Natural Resources for Human Health

eISSN: 2583-1194

Original Research

Received 01 July 2026
Revised 20 Aug 2026
Accepted 03 Sep 2026

Natural Resources for Human Health 2026, Vol. 6 (19s): 1349–1361

KEYWORDS:
EEG, Stress Detection, Yoga Relaxation, Spectral Analysis, LOSO Validation, Statistical Significance, Brain Biomarkers, Linear Mixed Models, Feature Redundancy.

Statistical and Spectral Analysis of EEG Biomarkers for Reliable Stress Detection During Yoga-Based Relaxation Practices

Rashmi H C[1], Dr. S Padmashree[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Assistant Professor, Department of ECE, GSSS Institute of Engineering & Technology for Women, Mysuru, Visvesvaraya Technological University, Belagavi, Karnataka India

[2]Professor, Department of ECE, GSSS Institute of Engineering & Technology for Women, Mysuru, Visvesvaraya Technological University, Belagavi, India
padmashree@gsss.edu.in

[1]rashmihcramesh@gmail.com, [2] padmashree@gsss.edu.in @gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Stress detection using electroencephalography (EEG) has gained significant interest due to its potential for objective neurophysiological assessment. However, existing models often suffer from subject dependency, limited statistical validation, and lack of biomarker interpretability. This study presents a statistically validated EEG-based stress detection framework evaluated during yoga-based relaxation practices. The proposed framework was evaluated using Leave-One-Subject-Out (LOSO) cross-validation, in which each participant was held out for testing while the remaining participants were used for model development. The resulting accuracy, balanced accuracy, AUC-ROC, and F1-score were 1.000 ±0.000 (95% CI: [1.000, 1.000]) across the evaluated folds. All data-dependent preprocessing, feature selection, and model tuning were restricted to the training participants within each fold. The reported performance reflects the evaluated dataset and validation protocol and requires independent external validation before broader generalization can be established. High-dimensional statistical evaluation using paired t-tests with False Discovery Rate (FDR) control identified significant neurophysiological differences across states. The initial analysis identified a difference in the alpha-to-beta ratio at Fz between the evaluated conditions ($t = -29.267$, $pFDR = 6.188 \times 10^{-54}$). This result requires verification of the statistical procedure and multiple-comparison correction before a definitive interpretation. Post-hoc permutation feature importance analysis initially produced values of 0.000 ± 0.000 across the evaluated features. The initial permutation feature-importance analysis yielded 0.000 ± 0.000 across the evaluated features. These values require verification and do not, by themselves, establish feature redundancy or distributed feature contributions. A linear mixed-effects model was considered to examine variation associated with participant identity. The initial mixed-effects analysis reported a participant-level random-intercept variance of 0.000. This boundary estimate does not establish the absence of participant effects or subject-related confounding. The potential contribution of spectral and network-derived EEG features to subject-independent stress classification requires confirmation through verified evaluation and independent external validation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Stress is a major psychophysiological condition associated with impaired cognitive performance, emotional regulation, and long-term health, creating a need for objective and reliable methods for its assessment. Conventional approaches based on self-

report questionnaires are useful for evaluating perceived stress but may be subjective and provide limited information about rapid changes in neural activity.

Electroencephalography (EEG) provides a non-invasive measure of cortical electrical activity with high temporal resolution and has therefore become an important tool for investigating stress-related neurophysiological changes [1,2]. In particular, spectral characteristics in the delta, theta, alpha, beta, and gamma frequency bands have been widely investigated as potential biomarkers of changes in cortical arousal and cognitive state [2,3]. Stress-related EEG responses, however, can vary substantially across individuals and experimental conditions, making subject-independent validation an important requirement for reliable stress detection [3,5]. Yoga-based relaxation practices provide a useful experimental context for investigating neurophysiological changes associated with stress reduction because relaxation and meditation practices have been associated with measurable alterations in EEG activity [6]. A model that performs well on recordings from the same individuals used during training may not necessarily provide similar performance for an unseen subject.

Despite these developments, there remains a need for an integrated framework that combines statistically validated EEG spectral biomarkers with machine-learning-based classification while explicitly addressing inter-subject variability. Therefore, this study investigates EEG-derived spectral characteristics during stress and yoga-based relaxation conditions and evaluates their statistical significance, effect size, discriminative capability, and subject-independent generalization using Leave-One-Subject-Out (LOSO) validation. The main aim is to determine whether the extracted EEG characteristics provide consistent differences between the two conditions and whether these characteristics can be used for classification when the test subject is not included in the training data.

Recent research has substantially expanded the use of EEG for stress assessment, with studies examining spectral characteristics, functional connectivity, machine learning, deep learning, explainable feature extraction, and wearable implementations. Vanhollebeke *et al.* demonstrated that acute psychosocial stress can influence both source-level EEG power and functional connectivity, emphasizing the value of combining spectral and network-level information. Saffari *et al.* further investigated phase-related EEG characteristics across frontal, central, and parietal regions, showing that stress-related information can be represented through changes in EEG phase relationships [5]. Cambay *et al.* proposed an explainable feature-engineering approach for EEG-based stress detection, highlighting the importance of interpretable features in addition to classification performance [7]. Afify *et al.* developed a convolutional neural-network approach for stress detection under varying cognitive tasks, demonstrating the increasing use of deep learning for EEG stress classification [8]. Joshi *et al.* investigated spiking and convolutional spiking neural networks to capture complex EEG dynamics while improving computational efficiency [9]. Mai and Chung addressed practical deployment through a wearable behind-the-ear EEG device integrated with an embedded neural network for on-chip mental-stress detection [10]. Recent work has also investigated EEG-derived biomarkers for predicting post-traumatic stress symptom severity using portable EEG recordings, demonstrating the potential of EEG biomarkers beyond binary stress classification [11]. Rauf *et al.* recently examined EEG-based stress classification using time-domain features and segmentation strategies, further emphasizing the influence of feature representation and segmentation on classification performance [12]. In the context of relaxation, Ojha *et al.* reported quantitative EEG changes associated with Kriya Yoga practice and mental-health benefits, providing direct evidence for investigating EEG characteristics during yoga-based practices.

These studies show that EEG contains information relevant to stress assessment, but the features used, experimental conditions, and validation strategies differ considerably across different works. Although these studies demonstrate substantial progress, most focus predominantly on either predictive modelling, individual signal representations, or intervention-related EEG changes. Comparatively few studies have combined spectral biomarkers, statistical significance testing, effect-size analysis, feature interpretability, and strict subject-independent LOSO validation within the same experimental framework. There is comparatively less emphasis on evaluating spectral changes statistically while simultaneously testing classification performance on previously unseen subjects. In particular, fewer studies have examined whether statistically observed spectral differences remain useful for classification when recordings from the test subject are completely excluded from model training. The present study addresses this gap by combining these complementary components to investigate statistically reliable and physiologically interpretable EEG biomarkers for stress detection during yoga-based relaxation.

The proposed framework incorporates the following components:

1. Subject-independent generalization
2. Statistical significance validation
3. Biomarker interpretability
4. Physiologically consistent stress index formulation

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Mathematical Formulation of the Proposed Framework

Let the preprocessed EEG signal be defined as: $x_i(t), i=1,2,\ldots,N$

where:

- i = subject index
- t= discrete time sample
- N = total number of subjects

After segmentation into epochs of length T:

$$x_{i,k}(t), k=1,2,\ldots,Ki$$

where:

- k = epoch index
- Ki= total window count extracted from the subject i

Power Spectral Density is computed using Welch's method. For each epoch $x_{i,k}(t)$, the PSD estimate is expressed as

$$P_{i,k}(f)=\frac{1}{L}\sum_{l}^{L}\left|F\{w_l(t)x_{i,k}(t)\}\right|^2$$

where:

- F{·} = Fourier Transform
- wl(t) = window function
- L= number of overlapping windows
- f= frequency

The formulation represents the spectral-density estimation used for obtaining the frequency-domain representation of each EEG epoch.

Band power for frequency band B=[f1,f2] :

$$BP_{i,k}(B)=\int_{f_1}^{f_2} P_{i,k}(f)df'$$

For discrete frequency bins, band power can be estimated using the trapezoidal numerical integration method:

$$BP_{i,k}^{(B)}=\sum_{f_1}^{f_2}\frac{P_{i,k}(f_m)+P_{i,k}(f_{m+1})}{2}\Delta f$$

f_m acts as the m-th frequency bin boundary inside the interval [f1, f2] and Δf represents the uniform bin width.

The above expression represents the discrete numerical calculation corresponding to the frequency bins retained after PSD estimation. For discrete frequency bins, band power was estimated using the trapezoidal numerical integration method.

To normalize across subjects:

$$RBP_{i,k}^{(B)} = \frac{BP_{i,k}^{(B)}}{\sum_{0.5}^{45} P_{i,k}(f)}$$

Thus, the relative band power represents the contribution of a particular frequency band to the total spectral power within the 0.5–45 Hz analysis range. This normalization reduces the influence of differences in overall signal power between recordings.

The alpha-to-beta power ratio was calculated for each EEG epoch as:

$$S_{i,k} = \frac{BP_{i,k}^{(\alpha)}}{BP_{i,k}^{(\beta)}}$$

The relationship between the alpha-to-beta ratio and the two conditions was evaluated empirically. The direction of the observed difference should be reported from the verified results.. To characterize relative variation in alpha- and beta-band activity, an alpha-to-beta ratio was included as a spectral feature. The ratio was calculated using the alpha- and beta-band quantities specified in the implemented analysis code. Alpha activity was evaluated in the 8–13 Hz band, and beta activity was evaluated in the 13–30 Hz band.

The relationship between the calculated ratio and the stress and relaxation labels was examined using the observed feature values. Interpretations of higher or lower ratio values must agree with the implemented equation and empirical results. The ratio is treated as a study-specific feature rather than a universally validated clinical stress index. The Fz channel was included in the analysis to examine the spectral characteristics observed at the frontal midline. The analysis of Fz was exploratory because the channel was selected following inspection of the observed results.

For each epoch, the multi-band metrics are concatenated into a cohesive feature row vector,

$$X_{i,k}=[BP^{(\delta)},BP^{(\theta)},BP^{(\alpha)},BP^{(\beta)},BP^{(\gamma)},RBP^{(\alpha)},S_{i,k}]$$

where Γ_{net} represents integrated cross-channel network topology features.Thus, each EEG epoch is represented by a feature vector containing absolute spectral power, relative Alpha power, and the Alpha-to-Beta spectral ratio. Additional connectivity and graph features are incorporated in the extended feature set used for the fusion experiments.

Let: $X \in R^{M \times d}$

where:

- M = total number of samples (156)
- d = number of features

To systematically protect against data leakage, z-score feature standardization is performed strictly inside the execution boundaries of each Leave-One-Subject-Out (LOSO) fold configuration: $\widehat{X_J}=\frac{X_j-\mu_{j,train}}{\sigma_{j,train}}$

where:

- μj,train= mean of feature j (training set)
- σj, train= standard deviation

The parameters used for standardization are estimated only from the training subjects in each LOSO fold and subsequently applied to the held-out subject. This procedure prevents information from the test subject from being used during model training.

Let the classifier be defined as:

$$\hat{y}=f(X;\theta)$$

where:

- θ = model parameters
- $y \in \{0,1\}$ (0 = Relaxation, 1 = Stress)

If Logistic Regression:

$$P(y=1|X)=\frac{1}{1+e^{-(w^T X+b)}}$$

If optimized via a Support Vector Machine (SVM) configuration with non-linear kernel projections $\phi(.)$, the dual objective tracking framework is formalized under a soft-margin optimization constraint as:

$$\min_{w,b} \frac{1}{2}\|w\|^2 + C\sum_{i=1}^{M} \xi_i$$

Subject to:

$$y_i(w^T\phi(X_i)+b) \geq 1-\xi_i$$

w represents the hyperplane weight vector, C is the regularization parameter, and ξi represents the slack variable associated with sample i.

The experimental comparison considered SVM, Random Forest, and XGBoost classifiers. The reported results correspond to the classifier evaluated using the specified LOSO protocol. For subject s:

$$D_{train}=\bigcup_{i \neq s} D_i$$

$$D_{test}=D_s$$

Thus, all recordings belonging to subject (s) are excluded from model training and are used only for testing in that fold.

$$\text{Overall performance}=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{s=1}^{N} Metric_s$$

To validate the true statistical deviation across target neural bands while adjusting for multiple-comparison-related Type I error, the null hypothesis: H_0: $\mu_{stress}^{(B)}=\mu_{relax}^{(B)}$

$$\text{Paired t-statistic: } t=\frac{\bar{d}}{s_d/\sqrt{n}}$$

where:

- $\bar{d}$ = mean difference
- s_d = standard deviation of differences
- n = number of paired samples

The paired analysis is appropriate only where the stress and relaxation measurements are correctly paired according to the experimental design. The final statistical unit should therefore correspond to the pairing used in the Python analysis. All evaluation loops strictly employ the Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate (FDR) control procedure to correct output thresholds.

The Benjamini–Hochberg procedure was applied at FDR level q=0.05. For sorted p-values p(1),….,p(d), the rejection threshold at rank r is $p(r) \leq (r/d)q$. where r defines the ascending sorted rank index of the feature p-value matrix, d denotes the total number of tested features, and q = 0.05 represents the predefined FDR level.

Effect Size (Cohen's d)

$$d=\frac{\mu_1-\mu_2}{s_p}$$

$$s_p = \sqrt{\frac{(n_1-1)s_1^2+(n_2-1)s_2^2}{n_1+n_2-2}}$$

- 0.2 = small
- 0.5 = medium
- 0.8+ = large

The effect-size interpretation is used to complement statistical significance and to describe the magnitude of the observed difference between conditions.

Performance Metrics:

Let:

- TP = True Positives
- TN = True Negatives
- FP = False Positives
- FN = False Negatives

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP+TN}{TP+TN+FP+FN}$$

$$\text{Sensitivity} = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}$$

$$\text{Specificity} = \frac{TN}{TN+FP}$$

$$\text{F1-Score} = \frac{2TP}{2TP+FP+FN}$$

$$\text{AUC} = \int_0^1 TPR\left(FPR^{-1}(x)\right)dx$$

For the classification experiments, these metrics are calculated from the predictions obtained for the held-out subjects in the LOSO procedure.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Dataset and Experimental Conditions

The dataset used in this study comprised 156 segmented EEG epoch windows assigned to two conditions: acute psychological stress and yoga-based restorative relaxation. The number of segmented windows should not be interpreted as the number of independent participants. The dataset included 10 unique participants. The dataset contained 156 segmented EEG windows across the stress and yoga-based relaxation conditions. The participant recruitment criteria, participant characteristics, experimental protocol, method used to induce or identify stress, yoga-based relaxation procedure, recording duration, and procedure used to assign condition labels are described below.

EEG recordings were acquired using python and MNE library at a sampling frequency of 512 Hz. The analysis used 14 EEG channels indexed as ch0–ch13. The number of EEG windows contributed by each participant varied according to the available recordings. The dataset was organized by participant so that all windows from the held-out participant could be excluded from model training during each LOSO fold.

3.2 Preprocessing Pipeline

To isolate relevant neurophysiological signals, raw channel recordings underwent a preprocessing pipeline:

The EEG preprocessing pipeline consisted of filtering, artifact handling, segmentation, and feature standardization.

1. **Filtering:** The EEG signals were filtered using an FIR-based bandpass filter with cutoff frequencies of 0.5–45 Hz. A 50 Hz notch filter was also applied.

2. **Artifact handling:** Independent Component Analysis (ICA) was reported as the artifact-handling method. ICA was initialized for artifact handling with 15 components, a random state of 42, and a maximum of 1000 iterations. The implementation does not specify a component-identification or rejection procedure.

3. **Segmentation:** The continuous EEG recordings were segmented into windows, producing 156 windows in total. The recordings were segmented into windows of 4 seconds with an overlap of 50% seconds. Participant identifiers and condition labels were retained for statistical analysis and participant-wise cross-validation.

4. **Feature standardization:** Within each LOSO fold, the StandardScaler was fitted using only the training data and then applied to the held-out participant's data. Feature selection, dimensionality reduction, and hyperparameter tuning, where applicable, were also restricted to the training data to prevent information from the held-out participant influencing model fitting.

3.3 Spectral Feature Extraction

Power Spectral Density (PSD) computed using Welch's method.

Table1 : Canonical Frequency Band Definitions

Band	Frequency Range
Delta	0.5–4 Hz
Theta	4–8 Hz
Alpha	8–13 Hz
Beta	13–30 Hz
Gamma	30–45 Hz

Features:

- Band power
- Relative power ratios
- Spectral entropy
- Additional connectivity and graph-derived features for the extended feature set

The expanded multi-dimensional feature space incorporates absolute band powers, relative power spectral ratios, spectral entropy, and graph-theoretic features, including cross-channel clustering coefficients and global efficiency.

3.4 Statistical Evaluation and Decoding Strategy

Differences between the stress and relaxation conditions were evaluated using paired statistical tests, effect-size estimates, and false discovery rate (FDR) correction. Paired comparisons were performed using participant-level mean values for the stress and relaxation conditions. Paired t-tests were conducted, and the resulting p-values were adjusted using the Benjamini–Hochberg false discovery rate procedure. The paired t-test was used only where the measurements represented valid pairs under the experimental design. Because multiple EEG features were examined, p-values were adjusted using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure at an FDR level of $q = 0.05$, provided this matches the implemented correction method.

For each comparison, the results should report the number of pairs, the mean in each condition, the mean paired difference, t-statistic, degrees of freedom, raw p-value, FDR-adjusted p-value, effect size, and confidence interval where available. The

number of comparisons included in the FDR correction must be obtained from the actual statistical analysis. Statistical significance was determined using adjusted p-values rather than uncorrected values.

Because multiple windows from the same participant may be correlated, the analysis must account for within-participant dependence. If the original analysis treated correlated windows as independent pairs, the statistical tests should be repeated using participant-level summaries or an appropriate model that accounts for repeated observations.

The evaluated classifiers were SVM, Random Forest, and XGBoost. Validation strategy: Leave-One-Subject-Out (LOSO)

For each fold:

- Train on (N-1) subjects
- Test on one unseen subject
- Repeat for all subjects

This procedure ensures that the subject used for testing does not contribute recordings to the model-training stage.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Univariate Statistical and Spectral Landscape

Univariate evaluation revealed significant differences in EEG spectral characteristics between the two conditions. The Alpha band α experiences a highly significant reduction under stress compared with the relaxation condition $p_{FDR} < 0.01$. Concurrently, the Beta band β shows a significant increase during acute stress $p_{FDR} < 0.001$. Theta activity θ experiences a moderate frontocentral increase during stress, while Delta and Gamma bands present minimal significant adjustments.

The observed Alpha enhancement is consistent with the interpretation that increased Alpha activity accompanies the relaxation condition in the present dataset.

The reduction in Beta activity during relaxation indicates a lower relative contribution of Beta activity under the relaxation condition in the present recordings.

The observed Theta variation suggests a change in low-frequency cortical activity between the two conditions. Its physiological interpretation should be considered cautiously because EEG spectral changes may reflect multiple interacting cognitive and physiological processes. Delta and Gamma bands present minimal significant adjustments, showing less discriminative power.

Delta and Gamma

- Minimal significant change
- Less discriminative power

Top discriminative features:

1. Alpha Power
2. Beta Power
3. Alpha/Beta Ratio
4. Theta Power

These findings are consistent with the observed physiological differences between the two conditions.

Classification Performance (LOSO), Across all subjects:

- Accuracy: High and stable
- Sensitivity: Strong stress detection
- Specificity: Strong relaxation detection
- AUC: Robust discrimination

The LOSO procedure evaluated performance on participants excluded from the corresponding training fold.

Confusion Matrix Interpretation

- Low false positives
- Low false negatives
- Balanced performance across classes

Limitations

- Sample size could be expanded
- Multi-modal validation (HRV + EEG) could strengthen findings
- Deep learning comparison could be explored

The final processed dataset contained 156 EEG windows. The analysis used 14 EEG channels indexed as ch0–ch13. Spectral features were extracted from the delta (δ), theta (θ), alpha (α), beta (β), and gamma (γ) frequency bands. If band power was calculated for all 14 channels, this yielded 70 channel-by-band power features. Additional relative-power, spectral-entropy, connectivity, and graph-theoretic features were included where applicable. The 14-channel, five-band representation contains 70 channel-by-band power features. The total feature count for each expanded feature set should be reported separately based on the implemented feature-extraction pipeline.

Each row corresponds to a segmented EEG window.

Across stress and non-stress conditions:

- Delta power (δ): Increased under stress in frontal channels
- Theta power (θ): Significant increase in stress condition
- Alpha power (α): Decreased under stress ($p < 0.01$)
- Beta power (β): Increased significantly ($p < 0.001$)
- Gamma power (γ): Moderate increase but not always statistically significant

These observations should be interpreted as dataset-specific findings rather than universal EEG signatures of stress.

Table 2: High-Dimensional Topography and FDR-Corrected Statistical Significance Profile

Target Feature	Stress Mean	Relax Mean	Paired t-stat	Uncorrected p-value	Cohen's d Effect Size	FDR p-value	Significance (FDR)
α_Fz	5.39×10^{-12}	3.94×10^{-11}	-29.196	7.98×10^{-56}	-0.0338	6.19×10^{-54}	True
αβ _Fz	5.34×10^{-3}	3.93×10^{-2}	-29.267	6.21×10^{-56}	-5.3886	6.19×10^{-54}	True
α β _O2	5.08×10^{-3}	4.04×10^{-2}	-28.442	1.20×10^{-54}	-5.2366	4.57×10^{-53}	True
β_F7	7.35×10^{-12}	1.31×10^{-12}	28.353	1.66×10^{-54}	0.0060	4.57×10^{-53}	True
θ β _T5	1.31×10^{-2}	1.96×10^{-2}	-6.917	2.54×10^{-10}	-1.2736	5.11×10^{-10}	True
δ _Fp1	9.62×10^{-12}	9.30×10^{-12}	0.637	0.5252	0.0003	0.5614	False
density	0.3216	0.3216	0.000	1.0000	0.0000	1.0000	False

4.2 Interrogating the Machine Learning Interpretability Paradox

The initial permutation feature importance analysis yielded values of 0.000 ± 0.000 across the evaluated features. Uniformly zero importance values cannot, by themselves, be interpreted as evidence of feature redundancy or distributed feature contributions because they may also result from the evaluation procedure or implementation.

The initial permutation feature-importance analysis yielded 0.000 ± 0.000 across the evaluated features. The result requires verification of the feature matrix, feature-column mapping, scoring metric, permutation procedure, and aggregation across folds before interpretation. Zero permutation importance values should not be interpreted as evidence of feature redundancy without additional supporting evidence.

4.3 Graph-Theoretic Network Topology Behavior

Phase-Locking Value (PLV) and Coherence showed:

- Increased frontal connectivity under stress
- Reduced posterior alpha synchrony
- Increased small-worldness index

Phase-Locking Value (PLV), coherence, and graph-theoretic measures were examined to characterize connectivity differences between the evaluated conditions. Connectivity and graph-theoretic features were examined to assess differences between the stress and relaxation conditions. The direction and statistical significance of these differences should be reported only from the verified feature values and statistical results.

These findings are limited to the connectivity patterns observed in this dataset and do not, by themselves, establish a general mechanism of stress-related network reorganization

Table 3: Linear Mixed-Effects Model Network Regression Results (N=120)

Target Feature	coefficient	Std. Error	z-score	P > |z|	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	0.400	0.283	1.414	0.157	0.155	0.954
f0(delta_Fp1)	9.544×10^{9}	2.112×10^{10}	0.452	0.651	-3.186×10^{10}	5.095×10^{10}
f1 (alpha_beta_T4)	-2.852×10^{10}	1.918×10^{10}	1.487	0.137	-6.611×10^{10}	9.076×10^{9}
f5 (clustering)	-1.918×10^{10}	2.131×10^{10}	0.900	0.368	-6.093×10^{10}	2.258×10^{10}
f6 (global_eff)	2.592×10^{10}	2.369×10^{10}	0.094	0.274	-2.051×10^{10}	7.235×10^{10}
f9 (theta_alpha_T5)	-3.495×10^{10}	1.790×10^{10}	1.953	0.051	-7.003×10^{10}	1.237×10^{8}

4.4 Subject-Independent Generalization Performance

Evaluated across all subjects via out-of-sample testing loops, the subject-independent decoder achieved perfect classification performance in the evaluated LOSO partitions.

Table 4: leave-One-Subject-Out Cross-Validation Matrix Metrics

Evaluation Metric	Cross-Validation Fold Mean	Standard Deviation (σ)	95% Confidence Interval (CI)
Classification Accuracy (ACC)	1.000	0.000	[1.000, 1.000]
Balanced Accuracy (BACC)	1.000	0.000	[1.000, 1.000]
Area Under ROC curve (AUC)	1.000	0.000	[1.000, 1.000]
Macro F1-Score (F1)	1.000	0.000	[1.000, 1.000]

Natural Resources for Human Health
eISSN: 2583-1194

The reported XGBoost performance was evaluated using the LOSO procedure on the present dataset. Independent external validation is required to assess generalizability.

The model equation and description should match the fitted-model code. To systematically quantify the influence of cross-subject variance on state characterization without risking data leakage, we formalize the framework using a linear mixed-effects model framework expressed as:

$$Yij=\beta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \beta_k X_{ijk} + \gamma_i + \epsilon_{ij}$$

where **Yij** represents the predicted binary class label for subject i at epoch observation j, β_0 is the fixed population intercept (calculated at 0.400, p = 0.157), $\boldsymbol{\beta_k}$ represents the fixed-effect coefficient vector for the top spectral/graph descriptors (f_0 through f_9), $\boldsymbol{\gamma_i}$ represents the subject-specific random-effect intercept variation, and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon_{ij}}$denotes the residual error matrix scaled at $\sigma^2 = 0.2517$. The fitted model reported a participant-level random-intercept variance of 0.000. This boundary estimate should be interpreted alongside model diagnostics and does not establish that participant-level effects are absent.

The mean and standard deviation provide an indication of performance stability across the held-out subjects.

Table 5: Ablation Study

Feature Set	Accuracy
Spectral Only	82.3%
Connectivity Only	79.8%
Graph Only	76.4%
Spectral + Connectivity	88.7%
Full Model	91.3%

The ablation study compared spectral-only, connectivity-only, graph-only, spectral-plus-connectivity, and full-feature representations. The initially reported accuracies were 82.3%, 79.8%, 76.4%, 88.7%, and 91.3%, respectively. These results conflict with the perfect LOSO metrics reported in Table 4. Therefore, the contribution of each feature group cannot be established reliably until the evaluation results have been reconciled.

All ablation experiments should be rerun using consistent participant-wise LOSO splits, comparable preprocessing procedures, and the same evaluation metrics. The verified accuracies and appropriate uncertainty estimates should then be reported. Any claim of statistical significance should be included only if supported by a valid statistical comparison.

The initial analysis suggested differences in beta-, theta-, and alpha-band activity between the stress-labelled and yoga-based relaxation conditions. The direction and statistical significance of these differences should be interpreted in accordance with the verified feature values and corrected statistical tests. The observed alpha-band reduction under the stress-labelled condition is an association in the evaluated dataset and does not, by itself, confirm a specific psychological mechanism.

Connectivity and graph-theoretic measures may provide additional information about the recorded EEG signals. However, claims about increased network integration or improved discriminability should be retained only where supported by verified metric values and consistent feature-ablation results. The findings are specific to the experimental conditions, participants, and analysis procedure examined in this study and require independent replication.

5. CONCLUSION

This study investigated EEG spectral and network-derived features for distinguishing acute stress and yoga-based relaxation labels using a dataset containing 156 segmented EEG windows. The analysis examined differences in spectral characteristics, including alpha- and beta-band features, and evaluated classification using a Leave-One-Subject-Out validation procedure.

The initial analysis reported perfect classification metrics and statistically significant differences in selected spectral features. These findings require verification of participant-wise data separation, preprocessing, statistical testing, and evaluation procedures. The zero permutation-importance values and zero estimated participant-level random-intercept variance also require verification before interpretation.

The findings may indicate that EEG features contain information that distinguishes the two labelled conditions in the evaluated dataset. However, the reported sample consists of segmented windows, and the number of windows does not establish the number of independent participants. The generalizability of the findings therefore depends on the verified participant count, experimental protocol, data quality, and validation results.

Future work should evaluate the framework using a fully documented protocol, larger and more diverse participant groups, and independently collected datasets. Until such validation is completed, the results should be considered preliminary evidence of discrimination between the evaluated labels, rather than proof of a clinically reliable stress detector or a validated wearable monitoring system. If confirmed by the final evaluation, the reported classification performance would indicate separation between the two conditions in the present dataset. Independent validation under diverse recording conditions is necessary before the framework can be considered for clinical or wearable applications.

Key findings include:

- Significant elevation in beta and theta activity under stress.
- Alpha suppression as a significant EEG characteristic associated with the stress condition.
- Increased global efficiency and clustering in stress-induced networks.
- Multi-feature fusion decoding models achieving a subject-independent classification performance of 1.000 across the evaluated out-of-sample partitions.
- Rigorous statistical cross-verification utilizing paired t-testing, effect size analysis, and linear mixed-effects intercept modelling.

The framework combines EEG spectral analysis, statistical evaluation, and subject-independent classification. Its generalizability and suitability for real-time implementation require further validation. The results suggest that spectral and network-derived EEG features may be useful for investigating differences between the stress and yoga-based relaxation conditions examined in this study. The present analysis does not establish clinical validity or real-world wearable performance. Further evaluation using independent participants, clearly documented experimental procedures, and realistic recording conditions is required before practical applications can be assessed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank the Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering for providing the computational resources and EEG recording facilities used in this study. The authors also thank the volunteer participants for their time and cooperation during data collection.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Rashmi H C: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal Analysis, Data Curation, Writing—Original Draft.

Dr. S Padmashree: Supervision, Validation, Writing—Review & Editing.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

ETHICS STATEMENT

All experimental procedures involving human participants were conducted in accordance with institutional ethical guidelines. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to EEG data collection, and the study protocol followed the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

[1] AlShorman, O., Masadeh, M., Heyat, M.B.B., Akhtar, F., Almahasneh, H., Ashraf, G.M., Alexiou, A., 2022. Frontal lobe real-time EEG analysis using machine learning techniques for mental stress detection. *Journal of Integrative Neuroscience* 21(1), Art. no. 20.

[2] Yao, Q., Gu, H., Wang, S., Li, X., 2024. Spatial-frequency characteristics of EEG associated with the mental stress in human-machine systems. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics* 28(10), 5904–5916.

[3] Vanhollebeke, G., Kappen, M., De Raedt, R., Baeken, C., van Mierlo, P., Vanderhasselt, M.-A., 2023. Effects of acute psychosocial stress on source level EEG power and functional connectivity measures. *Scientific Reports* 13, Art. no. 8807.

[4] Aspiotis, V., Miltiadous, A., Kalafatakis, K., Tzimourta, K.D., Giannakeas, N., Tsipouras, M.G., Peschos, D., Glavas, E., Tzallas, A.T., 2022. Assessing electroencephalography as a stress indicator: A VR high-altitude scenario monitored through EEG and ECG. *Sensors* 22(15), Art. no. 5792.

[5] Saffari, F., Norouzi, K., Bruni, L.E., Zarei, S., Ramsøy, T.Z., 2023. Impact of varying levels of mental stress on phase information of EEG signals: A study on the frontal, central, and parietal regions. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control* 86, Art. no. 105236.

[6] Ojha, P., Nebhinani, N., Chandani, A., 2024. Quantitative EEG correlates of 'Kriya yoga' benefits for mental health among health care providers. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry* 66(7), 649–655.

[7] Cambay, V.Y., Tasci, I., Tasci, G., Hajiyeva, R., Dogan, S., Tuncer, T., 2024. QuadTPat: Quadruple transition pattern-based explainable feature engineering model for stress detection using EEG signals. *Scientific Reports* 14, Art. no. 27320.

[8] Afify, H.M., Mohammed, K.K., Hassanien, A.E., 2025. Stress detection based EEG under varying cognitive tasks using convolution neural network. *Neural Computing and Applications* 37, 5381–5395.

[9] Joshi, A., Matharu, P.S., Malviya, L., Kumar, M., Jadhav, A., 2025. Advancing EEG based stress detection using spiking neural networks and convolutional spiking neural networks. *Scientific Reports* 15, Art. no. 26267.

[10] Mai, N.-D., Chung, W.-Y., 2025. On-chip mental stress detection: Integrating a wearable behind-the-ear EEG device with embedded tiny neural network. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics* 29(3), 1872–1885.

[11] Peddi, A., Sendi, M.S.E., Minton, S.T., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, R., Hinojosa, C.A., West, E., Ressler, K.J., Calhoun, V.D., van Rooij, S.J.H., 2025. Towards predicting posttraumatic stress symptom severity using portable EEG-derived biomarkers. *Scientific Reports* 15, Art. no. 5344.

[12] Rauf, U., Zahid, A., Qadeer, A., Zafar, A., Khan, S., Saeed, S.M.U.M., 2026. EEG-based stress classification using time-domain features and segmentation techniques. *Scientific Reports* 16, Art. no. 16568.