medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Neuromagnetic speech discrimination responses are associated with reading-related skills in dyslexic and typical readers

Thiede, A.[1], Parkkonen, L.[2,7], Virtala, P.[1], Laasonen, M.[3, 4, 5], Mäkelä, J.P.[6], Kujala, T.[1]

[1] Cognitive Brain Research Unit, Department of Psychology and Logopedics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Helsinki

[2] Department of Neuroscience and Biomedical Engineering, School of Science, Aalto University

[3] Department of Psychology and Logopedics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Helsinki

[4] Phoniatric Unit, Helsinki University Hospital

[5] Department of Psychology and Speech-Language Pathology, University of Turku

[6] BioMag Laboratory, HUS Medical Imaging Center, Helsinki University Central Hospital

[7] Aalto Neuroimaging, Aalto University

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Dyslexia is currently thought to be based on poor phonological processing. We investigated neural speech-sound discrimination in adults with or without dyslexia by recording mismatch fields (MMF) with magnetoencephalogram (MEG) and by determining their association with reading-related skills. We expected weak and atypically lateralized MMFs in dyslexics, and associations between reading-related skills and MMF strength. Responses were recorded to a repeating pseudoword /*ta-ta*/ with occasional changes in vowel identity, vowel duration, or syllable frequency from 43 adults, 21 with confirmed dyslexia. Phonological processing, reading, working memory, and IQ were additionally assessed. Speech-sound changes elicited MMFs and late MMFs in bilateral auditory cortices, with no group differences in source strengths. MMFs and/or late MMFs to vowel identity and duration changes were left-lateralized. Better verbal working memory was associated with stronger left-hemispheric MMF sources across groups, suggesting the relevance of verbal working memory for speech processing. Faster and more accurate technical reading was associated with stronger right-hemispheric MMF sources in dyslexics, which might suggest a right-hemispheric compensatory mechanism for language processing. In conclusion, contrary to prior work, our results did not support deficient speech-sound processing in dyslexia. However, in line with previous studies, we showed left-lateralized MMFs to speech sound changes and their association with reading-related skills, promoting the use of MMFs in investigating reading-related brain processes.

Keywords: dyslexia, magnetoencephalography (MEG), speech processing, mismatch field (MMF), reading skills, verbal working memory

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 Introduction

Developmental dyslexia has been associated with several structural and functional brain abnormalities and significant difficulties in phonological processing [1,2], which may result from poor phonological representations or their accessibility [1,3]. Also working memory, especially verbal short-term memory is impaired in some dyslexics [4,5].

Acoustic–phonological processes pertinent for speech functions can be investigated with mismatch negativity (MMN) with electroencephalography (EEG) or magnetoencephalography [MEG; 6]. MMN is an event-related component elicited by rare changes in a stream of repeating sounds [7], reflecting neural sound discrimination [8]. The primary MMN generators are located in bilateral temporal cortices [e.g., 9], with the left than right generator having a stronger contribution to speech processing [e.g., 10, 11]. MMNs recorded in kindergarten [12] and infancy [13] were shown to be associated with language and reading outcomes at school. Furthermore, intervention of preschoolers at risk of dyslexia increased the MMN concurrently with the improvement of pre-reading skills [14].

MMNs to non-speech and speech-sound changes were shown to be diminished and delayed in children and adults with dyslexia [for reviews, see 15–17], and even in infants and children having a familial risk of dyslexia [for a review, see 18]. However, not all studies were able to consistently show such results [e.g., 19].

Also abnormal MMN lateralization to tone changes in dyslexia has been suggested [20, see, however, 21]. Only few studies have investigated lateralization of speech-elicited MMNs in dyslexia or dyslexia risk, the results being mixed. Left-lateralized MMN to phoneme changes in kindergarten was found to predict good and right-lateralized MMN poor reading skills at school [22]. Some studies report no differences in the lateralization of the speech-elicited MMN between dyslexic and control groups [20,21].

Very few MMN studies on dyslexia have so far used spatially accurate methods to determine response strengths or lateralization. Renvall and Hari [23] reported weaker left-hemispheric mismatch fields (MMFs, used here) or magnetic mismatch negativity (MMNm) to tone frequency changes in adult dyslexic than non-dyslexic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

readers. To our knowledge, the only previous study comparing MMFs in dyslexic and control participants to speech-sound changes (/*ba*/ vs. /*da*/) failed to find group differences [24]. The present study addresses this apparent niche in dyslexia research by utilizing MEG, and improves the source localization with the help of individual head models from anatomical MRIs.

We investigated neural speech discrimination in dyslexia and its association with reading-related skills by recording MMFs to several relevant speech-sound changes (vowel, vowel duration, syllable frequency) in a phonotactically legal pseudoword. Furthermore, we used an extensive neuropsychological test battery tapping different cognitive domains including reading, phonological processing, intelligence quotient (IQ), and working memory. We expected to find diminished and/or delayed MMF source amplitudes in dyslexic participants. Based on previous studies on lateralization, no clear prediction could be made on group laterality differences. Furthermore, better outcomes in reading-related neuropsychological tests were expected to correlate with stronger MMFs.

2 Material and Methods

2.1 Participants

Forty-three healthy Finnish participants (21 dyslexics, 22 controls) aged 19–45 years without history of neurological diseases participated in the study. The inclusion criteria for the dyslexic group were a diagnostic dyslexia statement (from a psychologist, special education teacher or similar), or a history of reading difficulties in childhood (see below) combined with below-norm performance in either speed or accuracy [below one standard deviation from age-matched standardized control data, see 2] in two or more reading subtests [word list reading, pseudoword list reading, text reading, 25]. Inclusion criteria for control participants were no report of dyslexia or co-occurring language disorders confirmed by within-norm performance in speed and accuracy in at least two reading subtests. General exclusion criteria were attention deficit disorders (see below),

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

performance IQ below 80, metal in the body, and an individualized school curriculum. Participants gave their written informed consent, and all procedures employed conformed to the Declaration of Helsinki. The Coordinating Ethics Committee (Hospital District of Helsinki and Uusimaa) approved the study protocol. The study has been pre-registered in ClinicalTrials.org (ID NCT02622360).

2.2 Questionnaires and neuropsychological test battery

All participants filled questionnaires before brain imaging measurements including Finnish versions of the adult reading history questionnaire [ARHQ; 26] and the adult ADHD self-report scale [ASRS; 27], paired with interviews. The neuropsychological tests included phonological processing [accuracy in Pig Latin, 25,span length in Nonword span, 28,speed in second trial of Rapid alternate stimulus naming RAN, 29], technical reading [speed and accuracy in word list reading and pseudoword list reading, 25], intelligence [verbal, performance and full IQ calculated from subtests Similarities and Vocabulary, Block design and Matrix reasoning, and all four, respectively, in the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale III, 30] and working memory [visual working memory (Visual Series) and verbal working memory (Letter-Number Series subtest) in Wechsler Memory Scale III, WMS-III, 31]. Composite scores were computed for phonological processing and technical reading by converting the raw scores of all subtests to *z*-scores and averaging them, and for working memory functions by following the procedure advised in WMS-III.

The control group had more education than the dyslexic group and outperformed the dyslexic group in technical reading, phonological processing, working memory, and verbal and performance IQ (Table 1, Figure S 1). As dyslexic readers are known to underperform in verbal, but not necessarily in performance IQ [5], the full IQ was taken into account in the correlation analysis as a control variable, and analyses including group comparisons were repeated with groups matched for performance IQ (see Section 2.6).

2.3 Stimuli

The repetitive “standard” stimulus was a Finnish 300-ms-long pseudoword /*ta-ta*/ (75.3%) with the stress on the first syllable. Occasional “deviant” stimuli (8.3% of each type) included a change in vowel duration (lengthening

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of second /*a*/ from 71 to 158 ms), vowel identity (adding /*o*/ to the second syllable from a natural recording of /*ta-to*/, pitch-controlled), or syllable frequency (shifting the F0 of the second syllable from 175 to 225 Hz) in the second syllable (edited with Adobe Audition CS6, 5.0, Build 708 and Praat 5.4.01). Stimuli were presented pseudo-randomly (at least one standard always following a deviant) in two ≈12.6 min recording blocks, each containing 946 stimuli and starting with five standard stimuli. The stimulus-onset asynchrony (SOA) was 800±50 ms (randomly alternating between 750, 760, 770, …, 840, 850 ms).

The stimuli were presented with Presentation Software (Neurobehavioural Systems Ltd., Berkeley, CA, USA) binaurally via plastic tubes and silicon earphones at a comfortable level (≈70–80 dB SPL). During stimulation, participants were sitting, instructed to keep the head still and to attend to a silenced movie projected (Panasonic PT-D7500E; Panasonic, Kadoma, Osaka, Japan) to a back-projection screen (MEGIN Oy, Helsinki, Finland) located 150 cm from the participant's head.

2.4 MEG/EEG and MRI procedure

MEG/EEG was recorded using a 306-channel Elekta Neuromag TRIUX (MEGIN Oy, Helsinki, Finland) whole-head MEG system (sampling rate 1 kHz and pass-band 0.03–330 Hz) in a magnetically shielded room (Euroshield/ETS Lindgren Oy, Eura, Finland) in BioMag Laboratory in Helsinki University Central Hospital (duration 2–3 h). Prior to the measurement, the positions of five head position indicator (HPI) coils and additional head surface points (EEG electrodes) were determined in relation to the nasion and both preauricular points with an Isotrak 3D-digitizer (Polhemus Inc., Colchester, USA). The head position with respect to the MEG sensor array was continuously monitored. Vertical and horizontal electro-oculograms (EOG) were recorded.

The anatomical T1-weighted images (MPRAGE) were acquired on a 3T MAGNETOM Skyra whole-body MRI scanner (Siemens Healthcare, Erlangen, Germany) with a 32-channel head coil at AMI centre of Aalto Neuroimaging (duration 30 min), Aalto University (176 slices, slice thickness 1 mm, voxel size 1 mm x 1 mm x 1 mm, field of view 256 mm x 256 mm). The images were checked for incidental findings by a physician.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2.5 Source modeling

Preprocessed MEG and MRI data (MEG: removal of artefacts, filtering, epoching; MRI: standard procedure, see Supplementary Methods, Data preprocessing and code at https://github.com/athiede13/neural_sources) were coregistered, individual generators computed in a cortically-constrained source space and mimimum-norm source estimates (MNE) computed and morphed to an average brain template. Functional regions of interest (ROI) were selected based on the most consistent activity across participants in anatomical regions comprising the auditory cortices. Maximum MMF source amplitudes and latencies were extracted for statistical analysis within selected time windows around group average peak latencies (300–400 ms for MMF, 450–650 ms for late MMF) within the ROI in both hemispheres. For a full description of the source modeling, see Supplementary Methods, Source modeling.

2.6 Statistical analysis

SPSS version 25.0.0.1 (IBM, Armonk, New York, USA), R [32] and RStudio version 1.1.453 [33] were used. Group and laterality effects and their interactions on MMF source amplitudes and latencies were tested for significance with one-sample *t*-tests and analyzed with two-way repeated-measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with group (control, dyslexic) as between-subjects factor and laterality (left, right) as within-subjects factor, separately for the three deviants and the two time windows.

Partial Pearson correlations were computed between MMF source amplitudes and neuropsychological test scores, controlling for the effect of full IQ. In order to reduce the amount of tests, correlations were analyzed in three steps both separately for the two groups and across groups; (1) MMF source amplitudes at two hemispheres averaged across all deviants with three neuropsychological composite scores, if significant, then (2) separately for MMFs to each deviant, if significant, then (3) separately for each subcomponent of the neuropsychological composite scores. Despite a potential risk of circular inference [34], this stepwise procedure was chosen to output the most meaningful associations from a neuroscientific and neuropsychological

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

perspective. A correction for multiple comparisons is addressed here unlike in many brain-behavior correlational studies [35].

Lateralization indices (LI) for the MMF source amplitudes were computed as LI = (left –right)/(left + right). An LI ≤ –0.20 was considered as right-dominance, LI ≥ 0.20 as left-dominance, and LI between those values as bilateral [36]. LI values were compared between groups with independent-samples *t*-tests.

To ensure that the IQ difference would not explain the results, statistical analyses comparing groups were repeated for a sample in which the groups were matched for performance IQ (N = 37, 19 in control group, 18 in dyslexic group). The profile of the matched groups did not otherwise differ from the original sample.

3 Results

MEG source estimates in both groups (Figure 1) revealed that all speech-sound changes elicited MMFs in the auditory cortices. Peak activations were located in the left middle temporal cortex (BA21 and BA22) and the right superior temporal cortex (BA41 and BA22). The source waveform indicated two responses, referred to as MMF and late MMF. Both responses were statistically significantly larger than zero for both groups and for all deviants (for all $p < .002$).

A significant laterality main effect was found for the MMF source amplitudes to the vowel deviant, indicating larger left- than right-hemispheric MMFs ($F(1,41) = 19.12$, $p = 8.2*10^{-5}$, $p_{adj} = 4.9*10^{-4}$, mean difference MD = 14 pAm). For the late MMF source amplitudes, significant laterality main effects were found for duration ($F(1,41) = 10.05$, $p = .003$, $p_{adj} = .018$, MD = 9 pAm) and vowel deviants ($F(1,41) = 11.62$, $p = .001$, $p_{adj} = .006$, MD = 11 pAm), indicating larger late MMFs in the left than right hemispheres. A significant laterality main effect for the late duration MMF latency was found, with a faster right- than left-hemispheric response ($F(1,41) = 4.12$, $p = .049$, however, not significant after Bonferroni-correction, $p_{adj} = .294$, MD = 16 ms). Full ANOVA statistics are reported in in Table S 1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Lateralization indices (LIs) indicate that the MMF was left-lateralized for the frequency deviant in the control (con) group (mean LI 0.21, SD 0.63) and bilateral in the dyslexic (dys) group (0.08, 0.36). Both groups had bilateral MMFs for the duration deviant (con: 0.05, 0.34; dys: -0.03, 0.33) and left-lateralized MMF for the vowel deviant (con: 0.20, 0.43; dys: 0.23, 0.38). LIs for the late MMF were consistent across groups. It was right-lateralized for the frequency deviant (con: -0.53, 9.02; dys: -1.83, 7.69) and left-lateralized for duration (con: 1.45, 6.12; dys: 0.29, 1.69) and vowel (con: 0.52, 1.63; dys: 0.88, 2.38) deviants. LIs for MMF and late MMF did not significantly differ between the groups ($p > .40$).

Source amplitudes of MMF and late MMF correlated with neuropsychological test scores (Figure 2, for complete statistics, see Table S 2). Larger MMF source amplitudes in the left hemisphere were weakly correlated with better working memory skills across all deviants and across both groups ($r = 0.24$, $p_{adj} = .033$). Separate correlation tests for the deviants revealed a moderate correlation across groups for the left duration MMF with working memory skills ($r = 0.38$, $p_{adj} = .036$). Separate working memory subtest analysis (visual and verbal) only showed a significant moderate correlation between the left duration MMF and the verbal component ($r = 0.45$, $p_{adj} = .006$). Within the control group, left MMFs across all deviants correlated moderately with working memory skills ($r = 0.36$, $p_{adj} = .020$). In separate tests for the deviants, however, none remained significant. Within the dyslexic group, larger right MMFs ($r = 0.35$, $p_{adj} = .039$) and right late MMFs ($r = 0.41$, $p_{adj} = .008$) across all deviants correlated moderately strongly with better technical reading skills. In separate tests for the deviants, however, none remained significant.

The reported ANOVA results remained similar when repeating the analyses for performance-IQ-matched subsamples of control and dyslexic groups (Table S 3), and LIs did not differ significantly between groups ($p > .40$).

4 Discussion

Our goals were to determine whether neural speech-sound discrimination is deficient or abnormally lateralized in adult dyslexics, and whether the neural responses correlate with reading-related skills. This is the first time, to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

our knowledge, that speech discrimination in dyslexic adults was evaluated with source estimates in the individual brain space. No group differences were found for the two responses of the MMF source amplitudes or latencies to vowel, vowel duration, or syllable frequency changes, contrary to our hypothesis. Previous studies have mostly shown diminished MMNs to speech-sound changes in dyslexia or dyslexia risk [17]. However, to our knowledge, the only one previous study comparing MMFs in dyslexic and control participants to speech-sound changes (/*ba*/ vs /*da*/) also failed to find group differences [24]. The authors suggested that this could have resulted from a too large stimulus difference that was too easy to discriminate for their dyslexic children. This is consistent with some previous observations showing diminished MMNs in dyslexia for small but not for large stimulus differences [e.g., 37]. The same could be the core reason for insignificant MMF source strength differences between groups in the present study, too, and future studies should aim to find the aspects of speech processing that are most sensitive to dyslexia.

In our previous study [38] utilizing identical stimuli and a paradigm as the current one, we found absent and atypical MMNs in infants at risk for dyslexia. This is quite a robust finding, since only ≈40–70% of children at risk of dyslexia become reading impaired [39]. Those together with the current results suggest that neurobiological abnormalities in dyslexia are more disruptive in infancy/childhood than in adulthood [see also, e.g., 40, reporting diminished MMNs to a range of speech stimuli in at-risk children]. Possibly, speech development is originally delayed in dyslexia but speech processes become more normal by adulthood [41].

Besides diminished MMN amplitudes, also atypical lateralization has been reported in some studies on dyslexia [e.g., 20,23,42] or poor reading outcome [12]. However, those results were not corroborated by our current findings that used spatially accurate source spaces for the estimation of neural sources from individual MRIs. The results on laterality effects in dyslexia and related language impairments are quite mixed [see, e.g., 43, reporting no laterality abnormalities in a large group of language impaired]. Therefore, to illuminate the laterality issue in dyslexia, larger sample sizes and careful phenotyping is needed.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Our MMF lateralization analyses revealed in both groups stronger MMFs in the left than right hemisphere to vowel deviants and late MMFs to duration and vowel deviants, in line with previous studies suggesting left-hemispheric lateralization of speech-elicited MMFs [e.g., 10,11]. Vowel duration changes make phonological distinctions in Finnish language [11,44], which explains the dominant use of the left hemisphere also for the duration deviants. While the faster elicited late MMF to duration deviant in the right than left hemisphere is somewhat in contrast with the opposite laterality finding for the source strengths, we are hesitant to discuss it further as it did not remain significant after correction for multiple comparisons.

Furthermore, the LIs demonstrated left-dominant frequency discrimination in controls only. This is consistent with an earlier finding of left-dominant processing of frequency in speech stimuli [45], suggesting that frequency discrimination is linguistically relevant in Finnish language [46]. As this was not seen in dyslexics, it is possible that at group level, only the typically reading controls could extract linguistically relevant information from the frequency changes.

We also aimed to determine whether reading-related measures are associated with MMF source strengths. We found that larger MMF source amplitudes in the left hemisphere were associated with better working memory skills across both groups, suggesting the relevance of efficient working memory for speech processing. *Post-hoc* analyses showed that the association was mainly driven by the MMF to the duration deviant and the verbal component of working memory. Studies associating verbal working memory and MMN are rare and yielded mixed results, one suggesting a diminished MMN predicting a working memory impairment [47], another one not confirming such connection [48], promoting further research on the topic. For technical reading, we found associations only in the dyslexic group: Larger right-hemispheric MMFs and late MMFs correlated with better skills. However, it is notable that lack of this association in the control group could result from the lack of variation in the technical reading scores due to a ceiling effect (see Figure S 1). Previously, increased left-hemispheric MMN was associated with better word reading skills in children [12]. The correlation between stronger right-hemispheric MMF sources and reading skills in our dyslexic group might suggest that some

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

dyslexics have developed a right-hemispheric compensatory mechanism for speech processing that is also beneficial for their reading skills [49].

To summarize, our results support the suggestion of left-hemispheric lateralization of the MMF to speech-sound changes but they failed to show abnormalities in dyslexics' neural speech-sound discrimination as evidenced by MMF strengths, latency, or lateralization. However, we found correlations between the MMFs to speech-sound changes and reading-related skills, promoting the use of MMFs in investigating reading-related brain processes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgements

The authors thank all participants that were involved in this study as well as all research assistants for their help with data acquisition and psychological testing, Marita Kattelus for her help with MRI acquisition, and the physician for examining the MRIs for incidental findings. The project was funded by Jane and Aatos Erkko foundation, Academy of Finland [project numbers 2764141 and 316970], KELA (The Finnish Social Insurance Institution), and University of Helsinki MRI measurement support. The first author was supported by the University of Helsinki Research Foundation and Arvo and Lea Ylppö foundation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

[1] F. Ramus, Dyslexia. Talk of two theories., Nature. 412 (2001) 393–395. https://doi.org/10.1111/iwj.12024.

[2] M. Laasonen, M. Lehtinen, S. Leppämäki, P. Tani, L. Hokkanen, Project DyAdd: Phonological processing, reading, spelling, and arithmetic in adults with dyslexia or ADHD, J. Learn. Disabil. 43 (2010) 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219409335216.

[3] F. Ramus, C.R. Marshall, S. Rosen, H.K.J. van der Lely, Phonological deficits in specific language impairment and developmental dyslexia: towards a multidimensional model, Brain. 136 (2013) 630–645. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/aws356.

[4] K. Banai, M. Ahissar, Poor frequency discrimination probes dyslexics with particularly impaired working memory, Audiol. Neuro-Otology. 9 (2004) 328–340. https://doi.org/10.1159/000081282.

[5] M. Laasonen, S. Leppämäki, P. Tani, L. Hokkanen, Adult Dyslexia and Attention Deficit Disorder in Finland—Project DyAdd, J. Learn. Disabil. 42 (2009) 511–527. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219409345013.

[6] R. Näätänen, The perception of speech sounds by the human brain as reflected by the mismatch negativity (MMN) and its magnetic equivalent (MMNm)., Psychophysiology. 38 (2001) 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8986.3810001.

[7] R. Näätänen, A.W.K. Gaillard, S. Mäntysalo, Early selective-attention effect on evoked potential reinterpreted, Acta Psychol. (Amst). 42 (1978) 313–329. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918(78)90006-9.

[8] T. Kujala, R. Näätänen, The adaptive brain: A neurophysiological perspective, Prog. Neurobiol. 91 (2010) 55–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pneurobio.2010.01.006.

[9] K. Alho, Cerebral generators of mismatch negativity (MMN) and its magnetic counterpart (MMNM) elicited by sound changes, Ear Hear. 16 (1995) 38–51. https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-199502000-00004.

[10] Y. Shtyrov, T. Kujala, S. Palva, R.J. Ilmoniemi, R. Näätänen, Discrimination of Speech and of Complex

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Nonspeech Sounds of Different Temporal Structure in the Left and Right Cerebral Hemispheres, Neuroimage. 12 (2000) 657–663. https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2000.0646.

[11] R. Näätänen, A. Lehtokoski, M. Lennes, M. Cheour, M. Huotilainen, A. Iivonen, M. Vainio, P. Alku, R.J. Ilmoniemi, A. Luuk, J. Allik, J. Sinkkonen, K. Alho, Language-specific phoneme representations revealed by electric and magnetic brain responses, Nature. 385 (1997) 432–434. https://doi.org/10.1038/385432a0.

[12] U. Maurer, K. Bucher, S. Brem, R. Benz, F. Kranz, E. Schulz, S. van der Mark, H.C. Steinhausen, D. Brandeis, Neurophysiology in Preschool Improves Behavioral Prediction of Reading Ability Throughout Primary School, Biol. Psychiatry. 66 (2009) 341–348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.02.031.

[13] T.L. Van Zuijen, A. Plakas, B.A.M. Maassen, N.M. Maurits, A. Van der Leij, Infant ERPs separate children at risk of dyslexia who become good readers from those who become poor readers, Dev. Sci. 16 (2013) 554–563. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12049.

[14] R. Lovio, A. Halttunen, H. Lyytinen, R. Näätänen, T. Kujala, Reading skill and neural processing accuracy improvement after a 3-hour intervention in preschoolers with difficulties in reading-related skills, Brain Res. 1448 (2012) 42–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2012.01.071.

[15] T. Kujala, R. Näätänen, The mismatch negativity in evaluating central auditory dysfunction in dyslexia, Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev. 25 (2001) 535–543. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7634(01)00032-X.

[16] J.A. Hämäläinen, H.K. Salminen, P.H.T.T. Leppänen, Basic Auditory Processing Deficits in Dyslexia, J. Learn. Disabil. 46 (2013) 413–427. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219411436213.

[17] G. Schulte-Körne, J. Bruder, Clinical neurophysiology of visual and auditory processing in dyslexia: A review, Clin. Neurophysiol. 121 (2010) 1794–1809. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2010.04.028.

[18] O. Ozernov-Palchik, N. Gaab, Tackling the 'dyslexia paradox': reading brain and behavior for early markers of developmental dyslexia, Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Cogn. Sci. 7 (2016) 156–176. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1383.

[19] S. Corbera, C. Escera, J. Artigas, Impaired duration mismatch negativity in developmental dyslexia.,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Neuroreport. 17 (2006) 1051–5. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.wnr.0000221846.43126.a6.

[20] C. Sebastian, I. Yasin, Speech versus tone processing in compensated dyslexia: Discrimination and lateralization with a dichotic mismatch negativity (MMN) paradigm, Int. J. Psychophysiol. 70 (2008) 115–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2008.08.004.

[21] G. Schulte-Körne, W. Deimel, J. Bartling, H. Remschmidt, Speech perception deficit in dyslexic adults as measured by mismatch negativity (MMN), Int. J. Psychophysiol. 40 (2001) 77–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8760(00)00152-5.

[22] U. Maurer, K. Bucher, S. Brem, D. Brandeis, Altered responses to tone and phoneme mismatch in kindergartners at familial dyslexia risk., Neuroreport. 14 (2003) 2245–2250. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001756-200312020-00022.

[23] H. Renvall, R. Hari, Diminished auditory mismatch fields in dyslexic adults, Ann. Neurol. 53 (2003) 551–557. https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.10504.

[24] I. Paul, C. Bott, S. Heim, C. Wienbruch, T.R. Elbert, Phonological but not auditory discrimination is impaired in dyslexia, Eur. J. Neurosci. 24 (2006) 2945–2953. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2006.05153.x.

[25] J. Nevala, L. Kairaluoma, T. Ahonen, M. Aro, L. Holopainen, Lukemis-ja kirjoittamistaitojen yksilötestistö nuorille ja aikuisille, Niilo Mäki Instituutti, Jyväskylä, 2006.

[26] M. Laasonen, J. Väre, H. Oksanen-Hennah, S. Leppämäki, P. Tani, H. Harno, L. Hokkanen, E. Pothos, A. Cleeremans, Project DyAdd: Implicit learning in adult dyslexia and ADHD, Ann. Dyslexia. 64 (2014) 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-013-0083-y.

[27] R. Kessler, L. Adler, M. Ames, O. Demler, S. Faraone, E. Hiripi, H. Mj, R. Jin, K. Secnik, T. Spencer, U. Tb, The World Health Organization Adult ADHD Self-Re ... [Psych ... The World Health Organization Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale (ASRS): a short screening scale for use in the general population ., Psychol. Med. 9 (2005) 245–256.

[28] M. Laasonen, Temporal acuity in developmental dyslexia across the life span: Tactile, auditory, visual, and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

crossmodal estimations, Dissertation, University of Helsinki, 2002.

[29] M. Wolf, Rapid alternating stimulus naming in the developmental dyslexias., Brain Lang. 27 (1986) 360–79.

[30] D. Wechsler, Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (Third Edition), III, San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation. Helsinki: Psykologien kustannus Oy., 2005.

[31] D. Wechsler, The Wechsler Memory Scale (Third Edition), San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation. Helsinki: Psykologien kustannus Oy., 2008.

[32] R Core Team, R: A language and environment for statistical computing, (2018).

[33] RStudio Team, RStudio: Integrated Development for R, (2016).

[34] N. Kriegeskorte, W.K. Simmons, P.S. Bellgowan, C.I. Baker, Circular analysis in systems neuroscience: The dangers of double dipping, Nat. Neurosci. 12 (2009) 535–540. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2303.

[35] G.A. Rousselet, C.R. Pernet, Improving standards in brain-behavior correlation analyses, Front. Hum. Neurosci. 6 (2012). https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00119.

[36] J.H. Han, A. Dimitrijevic, Acoustic change responses to amplitude modulation: A method to quantify cortical temporal processing and hemispheric asymmetry, Front. Neurosci. 9 (2015) 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2015.00038.

[37] T. Baldeweg, A. Richardson, S. Watkins, C. Foale, J. Gruzelier, Impaired auditory frequency discrimination in dyslexia detected with mismatch evoked potentials., Ann. Neurol. 45 (1999) 495–503.

[38] A. Thiede, P. Virtala, I. Ala-Kurikka, E. Partanen, M. Huotilainen, K. Mikkola, P.H.T. Leppänen, T. Kujala, An extensive pattern of atypical neural speech-sound discrimination in newborns at risk of dyslexia, Clin. Neurophysiol. 130 (2019) 634–646. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2019.01.019.

[39] J.C. DeFries, M. Alarcón, Genetics of specific reading disability, Ment. Retard. Dev. Disabil. Res. Rev. 2 (1996) 39–47. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2779(1996)2:1<39::AID-MRDD7>3.0.CO;2-S.

[40] R. Lovio, R. Näätänen, T. Kujala, Abnormal pattern of cortical speech feature discrimination in 6-year-old

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

children at risk for dyslexia, Brain Res. 1335 (2010) 53–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2010.03.097.

[41] A.M. Galaburda, J. LoTurco, F. Ramus, R.H. Fitch, G.D. Rosen, From genes to behavior in developmental dyslexia, Nat. Neurosci. 9 (2006) 1213–1217. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1772.

[42] T. Kujala, S. Belitz, M. Tervaniemi, R. Näätänen, Auditory sensory memory disorder in dyslexic adults as indexed by the mismatch negativity, Eur. J. Neurosci. 17 (2003) 1323–1327. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1460-9568.2003.02559.x.

[43] A.C. Wilson, D.V.M.M. Bishop, Resounding failure to replicate links between developmental language disorder and cerebral lateralisation, PeerJ. 2018 (2018). https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4217.

[44] U. Kirmse, S. Ylinen, M. Tervaniemi, M. Vainio, E. Schröger, T. Jacobsen, Modulation of the mismatch negativity (MMN) to vowel duration changes in native speakers of Finnish and German as a result of language experience, Int. J. Psychophysiol. (2008). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2007.10.012.

[45] A. Sorokin, P. Alku, T. Kujala, Change and novelty detection in speech and non-speech sound streams, Brain Res. 1327 (2010) 77–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2010.02.052.

[46] J. Järvikivi, M. Vainio, D. Aalto, Real-time correlates of phonological quantity reveal unity of tonal and non-tonal languages, PLoS One. 5 (2010) 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0012603.

[47] J. Ahveninen, I.P. Jaaskelainen, E. Pekkonen, A. Hallberg, M. Hietanen, R. Makela, R. Naatanen, P. Sillanaukee, Suppression of mismatch negativity by backward masking predicts impaired working-memory performance in alcoholics, Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res. 23 (1999) 1507–1514. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.1999.tb04674.x.

[48] G.A. Light, N.R. Swerdlow, D.L. Braff, Preattentive sensory processing as indexed by the MMN and P3a brain responses is associated with cognitive and psychosocial functioning in healthy adults, J. Cogn. Neurosci. 19 (2007) 1624–1632. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2007.19.10.1624.

[49] G.F. Eden, K.M. Jones, K. Cappell, L. Gareau, F.B. Wood, T.A. Zeffiro, N.A.E. Dietz, J.A. Agnew, D.L. Flowers,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Neural changes following remediation in adult developmental dyslexia, Neuron. (2004). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2004.10.019.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Tables

Table 1. Demographic and neuropsychological characterization of the study groups.

Variable	CON (N=22)	DYS (N=21)	comparison		
			test statistic	*p*	95% confidence interval
demographic					
gender [f/m]	12/10	12/9	$X^2(1) = 0$	1	
age [years]	29.9 (5.9)	31.0 (8.6)	$t(35) = -0.48$	.633	[-5.68 3.50]
education [years]	17.0 (2.5)	14.7 (2.5)	$t(40) = 3.06$	**.004	[0.80 3.93]
music education# [years]	0.25 (5.5)	0.0 (2.0)	W = 283.5	.152	
neuropsychological					
full IQ	117.0 (7.0)	104.0 (9.4)	t(37) = 5.18	***$8.0*10^{-6}$	[8.00 18.26]
verbal IQ#	115.0 (10.0)	100.0 (22.0)	W = 390.5	***$1.0*10^{-4}$	
performance IQ	120.0 (10.0)	110.0 (12.3)	t(39) = 3.13	**.003	[3.77 17.61]
phonological processing	0.49 (0.42)	-0.33 (0.60)	t(36) = 5.18	***$8.9*10^{-6}$	[0.50 1.14]
technical reading#	0.61 (0.17)	-0.34 (0.82)	W = 461	***$3.8*10^{-12}$	
working memory	24.3 (4.8)	19.8 (5.0)	t(41) = 3.01	**.004	[1.49 7.53]

Notes. Mean and standard deviation (in brackets) for normally-distributed variables (Shapiro-Wilk test). Group comparison with independent-samples t-test. Median and interquartile range (in brackets) for non-normally-distributed variables, indicated by the hash sign#. Group comparison with Wilcoxon Rank Sum W-test. Test statistics, degrees of freedom (in brackets), significance levels *p*, and 95% confidence intervals are reported. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$. CON – control group, DYS – dyslexic group.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figures



Figure 1. Neural sources of MMF and late MMF to frequency, duration, and vowel changes as MNE's on lateral brain surfaces (top and bottom panel), and extracted ROI time courses (middle panel). Grey shaded areas in the middle panel depict the time windows of interest (first – MMF, second – late MMF).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Significant partial Pearson correlations after Bonferroni correction of MMF and late MMF source amplitudes with working memory and technical reading skills after regressing out FIQ. Scatter plots with linear regression lines (black – across both groups, blue – control group, yellow – dyslexic group) are shown for both all deviants pooled together (upper left and both bottom panels) and separately for one deviant (upper middle and right panels). Number series is one subcomponent of the working memory composite score (upper right panel). One outlier (dyslexic) was removed, because of the technical reading score being below three interquartile ranges. work mem – working memory, tech read – technical reading, dur - duration, lh – left hemisphere amplitude, rh – right hemisphere amplitude

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.29.19016113; this version posted January 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

CRediT author statement

Thiede, A.: Conceptualization, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Visualization, Project administration, Funding acquisition. **Parkkonen, L.**: Resources, Formal analysis, Writing - Review & Editing. **Virtala, P.**: Conceptualization, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition. **Laasonen, M.**: Conceptualization, Writing - Review & Editing. **Mäkelä, J.P.**: Resources, Writing - Review & Editing. **Kujala, T.**: Conceptualization, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition.


Frequency
Duration
Vowel
lh
rh
lh
rh
lh
rh
MMF
late MMF
Source amplitude [pAm]
Time [ms]
10
20
30
source amplitude [pAm]
control group
dyslexic group


Working memory
MMF lh | FIQ [pAm]
work mem | FIQ [std]
MMF dur lh | FIQ [pAm]
work mem | FIQ [std]
MMF dur lh | FIQ [pAm]
number series | FIQ [std]
Technical reading
MMF rh | FIQ [pAm]
tech read | FIQ [z]
late MMF rh | FIQ [pAm]
tech read | FIQ [z]
group
con
dys