output channel-dimension (kd)	3
The length of each start/end slice (ts)	125/75 sample points (0.25/0.3 seconds)
Number of graph convolutional kernels (K)	3
Graph-convolutional-kernels output feature dimension (FS)	128
Layernorm-LSTM hidden-layer/output feature dimension (FL)	64
The output channel-dimension of GT layer (C)	5
Number of GT layers	2
Output feature dimension of the weighted matrix $\mathbf{W}$ in modified GTN layer (FG)	64

the depression detection field, linked with the proposed model, were reproduced. The results may differ divergently from those shown in the original studies, which is probably due to the usage of different datasets, different set of experiments, and possibly negligence in the reproduction process. The experiments are presented below:

***For the MODMA dataset, the results of several studies are directly cited:***

- (1) **GraphD** [7]. The classification results of the original study were based on individuals. The study utilized Node2vec algorithms to generate the feature for each subject and vote at the decision-level by predictions from multiple channels.
- (2) **DLMFD** [35]. The classification results of the original study were based on segments. The study exploited a multi-agent cooperation to join the decision of multiple classifiers under the selected linear/non-linear features and graphical features.
- (3) **AMG** [36]. The manual feature differential entropy (DE) extracted from the alpha frequency band was used as the node feature of each EEG channel. The original DE feature was further processed and was then input into a multi-head GCN to extract the innate spatial features of EEG.

***For both datasets, the results of several studies are directly cited:***

- (4) **AMGCN-L** [37]. The DE feature was also used as the original node feature. However, in this study, DE was extracted from multiple frequency bands. In the original study, multiple time-windows were also used, and the multi-time-window GCN was utilized and combined with the LSTM to extract the spatiotemporal feature.
- (5) **SSPA-GCN** [38]. The GCN was proposed to be combined with a weighted matrix, which weights the channel and the feature dimensions of the feature maps extracted from the EEG signals. Furthermore, a domain-generalization method was proposed to obtain the domain-invariant features.

***For both datasets, several studies were reproduced to obtain the individual-based tenfold cross-validation results:***

- (6) **GICN** [39]. An improved GCN was proposed in the original study, where a weighted matrix was applied between the input and the GCN. The node features consisted of four linear features: activity, mobility, complexity, and power spectral density. The connectivity matrix used in the GCN was generated by the Pearson correlation analysis under these node features.
- (7) **DepHNN** [40]. The construction of the main body of the model was based on the CNN+LSTM structure, where one layer of the CNN and two layers of the LSTM were contained. The CNN layer was used to extract the temporal feature in the original study while the LSTM layers were used to process the sequences.
- (8) **LSDD\_EEGNet** [41]. The construction of the main body of the model was also based on the CNN+LSTM structure, where three CNN blocks and one LSTM layer were exploited. Three CNN blocks were used to extract the long-temporal feature, spatial feature, and short-term feature, respectively. In addition, a GRL was applied after the LSTM to implement the domain adversarial process and obtain the domain-invariant feature,

### 3.3 Evaluation Criterion

The criterion, including Accuracy (Acc), recall (Rec), Precision (Pre) and F1 score (F1), are commonly used in the performance-evaluation stage in a classification task, where  $Acc = (TP + TN) / (TP + FN + FP + TN)$ ,  $Rec = TP / (TP + FN)$ ,  $Pre = TP / (TP + FP)$  and  $F1 = (2 \times Pre \times Rec) / (Pre + Rec)$ . The ‘TP’, ‘TN’, ‘FP’, ‘FN’ mean true positive, true negative, false positive, and false negative, respectively. Apart from using these criteria, the polygon area metric (PAM) [42] was introduced as an auxiliary metric, where a higher value also indicates a better performance like the former criteria and the formula is shown in Eq. (13).

$$\begin{cases} SP = \frac{TN}{TN+FP}, JI = \frac{TP}{TP+FP+FN}, AUC = \int_0^1 ROC(x)dx \\ PAM = \frac{\sqrt{3} * (Acc * Rec + Rec * SP + SP * JI + JI * F1 + F1 * AUC + AUC * Acc)}{4 * 2.59807} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where the ‘SP’, ‘JI’, ‘ROC’ and ‘AUC’ denote specificity, Jaccard index, receiver operating characteristic curve and the

area under the ROC, respectively.

## 4. Results and Analysis

### 4.1 Results and Analysis of Experiments on Domain-Related Structure

The results for the experiments are shown in Fig. 4. In Fig. 4(a), regarding the results obtained on the PRED+CT dataset, it is observed that the outcomes under DANN are generally superior, and the best performance is achieved with DANN+SpS-way, where the Accuracy reaches 92.00%. However, when SpS-way is replaced with CF-way, a decline in all performance metrics is observed. For instance, Recall decreases from 90.49% to 84.21%, and PAM from 78.53% to 65.86%. From this perspective, considering the spatial features  $f_{spS}$  further extracted from common features as domain-invariant features is a better choice. Yet, comparing the results of MDAN+CF-way and MDAN+SpS-way, it is noted that MDAN+CF-way achieves higher metrics with 88.00% Acc, 86.21% F1 score, and 65.86% PAM, surpassing the indicators obtained with MDAN+SpS-way, where Acc, F1 score, and PAM are 84.00%, 80.95%, and 55.18%, respectively. Given this scenario, utilizing MDAN appears to have a negative impact on using  $f_{spS}$  as domain-invariant features. Hence, adopting the DANN approach yields better results.

At this point, in the results of the PRED+CT dataset, an interesting phenomenon can be observed: the performance metrics for DANN+CF-way are identical to those of MDAN+CF-way. However, on the one hand, when analyzing DANN+SpS-way and MDAN+SpS-way, a significant difference is evident through their F1 score and PAM outcomes, with the former achieving 91.32% and 78.53%, and the latter 80.95% and 55.18%, respectively. Thus, employing the DANN method still yields better results. On the other hand, upon examining the performance outcomes of DANN+CF-way versus MDAN+CF-way on the MODMA dataset in Fig. 4(b), a considerable discrepancy is noticed, with the DANN method again proving superior. The reason for the identical results between DANN+CF-way and MDAN+CF-way in Fig.4 (a) and the significant differences in Fig. 4(b) may be attributed to the differing signal lengths contained within each time window of the two datasets. The dimensions of the common features generated vary when automatic feature generation is utilized, such as obtaining a common feature dimension of 1004 in PRED+CT compared to 447 using MODMA. This variation is a natural consequence of employing convolution kernels of the same size and the employment of the time intervals, highlighting an area for future improvement. Given the higher common feature dimension in PRED+CT, both the DANN and MDAN domain adversarial methods might produce favorable outcomes. In contrast, a greater variation in results between DANN+CF-way and MDAN+CF-way is likely to occur in the MODMA dataset.





Figure 4. The results of the experiments on domain-related structure obtained from the PRED+CT and the MODMA datasets are given in (a) and (b), respectively. Acc, Pre, Rec and F1 represent Accuracy, Precision, Recall and F1 score, respectively.

Apart from the PRED+CT dataset, the results for the MODMA dataset are presented in Fig. 4(b), where the best performance is also observed under DANN+SpS-way, with Acc, F1 score, and PAM reaching 94.00%, 87.92%, and 85.76%, respectively. For the MODMA dataset under DANN+CF-way, the results show Acc, F1 score, and PAM at 90.00%, 90.00%, and 78.46%, respectively, with PAM experiencing a 7.3% decrease from DANN+SpS-way to DANN+CF-way. Furthermore, under the MDAN method, transitioning from using spatial features  $\mathbf{f}_{SpS}$  to common features  $\mathbf{f}_{common}$  as domain-invariant features resulted in a more pronounced decrease in performance metrics, with Acc, F1 score, and PAM declining by 8.00%, 8.07%, and 12.55% (from 86.00%, 85.99%, and 70.80% to 78.00%, 77.92%, and 58.25%), respectively. This further affirms that spatial features should be considered domain-invariant features, which aligns well with the network's logic, indicating that spatial features, in comparison, encapsulate more aggregated information. When analyzing the differences in results using different domain adversarial adaptation methods under the same domain-invariant features, it is noted that for the MODMA dataset, the DANN method generally yields better results than the MDAN method. This observation, combined with the phenomenon that DANN generally outperforms MDAN in the PRED+CT dataset, might be attributed to the following. Although a domain classifier is applied to each subject in the test set, each classifier still needs to handle 20 time-windows. Each time window is specific, and the domain classifiers for each subject are directly applied to all 20 unique time windows of their corresponding subjects, leading to this phenomenon.

For both the PRED+CT and MODMA datasets, the best results were achieved with the DANN+SpS-way approach, achieving high classification accuracy. Albeit the results on the MODMA dataset at this juncture do not necessarily exceed those on the PRED+CT dataset in the case of employing MDAN, while the results on the MODMA dataset generally surpassed those on the PRED+CT dataset regarding the DANN application, the best performance of two datasets is still similar with the best outcome for PRED+CT being an accuracy of 92.00%, closely approaching the best result of 94.00% accuracy on the MODMA dataset, which represents the stability of SAD-TIME. The differences mentioned are potentially due to the choice of domain adversarial learner, inter-subject variability, the application of different EEG signal channels, varying length of  $\mathbf{T}_i$ , and differences in the dimensionality of automatically generated common features.




Aside from Fig. 4, this section also presents t-SNE feature maps of  $\mathbf{f}_{SpS}$  for each time window under the DANN+SpS-way approach, utilizing  $\mathbf{f}_{SpS}$  as domain-invariant features, as shown in Fig. 5. These t-SNE feature maps are derived from randomly selecting one depressed subject and one healthy subject from the same target domain.

The t-SNE feature maps from the figures reveal several insights. Firstly, after t-SNE dimensionality reduction, the features' value distributions along the y-axis vary across different time-windows, and the dispersion of data points across channels also differs within each time window. This indicates that the spatial features of the two datasets exhibit specificity across various time windows. Secondly, even when the data comes from subjects within the same target domain, one with depression and the other healthy, the data, although still displaying a distinguishable trend, also show a degree of blending. For instance, in Fig. 5(a), related to the PRED+CT dataset, time-windows 3, 5, 6, 9, 15, and 19 maintain a relatively clear separation, but time-windows 2, 11, 14, 16, and 20 exhibit significant feature blending, with other time windows also showing some level of blending to varying degrees. Similarly, Fig. 5 (b), concerning the MODMA dataset, demonstrates clear separations in data clusters for each time window, yet one cluster noticeably contains feature points from the other cluster, indicating feature fusion. This phenomenon arises from the functioning of DANN, where the domain classifier updates in a direction that makes it challenging to distinguish features, leading to the target domain features aligning more closely with those of the source domain. Consequently, feature blending of the subjects under same domain occurs. However, since the features still belong to two subjects or classes within the same domain, boundaries between them can still be observed.

After applying the TeS to fuse the multiple time-windows and extract temporal features, the distribution of features from two randomly selected subjects within the target domain exhibits a clear separation, as illustrated in Fig. 6. This indicates that the TeS effectively fused the information from different time-windows and enhances the distinguishability between the classes, highlighting its utility in improving the classification performance by further emphasizing the fusion of temporal information of the data, leading to more distinct and separable feature distributions under a same domain.

Fig. 6 demonstrates that after employing the TeS for the fusion and extraction of temporal information from multiple time-windows, a clear demarcation between subjects within the two datasets is observed in the t-SNE maps, particularly within the MODMA dataset. This observation suggests that the TeS successfully fuses different time-windows and extracts deep temporal information from EEG signals, significantly aiding in the final classification outcomes. Moreover, it is noted that the distribution of features under the dimensionality-reduced t-SNE for individual subjects across various channels is not highly clustered. This dispersion might be attributed to significant differences between channels and the fact that while DANN constrains inter-domain distances, it does not impose strict restrictions on intra-domain feature distances.



## 4.2 Results and Analysis of Ablation Study

The results from the ablation study are presented in Fig. 7, where a noticeable performance decline in each ablation experiment is observed upon removing each key component from the proposed SAD-TIME model. This demonstrates the significance of these components, i.e. the TiS, the  $\lambda$ -mask matrix, and the TeS. Additionally, it is evident from the figure that the results on the MODMA dataset are more sensitive to variations in these modules.

When the TiS component is removed from the CFE within the SAD-TIME model, results for both datasets show a decline, yet they remain close and relatively good. The Acc, F1 score, and PAM for the PRED+CT and MODMA datasets are respectively 90.00%, 89.27% and 88.00%, 87.68%, 74.77% and 72.05%. The decrease in performance upon removing the TiS demonstrates, on one hand, the effectiveness of the multiscale depth-wise 1D-CNN in automatically generating features, and on the other hand, it highlights the efficiency of the subsequent sub-networks in extracting spatiotemporal features from EEG signals.

Comparing these results with those presented in Fig. 4, it's observed that the Acc for the PRED+CT dataset decreased by 2.00%, while for the MODMA dataset, it dropped by 6.00%. This indicates that the MODMA dataset's outcomes are more significantly affected by the removal of TiS compared to the PRED+CT dataset. A potential reason could be the relatively smaller feature dimensionality automatically generated for the MODMA dataset; when the TiS is removed, the impact is naturally greater. Conversely, the PRED+CT dataset, having a larger common feature dimensionality, still retains high-dimensional features generated by the multiscale depth-wise 1D-CNN even after the removal of the TiS component.

When the  $\lambda$ -mask matrix  $A_\lambda$  is deleted, a more significant performance drop is observed on both datasets compared to the experiment where the TiS was removed. Particularly for the MODMA dataset, which utilizes 128 EEG signal channels, the Acc drops to just 76.00%, and the PAM to 55.84%. These reductions represent a decrease of 18.00% and 29.92% respectively, compared to the model's peak performance. This phenomenon indicates that the  $A_\lambda$  plays a crucial role in processing common features in the SpS part by fusing different connectivity maps and suggests that its impact may be related to the number of EEG signal channels. The substantial influence of the  $A_\lambda$  removal, especially on the MODMA dataset, underscores its importance in effectively handling the complexity and diversity of features derived from a larger number of EEG channels, thereby affirming its significance in enhancing model performance through spatial connectivity-map fusion.

The results regarding the removal of the TeS component present a more complex and unexpected scenario. Initially, it was hypothesized that the performance impact of removing either the layernorm-LSTM or the modified GTN component




Figure 7. The results of the experiments on ablation study obtained from the PRED+CT and the MODMA datasets are given, where three metrics are evaluated, including accuracy (Acc),  $F1$  score (F1) and polygon area metric (PAM).



would be significantly less detrimental than removing both, essentially eliminating the entire TeS component, which includes layernorm-LSTM and the modified GTN. However, findings reveal that for the PRED+CT dataset, the outcomes of removing the LSTM were equivalent to those of removing the GTN, and though close to the results of eliminating the TeS entirely, the removal of the entire TeS component surprisingly yielded slightly better results. For the MODMA dataset, from the perspective of PAMs (with PAMs for ‘delete TeS’, ‘delete LSTM’, and ‘delete GTN’ being 24.16%, 23.51%, and 18.84%, respectively), the best performance was unexpectedly observed by removing both components. Yet, when considering Acc and F1 score, removing the LSTM did not perform as well as removing the entire TeS, while removing the GTN resulted in better outcomes than eliminating the TeS component. The only result consistent with initial expectations, where removing GTN leads to better performance than removing the TeS, was observed in the MODMA dataset from this specific perspective. In the PRED+CT dataset, regardless of which performance metric is considered, the effect of removing the entire TeS component was counterintuitively found to be more beneficial than removing just one of its parts. This phenomenon suggests that the interconnection between these temporal windows is intricate and that the combination of layernorm-LSTM with the modified GTN is essential to fuse those time-windows successfully and achieve good performance. It also highlights the complex nature of temporal information fusion in EEG signal analysis and suggests that the synergistic effect of combining these two components is critical for capturing the nuanced temporal dynamics within the data.

### 4.3 Results and Analysis of Comparisons with the State-of-the-Art Models

The results of the comparison are showcased in Table 3. The results indicate that the proposed SAD-TIME model outperforms other models in cross-subject ten-fold cross-validation on both datasets and reaches a state-of-the-art result. The results of the directly cited model AMGCN-L on the PRED+CT dataset are the suboptimum results. Furthermore, the F1 score and the PAM are the same as the result of the SAD-TIME model. The results of the models directly cited on the MODMA dataset obtain suboptimum results at different evaluation metrics. For instance, SSPA-GCN has suboptimum Acc, and DLMFD obtains the suboptimum Rec. However, the best results are derived by the SAD-TIME model on both datasets at each evaluation metric. When comparing with the suboptimum results, the best results of the PRED+CT dataset obtain an increase of 1.62%, 1.17%, and 2.05% in Accuracy, Precision, and Recall, respectively, while the increase for the MODMA dataset of 1.13%, 2.83%, 0.41%, 1.82%, and 2.13% in Accuracy, Precision, Recall, F1 score, and PAM, respectively. Furthermore, although the results of the DLMFD model are based on segment-based ten-fold cross-validation, it achieved classification outcomes similar to those of the proposed SAD-TIME model, with an Accuracy of 94.00% and Recall of 93.75%, while DLMFD's Accuracy and Recall were 92.13% and 93.34%, respectively. This reveals an area for improvement in the current study: while the proposed model demonstrates high performance on a smaller sample size (based on individuals), it still lacks evidence of good performance on a larger sample size (based on segments). The results based on larger sample sizes require further investigation in future studies.

For the reproduced models, which further utilized spatial or spatiotemporal features, the best classification accuracy on the PRED+CT dataset was only 69.23% of the GICN model, while on the MODMA dataset, the best Accuracy for the reproduced model was 83.02%, achieved by the DepHNN model. However, it's noted that, firstly, DepHNN did not perform as well on the PRED+CT dataset as it did on the MODMA dataset. Secondly, the PAM, used as an auxiliary metric, was exceptionally low for both datasets under DepHNN, at 5.13% and 3.19%, respectively. This could be due to the calculation of SP or JI having a denominator of zero in some cases, leading to incorrect calculations of SP or JI. In these instances, they were set to zero for the purposes of the study, suggesting that PAM should not be included in the analysis for DepHNN.

In addition, a phenomenon is noted that for the reproduced models, results on the MODMA dataset generally surpassed those obtained on the PRED+CT dataset, with GICN being an exception where only its Accuracy on the MODMA dataset exceeded that on the PRED+CT dataset. This trend aligns with the best results scenario of the SAD-TIME model. Considering that the dimensionality of common features in the MODMA dataset is not higher than that in the PRED+CT dataset and that the feature dimension under each time-window is consistent after the SpS process, it's speculated that this phenomenon might be partially attributed to the use of the  $A_\lambda$ . The MODMA dataset utilizes more EEG signal channels

than the PRED+CT dataset, and the SpS part effectively extracts spatial information from these multi-channel signals with  $A_\lambda$  fusing two different connectivity maps. The ablation results in Fig. 7 of removing the  $\lambda$ -mask matrix underscore this point; the MODMA dataset experienced a decline of 18.00% in Accuracy and 29.92% in PAM, while the PRED+CT dataset saw declines of only 4.00% and 10.74% in these metrics, respectively. This suggests that the proposed SAD-TIME model's performance on the MODMA dataset is significantly more influenced by the  $\lambda$ -mask matrix compared to the PRED+CT dataset. This difference likely explains the observed phenomenon, highlighting the  $\lambda$ -mask matrix's critical role in effectively managing the spatial information from a larger number of EEG channels by fusing different connectivity maps, thereby significantly impacting the model's overall performance, particularly on datasets with a greater number of channels like MODMA.

Moreover, it's observed that when the temporal part is omitted while retaining the  $\lambda$ -mask matrix ('delete TeS'), the SAD-TIME model can achieve better classification results for the PRED+CT dataset, with an Accuracy of 84.00% and PAM of 67.65%. In contrast, for the MODMA dataset, these metrics stand at 50.00% and 24.16%, respectively, indicating a significant difference between the two outcomes. It appears that, in this scenario, the PRED+CT dataset, which uses fewer EEG signal channels, actually achieves better results. However, considering the significant impact of the TeS component, which fuses temporal information from different time-windows, the observed superiority of the PRED+CT dataset under conditions where the temporal part is omitted and the  $\lambda$ -mask matrix is retained might be more influenced by the absence of the TeS component. Therefore, the MODMA dataset exhibits slightly better performance than the PRED+CT dataset under other conditions that could also involve the influence of the temporal component. This also suggests that the interplay between spatial and temporal feature extraction is crucial for maximizing the performance of EEG-based classification models, especially when dealing with varied datasets that differ in channel count and the inherent complexity of the signals they contain.

Considering the temporal aspect, apart from the TeS, the time intervals utilized within the TiS represent another crucial component of the temporal dimension. In the ablation experiments where the TiS was removed, both the PRED+CT and MODMA datasets exhibited relatively good Accuracy, at 90.00% and 88.00%, respectively. These performance metrics decreased by 2.00% and 6.00% compared to the best classification results, respectively, with the MODMA dataset being more significantly affected. Therefore, time intervals, functioning as time pattern containing the temporal information between discrete time windows, are also considered a key factor in explaining why results on the MODMA dataset are generally better than those on the PRED+CT dataset. The impact of the temporal part, specifically the TeS, is deemed as a

Table 3. The results of the comparison with the state-of-the-art model.

Dataset	Model	Accuracy (%)	Precision (%)	Recall (%)	F1 score (%)	PAM (%)
PRED+CT	AMGCN-L	<u>90.38</u>	<u>91.34</u>	<u>88.44</u>	<u>91.32</u>	<u>78.53</u>
	SSPA-GCN	83.17	81.74	84.15	82.93	65.69
	GICN	69.23	67.50	67.50	67.50	38.69
	DepHNN	61.54	30.77	50.00	38.10	5.13
	LSDD_EEGNet	30.77	15.28	50.00	23.53	14.03
	<b>SAD-TIME</b>	<b>92.00</b>	<b>92.51</b>	<b>90.49</b>	<b>91.32</b>	<b>78.53</b>
MODMA	GraphD	88.20	86.60	87.20	87.10	\
	DLMFD	92.13	\	<u>93.34</u>	\	\
	AMG	88.68	91.43	87.50	88.17	76.65
	AMGCN-L	90.57	90.43	90.66	90.51	81.03
	SSPA-GCN	<u>92.87</u>	<u>92.00</u>	92.23	<u>92.12</u>	<u>83.63</u>
	GICN	67.92	76.26	64.94	62.60	21.96
	DepHNN	83.02	85.92	81.61	82.10	3.19
	LSDD_EEGNet	53.85	26.92	50.00	35.00	42.41
	<b>SAD-TIME</b>	<b>94.00</b>	<b>94.83</b>	<b>93.75</b>	<b>93.94</b>	<b>85.76</b>

Note: DLMFD also provided a specificity (SP) of 89.32 %. The bold means the best performance of the corresponding evaluation metric, and the *italic* with underline represents suboptimum-result of the corresponding evaluation metric.

more critical element in explaining the phenomenon. This is considering the outcomes obtained from time-related ablation experiments (i.e., ‘delete TeS’, ‘delete LSTM’, and ‘delete GTN’), where the MODMA dataset's performance was generally inferior to that of the PRED+CT dataset, indicating that for the MODMA dataset, the proposed SAD-TIME model's approach to processing time has a greater impact, and the importance of fusing time windows is more pronounced. When processed with the TeS, the MODMA dataset achieves better results, underscoring the significance of effectively managing temporal dynamics and the interconnectedness of temporal windows in enhancing classification performance.

## 5. Conclusion

In this work, a Spatiotemporal-fused network with Automated multi-scale Depth-wise and TIME-interval-related common feature extractor (SAD-TIME) is proposed to automatically extract EEG channel feature and properly fuse the multiple time-windows, where a novel automated and independent-of-prior-knowledge common-feature extractor (CFE) with multi-scale depth-wise 1D-CNN sector (DwCS) and time-interval sector (TiS), a spatial sector with a  $\lambda$ -mask matrix and a multi-head graph convolutional network, a temporal sector with layernorm long short-term memory (LSTM) and modified graph transformer networks (GTN) and a domain adversarial learner (DAL) are contained. Extensive experiments have been conducted in the individual-based tenfold cross-validation for depression detection with the cross-subject mode. SAD-TIME has achieved an accuracy of 92.00% and 94.00% on PRED+CT and MODMA datasets for the depression detection task, respectively. Furthermore, from the results of those experiments, it would help to fuse the information from multiple time-windows of the depressed and healthy subjects properly by both the combination of the modified LSTM and GTN and the usage of the novel CFE that includes a depth-wise convolution fraction remaining the innate relations among multiple electroencephalogram (EEG) channels and time-interval-feature generation fraction revealing one kind of time pattern. Furthermore, the  $\lambda$ -mask matrix is demonstrated to assist with the fusion of spatial information from the common feature and improve the performance of the model.

However, firstly, in the DwCS and TiS, the generated feature dimension is different for two datasets as a consequence of the bound of the kernel size and the different signal time lengths of two datasets. A more plug-and-play and generalized automated feature extraction module should be further studied. Secondly, the proposed SAD-TIME model works on the small-size samples. Therefore, further research will be carried out on the frame-wise tragedy with larger-sized segmented samples. The leave-one-cross-subject mode may be better suited when using larger samples and the domain adaption method. Finally, in the DAL, a proper domain adaption method for a better feature-fusion effect of multiple time windows may be studied further.

## Reference

- [1] Mental Disorders, Available: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-disorders/>, 2023 (Accessed: 15 September 2023).
- [2] J. Upton, Beck depression inventory (BDI), in *Encyclopedia of Behavioral Medicine*, New York, 2013, pp. 178–179.
- [3] K. Kroenke, R. L. Spitzer, and J. B. Williams, The PHQ-9: Validity of A Brief Depression Severity Measure, *J. Gen. Intern. Med.* 16 (2001) 606–613.
- [4] American Psychiatric Association, Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5, *J. Nerv. Ment. Dis.* 201 (2013) 727-729.
- [5] N. Timmerby, J. H. Andersen, S. Søndergaard, S. D. Østergaard, and P. Bech, A systematic review of the clinimetric properties of the 6-item version of the Hamilton depression rating scale (HAM-D6), *Psychother: Psychosom.* 86 (2017) 141-149.
- [6] S. Yasin, S. A. Hussain, S. Aslan, I. Raza, M. Muzammel, and A. Othmani, EEG based major depressive disorder and bipolar disorder detection using neural networks: a review. *Comput. Methods. Programs. Biomed.* 202 (2021) 106007.
- [7] S. Soni, A. Seal, A. Yazidi, and O. Krejcar, Graphical representation learning-based approach for automatic

classification of electroencephalogram signals in depression. *Comput. Biol. Med.* 145 (2022) 105420.

- [8] Y. Mohammadi, M. Hajian, and M. H. Moradi, Discrimination of Depression Levels Using Machine Learning Methods on EEG Signals', in *2019 27th Iranian Conference on Electrical Engineering (ICEE)*, Yazd, Iran, 2019, pp. 1765–1769.
- [9] Z. Zhao, Y. Niu, and X. Zhao *et al.*, EEG microstate in first-episode drug-naive adolescents with depression, *J. Neural Eng.* 19 (2022) 056016.
- [10] H. Cai, Z. Qu, Z. Li, Y. Zhang, X. Hu, and B. Hu, Feature-level fusion approaches based on multimodal EEG data for depression recognition, *Inf. Fusion.* 59 (2020) 127-138.
- [11] L. Piho and T. Tjahjadi, A mutual information based adaptive windowing of informative EEG for emotion recognition, *IEEE Trans. Affect. Comput.* 11 (2020) 722–735.
- [12] Y. Zhao, P. Durongbhan, and L. Chen *et al.*, Imaging of nonlinear and dynamic functional brain connectivity based on EEG recordings with the application on the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging.* 39 (2020) 1571-1581.
- [13] F. Wang, Y. -C. Tian, X. Zhang, and F. Hu, Detecting disorders of consciousness in brain injuries from EEG connectivity through machine learning, *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Top. Comput. Intell.* 6 (2022) 113–123.
- [14] W. Liu, K. Jia, Z. Wang, and Z. Ma, A depression prediction algorithm based on spatiotemporal feature of EEG signal. *Brain Sci.* 12 (2022) 630.
- [15] X. Li, R. La, and Y. Wang *et al.*, EEG-based mild depression recognition using convolutional neural network. *Med. Biol. Eng. Comput.* 57 (2019) 1341-1352.
- [16] X. Li, R. La, Y. Wang, B. Hu, and X. Zhang, A deep learning approach for mild depression recognition based on functional connectivity using electroencephalography. *Front. Neurosci.* 14 (2020) 192.
- [17] A. Saeedi, M. Saeedi, A. Maghsoudi, and A. Shalhaf, Major depressive disorder diagnosis based on effective connectivity in EEG signals: a convolutional neural network and long short-term memory approach. *Cogn. Neurodyn.* 15 (2021) 239-252.
- [18] C. Xu, F. Fan, and J. Shen *et al.*, An EEG-based depressive detection network with adaptive feature learning and channel activation, in *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 2024.
- [19] Z. Wan, J. Huang, H. Zhang, H. Zhou, J. Yang, and N. Zhong, HybridEEGNet: a convolutional neural network for EEG feature learning and depression discrimination, *IEEE Access.* 8 (2020) 30332–30342.
- [20] B. Ay, O. Yildirim, and M. Talo *et al.*, Automated depression detection using deep representation and sequence learning with EEG signals. *J. Med. Syst.* 43 (2019) 205.
- [21] W. Yan, L. Yu, D. Liu, J. Sui, V. D. Calhoun, and Z. Lin, Multi-scale convolutional recurrent neural network for psychiatric disorder identification in resting-state EEG. *Front. Psychiatry.* 14 (2023) 1202049.
- [22] R. Ramos-Aguilar, J. A. Olvera-López, I. Olmos-Pineda, S. Sánchez-Urrieta, and M. Martín-Ortiz, Parameter experimentation for epileptic seizure detection in EEG signals using short-time Fourier transform', *Res. Comput. Sci.* 148 (2019) 83-96.
- [23] P. Gaur, H. Gupta, A. Chowdhury, K. McCreadie, R. B. Pachori, and H. Wang, A sliding window common spatial pattern for enhancing motor imagery classification in EEG-BCI, *IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas.* 70 (2021) 1–9.
- [24] L. Cao, H. Wu, and S. G. Chen *et al.*, A novel deep learning method based on an overlapping time window strategy for brain-computer interface-based stroke rehabilitation. *Brain Sci.* 12 (2022) 1502.
- [25] Y. Zhu, F. Lyu, C. Hu, X. Chen, and X. Liu, Encoder-decoder architecture for supervised dynamic graph learning: a survey, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10480*, 2022. doi:10.48550/arXiv:2203.10480.
- [26] W. Zheng, H. Liu, B. Wang, and F. Sun, Cross-modal surface material retrieval using discriminant adversarial learning, *IEEE Trans. Industr. Inform.* 15 (2019) 4978–4987.
- [27] P. Luu and T. Ferree, Determination of the HydroCel Geodesic sensor nets' average electrode positions and their 10 – 10 international equivalents, *Inc. technical note.* 1 (2005) 7.
- [28] P. Veličković, G. Cucurull, A. Casanova, A. Romero, P. Liò, and Y. Bengio, Graph attention networks, *arXiv preprint*

*arXiv:1710.10903*, 2017. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1710.10903

- [29] S. Yun, M. Jeong, R. Kim, J. Kang, and H. J. Kim, Graph transformer networks, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, Vancouver, Canada, 2019.
- [30] Y. Ganin, E. Ustinova, and H. Ajakan *et al.*, Domain-Adversarial Training of Neural Networks, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 17 (2016) 1-35.
- [31] Y. Li, Q.-H. Meng, Y. Wang, T. Yang, and H. Hou, MASS: a multi-source domain adaptation network for cross-subject touch gesture recognition, *IEEE Trans. Industr. Inform.* 19 (2022) 3099-3108.
- [32] J. F. Cavanagh, Multiple dissociations between comorbid depression and anxiety on reward and punishment processing: evidence from computationally informed EEG, *Comput. Psychiatr.* 3 (2019) 1-17.
- [33] H. Cai, Y. W. Gao, and S. T. Sun *et al.*, MODMA dataset: a multi-modal open dataset for mental-disorder analysis, *Sci. Data*, 9 (2022) 178.
- [34] H. Zhao, S. Zhang, G. Wu, J. M. F. Moura, J. P. Costeira, and G. J. Gordon, Adversarial multiple source domain adaptation, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing System 31*, Montréal Canada, 2018.
- [35] B. Zhang, H. Cai, Y. Song, L. Tao, and Y. Li, Computer-aided recognition based on decision-level multimodal fusion for depression. *IEEE J. Biomed. Health Inform.* 26 (2022) 3466-3477.
- [36] H.-G. Wang, Q.-H. Meng, L.-C. Jin, J.-B. Wang, and H.-R. Hou, AMG: a depression detection model with autoencoder and multi-head graph convolutional network, in *2023 42nd Chinese Control Conference (CCC)*, Tianjin, China, 2023, pp. 8551–8556.
- [37] H.-G. Wang, Q.-H. Meng, L.-C. Jin, and H.-R. Hou, AMGCN-L: an adaptive multi-time-window graph convolutional network with long-short-term memory for depression detection, *J. Neural. Eng.* 20 (2023) 056038.
- [38] Z. Zhang, Q. Meng, L. Jin, H. Wang, and H. Hou. A novel EEG-based graph convolution network for depression detection: incorporating secondary subject partitioning and attention mechanism, *Expert Syst. Appl.* 239 (2024) 122356.
- [39] J. Zhu, C. Jiang, and J. Chen *et al.*, EEG based depression recognition using improved graph convolutional neural network, *Comput. Biol. Med.* 148 (2022) 105815.
- [40] G. Sharma, A. Parashar, and A. M. Joshi, DepHNN: a novel hybrid neural network for electroencephalogram (EEG)-based Screening of Depression, *Biomed. Signal Process Control.* 66 (2021) 102393.
- [41] X. Song, D. Yan, L. Zhao, and L. Yang, 'LSDD-EEGNet: an efficient end-to-end framework for EEG-based depression detection, *Biomed. Signal Process Control.* 75 (2022) 103612.
- [42] O. Aydemir, A new performance evaluation metric for classifiers: polygon area metric, *J. Classif.* 38 (2021) 16–26.