Novelty-induced frontal-STN networks in Parkinson's disease
Running Title: Novelty-induced networks in Parkinson's disease

Rachel C Cole[1], Arturo I Espinoza[1], Arun Singh[2], Joel I Berger[3], James F Cavanagh[4], Jeremy D Greenlee[3], Nandakumar S Narayanan[1]

[1]Department of Neurology, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, 52242, [2]Division of Basic Biomedical Sciences, Sanford School of Medicine, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, SD, 57069, [3]Department of Neurosurgery, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, 52242, [4]Department of Psychology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87131

***Corresponding Author**
Nandakumar Narayanan
nandakumar-narayanan@uiowa.edu
169 Newton Road
Pappajohn Biomedical Discovery Building—5336
University of Iowa, Iowa City, 52242
319-353-5698

46 pages, 7 figures, 2 tables

Abstract: 135 words; Introduction, 617 words; Discussion: 1,207 words

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge Haiming Chen, Youngcho Kim, Derrick Okine, Jan Wessel, Darcy Diesberg, and Tobin Dykstra for technical contributions and helpful discussions. This work was funded by NINDS R01 NS100849-01A1 to NN/JG/JFC and NIA F32 AG069445-01 to RC. This study was supported in part by the University of Iowa Institute for Clinical and Translational Science, which is granted with Clinical and Translational Science Award funds from the National Institutes of Health (UL1TR002537).

Abstract

Evaluating and responding to new information requires cognitive control. Here, we studied novelty-response mechanisms in Parkinson's disease (PD). In PD patient-volunteers, we recorded from cortical circuits with scalp-based electroencephalography (EEG) and from subcortical circuits using intraoperative neurophysiology during surgeries for implantation of deep-brain stimulation (DBS) electrodes. We report three major results. First, novel auditory stimuli triggered midfrontal ~4-Hz rhythms, which were attenuated in PD patients but were not linked with cognitive function or novelty-associated slowing. Second, 32% of subthalamic nucleus (STN) neurons were response-modulated; nearly all (94%) of these were also modulated by novel stimuli. Finally, response-modulated STN neurons were coherent with midfrontal low-frequency activity. These findings link scalp-based measurements of neural activity with neuronal activity in the STN. Our results provide insight into midfrontal cognitive control mechanisms and how hyperdirect circuits evaluate new information.

49 **Significance statement**

50 Parkinson's disease (PD) is a neurodegenerative disorder with motor and cognitive symptoms.
51 Here we studied how the brain recruits cognitive control in response to new information. We
52 found that PD patients have decreased cortical low-frequency oscillations linked to cognitive
53 control. We also examined single neurons in PD patients in a deep brain structure called the
54 subthalamic nucleus, and found that response-modulated neurons were uniquely modulated by
55 novelty and they fired in-phase with these same low-frequency brain oscillations. Our work helps
56 illustrate how neural circuits evaluate new information, which could be relevant for PD as well
57 as other diseases that disrupt cognition.

INTRODUCTION

New information requires careful consideration. Indeed, when the brain evaluates novel information it recruits cognitive-control processes reflected by bursts of midfrontal low-frequency 1-8 Hz activity (Cavanagh & Frank, 2014; Solís-Vivanco et al., 2018). In the prefrontal cortex, our group and others have shown that these bursts of midfrontal activity engage single neurons encoding cognitive functions (Kim et al., 2017; Kim & Narayanan, 2019; Mikell et al., 2014; Narayanan et al., 2013). This interaction between cortical oscillations and single neurons may orchestrate the arc from extrinsic perceptions to intrinsic responses. Human diseases such as Parkinson's disease (PD) involve slowed or profoundly disrupted movements; however, it is unknown how stimulus-related factors such as novelty interact with motor responses. In this study, we studied midfrontal cognitive-control processes in PD via novelty-related processes.

One paradigm used to study the link between novel stimuli and responses is the oddball task. In this task, participants must respond to a commonly-occurring, standard stimulus on most trials. When novel stimuli are presented, the orienting response causes motor slowing (Sokolov, 1962) and elicits control processes (Fan, 2014). In electroencephalography (EEG) studies, novel stimuli and the subsequent orienting response evoke characteristic event-related potential (ERP) signatures in the midfrontal cortex (Debener et al., 2005; Polich, 2007; Ranganath & Rainer, 2003). Novelty-induced orienting can be considered a sub-feature of control. Cortical responses to novel stimuli involve midfrontal low-frequency oscillations between 1-8 Hz. Cavanagh and Frank (2014) proposed that these midfrontal oscillations reflect the recruitment of cognitive-control processes, however, the precise bands and topography of novelty-related slowing, particularly in PD patients, is unclear. Frontal activity may serve as a mechanism by which

neurons exert top-down control across the brain (Cavanagh & Frank, 2014), including subcortical networks in the basal ganglia (Zink et al., 2006). These subcortical basal ganglia networks can be modulated by novelty; indeed, a human intraoperative study by Mikell and colleagues (2014) found that subcortical neurons in the substantia nigra increased firing more following infrequent novel sounds than frequent standard sounds.

We and others have found consistent evidence that PD attenuates midfrontal 1-8 Hz activity during attentional orienting, conflict, interval timing, and responses to startling stimuli (Cavanagh et al., 2018; K.-H. Chen et al., 2016; Kelley et al., 2018; Lange et al., 2016; Parker et al., 2015; Singh et al., 2018, 2021; Solís-Vivanco et al., 2018). Furthermore, we have found that during interval timing midfrontal ~4-Hz rhythms are coherent with field potentials in the subthalamic nucleus (STN) (Kelley et al., 2018). Notably, Singh and colleagues (2021) found that attenuated ~4-Hz EEG oscillatory activity during interval timing was predictive of cognition as measured by the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA), suggesting that the recruitment of midfrontal ~4-Hz oscillations reflects general cognitive-control processes. These data lead to the hypothesis that midfrontal ~4-Hz rhythms engage subcortical networks in response to novelty.

We tested this idea by first comparing midfrontal EEG during an oddball task between PD patients and healthy older adult subjects (Andrés et al., 2006; Escera et al., 1998; Parmentier et al., 2008, 2010). In addition, we recorded midfrontal EEG and intracranial STN neurons during an intraoperative oddball task in PD patients undergoing DBS implantation surgery. We report three main findings. First, we found that PD patients had decreased midfrontal ~4-Hz rhythms compared to controls; however, these rhythms did not correlate with cognitive status or novelty-related slowing. Second, we found that neurons in the STN were strongly response-modulated rather than cue-modulated, and most response-modulated STN neurons were influenced by

104 novelty. Third, we found that midfrontal low-frequency oscillations were coherent with
105 response-modulated STN neurons. These data provide insight into how novel information
106 engages a midfrontal cognitive control system, and how this system in turn contributes to a
107 hyperdirect subcortical mechanism for response control.
108

109 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

110 *Participants*

111 This investigation included both an EEG experiment and an intraoperative neurophysiology
112 experiment. For the EEG experiment, we recruited PD patient-volunteers and demographically-
113 similar control participants (see Table 1). PD patients were recruited through the Movement
114 Disorders clinic at University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics (UIHC). Healthy older adults were
115 recruited to serve as control participants from either the Seniors Together in Aging Research
116 (STAR) registry or a list of people who previously participated in research in our lab and agreed
117 to be contacted for new research opportunities. Participants were considered healthy if they did
118 not have any neurological and psychological diseases or disorders. Participants were recruited by
119 email or phone and received compensation of $30/hour. All procedures were approved by the
120 University of Iowa (UI) Institutional Review Board (IRB) (#201707828).

121 In parallel with the EEG experiment, we recruited 18 PD patient-volunteers who had elected
122 to undergo bilateral STN deep brain stimulation (DBS) implantation surgery (see Table 2). These
123 participants were recruited over a time period of 1.5 years (July 2019–August 2020). Within the
124 study period there was a 5-month pause in enrollment due to research suspension during the
125 COVID-19 crisis. Patients were asked during preoperative clinical sessions (1–14 days prior to
126 surgery) whether they were interested in participating in research during their DBS implantation

surgery. If they agreed, a researcher separate from the surgical team discussed the research protocols with them, obtained informed consent, and completed a brief practice session of the task. All intraoperative research procedures were approved by the UI IRB (#201402730). All patients were tested on levodopa as our past work has shown that levodopa does not reliably modulate midfrontal ~4 Hz rhythms (Singh et al., 2018, 2021). Levodopa-equivalent doses (LEDD) are presented in Table 2.

Oddball task for EEG experiment

We assessed the response to novelty using a version of the cross-modal oddball distractor task (Andrés et al., 2006; Escera et al., 1998; Parmentier et al., 2008, 2010; Parmentier & Hebrero, 2013). This task was presented using the PsychToolbox-3 functions (Brainard, 1997; Kleiner et al., 2007; Pelli, 1997, http://psychtoolbox.org/) in MATLAB 2018b on either a Linux or Windows computer. Task-specific audio was played through Dell Rev A01 speakers positioned on either side of the monitor. Responses were made with the left and right index fingers on a standard QWERTY USB-keyboard. In addition to the cross-modal oddball distractor task, participants completed additional cognitive and motor tasks, as well as detailed neuropsychological and neuropsychiatric assessments as part of other protocols (Singh et al., 2018, 2021).

Our version of the cross-modal oddball distractor task involved a choice reaction-time task in which a white arrow appeared in the center of a black screen, and the participant was required to press the key that corresponded with the direction of the arrow ("q" for left arrow, "p" for right arrow) as quickly as possible. The appearance of the arrow was preceded by an audio-visual cue by 500 ms (either the standard cue or the distractor cue). Participants were instructed that this

cue would appear 500 ms before the target stimulus (white arrow), and they were told that the cue would be a green circle and a short tone (600-Hz sine wave tone lasting 200 ms). The audio-visual cue was followed by the target arrow (**Figure 1A**). Participants had to respond within 1 s, after which the fixation cross reappeared and the next trial started after a variable inter-trial interval between 500–1000 ms.

Participants completed a brief practice of the task (10 trials), which had all the familiar standard cues described above. Following the practice, participants completed four blocks of 60 trials each, for a total of 240 trials. Of the 240 trials, 80% contained the standard cues as described above, 10% contained an unexpected auditory oddball cue (non-repeating, randomly-created sine wave that sounded like a birdcall or robotic noise lasting 200 ms in duration) in place of the expected tone, and 10% contained an unexpected visual oddball cue (unique shape/color combination) in place of the green circle. Because visual stimuli were not presented during intraoperative research, only auditory oddball trials were analyzed.

EEG recordings

EEG recordings were performed according to methods described in detail previously (Singh et al., 2020, 2021). Briefly, we used a 64-channel EEG actiCAP (Brain Products GmbH) with a 0.1-Hz high-pass filter and a sampling frequency of 500 Hz. We used electrode Pz as reference and electrode FPz as the ground. EEG activity was referenced according to the procedures described in Singh et al., (2020, 2021). Briefly, an additional channel was recorded at the mid-inion region (Iz), and we removed unreliable Fp1, Fp2, FT9, FT10, TP9, and TP10 channels, resulting in 59 channels for pre- and post-processing. Data were epoched around the cues from -1000 ms to 2500 ms peri-cue.

Bad channels and bad epochs were identified using the FASTER algorithm (Nolan et al., 2010) and the pop_rejchan function from EEGLAB, and were then interpolated and rejected respectively. On average, 1.6 ± 0.9 channels per subject were removed, and Cz was never removed during preprocessing. Eye blink contaminants were removed following independent component analysis (ICA).

Event-related potentials (ERPs) were low-pass-filtered at 20 Hz for analyses. Our primary interest was in ~4-Hz midfrontal rhythms; consequently, we utilized time-frequency analyses. We computed spectral measures by multiplying the fast Fourier transformed (FFT) power spectrum of single-trial EEG data with the FFT power spectrum of a set of complex Morlet wavelets (defined as a Gaussian-windowed complex sine wave: $e^{i2\pi tf}e^{-t^2/(2x\sigma^2)}$, where *t*=time and *f*=frequency). Wavelets increased from 1–50 Hz in 50 logarithmically-spaced steps, which defined the width of each frequency band, increasing from 3–10 cycles between 1–50 Hz and taking the inverse FFT (Cohen, 2014). The end result of this process was identical to time-domain signal convolution, and it resulted in estimates of instantaneous power (the magnitude of the analytic signal) and phase angle (the arctangent of the analytic signal). We then cut the length of each signal accordingly for each trial (-500 ms to 1000 ms). These short temporal epochs reflect the wavelet-weighted influence of longer time and frequency periods. Power was normalized by converting to a decibel (dB) scale ($10*\log10(power_t/power_{baseline})$), allowing us to directly compare the effects across frequency bands. The baseline for each frequency was calculated by averaging power from -300 ms to -200 ms prior to cue onset (Singh et al., 2018, 2020, 2021). A 100 ms duration is often used as an effective baseline since pixel-wise time-frequency data points have already been resolved over smoothed temporal and frequency dimensions with the wavelets. For plotting purposes only, statistical-cluster-based thresholding

(minimum cluster-size of 500 pixels) was used to visualize areas where temporal-frequency power differed between controls and PD patients (**Figure 2D,** black contours). Our previous work has focused on diminished midfrontal cue-triggered ~4-Hz rhythms in PD, although we have observed differences across 1-8 Hz depending on the specific demands elicited by the task (e.g. 1-4 Hz novelty vs. 4-8 Hz control-related processes) (K.H. Chen et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2017; Narayanan et al., 2013; Singh et al., 2018, 2020, 2021).

Oddball task for intraoperative neurophysiology

We used an auditory version of a 3-tone oddball task during intraoperative human neurophysiology to capture the response to novelty in the operating room during DBS-electrode implantation surgeries. This task is ideal for research for intraoperative patients whose heads are in a stereotaxic frame during multielectrode recordings because, 1) it is in the auditory domain and does not require a monitor for visual stimuli, 2) it is relatively simple in that it requires a motor response to tones, and 3) several trials can be collected in a few minutes. Similar 3-tone designs have been used previously (Debener et al., 2005), in which novelty is probed with novel tones. All stimuli were auditory and presented at an appropriate volume through earbuds or external speaker to be clearly heard over operating room noise. The task and stimuli were presented using PsychToolbox-3 in MATLAB 2018b on a Windows laptop. Responses were made with a Kinesis pedal that the patients held in their hands. Participants pressed buttons with their thumbs to respond.

For the 3-tone oddball task, each trial consisted of one of the following sounds being played: a standard tone that occurred frequently (500 Hz: 50% of trials), a target sound that occurred infrequently (the word “Go”: 30% of trials; this trial type was used to maintain attention), or a

219 novel tone (unique birdcall: 20% of trials; **Figure 3A**). Patients were instructed to press with
220 their left hand (typically thumb) if they heard the word "Go," and to press with their right
221 hand/thumb if they heard anything else. We focused our analyses on the standard and the novel
222 tones, as patients responded with their right hand for both the standard tones and the novel
223 oddball tones, facilitating a direct comparison of novelty induced motor initiation. Patients
224 practiced the task with 30 trials preoperatively and again on the morning of surgery. The
225 intraoperative experiment was conducted after the clinically-necessary microelectrode recording
226 electrodes were confirmed to be in the STN based on clinical recordings.
227
228 *Intraoperative neurophysiology recordings*
229 Bilateral DBS electrodes were implanted sequentially during a single stereotactic procedure.
230 Participants received short-acting pain relief and sedative medications such as remifentanil
231 and/or dexmedetomidine; these were stopped >1 hour prior to the task for participants to be
232 maximally awake for necessary clinical testing and participation in research. Patients underwent
233 standard bilateral DBS lead implantations using indirect framed stereotactic STN targeting,
234 refined by microelectrode recordings from 0.4 to 0.8 mΩ tungsten electrodes (Alpha-Omega,
235 Inc). Three simultaneous microelectrode recording tracks were used, consisting of anterior,
236 middle, and posterior trajectories, separated by 2 mm center-to-center from an entry point near
237 the coronal suture. STN margins were defined by the functional and electrical properties from
238 these microelectrode recordings, in line with standard clinical practice. Because microelectrode
239 recordings were clinically necessary, participants were not exposed to extra electrode
240 penetrations to participate in the study.

In addition to STN recordings, scalp EEG was also simultaneously recorded in the operating room during the oddball task. Prior to the start of surgery, three midfrontal EEG electrodes (Cadwell Industries, Inc) were placed over frontal locations on the forehead at the hairline with right and left electrodes approximating F1 and F2 and midfrontal lead approximating Fz (**Figure 4A**). A reference electrode was placed on the left mastoid. We recorded EEG because this location indexes midfrontal ~4-Hz rhythms and is in line with prior work (K.-H. Chen et al., 2016; Kelley et al., 2018; Narayanan et al., 2013; Singh et al., 2021). EEG recordings were recorded at 24 kHz and subsequently downsampled to 500 Hz. Signal was filtered below 50 Hz with a low-pass filter, followed by a 1-Hz high-pass filter. Microelectrode recordings were sampled at 24 kHz, amplified, and filtered for single neurons (1–8 kHz) and STN local field potentials (<200 Hz). Neurophysiological and behavioral data were acquired simultaneously using a Tucker-Davis Technologies multi-channel data acquisition system.

After the experiments, Offline Sorter (Plexon) was used to analyze STN activity and remove artifacts. Spike activity was analyzed for all cells that fired at rates above 0.1 Hz. Principal component analysis (PCA) and waveform shape were used for spike sorting. Single units were defined as those 1) having a consistent waveform shape, 2) being a separable cluster in PCA space, and 3) having a consistent refractory period of at least 2 ms in interspike interval histograms. Isolated STN single units were included for analyses if 1) the recording location was confirmed by the neurosurgeon to be in the STN based on clinically-necessary and observable STN firing patterns during surgery, and 2) the unit was held throughout the duration of the task.

Experimental Design and Statistical Analyses

All data and statistical approaches were reviewed by the UI Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Research Design Core at the Institute for Clinical and Translational Science. All code and data are available at narayanan.lab.uiowa.edu. For demographic summary statistics, medians and interquartile ranges were calculated for continuous measures. Counts and percentages were calculated for categorical measures. EEG participant demographics were stratified by group and gender. Intraoperative patient-volunteer demographics were stratified by gender. We used the nonparametric Wilcoxon rank sum test to test for differences in age, education, and MoCA between strata. For behavioral data, we used a linear mixed-effects model with random intercept for participants' response time to capture the effects of predictor variables (tone type: standard vs novel tones and group: PD vs control) on response time. For behavioral data for the intraoperative task, we used the nonparametric Wilcoxon rank sum test to test for differences between different sound stimuli on accuracy and reaction time. For EEG data, we used a linear mixed-effects model with random intercept for participants' time-frequency power to compare average time-frequency-power between groups. The fixed-effect predictors included group, tone type, MoCA score, and Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) Part 3 as control variables and time-frequency power from the *a priori* region of interest (ROI) as the outcome variable. We set our alpha for these analyses at 0.05. The MoCA score was included in the model as a covariate given that it was different between groups. UPDRS Part 3 was included as a covariate for PD subjects in order to account for degree of motor impairment. These analyses were conducted in R.

Neuronal modulations were defined via a generalized linear model (GLM) for each neuron, where the outcome variable was firing rate, and the predictor variable was cue or response, consistent with past work (Emmons et al., 2019, 2020). For each neuron, we constructed a model

in which the outcome variable was the firing rate binned at 0.1 seconds, and the predictor variable was either cue or response. Main effects comparisons were made stratified by neuron. Across the ensemble, p values were corrected via Benjamini-Hochberg false-discovery-rate (FDR; Benjamini & Yekutieli, 2001), with p values <0.05 considered significant modulation for each neuron. We also analyzed neuronal patterns using PCA of peri-event histograms around response binned at 0.1 second with kernel-density estimates (bandwidth 0.25). Finally, we analyzed midfrontal EEG-STN coherence with the Neurospec 2.0 coherence toolbox using the sp2a_m1 function with a segment power of 9 and a window size of 250 ms. To compare coherence across neurons with different spike rates and trial numbers, spike-field coherence was scaled such that the raw spike-field coherence of each neuron was divided by the 95% confidence interval for each neuron. According to this metric, a "1" represents coherence at the 95% confidence interval. These analyses were performed in MATLAB.

RESULTS

Demographics

Table 1 shows demographics for the EEG study and Table 2 shows demographics for the intraoperative study. For EEG participants, demographic results were stratified by group and gender. Wilcoxon test results showed that the groups were not significantly different in terms of age (p=0.38, effect size r=0.10) or years of education (p=0.09, effect size r=0.20). The MoCA score was higher for the control subjects compared to PD subjects (p<0.01, effect size r=0.36), thus we accounted for MoCA in our analyses.

PD patients had slowed reaction-times during novelty-related distraction

We studied how novelty engaged cortical cognitive control mechanisms by recording EEG during the cross-modal oddball distractor task (**Figure 1**). This task asks participants to respond to a target cue (arrow) following either a familiar stimulus (600-Hz tone) or a novel stimulus consisting of complex and unique auditory features.

Accuracy was high overall (Median (1st Quartile–3rd Quartile); Control: standard 99.4% (99%-100%), novel 100% (100%-100%); PD: standard 98.2% (93.3%-99.4%), novel 97.9% (92-100%)), although control participants were more accurate than PD patients ($F_{(1,73)}$=11.1, p=0.001). There was no main effect of tone type ($F_{(1,73)}$=0.39, p=0.54), and no interaction between group and tone type ($F_{(1,73)}$=1.61, p=0.21). Regarding response speed, on trials with a distracting novel tone, control subjects responded approximately the same as on trials with a standard tone (Median (1st Quartile–3rd Quartile); Control: novel 454 ms (426-514), standard 454 ms (426-531 ms)), whereas PD patients responded more slowly compared to trials with a standard tone (PD: novel 505 ms (439-571 ms), standard 462 ms (416-515 ms); **Figure 1B**). There was a significant main effect of tone type ($F_{(1,73)}$=22.4 p<0.001), but this appears to be driven by the effect within the PD group. There was no significant effect of Control vs. PD on reaction time ($F_{(1,73)}$=1.0, p=0.32); however, there was a significant interaction between the effects of group and tone type on reaction time ($F_{(1,73)}$=6.0, p=0.02). Post-hoc analyses revealed that within the PD group, there was a significant difference between reaction times for the tone types (t(73)=-6.2, p<0.0001). No other post hoc contrast was significant.

Finally, we found that novelty-related slowing was not related to cognitive function, as measured by MoCA (Spearman ρ=-0.15, p=0.19; **Figure 1C**), or motor function, as measured by UPDRS Part 3 in PD patients (Spearman ρ=0.10, p=0.50; **Figure 1D**). Taken together, these data suggest that PD patients were more distracted by novel stimuli than controls.

PD patients had attenuated ~4-Hz midfrontal rhythms

Next, we examined cortical correlates of cognitive control in response to novelty. We found that ERPs were distinct between controls and PD patients, with PD patients showing smaller negative deflections around 100 ms and 300 ms for standard tone trials (**Figure 2A**, top panel) and smaller negative deflections around 100 ms and 200 ms for novel tone trials (**Figure 2A**, bottom panel). In all participants, novel tone trials showed a late (>300 ms) positive component compared to the leveling off observed in the standard tone trials (e.g. the "P3a"). This positive deflection appeared to be higher for PD subjects than control subjects; however, the possibility of an underlying low-frequency contribution across the entire ERP in PD subjects suggests that time-frequency analysis might be more effective in isolating unique temporal events that differ between groups.

We examined power from an *a priori* tf-ROI (4-8 Hz for 300-400 ms post-tones; blue box in **Figure 2D**). Our linear mixed-effects model revealed a significant effect of tone type on this tf-ROI ($F(1,73)=51.1$, $p<0.001$), with novel trials showing higher 4-8 Hz band power. However, there were no significant main effects of group, MoCA, or UPDRS Part 3, and there was not a significant interaction between group and trial condition ($F(1,73)=3.7$, $p=0.06$). We found that there was no significant relationship between midfrontal ~4-Hz power and novelty-related slowing (Spearman $\rho=-0.16$, $p=0.17$), indicating that average ~4-Hz power across novelty trials may not directly translate to performance on this task. Further, ~4-Hz power in our tf-ROI on novel trials did not correlate significantly with MoCA (Spearman $\rho=0.13$, $p=0.28$) or UPDRS Part 3 (for PD group only; Spearman $\rho=-0.24$, $p=0.10$), suggesting that midfrontal activity during this task may not be associated with general cognitive functioning or affected by PD

355 motor symptoms. These data are convergent with our past work showing that that midfrontal ~4-
356 Hz rhythms signify cues and are distinct in PD, but are not specifically linked with response
357 control.

358

359 *Human single STN neurons were modulated around responses to novelty*

360 To comprehensively investigate the cortico-striatal pathways underling novelty-modulated
361 responses, we leveraged intraoperative neurophysiology to record from single STN neurons.
362 Participants performed the task with a median accuracy of 87% (Q1-Q3: 82%-92%); there was
363 no difference in median accuracy or reaction time between tone types (accuracy: standard 86%
364 (77%-93%), novel 90% (80%-95%), p=0.21, effect size r=0.71; reaction time: standard 877 ms
365 (721-1024 ms), novel 875 ms (761-936 ms), p=0.99, effect size r=0.71; **Figure 3B**).

366 With these 18 participants, we also performed intraoperative scalp EEG (**Figure 4A**).
367 Although these recording locations were anterior to the midfrontal areas which showed peak ~4-
368 Hz activity in the EEG experiment outside the operating room (i.e. **Figure 2E)**, we were able to
369 capture midfrontal cue-related ~4-Hz activity during trials with standard tones from the
370 intraoperative participants (**Figure 4B**). We did not identify strong novelty-related midfrontal
371 ~4-Hz activity (**Figure 4C**), although a poorer signal-to-noise ratio due to intraoperative
372 limitations may have particularly affected responses to novel stimuli wherein trial numbers were
373 lower.

374 We identified 54 well-isolated STN neurons from 17 of the 18 participants (1 did not have
375 STN neuronal recordings; **Figure 4D-E**). We defined modulations via neuron-by-neuron GLMs
376 of firing rate vs. all cues and responses at a trial-by-trial level. We found that 5 of the 54 neurons

377 (9%) were significantly modulated around the cue. By contrast, we found significantly more
378 neurons (17 of 54, 32%) with response-related activity (χ^2=8.2; p=0.004; **Figure 4E & Figure**
379 **5A–B**). To further characterize the patterns of neuronal activity, we utilized PCA, a proven, data-
380 driven technique, to characterize neuronal activity (Chapin & Nicolelis, 1999; Narayanan &
381 Laubach, 2009). We found that the first component (principal component 1; PC1) explained
382 38.5% of variance and appeared to be modulated around response; PC2 explained 28.5% of
383 variance and was modulated prior to response (**Figure 5C-D**). These results provide convergent
384 evidence from two distinct analytic approaches (GLM and PCA) that STN neurons were strongly
385 response modulated.
386 Next, we were interested in how response-related activity was modulated by novel cues.
387 Strikingly, we found that nearly all (16 of 17; 94%; **Figure 6B**) response-related neurons had
388 differential activity with novel cues as quantified by an FDR-corrected neuron-by-neuron GLM
389 of event type on response-related activity. Thus, these data indicate that STN response-related
390 activity was powerfully modulated by novelty.
391
392 *Response-related STN neurons had low-frequency coherence with midfrontal EEG*
393 Finally, we were interested in the relationship between STN neuronal activity with scalp
394 EEG-related modulations. We examined spike-field coherence, through which we could link the
395 activity of midfrontal scalp electrodes to STN spiking (Kim & Narayanan, 2019; Narayanan et
396 al., 2013; Parker et al., 2014, 2015). For some STN neurons, we noticed that spikes fired in-
397 phase with low-frequency scalp EEG activity (**Figure 7A**). Among response-related STN
398 neurons, we noticed significant low-frequency spike-field scalp-STN coherence after the cue
399 around the time of responses (**Figure 7B**). Around responses, low-frequency coherence was

stronger for response-related neurons compared to non-response-related neurons (**Figure 7C vs 7B**; scaled spike-field coherence for response neurons: 1.1(0.5-1.8) vs. non-response neurons 0.3(0.1-0.7); Wilcoxon rank sum p=0.003; effect size r=0.40). These data provide evidence that STN response-related activity could reflect frontal top-down novelty-induced orienting and control. Together, these data support the idea that novelty can trigger midfrontal low-frequency rhythms, which in turn engage subcortical STN circuits involved in response control.

Discussion

In this study, we combined scalp-based EEG and intraoperative recordings to examine novelty-related brain activity in frontal-subcortical circuits. We report three main results: 1) Both PD and control participants engaged low-frequency power in response to novel stimuli, but, compared to control participants, PD patients had an attenuated midfrontal response ~4-Hz (although this activity was not linked with novelty-related slowing or cognitive status); 2) STN neurons were strongly modulated by novel responses, and 3) STN response-related neurons exhibited low frequency coherence with midfrontal EEG activity. Our findings provide a better understanding of midfrontal-STN cognitive control systems in PD and neuronal responses to novel information.

Midfrontal ~4-Hz rhythms are prominently triggered by events that recruit cognitive control such as errors, conflict, feedback, and novelty (Cavanagh & Frank, 2014; Cohen & Donner, 2013; Singh et al., 2018). Our past work found that this response is highly conserved in humans and rodents, and cortical dopamine is critical for coupling of cortical neurons with low-frequency oscillations (Narayanan et al., 2013; Parker et al., 2015). Taken together, our data support the

422 idea that midfrontal low-frequency rhythms recruit neuronal resources to respond to new
423 information.

424 Our work here is in line with past studies from our group and others showing that PD patients
425 have attenuated midfrontal rhythms between 1-8 Hz (Cavanagh et al., 2018; K.-H. Chen et al.,
426 2016; Giller et al., 2020; Singh et al., 2018, 2021; Solís-Vivanco et al., 2018). This line of work
427 includes data from the Simon reaction-time task (Singh et al., 2018), interval timing tasks (Singh
428 et al., 2021), and working memory manipulations (Itthipuripat et al., 2013). Our past work has
429 found that midfrontal 1-4 Hz frequencies are attenuated in PD (Kim et al., 2017; Parker et al.,
430 2014) and strongly correlated with cognitive function during an interval timing task (Singh et al.,
431 2021), although in the present study, these bands were novelty-specific but not reliably distinct
432 between control and PD patients (**Figure 2**, bottom panel and 2D). By contrast, we found that
433 novelty-triggered midfrontal 4-8 Hz oscillations were attenuated in PD but did not correlate with
434 novelty-related slowing. There are multiple generators of mid-frontal low-frequency activity
435 (Zuure et al., 2020), and it is possible that lower frequencies (1-4 Hz) are more commonly
436 evoked by an orienting response (Cavanagh et al., 2018; Parker et al., 2015; Wessel et al., 2016),
437 and higher frequencies (5-8 Hz) represent performance-related cognitive control (Cavanagh &
438 Frank, 2014; Cohen & Donner, 2013; Singh et al., 2018; Töllner et al., 2017; Zuure et al., 2020).

439 We found that response-modulated STN neuronal activity was coherent with these lower
440 frequencies 1-4 Hz. Our work is consistent with prior studies of STN neural activity; indeed,
441 Bockova and colleagues (2011) found that the STN was modulated by distractor stimuli with a
442 positive ERP peak around 200 ms, and Brittain and colleagues (2012) found that response
443 inhibition is associated with STN activity, which serves to suppress motor-related output from
444 the basal ganglia. The low-frequency coherence we found is consistent with recent studies that

445 revealed that oscillations in the STN during conflict are driven by midfrontal 2-7 Hz activity
446 (Cavanagh et al., 2011, 2017; Zavala et al., 2014; Zeng et al., 2021). It is possible that multiple
447 cortical 4-8 Hz theta features could couple with lower-frequency (~2 Hz) STN oscillations,
448 resulting in a novelty-induced slowing mechanism. This could suggest that the cortex has more
449 sophisticated information integration whereas the STN could more simply carry out reactive
450 responses to novelty (e.g. stop & orient). Multiple studies have indirectly demonstrated
451 connectivity between the frontal cortex and the STN in a pathway known as the hyperdirect
452 pathway (Brunenberg et al., 2012; Haynes & Haber, 2013). This pathway was described by
453 Nambu and colleagues (2002) as a cortico-subthalamo-pallidal pathway involved in motor
454 control and output. Intraoperative stimulation studies have demonstrated monosynaptic
455 hyperdirect connectivity (W. Chen et al., 2020; Kelley et al., 2018; Miocinovic et al., 2018;
456 Walker et al., 2012). It is possible that STN-midfrontal spike-field coherence is a result of either
457 hyperdirect connectivity or feed-forward activity via the basal ganglia indirect pathway, or both.
458 Experimentally teasing these contributions apart may require experiments in nonhuman systems
459 in which basal ganglia pathways can be reversibly inactivated while recording from STN
460 neurons.

461 Our data help us understand how PD impacts novelty-related responses. Previous studies have
462 shown that PD patients present with impaired habituation over repeated stimulus presentations,
463 and that attenuated midfrontal theta activity is related to the rate of startle habituation (Cavanagh
464 et al., 2018; K.H. Chen et al., 2016). Importantly, EEG habituation to novelty can effectively
465 classify PD patients (Cavanagh et al., 2018). In our study, PD patients were not as successful as
466 controls at quickly reorienting to the task at hand when presented with distracting novel stimuli.
467 We found that PD patients also demonstrated reduced novelty-related frontal theta oscillations

compared to controls (although theta power was not directly related to behavioral response speed). These findings suggest that structural and functional changes related to PD affect the circuitry that evaluates and responds to novel stimuli.

Our work has several limitations. First, intraoperative recordings present many challenges, including a lack of control over the experimental environment. In particular, our intracranial EEG used adhesive electrodes and the electrode placement was somewhat anterior to the peak of midfrontal ~4-Hz activity our whole scalp EEG experiment captured (i.e. **Figure 2E**). These factors may have affected our signal-to-noise ratio, particularly on novel trials with low trial numbers. Because STN single-unit recordings occur in PD patients with attenuated novelty-triggered midfrontal ~4-Hz rhythms, it is unknown how our STN findings generalize to non-PD patients or patients with other brain diseases that disrupt frontostriatal circuits. Finally, our *a priori* approach focused on a midfrontal ~4-Hz region-of-interest, which did not perfectly overlap with data-driven novelty-related differences in controls vs. PD patients.

Overall, we found evidence for a ~4-Hz stimulus-response arc between the frontal cortex and STN during novelty. Our findings align with recent work demonstrating clinical relevance of midfrontal ~4-Hz activity in PD (Singh et al., 2021; Solís-Vivanco et al., 2018). Further, small studies have revealed that STN low-frequency (~4–5 Hz) stimulation can beneficially impact conflict (Scangos et al., 2017) and interval timing (Kelley et al., 2018). These findings in humans are further supported by evidence from animal models of PD showing that highly-specific low-frequency stimulation can improve interval timing (Kim et al., 2017; Kim & Narayanan, 2019). It is possible, though it remains to be demonstrated in humans, that stimulating the STN at 4 Hz resolves impaired midfrontal ~4-Hz oscillatory activity. Restoring behaviorally-relevant ~4-Hz

490 oscillations may contribute directly to improved cognitive performance. Future research should
491 systematically evaluate this mechanism in humans.
492 Overall, the current studies show that novelty-related distraction is more evident in PD
493 subjects compared to controls, that PD patients engage less novelty-related theta power, that
494 neurons in the STN are modulated around responses to novelty, and that neurons in the STN and
495 the midfrontal cortex have low-frequency coherence around responses to novelty. Our data
496 illuminate how novelty modulates ~4-Hz rhythms in hyperdirect circuits, which may provide
497 insight into neuronal responses to novelty and PD-related changes in cognitive control. This
498 work may be significant in the development of novel biomarkers or treatments for PD and other
499 brain diseases degrading basal ganglia circuits.
500

Contributions

RC, NN, JFC, and JG conceived and designed experiments; RC and AE recorded EEG data; RC and JG performed intraoperative recordings; AS, RC, JFC, and NN wrote analysis code; RC, JFC, NN, and JG wrote the paper; and JB independently checked the data.

References

Andrés, P., Parmentier, F. B. R., & Escera, C. (2006). The effect of age on involuntary capture of attention by irrelevant sounds: A test of the frontal hypothesis of aging. *Neuropsychologia*, *44*(12), 2564–2568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.05.005

Benjamini, Y., & Yekutieli, D. (2001). The Control of the False Discovery Rate in Multiple Testing under Dependency. *The Annals of Statistics*, *29*(4), 1165–1188. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2674075

Bočková, M., Chládek, J., Jurák, P., Halámek, J., Baláž, M., & Rektor, I. (2011). Involvement of the subthalamic nucleus and globus pallidus internus in attention. *Journal of Neural Transmission*, *118*(8), 1235–1245. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-010-0575-4

Brainard, D. H. (1997). The Psychophysics Toolbox. *Spatial Vision*, *10*(4), 433–436.

Brittain, J. S., Watkins, K. E., Joundi, R. A., Ray, N. J., Holland, P., Green, A. L., Aziz, T. Z., & Jenkinson, N. (2012). A role for the subthalamic nucleus in response inhibition during conflict. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *32*(39), 13396–13401. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2259-12.2012

Brunenberg, E. J. L., Moeskops, P., Backes, W. H., Pollo, C., Cammoun, L., Vilanova, A., Janssen, M. L. F., Visser-Vandewalle, V. E. R. M., ter Haar Romeny, B. M., Thiran, J. P., & Platel, B. (2012). Structural and resting state functional connectivity of the subthalamic nucleus: Identification of motor stn parts and the hyperdirect pathway. *PLoS ONE*, *7*(6). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0039061

Cavanagh, J. F., & Frank, M. J. (2014). Frontal theta as a mechanism for cognitive control. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *18*(8), 414–421. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.04.012

Cavanagh, J. F., Kumar, P., Mueller, A. A., Richardson, S. P., & Mueen, A. (2018). Diminished

EEG habituation to novel events effectively classifies Parkinson's patients. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *129*(2), 409–418. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2017.11.023

Cavanagh, J. F., Sanguinetti, J. L., Allen, J. J. B., Sherman, S. J., & Michael, J. F. (2017). The Subthalamic Nucleus Contributes to Post-error Slowing. *Washington, DC: APA, Guideline Development Panel for the Treatment of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in Adults.*, 139. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00659

Cavanagh, J. F., Wiecki, T. V., Cohen, M. X., Figueroa, C. M., Samanta, J., Sherman, S. J., & Frank, M. J. (2011). Subthalamic nucleus stimulation reverses mediofrontal influence over decision threshold. *Nature Neuroscience*, *14*(11), 1462–1467. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2925

Chapin, J. K., & Nicolelis, M. A. L. (1999). Principal component analysis of neuronal ensemble activity reveals multidimensional somatosensory representations. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, *94*(1), 121–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0270(99)00130-2

Chen, K.-H., Okerstrom, K. L., Kingyon, J. R., Anderson, S. W., Cavanagh, J. F., & Narayanan, N. S. (2016). Startle Habituation and Midfrontal Theta Activity in Parkinson Disease. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *10*(4), 431–441. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01012

Chen, W., de Hemptinne, C., Miller, A., Leibbrand, M., Little, S., Lim, D., Larson, P., & Starr, P. (2020). Prefrontal-Subthalamic Hyperdirect Pathway Modulates Movement Inhibition in Humans. *Neuron*, *106*(4), 579-588.e3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2020.02.012

Cohen, M. X. (2014). *Analyzing Neural Time Series Data: Theory and Practice*. The MIT Press.

Cohen, M. X., & Donner, T. H. (2013). Midfrontal conflict-related theta-band power reflects neural oscillations that predict behavior. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *110*(12), 2752–2763. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00479.2013

Debener, S., Makeig, S., Delorme, A., & Engel, A. K. (2005). What is novel in the novelty oddball paradigm? Functional significance of the novelty P3 event-related potential as revealed by independent component analysis. *Cognitive Brain Research*, *22*(3), 309–321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2004.09.006

Emmons, E., Kennedy, M., Kim, Y., & Narayanan, N. (2019). Corticostriatal stimulation compensates for medial frontal inactivation during interval timing. *Scientific Reports*, *9*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-50975-7

Emmons, E., Tunes-Chiuffa, G., Choi, J., Bruce, R., Weber, M., Kim, Y., & Narayanan, N. (2020). Temporal Learning Among Prefrontal and Striatal Ensembles. *Cerebral Cortex Communications*, *1*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1093/texcom/tgaa058

Escera, C., Alho, K., Winkler, I., & Naatanen, R. (1998). *Neural Mechanisms of Involuntary Attention*. 590–604.

Fan, J. (2014). An information theory account of cognitive control. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *8*(SEP), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00680

Giller, F., Bensmann, W., Mückschel, M., Stock, A. K., & Beste, C. (2020). Evidence for a causal role of superior frontal cortex theta oscillations during the processing of joint subliminal and conscious conflicts. *Cortex*, *132*, 15–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2020.08.003

Haynes, W. I. A., & Haber, S. N. (2013). The organization of prefrontal-subthalamic inputs in primates provides an anatomical substrate for both functional specificity and integration: Implications for basal ganglia models and deep brain stimulation. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *33*(11), 4804–4814. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4674-12.2013

Itthipuripat, S., Wessel, J. R., & Aron, A. R. (2013). Frontal theta is a signature of successful

working memory manipulation. *Experimental Brain Research*, *224*(2), 255–262. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-012-3305-3

Kelley, R., Flouty, O., Emmons, E. B., Kim, Y., Kingyon, J., Wessel, J. R., Oya, H., Greenlee, J. D., & Narayanan, N. S. (2018). A human prefrontal-subthalamic circuit for cognitive control. *Brain*, *141*(1), 205–216. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awx300

Kim, Y., Han, S. W., Alberico, S. L., Ruggiero, R. N., De Corte, B., Chen, K.-H., & Narayanan, N. S. (2017). Optogenetic Stimulation of Frontal D1 Neurons Compensates for Impaired Temporal Control of Action in Dopamine-Depleted Mice. *Current Biology*, *27*(1), 39–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.11.029

Kim, Y., & Narayanan, N. S. (2019). Prefrontal D1 Dopamine-Receptor Neurons and Delta Resonance in Interval Timing. *Cerebral Cortex*, *29*(5), 2051–2060. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhy083

Kleiner, M., Brainard, D., & Pelli, D. (2007). What's new in Psychtoolbox-3? *Perception 36 ECVP Abstract Supplement*.

Lange, F., Seer, C., Loens, S., Wegner, F., Schrader, C., Dressler, D., Dengler, R., & Kopp, B. (2016). Neural mechanisms underlying cognitive inflexibility in Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychologia*, *93*(May), 142–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.09.021

Mikell, C. B., Sheehy, J. P., Youngerman, B. E., McGovern, R. A., Wojtasiewicz, T. J., Chan, A. K., Pullman, S. L., Yu, Q., Goodman, R. R., Schevon, C. A., & McKhann, G. M. (2014). Features and timing of the response of single neurons to novelty in the substantia nigra. *Brain Research*, *1542*, 79–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2013.10.033

Miocinovic, S., de Hemptinne, C., Chen, W., Isbaine, F., Willie, J., Ostrem, J., & Starr, P.

(2018). Cortical potentials evoked by subthalamic stimulation demonstrate a short latency hyperdirect pathway in humans. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *38*(43), 9129–9141. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1327-18.2018

Nambu, A., Tokuno, H., & Takada, M. (2002). Functional significance of the cortico-subthalamo-pallidal "hyperdirect" pathway. *Neuroscience Research*, *43*(2), 111–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-0102(02)00027-5

Narayanan, N. S., Cavanagh, J. F., Frank, M. J., & Laubach, M. (2013). Common medial frontal mechanisms of adaptive control in humans and rodents. *Nature Publishing Group*, *16*(12), 1888–1895. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3549

Narayanan, N. S., & Laubach, M. (2009). Dynamic imaging of brain function. In F. Hyder (Ed.), *Dynamic Brain Imaging: Multi-Modal Methods and In Vivo Applications* (pp. 135–165). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-59745-543-5_1

Nolan, H., Whelan, R., & Reilly, R. B. (2010). FASTER: Fully Automated Statistical Thresholding for EEG artifact Rejection. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, *192*(1), 152–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2010.07.015

Parker, K. L., Chen, K.-H., Kingyon, J. R., Cavanagh, J. F., & Narayanan, N. S. (2014). D1-dependent 4 Hz oscillations and ramping activity in rodent medial frontal cortex during interval timing. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *34*(50), 16774–166783. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2772-14.2014

Parker, K. L., Chen, K.-H., Kingyon, J. R., Cavanagh, J. F., & Narayanan, N. S. (2015). Medial frontal ∼4-Hz activity in humans and rodents is attenuated in PD patients and in rodents with cortical dopamine depletion. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *114*(2), 1310–1320. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00412.2015

Parmentier, F. B. R., Elford, G., Escera, C., Andrés, P., & Miguel, I. S. (2008). The cognitive locus of distraction by acoustic novelty in the cross-modal oddball task. *Cognition*, *106*(1), 408–432. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.03.008

Parmentier, F. B. R., & Hebrero, M. (2013). Cognitive control of involuntary distraction by deviant sounds. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition*, *39*(5), 1635–1641. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032421

Parmentier, F. B. R., Maybery, M. T., & Elsley, J. (2010). The involuntary capture of attention by novel feature pairings: A study of voice-location integration in auditory sensory memory. *Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics*, *71*(7), 1439–1459. https://doi.org/10.3758/APP

Pelli, D. G. (1997). The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: Transforming numbers into movies. In *Spatial Vision* (Vol. 10, Issue 4, pp. 437–442). https://doi.org/10.1163/156856897X00366

Polich, J. (2007). Updating P300: An Integrative Theory of P3a and P4b. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *118*(10), 2128–2148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2007.04.019.Updating

Ranganath, C., & Rainer, G. (2003). Cognitive neuroscience: Neural mechanisms for detecting and remembering novel events. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *4*(3), 193–202. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1052

Scangos, K. W., Carter, C. S., Gurkoff, G., Zhang, L., & Shahlaie, K. (2017). A pilot study of subthalamic theta frequency deep brain stimulation for cognitive dysfunction in Parkinson's disease. *Brain Stimulation*, *11*, 456–458. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2017.11.014

Singh, A., Cole, R. C., Espinoza, A. I., Evans, A., Cao, S., Cavanagh, J. F., & Narayanan, N. S.

(2021). Timing variability and midfrontal ~4 Hz rhythms correlate with cognition in Parkinson's disease. *Npj Parkinson's Disease*, 2020.10.26.356154. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41531-021-00158-x

Singh, A., Cole, R., Espinoza, A., Brown, D., Cavanagh, J., & Narayanan, N. (2020). Frontal theta and beta oscillations during lower-limb movement in Parkinson's disease. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *131*(3), 694–702. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2019.12.399

Singh, A., Richardson, S., Narayanan, N., & Cavanagh, J. (2018). Mid-frontal theta activity is diminished during cognitive control in Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychologia*, *117*(May), 113–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.05.020

Sokolov, E. N. (1962). *Higher Nervous Functions: The Orienting Reflex*.

Solís-Vivanco, R., Rodríguez-Violante, M., Cervantes-Arriaga, A., Justo-Guillén, E., & Ricardo-Garcell, J. (2018). Brain oscillations reveal impaired novelty detection from early stages of Parkinson's disease. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, *18*(March), 923–931. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2018.03.024

Töllner, T., Wang, Y., Makeig, S., Müller, H. J., Jung, T.-P., & Gramann, K. (2017). Two Independent Frontal Midline Theta Oscillations during Conflict Detection and Adaptation in a Simon-Type Manual Reaching Task. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *37*(9), 2504–2515. https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.1752-16.2017

Walker, H., Huang, H., Gonzalez, C., Bryant, J., Killen, J., Cutter, G., Knowlton, R., Montgomery, E., Guthrie, B., & Watts, R. (2012). Short latency activation of cortex during clinically effective subthalamic deep brain stimulation for Parkinson's disease. *Movement Disorders*, *27*(7), 864–873. https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.25025

Wessel, J. R., Jenkinson, N., Brittain, J. S., Voets, S. H. E. M., Aziz, T. Z., & Aron, A. R.

(2016). Surprise disrupts cognition via a fronto-basal ganglia suppressive mechanism. *Nature Communications*, *7*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11195

Zavala, B. A., Tan, H., Little, S., Ashkan, K., Hariz, M., Foltynie, T., Zrinzo, L., Zaghloul, K. A., & Brown, P. (2014). Midline frontal cortex low-frequency activity drives subthalamic nucleus oscillations during conflict. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *34*(21), 7322–7333. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1169-14.2014

Zeng, K., Drummond, N. M. ., Ghahremani, A., Saha, U., Kalia, S. K., Hodaie, M., Lozano, A. M., Aron, A. R., & Chen, R. (2021). Fronto-subthalamic phase synchronization and cross-frequency coupling during conflict processing. *NeuroImage*, *238*(March), 118205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.118205

Zink, C. F., Pagnoni, G., Chappelow, J., Martin-Skurski, M., & Berns, G. S. (2006). Human striatal activation reflects degree of stimulus saliency. *NeuroImage*, *29*(3), 977–983. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.08.006

Zuure, M. B., Hinkley, L. B., Tiesinga, P. H. E., Nagarajan, S. S., & Cohen, M. X. (2020). Multiple midfrontal thetas revealed by source separation of simultaneous MEG and EEG. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *40*(40), 7702–7713. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0321-20.2020

Figures and Tables



Figure 1. Novelty slows responses in control and PD. A) The cross-modal oddball distractor task consisted of trials with an arrow preceded by either a standard tone (80% of trials) or a novel tone (10%; of note, 10% of trials used a novel visual stimulus; these trials were not analyzed). The arrow required a left "p" or right "q" key press, based on the direction. B) Reaction time for Control and PD patients; each dot represents an individual's median RT and the thick horizontal bar represents group medians. Novel oddball stimuli disproportionately distracted PD subjects. Compared to Control participants, PD patients responded more slowly to the arrow on trials when novel distractors were presented relative to a standard tone. * indicates a significant main effect of tone type (standard vs. novel). # indicates a significant interaction between tone type

703 and group (control vs. PD) on reaction time via a linear mixed-effects model. C) Cognitive
704 function as measured by the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) did not significantly
705 correlate with novelty-related slowing. D) UPDRS Part 3 did not significantly correlate with
706 novelty-related slowing in PD patients**.**

707



Figure 2. Novelty boosts midfrontal ~4-Hz power, which is attenuated in PD. A) Average event-related potentials for trials with standard tones (top row) and novel tones (bottom row) for controls (blue line) and PD patients (red line). B) Time-frequency power spectrograms for standard tones (top panels), novel tones (middle panels), and novel – standard (bottom panels) for Control and C) PD, and D) Subtraction of Control – PD. Black lines indicate areas of significance as determined by cluster thresholding. The blue box represents the theta band region-of-interest (ROI) (4-8 Hz) 300-400 ms after the cue. A linear mixed-effects model revealed a significant main effect of tone type (novel vs. standard) on activity in this ROI, no main effect of group (control vs. PD), and a trend towards interaction between tone type and group ($p<0.06$). E) Topographical representation of the comparison of theta power for standard

721 tones (top panel) and novel tones (bottom panel) between controls and PD patients (Control –

722 PD). Data from 50 PD and 25 control participants.

723



Figure 3. Intraoperative recordings of novelty-related responses. A) Auditory 3-tone oddball task performed by patients with Parkinson's disease in operating room during deep brain stimulation surgery. Patients responded to standard (50% of trials) and novel tones (20% of trials) with a right-hand response using a hand-held Kinesis pedal; an additional trial type with a constant stimulus required a left response and was not analyzed. B) Reaction times for standard and novel oddball tones; each dot represents individual median reaction times, and thicker horizontal lines represent group median reaction times. No significant differences for reaction times between groups were found by linear mixed-effect models. Data from 18 PD patient-volunteers during intraoperative neurophysiology.



Figure 4. Recording simultaneously from frontal lobe and STN during surgery. A) Schematic of surgical recording with three frontal scalp-based electrodes (center, right, and left channels), and STN microelectrode recordings. B) Time-frequency plots of activity from the center channel for standard and novel tones in the auditory 3-tone oddball task. Data from 18 PD patient-volunteers undergoing DBS implantation surgery. D) Waveforms from a single STN neuron indicating that neuronal waveforms of voltage vs. time were stable over ~6 minutes. E) Response-locked peri-event raster of neuronal firing from an exemplar neuron; the top panel is a

749 peri-response raster, with each row representing one trial and each tick representing an action

750 potential. The bottom panel represents a peri-event histogram of firing rate around all responses.

751



752

753

754 **Figure 5. STN neurons had prominent response modulations.** A) Average z-scored activity of

755 all 54 STN neurons around responses. B) Trial-by-trial generalized linear models of firing rate

756 vs. cue and response revealed that STN neurons were more strongly modulated by response than

757 cue; *indicates significance via a $\chi 2$ test. C) Principal component analysis (PCA), a data-driven

758 approach to identify neuronal patterns across an ensemble, revealed that principal components 1

759 and 2 (PC1 and PC2) explained 64% of variance among STN ensembles. D) PC1 and PC2 were

760 modulated around response. Data from 54 STN neurons in 17 PD patient-volunteers.

761



Figure 6. Most response-related neurons in the subthalamic nucleus were modulated by novelty. A) Example raster of neuronal spiking from one novelty-modulated neuron. B) We recorded from 54 STN neurons. Of these, 17 STN neurons had response-modulations. 16 were modulated by novelty and response (30% of the total), and 1 was modulated by response only (2% of the total). Data recorded in 17 patient-volunteers.



Figure 7. Response-related STN neurons had low frequency coherence with frontal EEG. A) An example time series from a single trial of center channel EEG and STN spiking activity; cue is denoted via a green triangle, and response is denoted via a red triangle. This neuron becomes coherent immediately with midfrontal low-frequency oscillations after the cue and prior to response. B) Across all 17 response-modulated STN neurons, there was significantly more ~4-Hz spike-field coherence with center-channel EEG electrodes than for C) 37 non-response modulated STN neurons. Spike-field coherence is scaled with 1 representing the 95%

779 confidence-interval for coherence for comparison across neurons. Data from 54 STN neurons in

780 17 PD patient-volunteers.

781

782 **Table 1: EEG patient-volunteer demographics**

Group	Gender	N (%)	Age Median years (Q1-Q3)	Age range yrs	Right Handed (%)	Education median years (Q1-Q3)	MoCA median (Q1-Q3)	UPDRS Part 3 median (Q1-Q3)
Control	Total	25	70.0 (64.0-76.0)	54-85	22 (88%)	16.0 (16.0-18.0)	27.0 (26.0-28.0)	-
	F	12 (48%)	67.0 (60.3-72.3)	54-77	10 (83%)	16.0 (13.8-17.3	28.0 (27.0-28.3)	-
	M	13 (52%)	71.0 (64.0-78.0)	60-85	12 (92%)	17.0 (16.0-18.0)	26.0 (26.0-28.0)	-
PD	Total	50	68.0 (60.3 - 72)	52-86	45 (90%)	15.0 (13.0-18.0)	25.5 (22.3-27.0)	11.5 (7.0-17.0)
	F	19 (38%)	68.0 (66.0-71.5)	53-86	16 (84%)	16.0 (14.0-18.0)	27.0 (24.5-28.0)	12.0 (7.5-16.5)
	M	31 (62%)	66.0 (60.0-73.0)	52-84	29 (94%)	14.0 (12.0-17.8)	24.0 (22.0-26.0)	11.0 (6.0-17.0)
Control vs PD		p=0.41 (χ^2; M vs F;)	p=0.38 (Wilcoxon)		p=0.79 (χ^2)	p=0.09 (Wilcoxon)	p=0.002 (Wilcoxon)	

783

784

785

786

787 **Table 2. Intraoperative patient-volunteer demographics**

Gender	N	Age median yrs (Q1-Q3)	Age range yrs	Right Handed (%)	LEDD median (Q1-Q3)	Disease Duration median yrs (Q1-Q3)
Total	18	67.0 (62.3-68.5)	53-71	15 (83%)	975.0 (687.5-1175.0)	7.0 (3.5-10.8)
F	4 (22%)	62.5 (57.5-68.0)	53-71	3 (75%)	921.5 (819.8-987.5)	12.0 (10.8-13.5)
M	14 (78%)	67.0 (63.0-68.5)	53-71	12 (86%)	1018.5 (687.5-1218.8)	6.5 (3.0-7.0)

788

789