## Suplementary Table 1. A summary of relevant information of the included studies

Last Name of First Author (Year)							Type of functional		
[Reference Number]	Study population interest	n	Age, years: Mean (SD)	Male n (%)	Disease duration, years: Mean (SD)	Main functional connectivity findings	connectivity measured	Type of fMRI analyses	Notes
			28.12 (8.87); 28.52 (9.03);		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	▲ In Second Hamble and work (High and advantage in the standards)		Graph-theory network	*Disease duration in months. High
Wang (2023) [28]	Suicidality	144; 129; 150	9.75 (6.91)	71 (49.3); 62 (48.1); 75 (50)	8.30 (4.74); 9.24 (5.72); - *	() in frontal-limbic network (High annedonia vs. low anedonia)	Static	analysis	anhedonia; low ahedonia; controls.
						$\downarrow$ in occipital regions, middle and superior temporal gyrus, left inferior frontal gyrus	,		Montreal Suicide Attempters; Montreal
						right posterior insula, bilateral primary motor and left somatosensory cortices, the			Depressed Patient Controls; Montreal
			37.8 (10.5); 40.7 (10.3);			left superior parietal lobe, and right parahippocampal gyrus (Suicide attempters vs.			Healthy controls   Jena Suicide Attempters
		16;20;38   26;23;3	3.1(8.2)   36.8(11.1);	3 (18.8);6 (30); 18 (47.3)   7		controls), NO differences between suicide attempters and depressed patients		Graph-theory network	Jena Depressed Patient Controls; Jena
Wagner (2019) [24]	Suicidality	28	35.1 (11.3); 36.7 (9.0)	(26.9); 4 (17.4); 9 (32.1)	-;-;-]-;-;-	controis	Static	analysis	Healthy controls
									*Disease duration in months. LLD group
						Detween the ventrolateral prefrontal context orbitorrontal contex and the caudate (nonsuicidal nations vs. LLD nations with current suicidal ideation and LLD nations			without suicidal ideation; LLD group with
			64 74 (5 22): 67 48 (5 64):		147 88 (107 72): 141 00 (118 56): 112 91	with past suicidal actions)			suicidal ideation; LLD group with current
Shao (2022) [25]	Suicidality	35: 33: 45	67.73 (5.68)	2 (5.71); 6 (18.2); 13 (28.9)	(80.95)*		Static	Spectral DCM analysis	attempts
						↓ between right frontal pole with the left pars orbitalis, right pars triangularis, and			
						the right pars orbital, $\downarrow$ between right frontal pole-bilateral pars orbitalis and right		Seed-based functional	
Kim (2022) [26]	Suicidality	20; 37	19.6 (1.4); 19.7 (1.3)	8 (40); 9 (24.3)	-:-	frontal pole-right pars triangularis (High suicidality vs. low suicidality)	Static	analysis	High suicidality; low suicidality
						$\uparrow$ between left habenula to the left precuneus cortex and the right precentral gyrus			
						(TRD vs. TSD), ↑ between left habenula and right precuneus cortex (TRD vs. TSD and			
			42.3 (14.1); 37.2 (11.0);			controls), $\downarrow$ in both measures (TSD vs. controls) but $\uparrow$ with suicidal ideation, $\uparrow$		Whole-brain voxel-wise	Treatment resistant depression; treatment
Barreiros (2022) [27]	Suicidality	35; 35; 38	47.1 (14.3)	14 (40); 17 (48.6); 17 (44.7)	-;-;-	between left habenula and Divin (TSD vs. TRD)	Static	comparisons	sensitive depression; healthy controls
			72 22 (7 02), 76 26 (5 60),			↓ in anterior DMN, posterior ventral DMN, posterior dorsal DMN, AUD, VIS		Costial independent	Alzneimer's patients; AB-positive healthy
Nuttall (2016) [41]	Alzheimer's disease	22-9-20	73.52 (7.95), 70.20 (5.00), 74.6 (7.86)	12 (54 5): 5 (55 6): 14 (70)		(increased cognitive impairment vs. low cognitive impairment)	Static	component analysis	control subjects, Ap-negative nearing
Nuttan (2010) [41]	Aizheimer 3 disease	22, 3, 20	69 82 (12 62) 66 97 (6 12)	12 (54.5), 5 (55.6), 14 (76)	_,_,_		Static	component analysis	control subjects
			76.38 (8.98): 67.15	6 (50): 8 (25.8)   2 (0.25): 1		↓ in SMN and between DMN and VIS, ↑ in FPN, between DMN and FPN, and			IDAC Alzheimer's patients: IDAC controls
Contreras (2019) [42]	Alzheimer's disease	12; 31   8; 13	(5.51)	(7.69)	-; -1 -; -	between DAN and VIS (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	Matrix of Pearson correlations	IMAS Alzheimer's patients; IMAS controls
								Regional homogeneity index.	
1				1		$\downarrow$ left parahippocampal gyrus (Alzheimer's vs. controls), $\downarrow$ cingulate cortex,		amplitude of low-frequency	1
1				1		parahippocampal gyrus, middle temporal gyrus, and left inferior parietal lobule		fluctuation (ALFF), fractional	1
			72.8 (8.2); 68.4 (7.9); 68.5			(Alzheimer's vs. mild cognitive impairment)		ALFF, and global brain	Alzheimer's patients; mild cognitive
Cha (2015) [43]	Alzheimer's disease	37; 34; 62	(8.0)	10 (27); 18 (52.9); 17 (27.4)	-; -; -		Static	connectivity analysis	impairment patients; healthy controls
			73.6 (6.4); 72.5 (5.2); 69.0			↓in DMN, ↓ in CEN (Alzheimer's vs. controls)		Independent component	Alzheimer's patient's; mild cognitive
Amaefule (2021) [44]	Alzheimer's disease	54; 86; 175	(5.3)	-	-;-;-		Static	analysis	impairment; healthy controls
						↓ in DMN (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	e	Group independent	
Mohtasib (2022) [45]	Alzheimer's disease	20; 20	62.4 (8.6); (66.7 ± 11.1)	12 (60%); 12 (60%)	-;-	I to NAM I had used bills to all infection and shall have and supported as a shaked have	Static	component analysis	Alzheimer's patient's; healthy controls
						In DAN,		Course la de se a de st	
11 (2012) [46]	Alzheimer's disease	15-16	64 (9 27) 65 (9 20)	6 (0 4): 7 (42 75)		frontal gyrus (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	component analysis	Alzheimer's patient's: healthy controls
[1 (2012) [40]	Aizheimer 3 disease	15, 10	04 (8.27), 03 (3.20)	0 (0.4), 7 (43.75)	_,_	I in left posterior cingulate cortex and left parabippocampal gyrus I, in middle	Static	component analysis	Alzheimer's patient's, neartiny controls
						temporal gyrus and right parahippocampal gyrus, $\downarrow$ in DMN (Alzheimer's vs.		Independent component	
Cha (2013) [47]	Alzheimer's disease	37; 62	72.8 (8.2); 68.5 (8)	10 (27); 17 (27.4)	-; -	controls)	Static	analysis	Alzheimer's patient's; healthy controls
						↓ in SN, ↓ in left orbito-frontal and superior frontal gyrus, and left posterior			
						superiortemporal gyris and middle temporal gyrus, $\psi$ in anterior temporal lobe and		Voxel-wise and a seed-based	
Mascali (2018) [48]	Alzheimer's disease	38; 19	72.2 (7.8); 68.5 (6.8)	10 (26.3); 13 (68.4)	-; -	left angular gyrus (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	analysis	Alzheimer's patient's; healthy controls
						. I. in DMN . I. in posterior cingulate and medial frontal cortex (Alzheimer's vs		Multisession temporal	
						controls)		concatenation independent	
Adriaanse (2012) [49]	Alzheimer's disease	25; 18	63 (6); 67 (6)	17 (0.68); 14 (77.8)	-;-		Static	component analysis	Alzheimer's patient's; healthy controls
						↑ in DMN, ↑ in bilateral medial prefrontal cortex and precuneus (Alzheimer's vs.			CD33 rs3865444 CC (Alzheimer's); CD33
						controls and mild cognitive impairment), $\downarrow$ in precuneus and dorsal anterior			rs3865444 CC (controls)   CD33 rs3865444
Cong (2010) [50]	Alabaimar's disease	12, 20   17, 28	72.89 (5.84); 72.75 (4.98)	5 (41.07); 14 (48.3)   9 (52.9);		cingulate cortex (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Statio	Global functional connectivity	A+ (Alzheimer S); CD33 IS3865444 A+
Goig (2019) [50]	Aizheimer s uisease	12, 29   17, 50	/5.21(/./0), /5.90(0.46)	24 (05.2)	-,-,-,-	I in left and right anterior circulate cortex and right medial superior frontal gurus	Static	density mapping	(controls)
						and right parahippocampal region. J. in nucleus caudatus and the bilateral olfactory		Seed-based functional	
Herdick (2020) [51]	Alzheimer's disease	51: 174	73.0 (6.6): 68.9 (5.2)	22 (43.1): 71 (40.8)	-:-	area (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	analysis	Alzheimer's patient's: healthy controls
					,	Just between posterior cingulate cortex and precupeus. A between posterior cingulate			
						cortex and right insula (mild cognitive impairement due to Alzheimer's vs.			
						Alzheimer's), $\downarrow$ in middle and superior frontal gyri, anterior cingulate cortex, right			
						middle and superior temporal gyri, BA 21 and the superior temporal pole, fusiform			
			65.667 ( 9.95); 69.571			gyri and the lingual gyri, posterior cingulate cortex, ↑ between BA9-BA19 and		Whole-brain, voxel-wise	Dementia due to Alzheimer's; mild
			(7.92); 68 (7.11); 59.816	7 (46.7); 9 (42.9); 3 (27.3); 17		cerebellum (dementia due to Alzheimer's vs. mild cognitive impairement due to		eigenvector centrality	cognitive imparirment due to Alzheimer's;
Skouras (2019) [52]	Alzheimer's disease	15; 21; 11; 49	(6.62)	(34.7)	-; -; -; -	Alzheimer's)	Static	mapping	preclinical Alzheimer's; healthy controls
Tumati (2020) [53]	Alzheimer's disease	26; 18	14 (53.8); 7 (38.9)	72.87 (7.2); 73.13 (5.7)	-;-	↓ dorsal anterior cingulate cortex network (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	Pearson correlation	Alzheimer's patient's; healthy controls
5 (2020) (5.4)	Alek alex ada 11	45.24	66.4667 (8.85); 63.94	1		↓ between hippocampus and posterior cingulate cortex, ↑ in CCN (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Canala	Group independent	Alebalmania material. 1. 11
Fu (2020) [54]	Aizneimer's disease	15; 31	(8.19)	-	-; -	L between DMNL SNL V/C and ALID (Alsheimer's us controls)	Static	component analysis	Aizneimer's patient's; healthy controls
nei20g (2022) [55]	Aizheimer's disease	43; 33	/0.55 (/./4); 6/./4 (8.37)	44 (44.4); 20 (40.8)	_,_	w between bivity, Sty, VIS, and AOD (Atzneimer's VS. controls)	sidtic	Pearson correlation	Autoenter's patient s; healthy controls
1			65 00 (0 09) 60 00 (7 (3))	1		$\downarrow$ in left temporal lobe in (Alzheimer's vs. controls), $\downarrow$ in left-precentral gyrus, left		rearson's correlation,	Alzheimer's patient's produced
Demirtas (2017) [56]	Alzheimer's disease	16: 12: 58	60 72 (6 99)	9 (56 3) 9 (75) 37 (64 9)		hippocampus and right temporal pole (preclinical Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	strength	Alzheimer's - healthy controls
Seria (2017) [50]	variation a disease	10, 12, 30	00.72 (0.99)	5 (55.5), 5 (75), 57 (64.5)	, ,		50000	Sucipul	valuements, nearthy concrois
1				1		$\downarrow$ between locus coeruleis with right caudate and left fusiform gyrus (Alzheimer's		1	1
				1		with depression vs. controls), $\downarrow$ between left locus coeruleis and right caudate, right		1	1
				1		middle frontal gyrus and left fusitorm gyrus (Alzheimer's without depression vs.		1	Depressed Alzheimer's patients: non-
1			71.2 (5.3); 74.1 (5.7); 70.8	1		precentral gyrus (Alzheimer's with depression vs. Alzheimer's without depression)		1	depressed Alzheimer's patients; healthy
Dai (2023) [36]	Alzheimer's disease	24; 14; 20	(3.3)	17 (70.8); 9 (64.3); 11 (55)	-; -; -		Static	Pearson correlation	controls
			73.33 (8.14); 72.28 (7.62);			$\uparrow$ in DMN, between DMN and the CBN, between DMN and SMN, between the CBN		Independent component	Alzheimer's patient's; mild cognitive
Mondragón (2021) [57]	Alzheimer's disease	18; 92; 33	74.70 (7.24)	11 (61.1); 44 (46.8); 13 (39.4)	-; -; -	and VIS (amnestic mild cognitive impairment vs. Alzheimer's with dementia)	Static	analysis	impairment; healthy controls
1				1				Group independent	1
1				1		↓ in VIS and motor networks, and between the two networks, ↑ between VIS/moto	r	component analysis, sliding	1
1	1					networks and SN, CCN, and temporal networks, $\downarrow$ in DMN (Alzheimer's vs. controls)		window approach, k-means	
				20 ( 50 ) 20 ( 74 )				clustering analysis, graph-	
Scnumacher (2019) [58]	Aizneimer's disease	29; 31	/5.2 (8.6); 76.4 (7.2)	20 (69); 22 (71)	3./ (1./); -	I to block and and added a solution (A. 1997) (A. 1997).	Dynamic	theory analysis	Aizneimer's patient's; healthy controls
Perata (2015) [50]	Alzheimer's disease	10.17	747 (95) 76 9 (57)	16 (94 2) - 14 (92 4)		<ul> <li>In nippocampus, and parietal, occipital and frontal cortices (Alzheimer's vs. controls)</li> </ul>	Static	Graph analysis	Alzheimer's patient's boothy control-
reiaza (2013) [33]	nizirelliter s uisease	13, 11	72 2 (6 0) 74 0 (5.7)	10 (04.2), 14 (02.4)	_,_	controlsy	Junic	Group independent	Alzheimer's patient's: AP, boolthu
Taylor (2017) [60]	Alzheimer's disease	22; 14; 24	(6.6)	10 (45.5); 8 (57.1): 6 (0.25)	-; -; -	↓ in DMN (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	component analysis	controls; Aβ- healthy controls

Thomas (2014) [61]	Alzheimer's disease	27; 74; 343   8; 15; 31: 25	70.1 (11.4); 74.0 (7.7); 68.7 (9.5)   49.4 (8.7); 41.4 (10.4); 33.9 (8.5); 30.9 (10.0)	(37); (58); (34)   (63); (33); (39): (40)		↓ in the DMN, DAN, and CON (higher CDR scores vs. lower CDR scores - includes ADAD and LOAD), ↓ between DMN and DAN (higher CDR scores vs. lower CDR scores - includes ADAD and LOAD)	Static	Whole-brain averaging of	Late-onset AD (CDR 1); Late-Onset AD (CDR 0) (S); Late-onset AD (CDR 0)   Autosomal Dominant AD (CDR >1) with + mutation; Autosomal Dominant AD (CDR 0.5) with + mutation; Autosomal Dominant AD (CDR 0) with + mutation; Autosomal Dominant AD (CDR 0) with - mutation
Teipel (2017) [62]	Alzheimer's disease	84; 151	72.0 (9.0); 69.0 (7.8)	38 (45.2); 69 (45.7)	-;-	$\downarrow$ in the precuneus, inferior parietal cortex, lateral temporal cortex and medial prefrontal cortex (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	Seed-based functional connectivity and independent component analysis	Alzheimer's patients; healthy controls
Zhang (2022) [63]	Alzheimer's disease	21; 24	66.3(9.4); 66.9(8.0)	6 (28.6); 11 (45.8)	-;-	$\downarrow$ in DMN and CEN, $\uparrow$ between DMN and VIS, $\uparrow$ between DMN and SMN (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	Functional connectivity strength analysis	Alzheimer's patients; healthy controls
Canu (2017) [64]	Alzheimer's disease	62: 48	59.7 (4.1): 57.4 (6.3)	25 (40.3): 17 (35.4)	3.6 (1.3):	$\downarrow$ in DMN, specifically in the precuneus bilaterally and the right calcarine cortex (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	Independent Component Analysis-based Automatic Removal Of Motion Artifacts	Early-onset Alzheimer's patients; healthy
Chabran (2020) [65]	Alzheimer's disease	59. 22	72 7 (9 2): 66 5 (7 9)	26 (44 8): 11 (50)		↓ in DMN and SN (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	Seed-based analysis (Conn toolbox) and independent	Alzhaimar's nationts: healthy controls
Whitwell (2015) [66]	Alzheimer's disease	24. 24	68 (10):65 (8)	12(50)-11(45.8)	41(12): -	$\downarrow$ in ventral DMN, $\downarrow$ in parietal regions of the right working memory network (Alzheimer's vs. controls)	Static	Group independent component analysis and spatial-temporal dual regression	Alzheimer's patients, healthy controls
Strain (2022) [67]	Alzheimer's disease	19; 33; 31; 40; 83   11; 39;51; 131	50.2 (8.6); 46.8 (9.2); 36.8 (6.7); 31.1 (8.6); 39.8 (11.3)   65.2 (7); 69 (5); 74.8 (6.6); 66 (6.5)	9 (47.4); 13 (39.4); 15 (48.4); 21 (52.5); 34 (41)   6 (55.5); 21 (53.8); 20 (39.2); 41 (31.3)	-;-;-;-   -;-;-;-	$\downarrow$ in DMN, SMN, AUD, and VIS (CDR 1+ in both LOAD and ADAD)	Static	Pearson correlation as well as covariance, also known as simply un-normalized correlation	Adjustments 5 patients, meaning controls $A\beta_{+}$ (+ mutation and CDR $\ge$ 1); $A\beta_{+}$ (+ mutation and CDR 0.5); $A\beta_{+}$ (+ mutation and CDR 0); $A\beta_{-}$ (+ mutation and CDR 0); $A\beta_{+}$ (CDR 0); (- mutation and control)   LOAD $A\beta_{+}$ (CDR 0.5); LOAD $A\beta_{+}$ (CDR 0.5); LOAD $A\beta_{+}$ (CDR 0); LOAD $A\beta_{+}$ (CDR 0.5); LOAD $A\beta_{+}$ (CDR 0);
		12; 9; 11   9; 18;	69.7 (6.49); 67.8 (7.5); 67.6 (7.9)   72.1 (7.6); 70.0 (7.0); 65.3 (7.7); 65.1	83±41;71±23; -   7.7±	8 (66.6); 4 (44.4); 3 (27.3)   6 (66.6); 12	$\psi$ in the hippocampus, $\uparrow$ between medial prefrontal cortex and posterior cingulate cortex (Parkinson's with cognitive impairment vs. Parkinson's with no cognitive impairment and healthy controls)	-	ROI-to-ROI connectivity	Parkinson's patients (with dementia/cognitive impairment - follow up visit); Parkinson's patients (no cognitive impairment- follow up visit). Parkinson's patients (with dementia- baseline wisit); Parkinson's patients (with cognitive impairment- baseline visit); Parkinson's patients (on cognitive impairment- baseline
Wu (2009) [69]	Parkinson's disease	22; 22	59.5(8.1); 59.7 (-)	16 (72.3); - (-)	4.1 (1.8); -	↓ in the putamen and cerebellum (Parkinson's vs. controls)	Static	Regional Homogeneity index	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
Chen (2015) [70]	Parkinson's disease	21; 26	58.3 (11.1); 61.3 (10.1)	10 (46.7); 10 (38.5)	3.2 (3.2); - (-)	↑ in bilateral superior frontal gyrus (medial) and bilateral superior frontal gyrus (Parkinson's vs. controls)	Static	Pearson correlation coefficient	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
Rommal (2021) [71]	Parkinson's disease	25; 25	65.1 (9.3); 63.5 (7.7)	17 (68); 12 (48)	4.7 (3.7); - (-)	↑ in putamen, thalamus, pons, and cerebellar vermis, ↓ in parieto-occipital association regions (Parkinson's vs. controls)	Static	Independent component analysis	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
Lucas-Jiménez (2016) [72]	Parkinson's disease	37; 16	67.97 (6.18); 65.13 (6.78)	22 (59.50); 12 (75.00)	- (-); - (-)	↓ between posterior cingulate cortex and medial temporal lobe, ↓ in DMN (Parkinson's vs. controls)	Static	Seed-to-voxel connectivity analysis	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
						↓ between right anterior caudate nucleus and the cerebellum anterior lobe, ↓ between right anterior caudate nucleus with bilateral IFG; ↓ between the left anterior putamen the cerebellum anterior lobe, the right hippocampus, and right rolandic operculum, ↓ between the right posterior putamen and the left inferior temporal gruss and right LG, between the right posterior putamen and the right rolandic operculum, right LG, left IFG, and right hippocampus (Parkinsor's with faigure sc. Parkinsor's without fatigue), ↑ between anterior caudate nucleus/anterior putamen with the cerebellum anterior lobe, ↑ between the anterior putamen and right rolandic operculum (Parkinsor's withof fatigue vs. controls), ↓ between the right anterior/posterior putamen and contralateral putamen, ↓ between hieral posterior putamen with hippocampus, ↓ between left posterior putamen and left precentral gruss and left inferior temporal gruss, ↓ between right posterior putamen with right insula (Parkinson's with fatigue vs. controls)			
Hou (2022) [73]	Parkinson's disease	19; 19; 31	49.11 (—); 46.75 (—); 48.91 (—)	6 (31.6); 7 (36.8); 12 (38.7)	1.32 (0.56); 1.62 (0.95); — (—)		Static	Seed-based resting state-fMR analysis	Parkinson's patients (with fatigue); healthy controls
Bellot (2022) [74]	Parkinson's disease	22; 8; 22	57.3 (10.5); 55,62 (7.3); 55.5 (9.4)	- (-); - (-); - (-)	- (); - (); - ()	↓ between superior colliculus and lateral geniculate nucleus, ↓ between superior colliculus and primary visual area	Static	Dynamic causal modeling	Parkinson's patients (no follow up); Parkinson's patients (with follow up); healthy controls
Econcietti (2010) [75]	Deckieren's disease	19, 19, 17	66 (7), 64 (8), 63 (0)	(61), (82), (50)	2 7 (2 4), 2 8 (2 0),	↓ DMN and SN (Parkinson's vs. controls), ↓ between posterior cingulate cortex and right superior forntal suicas and IPL, ↓ in right lateral parietal cortex, left anterior insula, and left lateral parietal cortex (Parkinson's and SSD-Parkinson's vs. controls), ↓ between posterior cingulate cortex and anterior cingulate cortex, ↓ between right middle frontal gyrus and right anterior insula (SSD-Parkinson's vs. Parkinson's and controls)	Statio	Fractional amplitude of low-	Parkinson's with Somatic Symptoms
Franciotti (2019) [75]	Parkinson's disease	10, 18; 22	00 (7); 04 (8); 03 (9)	- (01); - (03); - (59)	5.7 (2.4), 3.8 (2.0); —	None	Static	Independent component	Disorder, Parksinson's without SSD; controls
Georgiopoulos (2019) [76]	Parkinson's disease	20; 20	67 (-); 66.5 (-)	10 (50); 8 (45)	- (-); - (-)	inone in the second sec	Static	analysis	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls

						↓ between dorsal anterior insula and the anterior cingulate cortex (Parkinson's			
Fathy (2020) [77]	Parkinson's disease	53: 15	67.3 (-); 66.9 (-)	- (58); - (66)	11.3 (-): -	patients vs. controls), 'P between dorsal anterior insula and DWIN (Parkinson's patients with more cognitive impairement vs. less cognitive impairment)	Static	Graph-theory network analysis	Parkinson's patients: healthy controls
				A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A		↑ between dorsal anterior cingulate cortex and right anterior insula, ↓ between			
						dorsal anterior cingulate cortex and the left lateral parietal cortex (DMN) (NGSES and			
Tinaz (2020) [78]	Parkinson's disease	35	5 64.3 (8.7)	25 (71.4)	6.2 (3.8)	SRS scores of Parkinson's vs. controls)	Static	Regional Homogeneity index	Parkinson's patients
						$\downarrow$ between the striatum and DMN (PD-MBI vs. controls), $\downarrow$ between striatum and			
						SN (PD-MBI vs; controls, and in PD-MBI vs. PD-noMBI). For greater MBI scores: $\downarrow$			
						middle frontal gyrus. J, between right caudate head and precupeus/superior occipital			
						cortex, dorsal anterior cingulate cortex, supramarginal/angular gyrus, and precentral			
						gyrus, $\uparrow$ between right caudate head with the posterior hippocampus and right			
						cerebellar hemisphere			De elde se de sudeb estil di bebes de se l
			71.8 (6.4): 70.4 (5.8): 69.8						impairment: Parkinson's with no mild
Lang (2020) [79]	Parkinson's disease	21, 53, 28	(6.7)	15 (71.4); 34 (64.2); 13 (46.4)	5.68 (3.75); 5.55 (3.99); —		Static	Atlas and seed-based analysis	behavioral impairment; controls
						↓ in precuneus, superior parietal gyri, occipital gyri, cuneus and lingual gyri		Node-based analysis and	
Jalakas (2019) [80]	Parkinson's disease	175; 51	65 (10); 65 (8.5)	-(-); -(-); -(-)	5.1 (4.9);	(Parkinson's vs. controls)	Static	Craddock atlas	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
						↑ in DMN, DGM and SN, ↓ in VIS (Parkinson's at time 2 vs. Parksinson's at time 1),			Parkinson's patients at time point 2;
Boon (2020) [81]	Parkinson's disease	31-31-50-15	65 5 (6 27): 64 4 (8 65)	14 (45.1); 14 (45.1); 26 (52); 10 (66.6)	11 9 (3 75) 8 87 (3 75) 9 20 (3 63) -	static $\uparrow$ and dynamic $\downarrow$ in DGM-FPN (cross sectional Parkinson's vs. controls)	Static and dynamic	analysis	(cross-sectional): healthy controls
5001 (2020) [01]	Turkingon y disease	51, 51, 50, 15	05.5 (0.27), 04.4 (0.05)	10 (00.0)	11.5 (5.75), 5.67 (5.75), 5.26 (5.65),	↓ in CEN. CCN, and prefrontal cortex. ↑ in left fronto-parietal network (FPN), and	Statie and dynamic	Group-level independent	(closs sectionally, nearly controls
Cordes (2018) [82]	Parkinson's disease	18; 18	57.11 (11.63); 64.25 (9.78)	10 (55.5); 14 (77.7)	0.83 (0.84); -	right FPN (Parkinson's vs. controls)	Static and dynamic	component analysis	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
						. in nutamen and sensorimotor and supramarginal cortex (Parkinson's vs. controls)		Voxel-mirrored homotopic	
Luo (2015) [83]	Parkinson's disease	51; 51	52.83 (8.68); 52.24 (8.66)	27 (53); 27 (53)	1.68 (1.02); -		Static	connectivity approach	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
						↑ in left midcingulate cortex (Depressed Parkinson's vs. controls and non-depressed			
						Parkinson's), ↑ in right inferior temporal gyrus (Depressed Parkinson's vs. non-			
						depressed Parkinson's), ↑ in left inferior temporal gyrus, ↓ in bilateral fusiform			
						(Parkinson's vs. controls), $\uparrow$ between the midcingulate cortex and the medial			
						midcingulate cortex and DMN (Depressed Parkinson's vs. non-depressed Parkinson's)			Depressed Parkinson's patients; non-
			58.05 (7.72); 54.69			······································		Amplitude of low frequency	depressed Parkinson's patients; healthy
Hu (2015) [37]	Parkinson's disease	20; 39; 41	(10.45); 56.37 (5.01)	9 (45); 26 (66.67); 20 (48.8)	5.35 (2.82); 6.5 (3.54); -	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Static	fluctuations	controls
14 (2020) [84]	Darkinson's disease	20, 15	EE A (7.1), E2 1E (11.4)	24 (90), 9 (52 2)	5 8 (2 2).	I in caudate and in anterior putamen,  between anterior and posterior putamen, between substantia pigra and the thalamus and pallidum.	Statio	Cood bacad approach	Dadvincon's nationts, healthy controls
LI (2020) [84]	Parkinson's disease	50, 15	33.4 (7.1), 33.13 (11.4)	24 (00), 8 (33.3)	5.8 (2.2), -		Static	Independent component	Parkinson's patients, nearthy controls
						None		analysis, seed-to-voxel	
Baggio (2019) [85]	Parkinson's disease	62; 39	65.3(10.2); 61.7(11.5)	46 (74.2); 17 (43.6)	-;-		Static	approach	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
						↑ between putamen and medial parietal cortex, between pallidum and occipital			
						cortex , ↑ in thalamus and insula regions, ↓ in premotor, motor, and somatosensory			
Müller Ophring (2014) [96]	Darkinson's disease	11. 11	62 (6), 62 (5)	E (0 4E): 7 (62 6)		controls)	Static	seed-to-voxel connectivity	Parkinson's patients, healthy controls
Muller-Gennig (2014) [86]	Parkinson's disease	11, 11	05 (0), 02 (5)	3 (0.43), 7 (03.0)	_,_		Static	Group-level independent	Parkinson's patients, nearthy controls
Miloserdov (2020) [87]	Parkinson's disease	16; 19	69.44 (8.52) ; 68.32 (6.30)	19 (100); 13 (81)	7.67 (6.99); -	None	Static	component analysis	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
	Parkinson's and Alzheimer's		62.1 (11.9); 74.5 (6.5);			$\downarrow$ in basal ganglia (Parkinson's vs. Alzheimer's and healthy controls), $\downarrow$ in posterior		Probabilistic independent	
Rolinski (2015) [88]	diesease	32; 31; 19	60.6 (7.7)	18 (56.3); 16 (51.6); 11 (57.9)	25.0 (13.9); -; - *	putamen (Parkinson's vs. healthy controls)	Static	component analysis	*Disease duration in months.
			68.92 (6.02); 62.21 (8.54);			↑ in left amygdala and the left intraparietal sulcus (Parkinson's with anxiety vs.			Anxious Parkinson's patients; Non-anxious
K. Chen (2023) [89]	Parkinson's disease	13; 20; 19	63.95 (8.95)	6 (46.1); 13 (0.65); 10 (52.6)	6.23 (3.68); 3.08 (2.15); —	Parkinson's without anxiety)	Static	Seed-based voxel-wise analys	is Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
			50 20 /6 24) 58 72 /0 21)			$\uparrow$ in VIS, $\uparrow$ in SMN and DMN (Parkinson's [depressed] vs. controls and Parkinson's			Depressed Parkinson's patients; Non-
Wang (2022) [38]	Parkinson's disease	20: 37: 41	60.10 (6.19)	8 (0.4); 20 (54); 21 (51.2)	2.0. 1.0	[not depressed])	Static	Regional Homogeneity index	controls
						A between persfercicular nucleus and descal nutamen. Linuslaus assumbers and		Independent component	
						subthalamic nucleus (Parkinson's vs. controls)		analysis, spectral DCM	
L. Chen (2023) [39]	Parkinson's disease	72; 60	60.44 (9.19); 60.11 (8.02)	33 (45.8); 25 (41.6)	4.51 (3.88); -		Static	analysis	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
Putcha (2015) [00]	Parkinson's disease	24: 20	62 5 (6 4): 65 0 (0 4)	12 (50): 9 (45)			Static	independent component	Parkinson's nations, healthy controls
Puttia (2013) [90]	Parkinson's disease	24, 20	02.3 (0.4), 03.9 (3.4)	12 (30), 9 (43)	_,_	Juin the BGN, specifically in the striatum and anygdala. Juin CBLN and EPN	Static	Group-spatial independent	Parkinson's patients, nearthy controls
Togo (2023) [91]	Parkinson's disease	71; 57	68.4 (8); 69.5 (6.5)	43 (60.6); 36 (63.2)	-; -	(Parkinson's vs. controls)	Static	component analysis	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
						↓ between SMN and CCN, between SMN and VIS, between SMN and AUD, between			
						CCN and VIS and between subcortical network and DMN (Parkinson's with MCI vs.		Independent component	
Díez-Cirarda (2017) [92]	Parkinson's disease	23; 26	69.17 (4.48); 68.31 (7.52)	(56); (69)	7.11 (5.67); -	controls)	Dynamic	analysis	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
						Lin DMN_DAN_and SMN (Parksinson's vs_controls)		Analysis of Eurotional	
Tinaz (2016) [93]	Parkinson's disease	20: 20	62.5 (6.9); 61.9 (6.6)	11 (55): 11 (55)	7.1 (3.3):		Static	Neuroimages (AFNI) software	Parkinson's patients: healthy controls
				Com Con	V - M	A la siste la via a side la fe antesia (a staria a stara a (fe side a side a side la via a side la la		Graph-based spectral	
Liu (2018) [94]	Parkinson's disease	30; 28	57.77 (9.85); 58.39 (7.64)	19 (63.3); 14 (50)	5.07 (3.19);	", in right insula and the left anterior/posterior putamen (Parkinson's vs. controls)	Dynamic	clustering algorithm	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
								Graph theory analysis, group	
						$\uparrow$ between DMN and BGN, $\uparrow$ between precuneus and caudate (Parkinson's with		independent component	Desidence of a set of the set of
			62 67 (8 19) 61 71 (0 50)			freezing of gait vs. Parkinson's without freezing of gait)		analysis; sliding window	Parkinson's patients with freezing of gait;
Gan (2023) [95]	Parkinson's disease	52; 73; 38	61.92 (5.57)	28 (53.8); 47 (64.4); 25 (65.8)	6.14 (3.76); 6.28 (4.44); -		Dynamic	clustering method	gait; healthy controls
								Group independent	
			71.75 (6.62); 65.87			J in AUD, VIS, SMN, CEN, DMN and CBN (Parkinson's vs. controls)		component analysis, sliding	
El	De aldas e als all	20.45.52.25	(11.37); 58.63 (9.58);	13 (65); 33 (71.7); -; 18			Durania	window approach, clustering	Desidence de contractor de la des
Fiorenzato (2019) [96]	Parkinson's disease	20; 46; 52; 35	01.29 (8.98)	(51.4)	12.35 (6.35); 9.09 (5.4); 9.48 (4.62); -		Dynamic	analysis	Parkinson's patients; healthy controls
						$\downarrow$ in nucleus accumbens in bilateral ventromedial prefrontal cortex, $\uparrow$ in the left		Seed-based correlation	behaviors: Parkinson's patients with non-
Kimura (2023) [97]	Parkinson's disease	37; 37	66 (11.6); 66.6 (11.3)	17 (46); 18 (49)	8.32 (8.1); 8.1 (7)	middle occipital gyrus (ICB vs. non-ICB)	Static	analysis	impulsive behaviors
-					-				-

Dumas (2013) [20]	Huntington's disease	20; 28; 28	46.5 (10.6); 43.21 (8.2); 48.5 (8.5)	5 (25); 11 (39.3); 13 (46.4)	6.8 (7.4);;	$\downarrow$ between medial visual network in the left frontal lobe and the right parteal lobe (Early HD and Pre-HD vs. controls), $\downarrow$ between medial visual network and the cingulate grous (DMM) (Pre-HD vs. controls), $\downarrow$ between medial visual network and superior occipital lobe putamen, globus pallidus, thalamus, and bi-lateral orbital frontal cortex (Early HD vs. Pre-HD), $\downarrow$ in left parietal lobe, $\downarrow$ between the pre-frontal cortex and DMM, between CEN and thalamus and left supramarginal grous (Early HD vs. Ortrols)	Static	Dual regression method	Early HD; Pre-HD; healthy controls
Poudel (2014) [21]	Huntington's disease	23; 25; 18	55.98 (9.4); 42.86 (9.2); 45.54 (13.7)	13 (57); 9 (36); 4 (22.2)	5.07 (1.5);;	In SMN and DAN (Pre-HD vs. controls),	Static	Independent component analysis	Symp-HD; Pre-HD; controls

LUD: late life depression, TSD: treatment-sensitive depression, TSD: treatment-resistant depression, TSD: treatment-resist