

Figure S1: Bar chart representing contributions of each of the $N=90$ AAL brain areas to the fronto-parietal FC state of interest $\left(V_{c}(\mathrm{n})>0\right.$ in red, blue otherwise) across clustering solutions $\mathrm{k}=6$ through $\mathrm{k}=10$. In each clustering solution, the probability of occurrence of this state was significantly reduced following the psilocybin injection. The Bonferroni-corrected p-values (i.e. p$\left.\mathrm{val}^{*} k\right)$ were: $0.022(k=6) ; 0.002(k=7) ; 0.008(k=8) ; 0.026(k=9)$ and $0.019(k=10)$. Regional contributions to the cluster centroid of interest show a high level of consistency across the clustering solutions.


Figure S2: Bar chart representing contributions of each of the $N=90 \mathrm{AAL}$ brain areas to the globally coherent state of interest $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathrm{n})>0\right.$ in red, blue otherwise) across clustering solutions $\mathrm{k}=6$ through $\mathrm{k}=10$. In each clustering solution, the probability of occurrence of this state was higher following the psilocybin injection, surviving the Bonferroni correction for $\mathrm{k}=7$ and $\mathrm{k}=10$. We note that prior to the Bonferroni correction, all the $p$-values were significant $(\alpha=0.05)$. The Bonferroni-corrected $p$-values (i.e. p-val ${ }^{*} k$ ) were: $0.13(k=6) ; 0.047(k=7) ; 0.14(k=8) ; 0.10(k=9) ; 0.032(k=10)$. Regional contributions to the cluster centroid of interest show a high level of consistency across the clustering solutions.


Figure S3-3D embedding of FC patterns (different projection angle). Identical results as in Fig. 3 in the main text, displayed using a different perspective of the same 3D scatter plots.

|  | I | II | III | IV | $\mathbf{V}$ | VI | VII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | 0.399 | 0.408 | 0.000 | 0.285 | 0.095 | 0.146 |
| II | 0.082 |  | 0.216 | 0.261 | 0.499 | 0.114 | 0.095 |
| III | 0.184 | 0.006 |  | 0.355 | 0.069 | 0.079 | 0.069 |
| IV | 0.217 | 0.426 | 0.002 |  | 0.247 | 0.077 | 0.041 |
| V | 0.006 | 0.171 | 0.038 | 0.145 |  | 0.366 | 0.380 |
| VI | 0.173 | 0.285 | 0.250 | 0.055 | 0.116 |  | 0.198 |
| VII | 0.042 | 0.494 | 0.040 | 0.176 | 0.397 | 0.388 |  |

[^0]
## Bipartition based on the leading eigenvector of the coherence matrix

In this section, we will show that a bipartition based on the signs of the entries of the leading eigenvector of the coherence matrix is optimal to produce two communities $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$ where coherence is maximised within and minimised between. We will follow very closely the prior works of Newman and colleagues (1, 2).

Let us first define the coherence matrix $B^{1}$ at time $t$ :

$$
B_{i j}(t)=\cos \left(\theta_{i}(t)-\theta_{j}(t)\right)
$$

As it is a symmetric, real valued matrix, the spectral theorem applies and thus, for each time $t$, there exists an eigenbasis $\left\{v_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{N}$, with associated eigenvalues $\left\{\lambda_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{N}$, where $N$ is the number of ROIs. We also define a community indicator variable $s_{i}$ such that:

$$
s_{i}=\left\{\begin{aligned}
1, & \text { if } i \in C_{1} \\
-1, & \text { if } i \in C_{2}
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

The aim is to make the within community coherence higher than the between communities coherence, i.e. group nodes that have similar phases and maximise the difference between the two communities average phases. To formalise this, we define the following quantity:

$$
P=\sum_{i, j}\left(\cos \left(\theta_{i}(t)-\theta_{j}(t)\right)\right)\left(s_{i} s_{j}+1\right) / 2
$$

that we will aim to maximise.

The only difference with Newman's derivation is presence of the constant term $A=\sum_{i, j}\left(\cos \left(\theta_{i}(t)-\theta_{j}(t)\right)\right) / 2$, and we can rewrite $P$ as:

$$
P=\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i, j}\left(\cos \left(\theta_{i}(t)-\theta_{j}(t)\right)\right) s_{i} s_{j}+A,
$$

[^1]and rewriting the first term in matrix notation reads :
$$
P=s^{\prime} B s+A
$$
with ' denoting the transposition operation. We now express $B$ and $s$ in the eigenbasis of $B$ :
$$
B=\sum_{i} \lambda_{i} v_{i} v_{i}^{\prime}, \quad s=\sum_{i} a_{i} v_{i}
$$
and can now rewrite $P$ as :
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
P & =\sum_{i, j, k} a_{i} v_{i}^{\prime} \lambda_{i} v_{j} v_{j}^{\prime} a_{k} v_{k} \\
& =\sum_{i} a_{i}^{2} \lambda_{i} \\
& =\sum_{i}\left(s^{\prime} v_{i}\right)^{2} \lambda_{i}
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

where we used the orthonormality of the eigenvectors and $a_{i}=s^{\prime} v_{i}$.

It is easy to see that $s^{\prime} v_{i}$ will be maximised if :

$$
s_{j}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
1, & \text { if } v_{i}^{j} \geq 0 \\
-1, & \text { if } v_{i}^{j}<0
\end{array}\right.
$$

Finally, we order the eigenvalues such that $\lambda_{1} \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{N}$, thus $P$ is maximised if the signs of $s$ are set based on the eigenvector corresponding to $v_{1}$, the leading eigenvector.

## Proportion of coherence explained by the leading eigenvector

Let us first define the coherence matrix $B^{2}$ at time $t$ :

[^2]$$
B_{i j}(t)=\cos \left(\theta_{i}(t)-\theta_{j}(t)\right)
$$

As it is a symmetric, real valued matrix, the spectral theorem applies and thus, for each time $t$, there exists an eigenbasis $\left\{v_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{N}$, with associated eigenvalues $\left\{\lambda_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{N}$

$$
B(t)=\sum_{i} \lambda_{i} v_{i} v_{i}^{\prime}=\sum_{i} \lambda_{i} P_{i}=V \Lambda V^{\prime}
$$

where $N$ is the number of ROIs, the columns of $V$ are the eigenvectors of $B, \Lambda$ is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues and $P_{i}$ is the projector onto the subspace spanned by $v_{i}$. We order the eigenvalues in decreasing order: $\lambda_{1} \geq \cdots \geq$ $\lambda_{N}$.

Using Principal Component Analysis (PCA), we can quantify the variance explained by each eigenspace of $B$, and thus the proportion of the signal explained by the leading eigenvector.

The entries of the $i^{\text {th }}$ column of $B$ are the similarities between the phase of the ROI $i$ and the others ROIs. We center the phases of $B$ by removing the mean, and refer to quantities related to the centered similiarities with a subscript $c$ :

$$
B_{c}=B-1 B_{m c}{ }^{\prime},
$$

where $B_{m c}$ is the vector of the mean of the columns of $B$. Thus $B_{c}^{\prime} B_{c}$ is the covariance matrix of the centered similarities between each pair of phases. Using standard PCA, we have :

$$
B_{c}^{\prime} B_{c}(i)=V_{c} \Lambda_{c} V_{c}^{\prime} V_{c} \Lambda_{c} V_{c}^{\prime}=V_{c} \Lambda_{c}^{2} V_{c}^{\prime} \Leftrightarrow V_{c}^{\prime} B_{c}^{\prime} B_{c} V_{c}=\Lambda_{c}^{2} .
$$

The ratio $\lambda_{c, i}^{2} / \sum_{j} \lambda_{c, i}^{2}$ is then the proportion of the total variance in the similarities of the phases captured by the $i^{t h}$ eigenspace. As the eigenvalues are ordered in decreasing order, the space associated with $\lambda_{c, 1}$ will explain the most variance, and if $\lambda_{c, 1}^{2}>\sum_{i>1} \lambda_{c, i}^{2}$, it explains most of the variance in the similarities between phases.


SI Figure 1. The leading eigenvector captures most of the variance in the similarities between phases at all time points. Histograms of the ratio of the leading eigenvalue with respect to the sum of all eigenvalues at each time point, for all subjects in each of the 4 experimental conditions. We find consistently that the leading eigenvalue represents more than $50 \%$ of all eigenvalues, thus confirming that $\lambda_{1}^{2}>\sum_{i>1} \lambda_{i}^{2}$.
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[^0]:    Table ST1 - The $p$-values for each entry of the switching matrix shown in Figure 5 of the main text.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ We use $B$ instead of $d F C$, as in the main text, for the readability of the equations.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ We use $B$ instead of $d F C$, as in the main text, for the readability of the equations.

