# 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] Department of Phoniatrics, 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

[*] Corresponding author. Address: Cognitive Brain Research Unit, Faculty of Medicine, University of Helsinki, P.O. box 21, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland. E-mail: anja.thiede@helsinki.fi

Version of 14.1.2020

## Highlights

- Speech-sound changes elicit comparable mismatch fields in dyslexics and controls.
- Mismatch fields (MMFs) to vowel identity and duration changes are left-lateralized.
- Stronger left MMFs are associated with better verbal working memory across groups.
- Stronger right MMFs are associated with better technical reading in dyslexics.
- Low-level neural speech discrimination is associated with reading-related skills.

## Abstract

Dyslexia is thought to result from poor phonological processing. We investigated neuromagnetic speech discrimination in dyslexic and typical readers with mismatch fields (MMF) and determined the associations between MMFs and reading-related skills. We expected weak and atypically lateralized MMFs in dyslexic readers, and associations between reading-related skills and MMF strength. MMFs were recorded to a repeating pseudoword /*ta-ta*/ with occasional changes in vowel identity, duration, or syllable frequency from 43 adults, 21 with confirmed dyslexia. Speech-sound changes elicited MMFs in bilateral auditory cortices, with no group differences in source strengths. MMFs to vowel identity and duration changes were left-lateralized. Better verbal working memory was associated with stronger left-hemispheric MMFs across groups, suggesting the relevance of verbal working memory for speech processing. Better technical reading was associated with stronger right-hemispheric MMFs in dyslexic readers, suggesting a right-hemispheric compensatory mechanism for language processing. In conclusion, contrary to prior work, our results did not support deficient speech discrimination in dyslexia. However, in line with previous studies, we observed left-lateralized MMFs to vowel identity and duration changes, and associations of MMFs with reading-related skills, highlighting the connection between neural speech processing and reading and 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

# 1 Introduction

Developmental dyslexia has been associated with several structural and functional brain abnormalities and significant difficulties in phonological processing (Laasonen, Lehtinen, Leppämäki, Tani, & Hokkanen, 2010; Ramus, 2001; Ramus, Altarelli, Jednoróg, Zhao, & Scotto di Covella, 2018), which may result from poor phonological representations or their accessibility (Ramus, 2001; Ramus, Marshall, Rosen, & van der Lely, 2013). Also working memory, especially verbal short-term memory is impaired in at least some dyslexic readers (Banai & Ahissar, 2004; Laasonen, Leppämäki, Tani, & Hokkanen, 2009).

Acoustic–phonological processes pertinent for speech functions can be investigated with mismatch negativity (MMN) with electroencephalography (EEG) or magnetoencephalography (MEG; Näätänen, 2001). MMN is an event-related component elicited by rare changes in a stream of repeating sounds (Näätänen, Gaillard, & Mäntysalo, 1978), reflecting neural sound discrimination (Kujala & Näätänen, 2010). The primary MMN generators are located in bilateral temporal cortices (e.g., Alho, 1995), with the left generator having a stronger contribution to speech processing than the right one (e.g., Näätänen et al., 1997; Shtyrov, Kujala, Palva, Ilmoniemi, & Näätänen, 2000).

Larger MMN amplitudes to changes in speech sounds have been associated with better phoneme processing skills in typically developing prereaders (Linnavalli, Putkinen, Huotilainen, & Tervaniemi, 2017) and better nonword scores in children with auditory processing disorder (Sharma et al., 2006). MMNs can also predict future development, as shown by MMNs recorded to speech sounds in kindergarten (Maurer et al., 2009) and in infancy (Van Zuijen, Plakas, Maassen, Maurits, & Van der Leij, 2013) that are associated with language and reading outcomes at school. Furthermore, grapheme-phoneme mapping intervention of preschoolers at risk of dyslexia increased the MMN to vowel changes in syllables concurrently with the improvement of pre-reading skills (Lovio, Halttunen, Lyytinen, Näätänen, & Kujala, 2012). These results suggest that there is an association between MMN and language and reading skills. In line with this, MMNs to speech-sound and non-speech sound changes were shown to be diminished and delayed in children and adults with

dyslexia (for reviews, see Hämäläinen, Salminen, & Leppänen, 2013; Kujala & Näätänen, 2001; Schulte-Körne & Bruder, 2010), and even in infants and children having a familial risk of dyslexia (Benasich et al., 2006; Leppänen et al., 2002; Lovio, Näätänen, & Kujala, 2010; Thiede et al., 2019; van Leeuwen et al., 2008; for a review, see Ozernov-Palchik & Gaab, 2016). Not all studies, however, were able to consistently show such results (Corbera, Escera, & Artigas, 2006; Hämäläinen, Leppänen, Guttorm, & Lyytinen, 2008; Meng et al., 2005; Schulte-Körne, Deimel, Bartling, & Remschmidt, 1998), suggesting that some types of changes or change magnitudes might not be sensitive enough to probe the neural auditory/speech deficit in dyslexia.

Also abnormal MMN lateralization to tone changes in dyslexia has been found (Kujala, Belitz, Tervaniemi, & Näätänen, 2003; Kujala et al., 2000; Renvall & Hari, 2003; Sebastian & Yasin, 2008; see, however, Kujala, Lovio, Lepistö, Laasonen, & Näätänen, 2006; Schulte-Körne, Deimel, Bartling, & Remschmidt, 1999, 2001; Sharma et al., 2006). Only few studies have investigated lateralization of speech-elicited MMNs in dyslexia or at risk of dyslexia, 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 (Maurer, Bucher, Brem, & Brandeis, 2003). Some studies report no differences in the lateralization of the speech-elicited MMN between dyslexic and control groups (Schulte-Körne et al., 2001; Sebastian & Yasin, 2008).

Very few MMN studies on dyslexia have so far used spatially accurate methods to determine response strengths or lateralization. Renvall and Hari (2003) reported weaker left-hemispheric mismatch fields (MMFs, used here) or magnetic mismatch negativity (MMNm) to tone frequency changes in adult dyslexic compared to non-dyslexic 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 (Paul, Bott, Heim, Wienbruch, & Elbert, 2006). The present study addresses this apparent niche in dyslexia research by utilizing MEG with improved source localization applying 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. To our knowledge, this is the first study determining neural sources of phonetic discrimination in adults with dyslexia.

# 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 2.2) combined with below-norm performance in either speed or accuracy (below one standard deviation from age-matched standardized control data, see Laasonen et al., 2010) in two or more reading subtests (word list reading, pseudoword list reading, text reading, Nevala, Kairaluoma, Ahonen, Aro, & Holopainen, 2006). 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 2.2), 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; Laasonen et al., 2014) and The Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale (ASRS; Kessler et al., 2005), paired with interviews. The neuropsychological tests included domains of phonological processing (span length in Nonword span, Laasonen, 2002; accuracy in Pig Latin, Nevala et al., 2006; speed in the second trial of Rapid Alternate Stimulus Naming RAN, Wolf, 1986), technical reading (speed and accuracy in word list reading and pseudoword list reading, Nevala et al., 2006), intelligence (verbal, performance, and full IQ calculated from subtests Similarities and Vocabulary, Block design and Matrix reasoning, and across all four, respectively, in the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale III, Wechsler, 2005) and working memory (visual working memory [Visual Series] and verbal working memory [Letter-Number Series subtest] of the Wechsler Memory Scale III, WMS-III, Wechsler, 2008). 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 higher education than the dyslexia group and outperformed the dyslexia group in technical reading, phonological processing, working memory as well as in verbal and performance IQ (Table 1, Figure S 1). As dyslexic readers are known to underperform in verbal, but not necessarily in performance IQ (Laasonen et al., 2009), 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 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 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.

### 2.5 Data preprocessing

The following processing steps were executed in MNE-Python software package v0.17.dev0 (Gramfort et al., 2014), unless indicated otherwise; the code is available at https://github.com/athiede13/neural_sources.

Temporal signal space separation (tSSS; Taulu & Simola, 2006) with head movement compensation and interpolation of previously marked bad channels was performed with Maxfilter software (version 2.2.15; MEGIN Oy, Helsinki, Finland). Ocular and cardiac artifacts were removed by signal space projection (SSP; Tesche et al., 1995). The data were filtered to 0.5–30 Hz with a finite impulse response filter, and epochs were extracted 100 ms before and 840 ms after stimulus onset for all stimulus types for all channels and each participant and recording. Epochs with signal excursion exceeding 4 pT in magnetometers, 4 pT/cm in gradiometers and 250 µV in EOG channels were excluded from analysis. For the standard stimuli, on average 679 epochs (range 667–681), and for deviants, on average 144 epochs (range 138–147) per participant were included in the analysis. Deviant-minus-standard subtraction curves (MMFs) were calculated for each deviant type with equal weights.

The anatomical MRI of each participant was preprocessed with Freesurfer software (http://surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu/) version 5.3 and 6.0 following the standard procedure (Fischl, 2012). Manual editing of pial surface and white matter control points (64% and 18% of cases, respectively) ensured a correct segmentation of the cortex.

### 2.6 Source modeling

After MRI–MEG coregistration (*mne coreg*), the generators of individual MMFs were estimated in a cortically-constrained source space; the MEG forward solution was calculated for 4098 source points per hemisphere. The minimum-norm source estimate (MNE) was computed for the MMFs using depth-weighting (0.8), fixed-orientation constraint, and the 100-ms-pre-stimulus-baseline regularized noise covariance of pooled deviant and standard waveforms of each participant. The MNE source estimates were morphed to Freesurfer's average subject (*fsaverage*) cortical space and averaged for each group.

Auditory cortices (lateral sections of superior temporal gyrus and sulcus of the Destrieux Atlas, aparc.a2009s in Freesurfer, Destrieux, Fischl, Dale, & Halgren, 2010) were *a priori* chosen as regions of interest (ROI) based on previous research (Alho, 1995; Renvall & Hari, 2003). As this region is considerably larger than

the presumed region generating MMF, the average of the dipole moments within that ROI is not representative of the activity of interest. Therefore, data-driven functional ROIs were created based on the MNE source estimate of each participant for each MMF at the individual peak time within the MMF time window (300–400 ms after stimulus onset). Specifically, the functional ROIs were created by taking the top 60% of individual peak source estimates within the anatomical *a priori* -defined ROI and then combined into one for the most consistent individual source points (in more than 45% of all functional ROIs) to represent the area with the most consistent activity across participants. The source time course at the functional ROI were extracted with source signs flipped depending on the source orientation (*pca_flip*) to avoid cancellation.

Time windows for determining the maximal MMF source amplitudes were selected around the peaks of the group averages across groups and deviant types, resulting in a 100-ms wide window for the first peak (300–400 ms) and a 200-ms wide window for the second peak (450–650 ms). Individual maximum amplitudes and the corresponding latencies were extracted within the determined time windows and ROI for statistical analysis in both hemispheres.

### 2.7 Statistical analysis

SPSS version 25.0.0.1 (IBM, Armonk, New York, USA), R (R Core Team, 2018) and RStudio version 1.1.453 (RStudio Team, 2016) were used for statistical analyses. 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 the 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 (Kriegeskorte, Simmons, Bellgowan, & Baker, 2009), this stepwise procedure was chosen to output the most meaningful associations from a neuroscientific and neuropsychological perspective. A correction for multiple comparisons is addressed here unlike in many brain-behavior correlational studies (Rousselet & Pernet, 2012).

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 (Han & Dimitrijevic, 2015). 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 in 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, it was not significant after Bonferroni-correction, ($p_{adj} = .294$, MD = 16 ms). Full ANOVA statistics are reported in Table 2.

Lateralization indices (LIs) for MMF and late MMF did not significantly differ between the groups ($p > .40$). The 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.

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 working memory 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, reflecting phonetic representations, is deficient or abnormally lateralized in adult dyslexic readers, and whether the neural responses correlate with reading-related skills. This is the first report of an investigation on speech discrimination in dyslexic adults with source estimates in the individual brain space. We found MMFs and late MMFs to all three speech-sound changes, generated in bilateral auditory cortices. Furthermore, across groups these MMFs and late MMFs were left-lateralized to the vowel deviant and the late MMF to the duration deviant. Contrary to our expectations, MMFs and late MMFs did not differ in source amplitudes or latencies between dyslexic and typical readers. However, the MMFs were associated with skills pertinent for reading. Stronger MMF source strengths in the left hemisphere were associated with better working memory skills across both groups and in the control group. This correlation seemed to originate specifically from the MMF to the duration deviant across groups, and from the verbal working memory component. In the dyslexic group, stronger MMF and late MMF in the right hemisphere correlated with better technical reading skills. To summarize, unlike several previous studies, we were not able to find evidence for poor phonological representations in dyslexia in the current sample. However, brain activity reflecting phoneme processing was associated with skills needed for fluent reading. This highlights the functional role of speech-related brain activity in reading and its impairments and promotes the utilization of the auditory MMF as a potential neural marker of abnormal reading.

## 4.1 Neural sources of MMF and late MMF

The sources of the MMFs indicated two response components: The MMF peaking at around 125–180 ms after change onset with a clear and narrow peak, the latency lying well within the established time range of the expected MMN/MMF (Kujala, Tervaniemi, & Schröger, 2007), having been associated with speech-sound discrimination (Kujala & Näätänen, 2010), and an additional broader, smaller response peaking at around 375–

420 ms (termed late MMF). The late MMN, usually found in children's responses (Cheour, Korpilahti, Martynova, & Lang, 2001; Volkmer & Schulte-Körne, 2018), has been reported only by few studies in adults at around 340–600 ms (Hill, McArthur, & Bishop, 2004; Hommet et al., 2009; Korpilahti, Lang, & Aaltonen, 1995; Schulte-Körne et al., 2001; Zachau et al., 2005). In adults, its functional role is still poorly understood. It was proposed to reflect linguistic processes as it was found to vowel changes, but not to tone changes (Hill et al., 2004; Korpilahti et al., 1995), although some studies have reported late MMNs to simple and complex tone changes (Schulte-Körne et al., 2001; Zachau et al., 2005). Due to the limited stimulus set of the current study that was not designed to investigate the role of the late MMF, the nature of this response remains to be investigated in more detail by future studies.

Our source estimates of both MMF and late MMF were located in primary and secondary auditory cortices (peak MNI coordinates corresponded to BAs 41, 21, 22) for all speech-sound changes. This is consistent with findings on MMN sources (Alho, 1995; Escera, Alho, Schröger, & Winkler, 2000). Our source modeling with distributed dipoles (MNE) confirms previous MMN/MMF findings from single-dipole models with a better spatial accuracy.

Our MMF lateralization analyses revealed stronger MMFs in the left than right hemisphere to vowel deviants and late MMFs to duration and vowel deviants in both groups, in line with previous studies suggesting left-hemispheric lateralization of speech-elicited MMFs (e.g., Näätänen et al., 1997; Shtyrov et al., 2000). Vowel duration changes make phonological distinctions in Finnish language (Kirmse et al., 2008; Näätänen et al., 1997), which explains the dominant use of the left hemisphere also for the duration deviants.

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 (Sorokin, Alku, & Kujala, 2010). These results are compatible with the suggestion that frequency discrimination is linguistically relevant in Finnish language (Järvikivi, Vainio, & Aalto, 2010).

### 4.2 Group comparisons of sources

No group differences were found for the two responses of the MMF source amplitudes or latencies to vowel, vowel duration, or syllable frequency changes, suggesting no deficits in phonological representations in dyslexia, as opposed to the phonological deficit theory (Bradley & Bryant, 1983; Ramus, 2001; Ramus et al., 2013; Snowling, 2000). These results also contradict with many previous studies, which have shown diminished MMNs to speech-sound changes in dyslexia or dyslexia risk (Schulte-Körne & Bruder, 2010). Like our present study, 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 (Paul et al., 2006). 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 previous observations showing diminished MMNs in dyslexia for small but not for large stimulus differences (e.g., Baldeweg, Richardson, Watkins, Foale, & Gruzelier, 1999). The same could be the core reason for insignificant MMF source strength differences between groups in the present study, too. Alternatively or additionally, the dyslexic subsamples of the different studies might differ in terms of their phonological deficits, since not all dyslexics have such deficits (e.g., only one third of children with "pure" dyslexia had deficits in phonological representations in Ramus et al., 2013). Future studies should determine the prevalence of core phonological deficits vs. dysfunctions in accessing or associating phonemes during reading in dyslexia in large participant samples. For instance, it was shown that dyslexics who displayed normal-like MMNs to phoneme changes presented with meaningless visual stimuli had diminished responses to the same changes when they were accompanied with written input (Mittag, Thesleff, Laasonen, & Kujala, 2013). Therefore, it can be predicted that a larger proportion of dyslexics suffer from impairments in integrating and accessing of phonological information than merely from their poor representations.

In our previous study (Thiede et al., 2019) utilizing identical stimuli and 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 (DeFries & Alarcón, 1996). As we did not see such

deficits in adult dyslexics, this suggests that neurobiological abnormalities in dyslexia may be more disruptive in infancy/childhood than in adulthood (see also, e.g., Lovio et al., 2010, 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 (Galaburda, LoTurco, Ramus, Fitch, & Rosen, 2006).

We expected to find group differences in MMF lateralization based on some previous studies on dyslexia (e.g., Kujala et al., 2003; Renvall & Hari, 2003; Sebastian & Yasin, 2008) or poor reading outcome (Maurer et al., 2009), but found no such effects. The results on laterality effects in dyslexia and related language impairments are mixed (Schulte-Körne et al., 2001; Sebastian & Yasin, 2008; Wilson & Bishop, 2018), which calls for larger sample sizes and careful phenotyping.

### 4.3 Correlation of source strengths with reading-related skills

We also aimed to determine whether reading-related measures are associated with MMF source strengths. With moderate sample sizes and a procedure addressing the correction of multiple comparisons, 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. A diminished MMN was found to predict a working memory impairment (Ahveninen et al., 1999; Javitt, Doneshka, Grochowski, & Ritter, 1995). In addition, a larger MMN was found to be associated with increased verbal working memory performance in children (Watson, Titterington, Henry, & Toner, 2007). Yet, another study found no connection between the MMN and working memory (Light, Swerdlow, & Braff, 2007). These studies together with the present results call for further investigations on the complex interplay between speech processing, working memory, and reading.

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 (Maurer et al., 2009), and longer MMN latency was associated with more errors in word and nonword reading across dyslexic and typical readers and within the dyslexic group (Baldeweg et al., 1999). The correlation between stronger right-hemispheric MMF sources and reading skills in our dyslexic group might suggest that some dyslexics have developed a right-hemispheric compensatory mechanism for speech processing that is also beneficial for their reading skills (Eden et al., 2004).

### 4.4 Limitations

The following limitations of the present study should be considered. The first one relates to the selection of the study sample. The participants of this study were adults between 18 and 45 years of age. Even though they were screened carefully for dyslexia to ensure that reading problems persisted into adulthood, many dyslexic adults may have found coping strategies for these problems since school age. Furthermore, our selected sample differed in IQ between the dyslexic and the typical-reading group. We addressed this by repeating our analysis with a performance-IQ -matched subsample and obtained similar results. Group sizes in this study were moderate consisting of 20+ participants in each group. Larger-scale studies should be aimed for, as the neuroimaging field suffers from replication failures of previous results obtained with small sample sizes (Kellmeyer, 2017). As the expected effect sizes are generally small, many of these studies might be underpowered. Second, the stimuli chosen for the current study have limitations, as discussed above. Stimuli that may be more sensitive to tap into the phonological impairment thought to be the predominant cause for dyslexia should be studied in the future. Lastly, future studies are needed to determine the nature of the late MMN/MMF.

### 4.5 Conclusions

To summarize, our results advanced with source-localization constraints from individual anatomical brain images support the suggestion of bilateral sources of the MMF to speech-sound changes in auditory cortices, as well as left-hemispheric lateralization of the MMF to vowel and vowel duration changes. We found comparable MMF strengths, latencies, and lateralization in typical and dyslexic readers, not confirming abnormalities in neural speech-sound discrimination in dyslexia, possibly due to stimuli not sensitive enough to probe these deficiencies, or a participant subsample not predominantly having phonological problems. However, we found correlations between the MMFs to speech-sound changes and reading-related skills, highlighting the connection of neural low-level speech processing and reading in adults, and promoting the use of MMFs in investigating reading-related brain processes.

## 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.

## Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

## 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.

## References


Ahveninen, J., Jaaskelainen, I. P., Pekkonen, E., Hallberg, A., Hietanen, M., Makela, R., … Sillanaukee, P. (1999). Suppression of mismatch negativity by backward masking predicts impaired working-memory performance in alcoholics. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, *23*(9), 1507–1514. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.1999.tb04674.x

Alho, K. (1995). Cerebral generators of mismatch negativity (MMN) and its magnetic counterpart (MMNM) elicited by sound changes. *Ear and Hearing*, *16*(1), 38–51. https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-199502000-00004

Baldeweg, T., Richardson, A., Watkins, S., Foale, C., & Gruzelier, J. (1999). Impaired auditory frequency discrimination in dyslexia detected with mismatch evoked potentials. *Annals of Neurology*, *45*(4), 495–503. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10211474

Banai, K., & Ahissar, M. (2004). Poor frequency discrimination probes dyslexics with particularly impaired working memory. *Audiology and Neuro-Otology*, *9*(6), 328–340. https://doi.org/10.1159/000081282

Benasich, A. A., Choudhury, N., Friedman, J. T., Realpe-Bonilla, T., Chojnowska, C., & Gou, Z. (2006). The infant as a prelinguistic model for language learning impairments: Predicting from event-related potentials to behavior. *Neuropsychologia*, *44*(3), 396–411. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2005.06.004

Bradley, L., & Bryant, P. E. (1983). Categorizing sounds and learning to read - A causal connection. *Nature*, *301*(5899), 419–421. https://doi.org/10.1038/301419a0

Cheour, M., Korpilahti, P., Martynova, O., & Lang, A.-. H. (2001). Mismatch negativity (MMN) and late discriminative negativity (LDN) in investigating speech perception and learning in children and infants. Invited Review. *Audiol Neurootol*, *6*, 2–11. https://doi.org/10.1159/000046804

Corbera, S., Escera, C., & Artigas, J. (2006). Impaired duration mismatch negativity in developmental dyslexia. *Neuroreport*, *17*(10), 1051–1055. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.wnr.0000221846.43126.a6

DeFries, J. C., & Alarcón, M. (1996). Genetics of specific reading disability. *Mental Retardation and*

*Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews*, *2*(1), 39–47. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2779(1996)2:1<39::AID-MRDD7>3.0.CO;2-S

Destrieux, C., Fischl, B., Dale, A., & Halgren, E. (2010). Automatic parcellation of human cortical gyri and sulci using standard anatomical nomenclature. *NeuroImage*, *53*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.06.010

Eden, G. F., Jones, K. M., Cappell, K., Gareau, L., Wood, F. B., Zeffiro, T. A., … Flowers, D. L. (2004). Neural changes following remediation in adult developmental dyslexia. *Neuron*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2004.10.019

Escera, C., Alho, K., Schröger, E., & Winkler, I. (2000). Involuntary attention and distractibility as evaluated with event-related brain potentials. *Audiology and Neuro-Otology*, *5*(3–4), 151–166. https://doi.org/10.1159/000013877

Fischl, B. (2012). FreeSurfer. *NeuroImage*, *62*(2), 774–781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.01.021

Galaburda, A. M., LoTurco, J., Ramus, F., Fitch, R. H., & Rosen, G. D. (2006). From genes to behavior in developmental dyslexia. *Nature Neuroscience*, *9*(10), 1213–1217. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1772

Gramfort, A., Luessi, M., Larson, E., Engemann, D. A., Strohmeier, D., Brodbeck, C., … Hämäläinen, M. S. (2014). MNE software for processing MEG and EEG data. *NeuroImage*, *86*, 446–460. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.10.027

Hämäläinen, J. A., Leppänen, P. H. T., Guttorm, T. K., & Lyytinen, H. (2008). Event-related potentials to pitch and rise time change in children with reading disabilities and typically reading children. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *119*(1), 100–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2007.09.064

Hämäläinen, J. A., Salminen, H. K., & Leppänen, P. H. T. T. (2013). Basic Auditory Processing Deficits in Dyslexia. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *46*(5), 413–427. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219411436213

Han, J. H., & Dimitrijevic, A. (2015). Acoustic change responses to amplitude modulation: A method to quantify cortical temporal processing and hemispheric asymmetry. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *9*(FEB), 1–15.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2015.00038

Hill, P. R., McArthur, G. M., & Bishop, D. V. M. (2004). Phonological categorization of vowels: A mismatch negativity study. *NeuroReport*, *15*(14), 2195–2199. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001756-200410050-00010

Hommet, C., Vidal, J., Roux, S., Blanc, R., Barthez, M. A., De Becque, B., … Gomot, M. (2009). Topography of syllable change-detection electrophysiological indices in children and adults with reading disabilities. *Neuropsychologia*, *47*(3), 761–770. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.12.010

Järvikivi, J., Vainio, M., & Aalto, D. (2010). Real-time correlates of phonological quantity reveal unity of tonal and non-tonal languages. *PLoS ONE*, *5*(9), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0012603

Javitt, D. C., Doneshka, P., Grochowski, S., & Ritter, W. (1995). Impaired Mismatch Negativity Generation Reflects Widespread Dysfunction of Working Memory in Schizophrenia. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *52*(7), 550–558. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1995.03950190032005

Kellmeyer, P. (2017). Ethical and Legal Implications of the Methodological Crisis in Neuroimaging. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, *26*(4), 530–554. https://doi.org/10.1017/S096318011700007X

Kessler, R., Adler, L., Ames, M., Demler, O., Faraone, S., Hiripi, E., … Tb, U. (2005). 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 . *Psychological Medicine*, *9*(2), 245–256.

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

Korpilahti, P., Lang, H., & Aaltonen, O. (1995). Is there a late-latency mismatch negativity (MMN) component? *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, *95*(4), 96P.

Kriegeskorte, N., Simmons, W. K., Bellgowan, P. S., & Baker, C. I. (2009). Circular analysis in systems

neuroscience: The dangers of double dipping. *Nature Neuroscience*, *12*(5), 535–540. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2303

Kujala, T., Belitz, S., Tervaniemi, M., & Näätänen, R. (2003). Auditory sensory memory disorder in dyslexic adults as indexed by the mismatch negativity. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *17*(6), 1323–1327. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1460-9568.2003.02559.x

Kujala, T., Lovio, R., Lepistö, T., Laasonen, M., & Näätänen, R. (2006). Evaluation of multi-attribute auditory discrimination in dyslexia with the mismatch negativity. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *117*(4), 885–893. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2006.01.002

Kujala, T., Myllyviita, K., Tervaniemi, M., Alho, K., Kallio, J., & Näätänen, R. (2000). Basic auditory dysfunction in dyslexia as demonstrated by brain activity measurements. *Psychophysiology*, *37*(2), 262–266. https://doi.org/null

Kujala, T., & Näätänen, R. (2001). The mismatch negativity in evaluating central auditory dysfunction in dyslexia. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *25*(6), 535–543. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7634(01)00032-X

Kujala, T., & Näätänen, R. (2010). The adaptive brain: A neurophysiological perspective. *Progress in Neurobiology*, *91*(1), 55–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pneurobio.2010.01.006

Kujala, T., Tervaniemi, M., & Schröger, E. (2007). The mismatch negativity in cognitive and clinical neuroscience: Theoretical and methodological considerations. *Biological Psychology*, *74*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2006.06.001

Laasonen, M. (2002). *Temporal acuity in developmental dyslexia across the life span: Tactile, auditory, visual, and crossmodal estimations*. Dissertation, University of Helsinki.

Laasonen, M., Lehtinen, M., Leppämäki, S., Tani, P., & Hokkanen, L. (2010). Project DyAdd: Phonological processing, reading, spelling, and arithmetic in adults with dyslexia or ADHD. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *43*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219409335216

Laasonen, M., Leppämäki, S., Tani, P., & Hokkanen, L. (2009). Adult Dyslexia and Attention Deficit Disorder in Finland—Project DyAdd. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *42*(6), 511–527. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219409345013

Laasonen, M., Väre, J., Oksanen-Hennah, H., Leppämäki, S., Tani, P., Harno, H., … Cleeremans, A. (2014). Project DyAdd: Implicit learning in adult dyslexia and ADHD. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *64*(1), 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-013-0083-y

Leppänen, P. H. T. T., Richardson, U., Pihko, E., Eklund, K. M., Guttorm, T. K., Aro, M., & Lyytinen, H. (2002). Brain responses to changes in speech sound durations differ between infants with and without familial risk for dyslexia. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, *22*(1), 407–422. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326942dn2201_4

Light, G. A., Swerdlow, N. R., & Braff, D. L. (2007). Preattentive sensory processing as indexed by the MMN and P3a brain responses is associated with cognitive and psychosocial functioning in healthy adults. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *19*(10), 1624–1632. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2007.19.10.1624

Linnavalli, T., Putkinen, V., Huotilainen, M., & Tervaniemi, M. (2017). Phoneme processing skills are reflected in children's MMN responses. *Neuropsychologia*, *101*, 76–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2017.05.013

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

Lovio, R., Näätänen, R., & Kujala, T. (2010). Abnormal pattern of cortical speech feature discrimination in 6-year-old children at risk for dyslexia. *Brain Research*, *1335*, 53–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2010.03.097

Maurer, U., Bucher, K., Brem, S., Benz, R., Kranz, F., Schulz, E., … Brandeis, D. (2009). Neurophysiology in Preschool Improves Behavioral Prediction of Reading Ability Throughout Primary School. *Biological*

*Psychiatry*, *66*(4), 341–348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.02.031

Maurer, U., Bucher, K., Brem, S., & Brandeis, D. (2003). Altered responses to tone and phoneme mismatch in kindergartners at familial dyslexia risk. *Neuroreport*, *14*(17), 2245–2250. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001756-200312020-00022

Meng, X., Sai, X., Wang, C., Wang, J., Sha, S., & Zhou, X. (2005). Auditory and speech processing and reading development in Chinese school children: Behavioural and ERP evidence. *Dyslexia*, *11*(4), 292–310. https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.309

Mittag, M., Thesleff, P., Laasonen, M., & Kujala, T. (2013). The neurophysiological basis of the integration of written and heard syllables in dyslexic adults. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *124*(2), 315–326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2012.08.003

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

Näätänen, R., Gaillard, A. W. K., & Mäntysalo, S. (1978). Early selective-attention effect on evoked potential reinterpreted. *Acta Psychologica*, *42*(4), 313–329. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918(78)90006-9

Näätänen, R., Lehtokoski, A., Lennes, M., Cheour, M., Huotilainen, M., Iivonen, A., … Alho, K. (1997). Language-specific phoneme representations revealed by electric and magnetic brain responses. *Nature*, *385*(6615), 432–434. https://doi.org/10.1038/385432a0

Nevala, J., Kairaluoma, L., Ahonen, T., Aro, M., & Holopainen, L. (2006). *Lukemis-ja kirjoittamistaitojen yksilötestistö nuorille ja aikuisille. Jyväskylä: Niilo Mäki …*. Jyväskylä: Niilo Mäki Instituutti.

Ozernov-Palchik, O., & Gaab, N. (2016). Tackling the "dyslexia paradox": Reading brain and behavior for early markers of developmental dyslexiax. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, *7*(2), 156–176. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1383

Paul, I., Bott, C., Heim, S., Wienbruch, C., & Elbert, T. R. (2006). Phonological but not auditory discrimination is

impaired in dyslexia. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *24*(10), 2945–2953. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2006.05153.x

R Core Team. (2018). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from https://www.r-project.org/

Ramus, F. (2001). Dyslexia. Talk of two theories. *Nature*, *412*(6845), 393–395. https://doi.org/10.1111/iwj.12024

Ramus, F., Altarelli, I., Jednoróg, K., Zhao, J., & Scotto di Covella, L. (2018). Neuroanatomy of developmental dyslexia: Pitfalls and promise. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *84*, 434–452. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.08.001

Ramus, F., Marshall, C. R., Rosen, S., & van der Lely, H. K. J. (2013). Phonological deficits in specific language impairment and developmental dyslexia: towards a multidimensional model. *Brain*, *136*(2), 630–645. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/aws356

Renvall, H., & Hari, R. (2003). Diminished auditory mismatch fields in dyslexic adults. *Annals of Neurology*, *53*(5), 551–557. https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.10504

Rousselet, G. A., & Pernet, C. R. (2012). Improving standards in brain-behavior correlation analyses. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *6*(MAY 2012). https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00119

RStudio Team. (2016). RStudio: Integrated Development for R. Boston, MA: RStudio, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.rstudio.com/

Schulte-Körne, G., & Bruder, J. (2010). Clinical neurophysiology of visual and auditory processing in dyslexia: A review. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *121*(11), 1794–1809. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2010.04.028

Schulte-Körne, G., Deimel, W., Bartling, J., & Remschmidt, H. (1998). Auditory processing and dyslexia: evidence for a specific speech processing deficit. *Neuroreport*, *9*(2), 337–340. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001756-199801260-00029

Schulte-Körne, G., Deimel, W., Bartling, J., & Remschmidt, H. (1999). Pre-attentive processing of auditory

patterns in dyslexic human subjects. *Neuroscience Letters*, *276*(1), 41–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3940(99)00785-5

Schulte-Körne, G., Deimel, W., Bartling, J., & Remschmidt, H. (2001). Speech perception deficit in dyslexic adults as measured by mismatch negativity (MMN). *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *40*(1), 77–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8760(00)00152-5

Sebastian, C., & Yasin, I. (2008). Speech versus tone processing in compensated dyslexia: Discrimination and lateralization with a dichotic mismatch negativity (MMN) paradigm. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *70*(2), 115–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2008.08.004

Sharma, M., Purdy, S. C., Newall, P., Wheldall, K., Beaman, R., & Dillon, H. (2006). Electrophysiological and behavioral evidence of auditory processing deficits in children with reading disorder. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *117*(5), 1130–1144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2006.02.001

Shtyrov, Y., Kujala, T., Palva, S., Ilmoniemi, R. J., & Näätänen, R. (2000). Discrimination of Speech and of Complex Nonspeech Sounds of Different Temporal Structure in the Left and Right Cerebral Hemispheres. *NeuroImage*, *12*(6), 657–663. https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2000.0646

Snowling, M. J. (2000). *Dyslexia*. Wiley. Retrieved from https://books.google.fi/books?id=7BGpoZPXWjgC

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

Taulu, S., & Simola, J. (2006). Spatiotemporal signal space separation method for rejecting nearby interference in MEG measurements. *Physics in Medicine and Biology*, *51*(7), 1759–1768. https://doi.org/10.1088/0031-9155/51/7/008

Tesche, C. D., Uusitalo, M. A., Ilmoniemi, R. J., Huotilainen, M., Kajola, M., & Salonen, O. (1995). Signal-space projections of MEG data characterize both distributed and well-localized neuronal sources. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, *95*(3), 189–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(95)00064-6

Thiede, A., Virtala, P., Ala-Kurikka, I., Partanen, E., Huotilainen, M., Mikkola, K., … Kujala, T. (2019). An extensive pattern of atypical neural speech-sound discrimination in newborns at risk of dyslexia. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *130*(5), 634–646. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2019.01.019

van Leeuwen, T., Been, P., van Herten, M., Zwarts, F., Maassen, B., & van der Leij, A. (2008). Two-month-old infants at risk for dyslexia do not discriminate /bAk/ from /dAk/: A brain-mapping study. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *21*(4), 333–348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2007.07.004

Van Zuijen, T. L., Plakas, A., Maassen, B. A. M., Maurits, N. M., & Van der Leij, A. (2013). Infant ERPs separate children at risk of dyslexia who become good readers from those who become poor readers. *Developmental Science*, *16*(4), 554–563. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12049

Volkmer, S., & Schulte-Körne, G. (2018). Cortical responses to tone and phoneme mismatch as a predictor of dyslexia? A systematic review. *Schizophrenia Research*, *191*, 148–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2017.07.010

Watson, D. R., Titterington, J., Henry, A., & Toner, J. G. (2007). Auditory Sensory Memory and Working Memory Processes in Children with Normal Hearing and Cochlear Implants. *Audiology and Neurotology*, *12*(2), 65–76. https://doi.org/10.1159/000097793

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

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

Wilson, A. C., & Bishop, D. V. M. M. (2018). Resounding failure to replicate links between developmental language disorder and cerebral lateralisation. *PeerJ*, *2018*(1). https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4217

Wolf, M. (1986). Rapid alternating stimulus naming in the developmental dyslexias. *Brain and Language*, *27*(2), 360–379. https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934x(86)90025-8

Zachau, S., Rinker, T., Körner, B., Kohls, G., Maas, V., Hennighausen, K., … Schecker, M. (2005). Extracting

rules: early and late mismatch negativity to tone patterns. *NeuroReport*, *16*(18), 16–20. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001756-200512190-00009

## 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.

*Table 2. Significant ANOVA results (N = 43)*

| **comp.** dev. | | ANOVA | | | | | Post-hoc | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | model | effect | $F(1,41)$ | $p$ | $p_{corr}$ | $\eta_p^2$ | effect | MD | stat |
| **MMF** | | | | | | | | | |
| fre | laterality * amplitude * group | laterality | 3.95 | .054 | .324 | .09 | left > right | 7 pAm | |
| dur | laterality * amplitude * group | group | 3.61 | .064 | .384 | .08 | con > dys | 7 pAm | |
| dur | laterality * latency * group | laterality | 2.99 | .091 | .546 | .07 | left > right | 8 ms | |
| vow | laterality * amplitude * group | laterality | 19.12 | $8.2*10^{-5}$ | ***$4.9*10^{-4}$ | .32 | left > right | 14 pAm | |
| **late MMF** | | | | | | | | | |
| fre | laterality * amplitude * group | laterality | 3.00 | .091 | .546 | .07 | left > right | 6 pAm | |
| fre | laterality * latency * group | laterality * group | 4.03 | .051 | .306 | .09 | right: con < dys | -27 ms | $t(41) = -1.83$, $p = .074$ |
| | | | | | | | con: left > right | 34 ms | $t(21) = 1.92$, $p = .069$ |
| dur | laterality * amplitude * group | laterality | 10.05 | .003 | *.018 | .20 | left > right | 9 pAm | |
| dur | laterality * latency * group | laterality | 4.12 | .049 | .294 | .09 | left > right | 16 ms | |
| vow | laterality * amplitude * group | laterality | 11.62 | .001 | **.006 | .22 | left > right | 11 pAm | |

Notes. Significant ($p < .05$) and marginally significant ($p < .1$) uncorrected $p$-values are reported. Bonferroni-corrected significance levels are indicated with asterisks *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$. comp. – component, dev. – deviant, dur – duration, vow – vowel, fre – frequency, MD – mean difference, stat – full statistics, con – control group, dys – dyslexic group.

# 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).*




*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*


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