

Verbal creativity correlates with the temporal variability of brain networks during the resting state

Journal:	<i>Cerebral Cortex</i>
Manuscript ID	CerCor-2017-01079.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Articles
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Sun, Jiangzhou; Southwest University, Faculty of Psychology Liu, Zhaowen; Xidian University, School of Computer Science and Technology Zhang, Jie; Fudan Univ., Center for computational system biology Rolls, Edmund T.; University of Warwick, Department of Computer Science Chen, Qunlin; Southwest University,, School of psychology Yao, Ye; Fudan Univ., Center for computational system biology Yang, Wenjing; Southwest University, Department of psychology Wei, Dongtao; Southwest University, Faculty of psychology Feng, Jianfeng; computational system biology, Computer Science Qiu, Jiang; Southwest University,, School of psychology</p>
Keywords:	Creativity, Temporal Variability, Default Mode Network, Attention/Control Networks

**Title: Verbal creativity correlates with the temporal variability of brain networks
during the resting state**

Running title: Verbal creativity and temporal variability

Jiangzhou Sun^{1,2, †}, Zhaowen Liu^{3,4, †}, Jie Zhang^{4, †}, Edmund T. Rolls^{5,6, †}, Qunlin Chen^{1,2, †}, Ye
Yao^{4, †}, Wenjing Yang,^{1,2} Dongtao Wei,^{1,2} Jianfeng Feng,^{4,5,7,8,*} Jiang Qiu^{1,2,*}

¹Key Laboratory of Cognition and Personality (SWU), Ministry of Education, Chongqing, China

²School of Psychology, Southwest University (SWU), Chongqing, China

³School of Computer Science and Technology, Xidian University, Xi'an 710071, Shanxi, PR China

⁴Institute of Science and Technology for Brain Inspired Intelligence, Fudan University, Shanghai,
PR China

⁵Department of Computer Science, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK

⁶Oxford Centre for Computational Neuroscience, Oxford UK

⁷Collaborative Innovation Center for Brain Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, 200433, PR
China

⁸Shanghai Center for Mathematical Sciences, Shanghai, 200433, P.R China

[†]These authors contributed equally.

*Corresponding author

Corresponding author information:

Professor Jiang Qiu

Faculty of Psychology,

Southwest University,

No.2, TianSheng Road, Beibei district, Chongqing 400715, China,

Tel: 86-23-6836 7942 Fax: 86-23-6836 7942

E-mail: qiu318@swu.edu.cn

Professor Jianfeng Feng

Department of Computer Science,

University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK

Tel: 86-21-65643621

Email: jianfeng64@gmail.com

Abstract

Creativity is the ability to see the world in new ways. Creative individuals exhibit the ability to switch between different modes of thinking and shift their mental focus. This suggests a connection between creativity and dynamic interactions of brain networks. We report here the first investigation into the relationship between the reconfiguration of dynamic brain networks during the resting state and verbal creativity using two fMRI datasets involving 574 subjects. We find that verbal creativity correlates with temporal variability of the functional connectivity (FC) patterns of the lateral prefrontal cortex, the precuneus, and the parahippocampal gyrus. High variability of these regions indicates flexible connectivity patterns which may facilitate executive functions. Furthermore, verbal creativity correlates with the temporal variability of FC patterns within the default mode network (DMN), between the DMN and attention/sensorimotor network, and between control and sensory networks. High variability of FCs between the DMN and attention networks characterizes frequent adjustments of attention. Finally, dynamic interaction between the cerebellum and task control network also contributes to verbal creativity, suggesting a relationship between the cerebellum and creativity. This study reveals a close relationship between verbal creativity and high variability of cortical networks involved in spontaneous thought, attention and cognitive control.

Keywords: Creativity, Temporal Variability, Default Mode Network, Attention/Control Networks

Introduction

Creativity is commonly defined as the ability to produce something both novel and useful (Stein MI 1953; Sternberg RJ and TI Lubart 1996; Runco MA and GJ Jaeger 2012). Creative thinking is linked not only to economic development and social progress, but also to almost all areas of daily life (Mumford MD 2002; Dietrich A and R Kanso 2010). Individuals with high creativity appear to have a richer and more flexible semantic associative network and can build relationships between apparently unrelated things or concepts (Bossomaier T et al. 2009). An important trait for creative people is that they are more capable of shifting between abstract, analytical, thinking, and dreaming, reverie thinking (Fink A et al. 2009). The ability of creative people to shift between these ways of thinking may be reflected in the variability during the resting state. Indeed, the resting state is likely to be an active state both physiologically and psychologically (Morcom AM and PC Fletcher 2007). Although the relationships between cognition and the resting state is still not fully understood (Morcom AM and PC Fletcher 2007; Morcom AM and PC Fletcher 2007), the activity of brain networks such as the default mode network (DMN) is associated with various cognitive processes such as mind-wandering, future thinking (Schacter DL et al. 2012), and perspective taking (Buckner RL and DC Carroll 2007). Previous resting-state fMRI studies showed that the coupling of large scale brain systems such as the DMN and the control network is related to creativity (Beaty RE et al. 2014; Chen Q et al. 2014; Beaty RE et al. 2015; Liu S et al. 2015). Furthermore, several studies showed that resting-state dynamic functional connectivity is related to cognitive flexibility and openness to experience which are closely related to creativity (Yang Z et al. 2014; Braun U et al. 2015; Chen T et al. 2016; Beaty RE et al. 2017; Cohen JR 2017). Based on all the above, the present study explored the

1
2
3 relationship between dynamic functional connectivity during the resting state and creativity which
4
5
6 was measured separately in all the participants.
7

8 A wide variety of neuroimaging studies (Jung-Beeman M et al. 2004; Qiu J et al. 2010;
9
10 Abraham A et al. 2012; Aziz-Zadeh L et al. 2013; Zhu F et al. 2013; Sun J et al. 2016) have been
11
12 conducted to explore the neural bases of creativity, and widespread brain areas have been
13
14 implicated in divergent thinking (Dietrich A and R Kanso 2010; Jung RE et al. 2013; Fink A and
15
16 M Benedek 2014). Our recent meta-analysis of task-fMRI showed that the lateral prefrontal cortex,
17
18 the posterior parietal cortex, the precuneus, the anterior cingulate cortex, and the temporal cortex
19
20 are typically activated in creativity-related processes (Wu X et al. 2015). Resting-state fMRI
21
22 analysis reveals that creativity is associated with functional connectivity (FC) between a large set
23
24 of brain regions and networks (Takeuchi H et al. 2012; Beaty RE *et al.* 2014; Wei D et al. 2014;
25
26 Beaty RE et al. 2016). For example, higher creative ability was related to greater resting-state
27
28 functional connectivity in the inferior frontal cortex and DMN (Beaty RE *et al.* 2014). The DMN
29
30 is more active at rest than it is in a range of tasks (Raichle ME et al. 2001; Raichle ME and AZ
31
32 Snyder 2007). The DMN has been related to the generation of creative thinking (Jung RE *et al.*
33
34 2013), and the coupling between the DMN and other networks has also been closely related to
35
36 creativity (Jung RE *et al.* 2013).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The frontal lobe, which is closely related to executive functions (such as cognitive flexibility,
46
47 inhibitory control, and working memory), also contributes to creative thinking (Miller EK and JD
48
49 Cohen 2001; Koechlin E et al. 2003; Aron AR et al. 2004; Petrides M 2005; Alvarez JA and E
50
51 Emory 2006; Dietrich A and R Kanso 2010). Cooperation between brain regions associated with
52
53 cognitive control (such as dorsolateral prefrontal areas) and other brain regions helps to generate
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 original ideas (Beaty RE *et al.* 2014). In addition, the role of the cerebellum in creativity has
4
5 received more and more attention. The cerebellum is involved in high-level functions, and
6
7 cortical-cerebellar interaction is associated with creative thinking (Akshoomoff NA *et al.* 1997;
8
9 Vandervert LR *et al.* 2007; Bostan AC *et al.* 2013; E KH *et al.* 2014; Leggio M and M Molinari
10
11 2015; Vandervert L 2015).

12
13
14
15
16 Most existing studies, however, have only paid attention to the static FC in resting-state fMRI
17
18 or activations in task-related fMRI, ignoring the dynamic reorganization of brain networks.
19
20 Recently the temporal variability of brain networks has attracted great attention due to its
21
22 important role in learning and task performance (Bassett DS *et al.* 2011; Garrett DD *et al.* 2011;
23
24 Kang J *et al.* 2011; Bassett DS *et al.* 2013; Hutchison RM *et al.* 2013; Calhoun VD *et al.* 2014;
25
26 Kopell NJ *et al.* 2014; Bassett DS *et al.* 2015; Braun U *et al.* 2015; Betzel RF *et al.* 2016; Chen X
27
28 *et al.* 2017), and in serving as a sensitive bio-marker for a number of brain disorders (Yu Q *et al.*
29
30 2015; Liu F *et al.* 2016). Currently, studies on the relationship between the dynamic properties of
31
32 brain networks and creativity are rare. Creativity is complex and is involved in cognitive processes
33
34 such as the generation and evaluation of ideas (Finke RA *et al.* 1992). Beaty RE *et al.* (2016)
35
36 proposed that the DMN contributes to the generation of ideas, and the control network contributes
37
38 to the evaluation of ideas. Both task-related fMRI and resting-state fMRI studies showed that
39
40 coupling of large scale brain systems such as the default mode network and control network is
41
42 related to creativity (Beaty RE *et al.* 2014; Chen Q *et al.* 2014; Beaty RE *et al.* 2015; Liu S *et al.*
43
44 2015). Rich functional connectivity patterns between these networks may contribute to frequent
45
46 information exchange which is related to creativity.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 Given this background, we therefore hypothesized that the dynamic FC patterns of regions of
56
57

1
2
3 the DMN, and the dynamic interactions between the DMN, and executive control related networks
4
5
6 (control networks and attention networks), and between the cerebral cortex and cerebellum during
7
8 the resting state, may be related to individual creative thinking. In the present study, we chose
9
10 verbal creativity because semantic processing is closely related to creativity, and verbal creativity
11
12 is widely used in neuroimaging studies (Dietrich A and R Kanso 2010; Green AE et al. 2012; Zhu
13
14 F et al. 2013; Benedek M, E Jauk, A Fink, et al. 2014; Fink A et al. 2014; Wei D et al. 2014;
15
16 Abraham A 2015). Previous functional imaging studies have shown a consistent and replicable
17
18 pattern of brain activity (Fink A et al. 2014) in the analysis of verbal creativity. To test our
19
20 hypothesis, we investigated the correlations between creativity and the temporal variability of
21
22 cortical areas and networks measured with resting-state fMRI. The approach used in the present
23
24 study allows localization of regions showing significant variability correlated with behavior or
25
26 regions showing variability changes between groups, thus helping to define the dynamics of
27
28 functional brain networks for various behaviors and brain disorders (Zhang J et al. 2016).
29
30 Furthermore, it allows coupling between temporal variability of the functional architecture of a
31
32 region and its neural activity to be analyzed (Zhang J et al. 2016). The larger the temporal
33
34 variability, the more functional communities/systems this region will be relate to across time
35
36 windows. We extend in this paper measures of temporal variability associated with specific brain
37
38 regions (Zhang J et al. 2016), to the temporal variability of FCs within and between specific
39
40 resting-state networks. Here, we show that high temporal variability within and between whole
41
42 networks is reflected also in richer functional connectivity patterns within and between networks.
43
44
45 Given that cerebral-cerebellar connectivity has been shown to be related to creativity
46
47 (Gonen-Yaacovi G et al. 2013; Saggar M et al. 2015; Vandervert L 2015), we also analyzed the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 relationship between verbal creativity and the temporal variability of cerebral-cerebellar functional
4
5 connectivity. We used one dataset involving 304 participants, and in addition cross-validated the
6
7 findings in a separate cohort with 270 subjects.
8
9

10 **Materials and Methods**

11 **Participants**

12
13
14
15
16 There were two cohorts of subjects recruited in this study. The first cohort involved 304
17
18 participants recruited from the Southwest University, China. In the second dataset, there were 270
19
20 participants from the same University. Participants were excluded who did not have behavioral
21
22 data, or whose head motion showed >10% displaced frames in a scrubbing procedure, or maximal
23
24 motion between volumes in each direction >3 mm, or rotation about each axis >3° during
25
26 scanning. All participants were right-handed and none of them had a history of neurological or
27
28 psychiatric illness. In accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (1991), written informed
29
30 consent was obtained from all participants. The study was approved by the Southwest University
31
32 Brain Imaging Center Institutional Review Board.
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Creativity assessment**

39
40 The verbal form of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT) (Torrance E 1974; Ye R
41
42 et al. 1988) was used to assess creativity, which demonstrates adequate reliability ($r > 0.90$) and
43
44 high predictive validity ($r > 0.57$) for future career and creative achievements. The verbal TTCT
45
46 consists of several subtasks (Torrance E 1974; Ye R *et al.* 1988): Asking Questions and Making
47
48 Guesses (subtests 1, 2 and 3), where participants write out questions and make guesses about
49
50 possible causes and consequences of situations based on a drawing of a scene; Improvement of a
51
52 Product (subtest 4), where the examinees list ways to change a toy elephant so that they will have
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 more fun playing with it; Unusual Uses (subtest 5), where the examinees list interesting and
4
5
6 unusual uses of a cardboard box; Unusual questions (subtest 6), where participants think unusual
7
8 questions relating to a cardboard box; and Supposing (subtest 7), where the examinees are asked
9
10 to list all the consequences should an improbable situation come true. For each task, 3 different
11
12 creative dimensions including (a) originality (the degree of originality of the responses, which is
13
14 associated with thinking “outside of the box”), (b) flexibility (the number of different categories of
15
16 responses, which reflects the ability to shift between conceptual fields), and (c) fluency (the
17
18 number of meaningful and relevant responses, which is associated with the ability to generate and
19
20 consider several different possibilities) were scored.
21
22
23
24

25 The total verbal creativity score is the sum of three dimensions of all subtasks. Three trained
26
27 postgraduates scored the verbal creativity responses to all items of the TTCT for all participants.
28
29 The three raters majored in psychology and were blind to the goal of this research. Their
30
31 inter-rater correlation coefficient was significant ($ICC > 0.90$). For the first dataset, all 7 tasks in
32
33 the verbal TTCT were performed, while in the second dataset, participants completed the
34
35 improving products part of the TTCT.
36
37
38
39

40 **Assessment of general intelligence**

41
42 In the first dataset, in order to examine intellectual ability, participants completed the
43
44 Combined Raven’s Test (CRT), which is an intelligence test with a high degree of reliability and
45
46 validity (Tang C et al. 2012). The reliability coefficient was 0.92 (Li D and G Chen 1989; Wang D
47
48 and M Qian 1989). The CRT, which included Raven’s standard progressive matrix (C, D, E sets)
49
50 and Raven’s colored progressive matrix (A, AB, B sets), consisted of 72 items revised by the
51
52 Psychology Department of East China Normal University in 1989. The score on this test (the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

number of correct answers given in 40 min) was used as a psychometric index of individual intelligence. In line with standard practice, the current study focused on the total score of the test (Jaeggi SM et al. 2008; Takeuchi H et al. 2010).

Neuroimaging Data Acquisition

For both datasets, the neuroimaging data were collected in the Southwest University China Center for Brain Imaging using a 3.0 T Siemens Trio MRI scanner (Siemens Medical, Erlangen, Germany). A magnetization-prepared rapid gradient echo (MPRAGE) sequence was used to acquire high-resolution T1-weighted anatomical images (repetition time = 1,900 ms, echo time = 2.52 ms, inversion time = 900 ms, flip angle = 9 degrees, resolution matrix = 256×256 , slices = 176, thickness = 1.0 mm, voxel size = $1 \times 1 \times 1 \text{ mm}^3$).

During resting-state fMRI scanning, the subjects were instructed to lie down, close their eyes, and rest without thinking about a particular thing, but not to fall asleep. The 8-min scan of 242 contiguous whole-brain resting-state functional images was obtained using gradient-echo planar imaging (EPI) sequences with the following parameters: slices = 32, repetition time (TR)/echo time (TE) = 2000/30 ms, flip angle = 90 degrees, field of view (FOV) = $220 \text{ mm} \times 220 \text{ mm}$, and thickness/slice gap = 3/1 mm, voxel size $3.4 \times 3.4 \times 4 \text{ mm}^3$.

FMRI data preprocessing

All fMRI data were preprocessed using SPM8 (<http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm>) and a Data Processing Assistant for Resting-State fMRI (DPARSF). We first discarded the first 10 EPI scans to suppress the equilibration effects and the remaining scans were slice timing corrected. Then, the data were realigned and normalized to a standard template (Montreal Neurological Institute) and resampled to $3 \times 3 \times 3 \text{ mm}^3$. All fMRI time-series underwent spatial smoothing (8 mm Full Width

1
2
3 Half Maximum FWHM), band-pass temporal filtering (0.01-0.1 Hz), nuisance signal removal
4
5 from white matter and cerebrospinal fluid, global mean signal regression, and 6 rigid-body motion
6
7 correction parameters. We carefully performed the following procedures to ensure data quality: 1)
8
9 subjects with poor structural scans, or functional MRI data, making successful preprocessing, i.e.,
10
11 normalization to Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) space, difficult or impossible, or without
12
13 complete demographic information, were excluded; and 2) for head movement, subjects were
14
15 excluded with >10% displaced frames in a scrubbing procedure, or maximal motion between
16
17 volumes in each direction >3 mm, and rotation about each axis >3°. See supplemental information
18
19 for a detailed discussion of global mean signal regression and data scrubbing.
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Temporal variability of the FC profile of a brain region**

26
27
28 The temporal variability of a brain region was obtained by correlating the FC profile of a
29
30 brain region across different time windows, which reflects the dynamical reconfiguration of a
31
32 brain region into distinct functional modules at different times, and is indicative of brain flexibility
33
34 and adaptability (Zhang J *et al.* 2016). Here we adopted the Power-264 module parcellation, i.e.,
35
36 with 264 ROIs defined based on Power JD *et al.* (2011). These ROIs span the cerebral cortex,
37
38 subcortical structures, and the cerebellum and can be divided into 13 brain network systems. To
39
40 characterize the temporal variability of a given ROI (see Fig. 1), we first segmented all BOLD
41
42 signals (see Fig. 1a) into n non-overlapping windows with length l . The whole-brain FC network
43
44 F_i (an $m \times m$ matrix, with $m = 264$ nodes) in the i th time window was then constructed, with the
45
46 Pearson correlation being the measure of FC (see Fig. 1). The FC profile of region k at time
47
48 window i is denoted by $F_i(k, :)$ (shortened as $F_{i,k}$, denoted by the shaded column in Fig. 1b),
49
50 which is an m -dimensional vector that represents all the functional connections of region k . The
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

variability of a ROI k is defined as:

$$V_k = 1 - \overline{\text{corrcoef}(F_{i,k}, F_{j,k})} \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n, i \neq j.$$

We calculate V_k at a number of different window lengths ($l =$ equal to 20, 22, 24, ... 40 seconds) and then take the average value as the final variability to avoid arbitrary choice of window length. The variability associated with a region characterizes the flexibility of the region's functional architecture. The larger the temporal variability of a ROI, the more functional communities/systems this region will be involved in at different times. Finally, the sum of the variability of all ROI's was termed the whole brain variability, which characterizes the mean flexibility of an individual's whole-brain networks.

Temporal variability of FCs within/between cerebral networks

In addition to calculating the variability of the functional-connectivity profile of a brain region, we furthermore characterized the variability of FCs within a specific network, or between two subnetworks, i.e., within-network variability (see Fig. 2a) and between-network variability (see Fig. 2b). We followed similar procedures used in regional variability to define within/between network variability. For a given brain network m , we denote all FCs within this network in time window i as Fm_i (the columns in Fig. 2a), and all FCs between network m_1 and network m_2 in time window i as $Fm_{1,i}m_{2,i}$ (the columns in Fig. 2b). The within-network variability of network m then is:

$$Vw_m = 1 - \overline{\text{corrcoef}(Fm_i, Fm_j)} \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n, i \neq j,$$

while the between-network variability (network l and network p) is defined as:

$$Vb_{lp} = 1 - \overline{\text{corrcoef}(Fm_{l,i}m_{l,p}, Fm_{j,i}m_{j,p})} \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n, i \neq j$$

Within-network variability characterizes whether the FCs within a particular brain network

1
2
3 are changing synchronously with time. Larger within-network variability indicates that the FC
4
5 patterns are less correlated across different time windows, and that the network demonstrates more
6
7 flexibility. Similarly, between-network variability depicts the extent to which the patterns of FC
8
9 between two different brain networks are correlated across different time windows, and large
10
11 between-network variability indicates patterns of interaction between two networks that are
12
13 abundant. Larger within/between network variability indicates that the network of interest, or the
14
15 interaction between two networks, demonstrate richer FC patterns possibly underlying versatile
16
17 functions, or cognitive flexibility.
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Temporal variability of FCs within the cerebellum and FCs between the cerebellum and** 24 **cerebral cortex** 25 26

27
28 We also calculated the variability of the FCs within cerebellum, and the variability of FCs
29
30 between the cerebellum and various networks in cerebral cortex. Following the above work, time
31
32 series of cerebellar nodes and cerebral cortex nodes (Power JD *et al.* 2011) were extracted and
33
34 used to calculate the temporal variability.
35
36
37

38 **Correlation between variability and the TTCT score** 39

40
41 In order to identify how the dynamic property of the resting-state functional brain networks
42
43 may be related to individual verbal creativity, the Pearson correlation between the variability
44
45 (including regional variability, within/between-network variability and whole-brain variability)
46
47 and the TTCT verbal creativity score was calculated across all individuals, with age, sex and the
48
49 Raven's score of intelligence being regressed out. Results surviving Benjamini and Hochberg
50
51 FDR (BH_FDR) correction are reported (Benjamini Y and Y Hochberg 1995).
52
53
54

55 **Cross-validation** 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 We used the first dataset to identify the regions or networks whose variability correlated with
4
5
6 creativity. To cross-validate the findings from the first dataset, we used an independent set of
7
8
9 individuals (a second dataset) with one of the TTCT tasks (“improving products”) the same as the
10
11 first dataset. We pooled the two datasets (for “improving products”) to validate the findings
12
13 obtained using only the 1st dataset and the overall TTCT score. The TTCT score for “improving
14
15 products” in these two sets were normalized before subsequent analysis. A 10-fold
16
17 cross-validation procedure was adopted: in each cross-validation run, 90% of all samples were
18
19 randomly chosen to perform the correlation analysis (between the variability of ROIs and the
20
21 creativity score for “improving products”), and the ROIs surviving FDR ($P < 0.05$) correction
22
23 were selected. We performed such 10-fold cross-validation 1000 times, and the ROIs (whose
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS

Temporal variability of brain regions

Demographic information about participants is shown in Table S1 in the Supplemental Information. The measurements used for the temporal variability at the regional level and network level are shown in Fig 1 and Fig 2.

In the first dataset with 304 subjects, the variability of 6 regions from the DMN, 1 from the salience network, and 1 from the auditory network (among all the 264 brain regions) were found to be significantly correlated (FDR corrected, $p_{BH_FDR} < 0.05$) with the **verbal** TTCT score, as shown in Table 1 and Fig 3.

Within-network and between-network variability of the cerebral cortex

1
2
3
4 Among the 13 sub-networks defined in the Power 264 modules (Power JD *et al.* 2011), the
5
6 within-network variability of the DMN was the only one that was significantly positively
7
8 correlated with the TTCT score ($r = 0.1296$, $p = 2.6 \times 10^{-2}$, $p_{BH_FDR} = 1.89 \times 10^{-2}$, see Fig 4).
9
10 Among all 78 between-network interactions ($13 \times 12 / 2$), we found that 7 between-network
11
12 variabilities were significantly positively correlated with the TTCT score (see Table 2 and Fig 5).
13
14 Specifically, the variabilities of the FCs between the DMN and the attention/sensory-motor
15
16 networks were involved. In addition, the variability of the FCs between the task control and
17
18 visual/auditory network was also involved.
19
20
21
22

23 **Within-network and between-network variability of the cerebellum**

24
25 The within-cerebellum network variability was not significantly correlated with the TTCT
26
27 score. The correlation between verbal creativity and variability of the connectivity between the
28
29 cingulo-opercular task control network and the cerebellum was marginally significant ($r = 0.1527$,
30
31 $p = 9.06 \times 10^{-3}$, $p_{BH_FDR} = 5.44 \times 10^{-2}$). In addition, the variability of the functional connectivity
32
33 between the cerebellum and other cortical networks, such as the dorsal attention network, salience
34
35 network, and sensory and auditory network, are also found correlated non-significantly with
36
37 creativity ($p < 0.05$, uncorrected, Supplemental Information Table S2).
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Whole-brain variability**

44
45 The whole brain variability was also positively significantly correlated with the TTCT verbal
46
47 score ($r = 0.1296$, $p = 2.6 \times 10^{-2}$).
48
49

50 **Cross-validation**

51
52 One region (ROI index: 124) that belongs to the DMN network (parahippocampal gyrus,
53
54 PHG) was found whose variability positively correlated with the TTCT sub-score (“improving
55
56
57
58
59
60

products”) in the first dataset. Using the 2nd dataset, this region was still identified in all the 10000 runs of 10-fold cross-validation ($p_{BH_FDR} < 0.05$). The overall correlation between the variability of this region and the TTCT sub-score was 0.1501 ($p = 3.3 \times 10^{-4}$).

Discussion

In the present study, we investigated the relationship between the temporal variability of brain networks during the resting state and the verbal creativity of the individual. We correlated the temporal variability of resting-state functional brain networks at three different scales (the regional level; the network level: within networks and between networks; and the whole-brain level) to the TTCT verbal score, to identify the neural correlates of creative thinking. We found that the temporal variability of the lateral prefrontal cortex (LPFC), posterior cingulate cortex (PCC), and precuneus within the DMN correlated significantly with the verbal TTCT score. This was complemented by the findings that both the within/between network variability (associated with the DMN) and the whole-brain network variability were also correlated with verbal creativity. Dynamic interaction between the cerebellum and cerebral cortex was also related to verbal creativity. These results suggest that high temporal variability of FCs of cortical networks and cortical-cerebellar interactions involved in spontaneous thought, attention and cognitive control are important for verbal creativity.

Temporal variability for FCs of DMN regions, LPFC and parahippocampus

We found that individuals with high verbal creativity ability displayed large temporal variability in DMN regions including the PCC/precuneus. The precuneus has wide-spread connectivity with cortical and subcortical structures in the resting state (Cavanna AE and MR Trimble 2006), and is involved in various memory tasks, such as episodic and source memories

1
2
3 (Lundstrom BN et al. 2005; Sadigh-Eteghad S et al. 2014). In particular, the precuneus is activated
4
5 in creative tasks (Fink A et al. 2010; Abraham A *et al.* 2012), and it has been shown to have
6
7 stage-specific functional connectivity bilaterally with the insula, the middle temporal gyrus, and
8
9 the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (Beaty RE *et al.* 2015) in a divergent thinking task, suggesting
10
11 that dynamical reorganization of precuneus connectivity is important in creativity. The high
12
13 temporal variability of the precuneus indicates that it is functionally interacting with different
14
15 parts of the cortex during the resting state, which may related to the retrieval of
16
17 knowledge/memory or providing the rich episodic contextual associations (Lundstrom BN *et al.*
18
19 2005) necessary for creativity (Dandan T et al. 2013).
20
21
22
23
24

25 Similarly we found that variability of the parahippocampal gyrus (PHG) was significantly
26
27 correlated (positively) with the TTCT sub-score “improving products” by cross-validation. The
28
29 PHG also plays an important role in memory (Bohbot VD et al. 2015), and was found to be
30
31 activated in creative tasks (Fink A *et al.* 2009; Ellamil M et al. 2012). Several task-related fMRI
32
33 studies showed that the medial temporal lobe system is critical for creativity (Luo J and K Niki
34
35 2003; Ellamil M *et al.* 2012; Fink A et al. 2012; Benedek M, E Jauk, A Fink, *et al.* 2014). Damage
36
37 in this region has a negative effect on creative performance (Duff MC et al. 2013). Higher
38
39 temporal variability of the PHG may reflect different types of information change in memory
40
41 systems across different time windows during the resting state (Kesner RP and ET Rolls 2015),
42
43 and a wealth of cortical connectivity patterns helps creativity.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 We found a positive correlation between verbal creativity and the temporal variability of the
51
52 LPFC. The LPFC is widely implicated in both domain-general and domain-specific creative
53
54 thinking tasks (Abraham A *et al.* 2012; Kleibeuker SW et al. 2013; Liu S *et al.* 2015; Sun J *et al.*
55
56
57
58
59
60

2016). The FC of the LPFC has been shown to related to creativity in both task and resting-state fMRI (Beaty RE *et al.* 2014; Beaty RE *et al.* 2015; Li W *et al.* 2016). **The fronto-parietal system is critical for creativity (Fink A *et al.* 2009; Shamay-Tsoory SG *et al.* 2011; Ellamil M *et al.* 2012; Shah C *et al.* 2013; Sagar M *et al.* 2015).** Importantly, the LPFC is consistently activated in cognitive control and executive function tasks including cognitive flexibility, inhibition control and working memory that are crucial for creative thinking (Koechlin E *et al.* 2003; Petrides M 2005; Alvarez JA and E Emory 2006; Dietrich A and R Kanso 2010; Liang X *et al.* 2016). Increasing behavioral evidence supports the notion that greater cognitive flexibility and inhibition control is associated with higher levels of creativity (Zabelina DL and MD Robinson 2010; Benedek M *et al.* 2012; Benedek M, E Jauk, M Sommer, *et al.* 2014; Chen Q *et al.* 2014). Here higher variability of the LPFC identified in our work indicates that the LPFC may be functionally connected with, or switch between different systems, such as the hippocampus, posterior temporal, and parietal cortex **during the resting state (Cole MW *et al.* 2012; Cole MW *et al.* 2013), and this may be related to cognitive flexibility and inhibitory control to switch which is important for creativity.**

Temporal variability for FCs within the DMN and between cerebral networks

At the network level, we found that high variability of the DMN was related to a high verbal creativity score. The DMN is associated with spontaneous thought such as mind wandering, autobiographical retrieval, and episodic future thinking (Raichle ME *et al.* 2001; Fox KC *et al.* 2015). In the process of creativity, the DMN is involved in the generation of original ideas (Jung RE *et al.* 2013). **Higher variability within the DMN during the resting state reflects abundant functional-connectivity patterns which may relate to the trait of frequent transitions between**

1
2
3 different topics in spontaneous thoughts for creative people.
4
5

6 In addition to the DMN, we also found that high variability of the FCs between the DMN and
7
8 the dorsal/ventral attention network (DAN/VAN) were related to high verbal creativity, indicating
9
10 that the dynamic interaction between the DMN and DAN/VAN is related to creative thinking. In
11
12 contrast to the DMN that generates spontaneous thought, both the DAN and VAN are primarily
13
14 involved in externally oriented mental processes, and are responsible for maintaining and
15
16 re-orienting attention, respectively (Christoff K et al. 2016). According to a dynamic framework
17
18 of spontaneous thought, creative thinking can be defined as a special type of spontaneous thought
19
20 that is intermediate between mind-wandering and goal-directed thought (Christoff K *et al.* 2016).
21
22 That is to say, deliberate constraints at various levels are needed from time to time in creative
23
24 thinking processes. The DMN may provide sustained internally oriented cognition for creative
25
26 thinking, while it couples with attention networks in a dynamic manner. This may lead to a
27
28 frequently shifting focus of thoughts to externally oriented cognition for exploring task-related
29
30 cues from environment, which favors high creativity. Here the high level of variability of FCs
31
32 between the DMN and attention network appears to characterize the frequently adjusting focus of
33
34 attention (Vartanian O 2009), or shifting of the focus of thoughts or concepts, which are important
35
36 for creative thinking.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Finally, the variability of the FCs between the task control and visual/auditory networks also
46
47 correlated positively with verbal creative performance. Creative people can utilize peripheral cues
48
49 to solve the current problem (Ansburg PI and K Hill 2003). Higher variability of the FCs between
50
51 the task control and visual/auditory networks may therefore facilitate dynamic selection of
52
53 external information obtained by visual or auditory inputs, and thus be related to verbal creativity.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Temporal variability for FCs associated with the cerebellum

In the present study, we also found a positive correlation between verbal creativity and the variability of FCs between the cerebellum and the cingulo-opercular task control network with marginal significance. Functional imaging studies show that the cerebellum is involved in high-level functions such as control of attention, emotion, working memory, music, timing, and language (Akshoomoff NA *et al.* 1997; Bostan AC *et al.* 2013; E KH *et al.* 2014; Leggio M and M Molinari 2015). The cerebellum has also been linked with creativity. For example, the cerebellum was activated in spontaneous creativity improvisation, and was associated with higher expert-rated creative content in drawings (Saggar M *et al.* 2015). The cerebellum has functional connectivity with the LPFC and inferior parietal lobule, which are involved in the executive control network, which is closely related to creativity (Dosenbach NU *et al.* 2007; Habas C *et al.* 2009). The role of cerebral-cerebellar connectivity during creative thinking has been previously discussed (Schmahmann JD 1991; Ito M 1993; Ito M 2006; Abraham A 2007; Chavez-Eakle RA 2007; Vandervert LR *et al.* 2007; Welling H 2007; Buckner RL 2013; Vandervert L 2015). Akshoomoff NA *et al.* (1997) and Leggio M and M Molinari (2015) proposed a role for the predictive cognitive functions of the cerebellum, and demonstrated that the cerebellum recognizes serial events, detects violations, and reconstructs correct events. Vandervert L (2015) proposed that a cerebrocerebellar blending model is the mechanism behind creativity, such as a high level of scientific discovery. These models emphasize that the interaction between the cerebellum and cerebral cortex, and especially brain regions related to executive functions, play important roles in creativity.

Some neuroimaging studies support this suggestion. For example, increased cerebral-cerebellar functional connectivity has been observed in expert musicians during

1
2
3 improvisation (Pinho AL et al. 2014). Our data provide further evidence for the involvement of
4
5
6 the cerebellum in creativity by demonstrating that the dynamic interaction between the cerebellum
7
8 and cerebral cortex, especially the cingulo-opercular task control network, may be closely related
9
10
11 to the production of creative ideas ($p = 0.0544$, BH_FDR corrected). In addition, the dynamic
12
13 interaction between the cerebellum and other cortical networks, such as the dorsal attention
14
15 network, salience network, sensory and auditory network, were also correlated with creativity ($p <$
16
17 0.05 , uncorrected). The high variability of FCs between the cerebellum and cerebral cortex
18
19 indicates abundant functional connectivity patterns between the cerebellum and cerebral cortex.
20
21
22 These abundant connectivity patterns therefore serve as the functional substrate for the constantly
23
24 changing “internal models” in the cerebellum (which are affected by the external stimulus passed
25
26 through the cerebral cortex) (Akshoomoff NA *et al.* 1997; Leggio M and M Molinari 2015;
27
28 Vandervert L 2015), and may therefore help individuals to be more creative.
29
30
31

32
33 This study also has some possible limitations. This study correlates resting-state temporal
34
35 variability with out-of-scanner performance. The results found in resting-state data might not be
36
37 able to make direct inferences to the task-based creativity process, although in fact a correlation
38
39 was found in this study between the TTCT score and the variability of the resting-state fMRI.
40
41
42 Exploring the dynamic brain networks interaction during creative process (task-based fMRI) is of
43
44 great importance. In future studies it might be of interest to explore the functional connectivity
45
46 flexibility using appropriate task paradigms.
47
48
49

50
51 In summary, the findings of the present study demonstrate that creative cognitive ability is
52
53 correlated with the dynamic reorganization of resting-state functional brain networks. For the first
54
55 time, we have provided support for the hypothesis that creative thought is related to dynamical
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reconfiguration of cortical and cerebellar networks, and in particular, of the DMN during the
4
5 resting state. This study provides insight into the neural mechanisms underlying creative thinking,
6
7 and simultaneously offers us a new index to predict individual verbal creativity. Considering the
8
9 variety of creativity measurement methods and neuroimaging approaches, further studies
10
11 combining verbal and non-verbal creativity in both resting state and task-related fMRI may further
12
13 help to explore the role of brain dynamics and variability in creativity. This is the first
14
15 investigation we know to draw out in a robust 'big data' analysis the relation between creativity
16
17 and the temporal variability of cortical and cerebellar FCs during the resting state. The concept of
18
19 variability being related to creativity is consistent with the hypothesis that randomness in the
20
21 transitions from one network state to another that are influenced by the random spiking times of
22
23 neurons for a given mean firing rate is related to creativity (Rolls ET 2013, 2016).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31470981; 31571137; 31500885, 31600878), National Outstanding young people plan, the Program for the Top Young Talents by Chongqing, the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (SWU1709568, SWU1509383, SWU1509451, SWU1609177), Natural Science Foundation of Chongqing (cstc2015jcyjA10106), Fok Ying Tung Education Foundation (151023), General Financial Grant from the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2015M572423, 2015M580767), Special Funds from the Chongqing Postdoctoral Science Foundation (Xm2015037), Key research for Humanities and social sciences of Ministry of Education (14JJD880009). J. Zhang is supported by the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC 61573107) and special Funds for Major State Basic Research Projects of China (2015CB856003). J. Feng is a Royal Society Wolfson Research Merit Award holder, partially supported by the National High Technology Research and Development Program of China (No. 2015AA020507) and the Key Project of Shanghai Science & Technology Innovation Plan (No. 15JC1400101), the National Centre for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences (NCMIS) of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and the Key Program of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 91230201).

References

- Abraham A. 2007. Can a neural system geared to bring about rapid, predictive, and efficient function explain creativity? *Creativity Research Journal* 19:19-24.
- Abraham A. 2015. Creative thinking as orchestrated by semantic processing vs. cognitive control brain networks. *The Cognitive, Emotional and Neural Correlates of Creativity*:73.
- Abraham A, Pieritz K, Thybusch K, Rutter B, Kröger S, Schweckendiek J, Stark R, Windmann S, Hermann C. 2012. Creativity and the brain: uncovering the neural signature of conceptual expansion. *Neuropsychologia* 50:1906-1917.
- Akshoomoff NA, Courchesne E, Townsend J. 1997. Attention coordination and anticipatory control. *International review of neurobiology* 41:575-598.
- Alvarez JA, Emory E. 2006. Executive function and the frontal lobes: a meta-analytic review. *Neuropsychology review* 16:17-42.
- Ansburg PI, Hill K. 2003. Creative and analytic thinkers differ in their use of attentional resources. *Personality and Individual Differences* 34:1141-1152.
- Aron AR, Robbins TW, Poldrack RA. 2004. Inhibition and the right inferior frontal cortex. *Trends Cogn Sci* 8:170-177.
- Aziz-Zadeh L, Liew S-L, Dandekar F. 2013. Exploring the neural correlates of visual creativity. *Social cognitive and affective neuroscience* 8:475-480.
- Bassett DS, Wymbs NF, Porter MA, Mucha PJ, Carlson JM, Grafton ST. 2011. Dynamic reconfiguration of human brain networks during learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108:7641-7646.
- Bassett DS, Wymbs NF, Rombach MP, Porter MA, Mucha PJ, Grafton ST. 2013. Task-based core-periphery organization of human brain dynamics. *PLoS Comput Biol* 9:e1003171.
- Bassett DS, Yang M, Wymbs NF, Grafton ST. 2015. Learning-induced autonomy of sensorimotor systems. *Nature neuroscience* 18:744-751.
- Beaty RE, Benedek M, Kaufman SB, Silvia PJ. 2015. Default and executive network coupling supports creative idea production. *Scientific reports* 5.
- Beaty RE, Benedek M, Silvia PJ, Schacter DL. 2016. Creative cognition and brain network dynamics. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 20:87-95.
- Beaty RE, Benedek M, Wilkins RW, Jauk E, Fink A, Silvia PJ, Hodges DA, Koschutnig K, Neubauer AC. 2014. Creativity and the default network: a functional connectivity analysis of the creative brain at rest. *Neuropsychologia* 64:92-98.
- Beaty RE, Chen Q, Christensen AP, Qiu J, Silvia PJ, Schacter DL. 2017. Brain networks of the imaginative mind: Dynamic functional connectivity of default and cognitive control networks relates to openness to experience. *Hum Brain Mapp*.
- Benedek M, Franz F, Heene M, Neubauer AC. 2012. Differential effects of cognitive inhibition and intelligence on creativity. *Pers Individ Dif* 53-334:480-485.
- Benedek M, Jauk E, Fink A, Koschutnig K, Reishofer G, Ebner F, Neubauer AC. 2014. To create or to recall? Neural mechanisms underlying the generation of creative new ideas. *NeuroImage* 88:125-133.
- Benedek M, Jauk E, Sommer M, Arendasy M, Neubauer AC. 2014. Intelligence, creativity, and cognitive control: The common and differential involvement of executive functions in intelligence and creativity. *Intelligence* 46:73-83.

- 1
2
3 Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach
4 to multiple testing. *Journal of the royal statistical society Series B (Methodological)*:289-300.
- 5 Betzel RF, Fukushima M, He Y, Zuo XN, Sporns O. 2016. Dynamic fluctuations coincide with periods of
6 high and low modularity in resting-state functional brain networks. *Neuroimage* 127:287-297.
- 7
8 Bohbot VD, Allen JJ, Dagher A, Dumoulin SO, Evans AC, Petrides M, Kalina M, Stepankova K, Nadel L.
9 2015. Role of the parahippocampal cortex in memory for the configuration but not the
10 identity of objects: converging evidence from patients with selective thermal lesions and
11 fMRI. *Frontiers in human neuroscience* 9:431.
- 12 Bossomaier T, Harré M, Knittel A, Snyder A. 2009. A semantic network approach to the creativity
13 quotient (CQ). *Creativity Research Journal* 21:64-71.
- 14 Bostan AC, Dum RP, Strick PL. 2013. Cerebellar networks with the cerebral cortex and basal ganglia.
15 *Trends Cogn Sci* 17:241-254.
- 16
17 Braun U, Schäfer A, Walter H, Erk S, Romanczuk-Seiferth N, Haddad L, Schweiger JI, Grimm O, Heinz A,
18 Tost H. 2015. Dynamic reconfiguration of frontal brain networks during executive cognition in
19 humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112:11678-11683.
- 20
21 Buckner RL. 2013. The cerebellum and cognitive function: 25 years of insight from anatomy and
22 neuroimaging. *Neuron* 80:807-815.
- 23
24 Buckner RL, Carroll DC. 2007. Self-projection and the brain. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 11:49-57.
- 25 Calhoun VD, Miller R, Pearlson G, Adalı T. 2014. The chronnectome: time-varying connectivity
26 networks as the next frontier in fMRI data discovery. *Neuron* 84:262-274.
- 27
28 Cavanna AE, Trimble MR. 2006. The precuneus: a review of its functional anatomy and behavioural
29 correlates. *Brain* 129:564-583.
- 30
31 Chavez-Eakle RA. 2007. From incubation to insight: Working memory and the role of the cerebellum.
32 *Creativity research journal* 19:31-34.
- 33
34 Chen Q, Yang W, Li W, Wei D, Li H, Lei Q, Zhang Q, Qiu J. 2014. Association of creative achievement
35 with cognitive flexibility by a combined voxel-based morphometry and resting-state
36 functional connectivity study. *Neuroimage* 102:474-483.
- 37
38 Chen T, Cai W, Ryali S, Supekar K, Menon V. 2016. Distinct Global Brain Dynamics and Spatiotemporal
39 Organization of the Salience Network. *PLoS Biol* 14:e1002469.
- 40
41 Chen X, Zhang H, Zhang L, Shen C, Lee SW, Shen D. 2017. Extraction of dynamic functional connectivity
42 from brain grey matter and white matter for MCI classification. *Hum Brain Mapp*.
- 43
44 Christoff K, Irving ZC, Fox KC, Spreng RN, Andrews-Hanna JR. 2016. Mind-wandering as spontaneous
45 thought: a dynamic framework. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*.
- 46
47 Cohen JR. 2017. The behavioral and cognitive relevance of time-varying, dynamic changes in
48 functional connectivity. *Neuroimage*.
- 49
50 Cole MW, Reynolds JR, Power JD, Repovs G, Anticevic A, Braver TS. 2013. Multi-task connectivity
51 reveals flexible hubs for adaptive task control. *Nature neuroscience* 16:1348-1355.
- 52
53 Cole MW, Yarkoni T, Repovs G, Anticevic A, Braver TS. 2012. Global connectivity of prefrontal cortex
54 predicts cognitive control and intelligence. *The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal*
55 *of the Society for Neuroscience* 32:8988-8999.
- 56
57 Dandan T, Haixue Z, Wenfu L, Wenjing Y, Jiang Q, Qinglin Z. 2013. Brain activity in using heuristic
58 prototype to solve insightful problems. *Behavioural brain research* 253:139-144.
- 59
60 Dietrich A, Kanso R. 2010. A review of EEG, ERP, and neuroimaging studies of creativity and insight.
Psychological bulletin 136:822.

- 1
2
3 Dosenbach NU, Fair DA, Miezin FM, Cohen AL, Wenger KK, Dosenbach RA, Fox MD, Snyder AZ, Vincent
4 JL, Raichle ME, Schlaggar BL, Petersen SE. 2007. Distinct brain networks for adaptive and
5 stable task control in humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
6 *States of America* 104:11073-11078.
- 7
8 Duff MC, Kurczek J, Rubin R, Cohen NJ, Tranel D. 2013. Hippocampal amnesia disrupts creative
9 thinking. *Hippocampus* 23:1143-1149.
- 10
11 E KH, Chen SH, Ho MH, Desmond JE. 2014. A meta-analysis of cerebellar contributions to higher
12 cognition from PET and fMRI studies. *Hum Brain Mapp* 35:593-615.
- 13
14 Ellamil M, Dobson C, Beeman M, Christoff K. 2012. Evaluative and generative modes of thought during
15 the creative process. *Neuroimage* 59:1783-1794.
- 16
17 Fink A, Benedek M. 2014. EEG alpha power and creative ideation. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral*
18 *Reviews* 44:111-123.
- 19
20 Fink A, Grabner RH, Benedek M, Reishofer G, Hauswirth V, Fally M, Neuper C, Ebner F, Neubauer AC.
21 2009. The creative brain: Investigation of brain activity during creative problem solving by
22 means of EEG and fMRI. *Human brain mapping* 30:734-748.
- 23
24 Fink A, Grabner RH, Gebauer D, Reishofer G, Koschutnig K, Ebner F. 2010. Enhancing creativity by
25 means of cognitive stimulation: Evidence from an fMRI study. *NeuroImage* 52:1687-1695.
- 26
27 Fink A, Koschutnig K, Benedek M, Reishofer G, Ischebeck A, Weiss EM, Ebner F. 2012. Stimulating
28 creativity via the exposure to other people's ideas. *Hum Brain Mapp* 33:2603-2610.
- 29
30 Fink A, Koschutnig K, Hutterer L, Steiner E, Benedek M, Weber B, Reishofer G, Papousek I, Weiss EM.
31 2014. Gray matter density in relation to different facets of verbal creativity. *Brain Structure*
32 *and Function* 219:1263-1269.
- 33
34 Finke RA, Ward TB, Smith SM. 1992. Creative cognition: Theory, research, and applications.
- 35
36 Fox KC, Spreng RN, Ellamil M, Andrews-Hanna JR, Christoff K. 2015. The wandering brain:
37 meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies of mind-wandering and related
38 spontaneous thought processes. *Neuroimage* 111:611-621.
- 39
40 Garrett DD, Kovacevic N, McIntosh AR, Grady CL. 2011. The importance of being variable. *The Journal*
41 *of Neuroscience* 31:4496-4503.
- 42
43 Gonen-Yaacovi G, de Souza LC, Levy R, Urbanski M, Josse G, Volle E. 2013. Rostral and caudal
44 prefrontal contribution to creativity: a meta-analysis of functional imaging data. *Frontiers in*
45 *human neuroscience* 7:465.
- 46
47 Green AE, Kraemer DJ, Fugelsang JA, Gray JR, Dunbar KN. 2012. Neural correlates of creativity in
48 analogical reasoning. *Journal of experimental psychology Learning, memory, and cognition*
49 38:264-272.
- 50
51 Habas C, Kamdar N, Nguyen D, Prater K, Beckmann CF, Menon V, Greicius MD. 2009. Distinct
52 cerebellar contributions to intrinsic connectivity networks. *The Journal of neuroscience : the*
53 *official journal of the Society for Neuroscience* 29:8586-8594.
- 54
55 Hutchison RM, Womelsdorf T, Allen EA, Bandettini PA, Calhoun VD, Corbetta M, Della Penna S, Duyn
56 JH, Glover GH, Gonzalez-Castillo J. 2013. Dynamic functional connectivity: promise, issues,
57 and interpretations. *Neuroimage* 80:360-378.
- 58
59 Ito M. 1993. Movement and thought: identical control mechanisms by the cerebellum. *Trends in*
60 *neurosciences* 16:448-450; discussion 453-444.
- Ito M. 2006. Cerebellar circuitry as a neuronal machine. *Progress in neurobiology* 78:272-303.
- Jaeggi SM, Buschkuhl M, Jonides J, Perrig WJ. 2008. Improving fluid intelligence with training on

- working memory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105:6829-6833.
- Jung-Beeman M, Bowden EM, Haberman J, Frymiare JL, Arambel-Liu S, Greenblatt R, Reber PJ, Kounios J. 2004. Neural activity when people solve verbal problems with insight. *PLoS Biol* 2:e97.
- Jung RE, Mead BS, Carrasco J, Flores RA. 2013. The structure of creative cognition in the human brain. *Front Hum Neurosci* 7:10.3389.
- Kang J, Wang L, Yan C, Wang J, Liang X, He Y. 2011. Characterizing dynamic functional connectivity in the resting brain using variable parameter regression and Kalman filtering approaches. *Neuroimage* 56:1222-1234.
- Kesner RP, Rolls ET. 2015. A computational theory of hippocampal function, and tests of the theory: new developments. *Neuroscience and biobehavioral reviews* 48:92-147.
- Kleibeuker SW, Koolschijn PC, Jolles DD, De Dreu CK, Crone EA. 2013. The neural coding of creative idea generation across adolescence and early adulthood. *Frontiers in human neuroscience* 7:905.
- Koechlin E, Ody C, Kouneiher F. 2003. The architecture of cognitive control in the human prefrontal cortex. *Science* 302:1181-1185.
- Kopell NJ, Gritton HJ, Whittington MA, Kramer MA. 2014. Beyond the connectome: the dynamome. *Neuron* 83:1319-1328.
- Leggio M, Molinari M. 2015. Cerebellar sequencing: a trick for predicting the future. *Cerebellum* 14:35-38.
- Li D, Chen G. 1989. Combined Raven's test (CRT): Chinese revised version. Shanghai: EastChinaNormal University.
- Li W, Yang J, Zhang Q, Li G, Qiu J. 2016. The Association between Resting Functional Connectivity and Visual Creativity. *Scientific reports* 6.
- Liang X, Zou Q, He Y, Yang Y. 2016. Topologically Reorganized Connectivity Architecture of Default-Mode, Executive-Control, and Salience Networks across Working Memory Task Loads. *Cereb Cortex* 26:1501-1511.
- Liu F, Wang Y, Li M, Wang W, Li R, Zhang Z, Lu G, Chen H. 2016. Dynamic functional network connectivity in idiopathic generalized epilepsy with generalized tonic-clonic seizure. *Human Brain Mapping*.
- Liu S, Erkkinen MG, Healey ML, Xu Y, Swett KE, Chow HM, Braun AR. 2015. Brain activity and connectivity during poetry composition: toward a multidimensional model of the creative process. *Human brain mapping* 36:3351-3372.
- Lundstrom BN, Ingvar M, Petersson KM. 2005. The role of precuneus and left inferior frontal cortex during source memory episodic retrieval. *Neuroimage* 27:824-834.
- Luo J, Niki K. 2003. Function of hippocampus in "insight" of problem solving. *Hippocampus* 13:316-323.
- Miller EK, Cohen JD. 2001. An integrative theory of prefrontal cortex function. *Annual review of neuroscience* 24:167-202.
- Morcom AM, Fletcher PC. 2007. Cognitive neuroscience: the case for design rather than default. *NeuroImage* 37:1097.
- Morcom AM, Fletcher PC. 2007. Does the brain have a baseline? Why we should be resisting a rest. *Neuroimage* 37:1073-1082.
- Mumford MD. 2002. Social innovation: ten cases from Benjamin Franklin. *Creativity research journal* 14:253-266.

- 1
2
3 Petrides M. 2005. Lateral prefrontal cortex: architectonic and functional organization. *Philosophical*
4 *transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological sciences* 360:781-795.
- 5 Pinho AL, de Manzano O, Fransson P, Eriksson H, Ullen F. 2014. Connecting to create: expertise in
6 musical improvisation is associated with increased functional connectivity between premotor
7 and prefrontal areas. *The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for*
8 *Neuroscience* 34:6156-6163.
- 9
10 Power JD, Cohen AL, Nelson SM, Wig GS, Barnes KA, Church JA, Vogel AC, Laumann TO, Miezin FM,
11 Schlaggar BL. 2011. Functional network organization of the human brain. *Neuron* 72:665-678.
- 12 Qiu J, Li H, Jou J, Liu J, Luo Y, Feng T, Wu Z, Zhang Q. 2010. Neural correlates of the "Aha" experiences:
13 evidence from an fMRI study of insight problem solving. *Cortex* 46:397-403.
- 14 Raichle ME, MacLeod AM, Snyder AZ, Powers WJ, Gusnard DA, Shulman GL. 2001. A default mode of
15 brain function. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 98:676-682.
- 16 Raichle ME, Snyder AZ. 2007. A default mode of brain function: a brief history of an evolving idea.
17 *Neuroimage* 37:1083-1090.
- 18
19
20 Rolls ET. 2013. *Emotion and decision making explained*: Oxford University Press.
- 21 Rolls ET. 2016. *Cerebral cortex: principles of operation*.
- 22 Runco MA, Jaeger GJ. 2012. The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal* 24:92-96.
- 23 Sadigh-Eteghad S, Majdi A, Farhoudi M, Talebi M, Mahmoudi J. 2014. Different patterns of brain
24 activation in normal aging and Alzheimer's disease from cognitive insight: meta analysis using
25 activation likelihood estimation. *Journal of the neurological sciences* 343:159-166.
- 26 Saggat M, Quintin EM, Kienitz E, Bott NT, Sun Z, Hong WC, Chien YH, Liu N, Dougherty RF, Royalty A,
27 Hawthorne G, Reiss AL. 2015. Pictionary-based fMRI paradigm to study the neural correlates
28 of spontaneous improvisation and figural creativity. *Sci Rep* 5:10894.
- 29 Schacter DL, Addis DR, Hassabis D, Martin VC, Spreng RN, Szpunar KK. 2012. The future of memory:
30 remembering, imagining, and the brain. *Neuron* 76:677-694.
- 31 Schmahmann JD. 1991. An emerging concept: the cerebellar contribution to higher function. *Archives*
32 *of neurology* 48:1178-1187.
- 33 Shah C, Erhard K, Ortheil HJ, Kaza E, Kessler C, Lotze M. 2013. Neural correlates of creative writing: an
34 fMRI study. *Hum Brain Mapp* 34:1088-1101.
- 35 Shamay-Tsoory SG, Adler N, Aharon-Peretz J, Perry D, Mayseless N. 2011. The origins of originality: the
36 neural bases of creative thinking and originality. *Neuropsychologia* 49:178-185.
- 37 Stein MI. 1953. Creativity and culture. *The journal of psychology* 36:311-322.
- 38 Sternberg RJ, Lubart TI. 1996. Investing in creativity. *American psychologist* 51:677.
- 39 Sun J, Chen Q, Zhang Q, Li Y, Li H, Wei D, Yang W, Qiu J. 2016. Training your brain to be more creative:
40 brain functional and structural changes induced by divergent thinking training. *Human brain*
41 *mapping*.
- 42 Takeuchi H, Taki Y, Hashizume H, Sassa Y, Nagase T, Nouchi R, Kawashima R. 2012. The association
43 between resting functional connectivity and creativity. *Cerebral Cortex* 22:2921-2929.
- 44 Takeuchi H, Taki Y, Sassa Y, Hashizume H, Sekiguchi A, Fukushima A, Kawashima R. 2010. White matter
45 structures associated with creativity: evidence from diffusion tensor imaging. *Neuroimage*
46 51:11-18.
- 47 Tang C, Li A, Huang H, Cheng X, Gao Y, Chen H, Huang Q, Luo Y, Xue Y, Zuo Q. 2012. Effects of lead
48 pollution in SY River on children's intelligence. *Life Science Journal* 9:458-464.
- 49 Torrance E. 1974. *The Torrance tests of creative thinking-TTCT Manual and Scoring Guide: Verbal test*

- 1
2
3 A, figural test. Lexington, KY: Ginn.
- 4 Vandervert L. 2015. How music training enhances working memory: a cerebrocerebellar blending
5 mechanism that can lead equally to scientific discovery and therapeutic efficacy in
6 neurological disorders. *Cerebellum & ataxias* 2:11.
- 7
8 Vandervert LR, Schimpf PH, Liu H. 2007. How working memory and the cerebellum collaborate to
9 produce creativity and innovation. *Creativity Research Journal* 19:1-18.
- 10 Vartanian O. 2009. Variable attention facilitates creative problem solving. *Psychology of Aesthetics,*
11 *Creativity, and the Arts* 3:57.
- 12 Wang D, Qian M. 1989. Revision on the Combined Raven's Test for the Rural in China [J]. *Psychol Sci* 5.
- 13 Wei D, Yang J, Li W, Wang K, Zhang Q, Qiu J. 2014. Increased resting functional connectivity of the
14 medial prefrontal cortex in creativity by means of cognitive stimulation. *cortex* 51:92-102.
- 15 Welling H. 2007. Cerebellar creativity: Abstraction of mental movements. *Creativity Research Journal*
16 19:55-57.
- 17
18 Wu X, Yang W, Tong D, Sun J, Chen Q, Wei D, Zhang Q, Zhang M, Qiu J. 2015. A meta - analysis of
19 neuroimaging studies on divergent thinking using activation likelihood estimation. *Human*
20 *brain mapping* 36:2703-2718.
- 21 Yang Z, Craddock RC, Margulies DS, Yan CG, Milham MP. 2014. Common intrinsic connectivity states
22 among posteromedial cortex subdivisions: Insights from analysis of temporal dynamics.
23 *Neuroimage* 93 Pt 1:124-137.
- 24
25 Ye R, Hong D, Torrance EP. 1988. Cross cultural comparion of creative thinking between Chinese and
26 American students using Torrance Test. *Chinese Journal of Applied Psychology* 3: 22-29.
- 27 Yu Q, Erhardt EB, Sui J, Du Y, He H, Hjelm D, Cetin MS, Rachakonda S, Miller RL, Pearlson G, Calhoun
28 VD. 2015. Assessing dynamic brain graphs of time-varying connectivity in fMRI data:
29 application to healthy controls and patients with schizophrenia. *Neuroimage* 107:345-355.
- 30 Zabelina DL, Robinson MD. 2010. Creativity as flexible cognitive control. *Psychology of Aesthetics,*
31 *Creativity, and the Arts* 4:136.
- 32
33 Zhang J, Cheng W, Liu Z, Lei X, Yao Y, Ben B, Liu Y, Kendrick K, Lu G, Feng J. 2016. Neural,
34 electrophysiological and anatomical basis of brainnetwork variability and its characteristic
35 changes in mental disorders. *Brain* 139:2307-2321.
- 36
37
38 Zhu F, Zhang Q, Qiu J. 2013. Relating inter-individual differences in verbal creative thinking to cerebral
39 structures: an optimal voxel-based morphometry study. *PLoS one* 8:e79272.
- 40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 ROIs whose temporal variability significantly correlated with the TTCT verbal score.

ROI index	Brain Region (Anatomical Automatic Labeling atlas)	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i> _{BH_FDR}
103	Frontal_Sup_L	0.2389	3.38×10^{-5}	8.91×10^{-3}
91	Cingulate_Post_L	0.2145	2.05×10^{-4}	1.36×10^{-2}
88	Precuneus_L	0.2098	2.86×10^{-4}	1.51×10^{-2}
95	Precuneus_R	0.1990	5.87×10^{-4}	2.58×10^{-2}
90	Precuneus_L	0.1950	7.60×10^{-4}	2.87×10^{-2}
220	Frontal_Mid_L (LPFC)	0.2285	7.49×10^{-5}	9.88×10^{-3}
68	SupraMarginal_L	0.2156	1.90×10^{-4}	1.36×10^{-4}
124	ParaHippocampal_L ^a	0.1501	3.3×10^{-4}	< 0.05

^a represents cross-validation results.

Table 2 The correlation of between-network variability and the TTCT verbal score.

Network1	Network2	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i> _{BH_FDR}
Default mode	Ventral attention	0.2388	3.74×10^{-4}	2.92×10^{-4}
Default mode	Dorsal attention	0.1723	3.08×10^{-3}	3.43×10^{-2}
Default mode	Sensory/somatomotor	0.1728	3.04×10^{-3}	3.43×10^{-2}
	hand			
Dorsal attention	Auditory	0.1951	7.87×10^{-4}	3.02×10^{-2}
Dorsal attention	Salience	0.1895	1.16×10^{-3}	3.02×10^{-2}
Cingulo-opercular task	Visual	0.1771	2.43×10^{-3}	3.43×10^{-2}
control				
Fronto-parietal task	Auditory	0.1738	2.95×10^{-3}	3.43×10^{-2}
control				

Captions to figures

Figure 1 Temporal variability of an FC profile associated with a brain region (the big red node in the left panel). The left part shows the brain region of interest (with its FC profile). (a) The BOLD time courses of all brain regions were first segmented into non-overlapping windows. (b) In each window the whole brain functional network was constructed (using Pearson correlations), and the FC profiles associated with brain region k in each time window (denoted by the shaded column) were correlated and averaged, and subtracted from 1.0, which led to a temporal variability for FC profile associated with brain region k .


Figure 2 Temporal variability of FCs within a network and between two networks. (a) The left part shows the network of interest (consisting of red nodes). The right part shows the BOLD time courses of all regions in the network, which were segmented into non-overlapping windows. Then the FC matrix of this network was constructed in each window, and the FCs of the network in each time window were correlated and averaged, subtracted from 1.0, which led to a temporal variability for FCs within a network. (b) The left part shows the two networks of interest (denoted by red and blue nodes, respectively). The right part shows the BOLD time courses of regions in these two networks, which were segmented into non-overlapped windows. Then the FCs between these two networks were obtained in each window. These FCs in different time windows were correlated and averaged, subtracted from 1.0, which led to the temporal variability for the FCs between two networks.

Figure 3 Regions whose temporal variability is correlated to the TTCT total score. The radar map

1
2
3
4 in the middle shows the correlation coefficient between the temporal variability of each brain
5
6 region and the TTCT total score. The small squares in the radar map show the specific correlation
7
8 coefficient of the temporal variability and the TTCT total score. The brain maps show the location
9
10 of the corresponding brain regions.
11
12
13
14
15

16 Figure 4 The within-network variability of the DMN is correlated with the creativity TTCT total
17
18 score. The brain map shows the within-network connectivity of the DMN. The correlation map
19
20 shows that the within-network variability of the DMN is positively related to TTCT total score.
21
22
23
24
25

26 Figure 5 Between-network variability is correlated with the TTCT total score. The radar map in
27
28 the middle shows the correlation coefficients of the between-network variability with the TTCT
29
30 total score. The brain maps show the corresponding two brain networks of interest (using different
31
32 colors). Abbreviations: DMN: default mode network, VAN: ventral attention network, DAN:
33
34 dorsal attention network, SHN: sensory/somatomotor hand network, AN: auditory network, SN:
35
36 salience network, VN: visual network, FTCN: fronto-parietal task control, CTCN:
37
38 cingulo-opercular task control network.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



24 Figure 1 Temporal variability of an FC profile associated with a brain region (the big red node in the left
25 panel). The left part shows the brain region of interest (with its FC profile). (a) The BOLD time courses of all
26 brain regions were first segmented into non-overlapping windows. (b) In each window the whole brain
27 functional network was constructed (using Pearson correlations), and the FC profiles associated with brain
28 region k in each time window (denoted by the shaded column) were correlated and averaged, and
29 subtracted from 1.0, which led to a temporal variability for FC profile associated with brain region k.

30 173x90mm (300 x 300 DPI)

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Review




Figure 2 Temporal variability of FCs within a network and between two networks. (a) The left part shows the network of interest (consisting of red nodes). The right part shows the BOLD time courses of all regions in the network, which were segmented into non-overlapping windows. Then the FC matrix of this network was constructed in each window, and the FCs of the network in each time window were correlated and averaged, subtracted from 1.0, which led to a temporal variability for FCs within a network. (b) The left part shows the two networks of interest (denoted by red and blue nodes, respectively). The right part shows the BOLD time courses of regions in these two networks, which were segmented into non-overlapped windows. Then the FCs between these two networks were obtained in each window. These FCs in different time windows were correlated and averaged, subtracted from 1.0, which led to the temporal variability for the FCs between two networks.

173x199mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3 Regions whose temporal variability is correlated to the TTCT total score. The radar map in the middle shows the correlation coefficient between the temporal variability of each brain region and the TTCT total score. The small squares in the radar map show the specific correlation coefficient of the temporal variability and the TTCT total score. The brain maps show the location of the corresponding brain regions.

173x150mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 4 The within-network variability of the DMN is correlated with the creativity TTCT total score. The brain map shows the within-network connectivity of the DMN. The correlation map shows that the within-network variability of the DMN is positively related to TTCT total score.

173x65mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Peer Review




Figure 5 Between-network variability is correlated with the TTCT total score. The radar map in the middle shows the correlation coefficients of between-network variability with the TTCT total score. The brain maps show the corresponding two brain networks of interest (using different colors). Abbreviations: DMN: default mode network, VAN: ventral attention network, DAN: dorsal attention network, SHN: sensory/somatomotor hand network, AN: auditory network, SN: salience network, VN: visual network, FTCN: fronto-parietal task control, CTCN: cingulo-opercular task control network.

173x150mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Supplemental Information

Global signal removal

Currently, no consensus has been reached in the neuroimaging field with respect to the removal of global signals when computing functional connectivity. Global signal removal has been shown to reduce physiological noise and movement-related effects (1), thus improving reliability (1-3), although it can also increase the number of negative functional connectivities (4). The main argument against global signal removal is the introduction of spurious correlations. In our study, variability is measured by calculating the correlation coefficient between the functional connectivity profile of a node at different time windows, which is related to the correlations between functional connectivity profiles, and is not directly related to the actual value of functional connectivity.

Data scrubbing

We further implemented careful volume censoring ('scrubbing') movement correction (5) to ensure that head motion artifacts were not driving observed effects. The mean framewise displacement was computed with the framewise displacement threshold of 0.5mm for exclusion. In addition to the frame corresponding to the displaced time point, one preceding and two succeeding time points were also deleted to reduce the spillover effect of head movements. Finally, we used mean framewise displacement as a covariate when comparing the two groups during statistical analysis.

Supplementary References

1. Yan CG, *et al.* (2013) A comprehensive assessment of regional variation in the impact of head micromovements on functional connectomics. *Neuroimage* 76:183-201.
2. Fox MD, Zhang D, Snyder AZ, & Raichle ME (2009) The global signal and observed anticorrelated resting state brain networks. *Journal of neurophysiology* 101(6):3270-3283.
3. Hayasaka S (2013) Functional connectivity networks with and without global signal correction. *Frontiers in human neuroscience* 7:880.
4. Saad ZS, *et al.* (2012) Trouble at rest: how correlation patterns and group differences become distorted after global signal regression. *Brain connectivity* 2(1):25-32.
5. Power JD, *et al.* (2014) Methods to detect, characterize, and remove motion artifact in resting state fMRI. *NeuroImage* 84:320-341.

Table S1 Demographic information of the two datasets used in the paper.

	Items	Total Participants
Dataset 1	No. of participants	304
	male/female	117/187
	age	19.97 (SD = 1.21)
	Raven's scores	65.78 (SD = 3.65)
	TTCT scores	103.80 (SD = 40.88)
Dataset 2	No. of participants	270
	male/female	68/202
	age	19.75 (SD = 1.75)
	TTCT scores (sub scale)	37.31 (SD = 13.09)

Table S2. The correlation of variability of FCs between cerebellum and various cerebral networks and TTCT verbal score. An interesting finding is the marginal correlation between variability of FCs between cerebellum and Cingulo-opercular Task Control network, with $p = 0.0544$, BH-FDR corrected. We also highlight those cerebral networks whose p value is smaller than 0.05 (uncorrected) with red color.

Network	r	p	$p_{BH\ FDR}$
Between cerebellum and Networks			
Sensory/somatomotor Hand	0.1262	0.0314	0.1064
Sensory/somatomotor Mouth	0.0491	0.4080	0.5900
Cingulo-opercular Task Control	0.1527	0.0091	0.0544
Auditory	0.1194	0.0440	0.1373
Default mode	0.0551	0.3536	0.5517
Memory retrieval	-0.0931	0.1151	0.2640
Ventral attention	0.0695	0.2390	0.4236
Visual	0.0754	0.2015	0.3735
Fronto-parietal Task Control	0.0598	0.3066	0.5038
Salience	0.1327	0.0233	0.0866
Subcortical	0.0763	0.1960	0.3735
Dorsal attention	0.6961	0.0232	0.7625
Within cerebellum	-0.0953	0.1046	-