Processing of slow-global auditory regularities causes larger neural responses to heartbeats in patients under minimal consciousness state, compared to unresponsive wakefulness syndrome.

Diego Candia-Rivera [1, 2], Federico Raimondo [2], Pauline Pérez [2], Lionel Naccache [2, 3, 4, 5, 6], Catherine Tallon-Baudry [1], Jacobo D. Sitt [2, 4].

[1] Laboratoire de Neurosciences Cognitives et Computationnelles, Département d'Etudes Cognitives, École Normale Supérieure, INSERM, Université PSL, Paris, France.

[2] Brain and Spine Institute, Paris, France.

[3] Pitié-Salpêtrière Faculty of Medicine, Pierre and Marie Curie University, Sorbonne Universities, Paris, France.

[4] National Institute of Health and Medical Research, Paris, France

[5] Department of Neurology, Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital Group, Public Hospital Network of Paris, Paris, France.

[6] Department of Neurophysiology, Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital Group, Public Hospital Network of Paris, Paris, France.

Abstract

Objectives:
Determine if contextual processing of auditory regularities (local-global paradigm) modulate the heartbeat-evoked responses (HERs), and if these modulations may provide complementary information to the auditory related potentials to facilitate the diagnose of patients with disorders of consciousness (DOC).

Methods:
DOC patients underwent the local-global paradigm to evaluate the cognitive processing of short/long term–auditory regularities. High-density EEG was recorded to evaluate HERs in local, global and overall conditions.

Results:
The global effect triggers higher HERs, as well as overall higher HER variance appears in minimally conscious patients. The variance and amplitude effects were uncorrelated, indicating different cognitive processes.

Discussion:
Our results corroborate previous findings on HER variance, a marker able to separate DOC without specific stimulations. HER modulations in response to global auditory irregularities represents a novel neural signature of consciousness access, which may facilitate the bedside diagnosis of state of consciousness with more affordable options to neuroimaging methods.

Introduction

Theoretical developments on consciousness and experimental research have rooted the basis of consciousness to how the brain responds to visceral inputs (Azzalini et al., 2019; Park and Tallon-Baudry, 2014). In post-comatose patients, the consciousness diagnosis is primarily based on behavioral signs of consciousness (Bayne et al., 2017), which aims at distinguishing between patients showing only reflex-like responses to the environment, diagnosed as Unresponsive Wakefulness Syndrome (UWS; Laureys et al., 2010), and patients with fluctuating but reproducible signs of non-reflex behavior, diagnosed as Minimally Conscious State (MCS; (Giacino et al., 2002, but see also Naccache, 2018). However, recent results demonstrate that behavioral assessment is not sufficient and neuroimaging techniques are used to detect covert states of consciousness (Kondziella et al., 2020).

We recently showed that cognitive modulation of the heart-cycle (Pérez et al., 2021; Raimondo et al., 2017) on one hand, and heartbeat-evoked responses (HERs) in resting state on the other hand (Candia-Rivera et al., 2021a) may capture residual signs of consciousness in post-comatose patients in resting-state, suggesting that HERs might convey state-of-consciousness relevant information about how the brain responds to body-related stimuli. Empirical and theoretical research on consciousness supports that bodily and interoceptive processes may shape exteroceptive and metacognitive awareness, and vice versa (Nikolova et al., 2021). Because HERs can correlate with perceptual consciousness in healthy participants (Al et al., 2020; Park et al., 2014), we hypothesized that HERs could be also modulated by contextual processing of different levels of auditory regularities, which may allow to provide additional biomarkers to distinguish between different levels of disorders of consciousness. In this study, we analyze HERs followed by auditory regularities in a cohort of 148 participants.

Materials and Methods

Patients

This study includes 148 participants (11 healthy, 20 Emerging MCS or EMCS, 58 MCS and 59 UWS). Patients were admitted at the Department of Neurology, Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital (Paris, France) for consciousness evaluation through Coma Recovery Scale-Revised (CRS-R) (Giacino et al., 2004).

The study was approved by the ethics committee of CPP Île de France 1 (Paris, France). Informed consent was signed by the patients' legal representatives for approval of participation in the study, as required by the declaration of Helsinki.

Experimental paradigm

Patients were recorded with high-density EEG (EGI 256 channels, 250 Hz sampling rate, referenced to the vertex) under the local-global paradigm that aims to evaluate the cognitive processing of local–short term–, and global–long term–auditory regularities (fig. 1A) (Bekinschtein et al., 2009). The paradigm consists in two embedded levels of auditory regularities in trials formed by five consecutive sounds. The 5th sound defines whether the trial is standard or deviant at two levels: local and global. The local level of regularities is defined within the trial. The global level of regularities is defined across trials (frequent trials ~80% define the regularity, and rare ones ~20% violate this regularity). In fig. 1A, in the XX blocks, the frequent stimulus corresponds to 5 equal sounds (local standard and global standard). In contrast, the infrequent stimulus corresponds to 4 equal sounds followed by a fifth different sound (local deviant and global deviant). In the XY blocks, the frequent stimulus corresponds to 4 equal sounds and a fifth different sound (local deviant and global standard). The infrequent stimulus corresponds to 5 equal sounds (local standard and global deviant).

Each trial is formed by five consecutive sounds lasting 50 milliseconds, with a 150-millisecond gap between the sounds' onsets and an intertrial interval ranging from 1,350 to 1,650 milliseconds.

Data preprocessing

MATLAB and Fieldtrip toolbox were used for data processing and analysis (Oostenveld et al., 2011). EEG data were offline filtered with a 1-25 Hz Butterworth band-pass order 4 filter, with a Hamming windowing at cutoff frequencies). Most artifacted channels were rejected based on the area under the curve of their z-score. Channels exceeding > 3 standard deviations were discarded iteratively (11 ± 1 SEM channels rejected on average). Following the procedure described in (Raimondo et al., 2017), Electrocardiograms (ECG) were recovered from the cardiac field artefact captured in EEG data using Independent Component Analysis (ICA) (Extended Infomax algorithm, default parameters from Fieldtrip). From this, ICA-corrected EEG data and an electrocardiogram derived from independent component analysis (ICA-ECG) is obtained.

To identify further noisy channels, the mean weighted-by-distance correlation of all channels between their neighbors was computed (36 ± 2 SEM channels rejected on average). Neighborhood relationships considered all channels up to distances of 4 cm. Channels with a mean weighted-by-distance correlation lower than 80% were replaced by spline interpolation of neighbors. EEG dataset was re-referenced using a common average and a subset of 64 channels was selected for data analysis (Candia-Rivera et al., 2021b).

Heartbeats were detected on the ICA-ECG using an automated process based on a sliding time window detecting local maxima (R-peaks). Both peak detection and resulting histogram of interbeat interval duration were visually inspected in each patient and manual addition/removal of peaks was performed if needed (23 ± 3 SEM manual corrections to individual heartbeats on average).

Heartbeat-evoked responses (HERs) (Schandry et al., 1986) were computed by extracting EEG epochs from the R-peaks that follow the 5th sound from all the trials, up to 500 ms (fig. 1B). Epochs with amplitude larger than 300 μV on any channel, or where the next or preceding heartbeat occurred at an interval shorter than 500 ms, were discarded.

Data analysis

We analyzed the local and global effects. The global effect is quantified by contrasting all global deviant versus all global standard trials. The local effect is quantified by contrasting all local deviant trials versus all local standard trials. Auditory-related potentials and HERs were analyzed to contrast MCS patients from UWS for both, local and global effects. The analysis performed consists in EEG activity locked to the stimuli or locked to heartbeats located right after the stimuli (epochs where the stimuli was located at less than 20 ms from the closest R-peaks were discarded).

Four HERs comparisons were performed between MCS and UWS patients: HERs to local deviants minus local standards, HERs to global deviants minus global standards, HER to all heartbeats and HER variance to all heartbeats. Auditory related potentials were analyzed locking EEG to stimuli's onset for local effect (local deviants minus local standards) and global effect (global deviants minus global standards).

Statistical analysis

Statistical comparisons were based on Wilcoxon rank sum, Pearson correlation, MANOVA and ANOVA tests as specified in the main text. Cluster analysis is performed in a Monte Carlo permutation test with 1000 randomizations with candidate clusters containing at least 2 neighboring channels for EEG and p-value threshold $p < 0.05$. Clusters were considered significant if cluster p-value < 0.05 after multiple comparisons.

Results

We evaluated HERs in patients with disorders of consciousness undergoing the local-global paradigm that aims to evaluate the cognitive processing of local–short term–, and global–long term–auditory regularities. HER-epochs were extracted as shown in Fig 1B. Average and variance of the epochs were analyzed for trials associated to the local and global effects, and for all trials. Average HER cluster analysis showed significant differences during the global effect (Fig 1C, D). Frontal electrodes at 250-350 ms from the R-peak could distinguish between MCS (0.20±0.79 µV) and UWS (-0.32±0.88 µV; Permutation test, t-stat=345.78, p-value=0.0480, SD=0.0068, ci=0.0132). No significant differences were found when the same cluster analysis was performed in the average HER during the local effect nor for all heartbeats.

To verify if the observed result comes from a modulation of the heartbeats and not the processing of auditory stimulation by itself, we compared the EEG locked to the 5th sound. No significant results were found when using the same cluster nor the best cluster of permutation analysis (Fig 1C). Group-wise HER average differs from EEG activity locked to the 5th sound, as compared in the same cluster or the best cluster (MANOVA test, χ^2=16.6366, df=3, p-value=0.0008).

HER distributions of the cluster with significant differences between MCS/UWS are shown in Fig. 1E. The four groups of patients come from populations with different means (ANOVA test, F=3.76, df=3, p-value=0.0122). EMCS and healthy participants show overall higher amplitudes compared to UWS, although statistically non-significant.

Overall HER higher variance is observed in MCS compared to UWS. Right centro-temporal electrodes at 100-400 ms after heartbeats are significantly different between MCS (0.33±0.33 µV) and UWS (0.16±0.13 µV; Permutation test, t-stat=579.84, p-value=0.0150, SD=0.0038,

ci=0.0075). HER variance is uncorrelated with HER global effect amplitude (Pearson correlation R=0.1645, p=0.0763).



Figure 1. Experimental description and EEG analysis. (A) Local-global paradigm. (B) Heartbeat-evoked response defined by the R-peaks that follow the 5th sound from all the trials, up to 500 ms. (C) Cluster analysis of heartbeat-evoked responses between MCS and UWS patients. The analysis is done for all the recording length and the epochs associated to the global and local effects. Significant differences result from the global effect. Thick electrodes show significant differences in multiple comparisons. Trials associated to local effect do not show significant differences, nor when analyzing all trials altogether. (D) EEG responses for local and global effects. On the first row is shown the time course of the best cluster from permutation analysis, where the R-peak after the 5th sound is t = 0. The second row shows the time course

of same electrodes from the first row, but here the 5th sound is t = 0. The third row is the time course of the best cluster from permutation analysis, where the 5th sound is t = 0. (E) HER distribution of UWS, MCS, EMCS and Healthy subjects of the significant cluster between a permutation test between MCS and UWS patients. Dash lines correspond to mean values. (F) Overall HER variance. On the left, topography of HER variance difference between MCS and UWS patients. Thick electrodes show significant differences in multiple comparisons. On the right the time course of the significant cluster.

Discussion

Considering that brain-heart interactions have demonstrated to be involved in consciousness (Azzalini et al., 2019; Candia-Rivera et al., 2021a; Pérez et al., 2021; Raimondo et al., 2017) we analyzed neural responses to heartbeats during processing of auditory irregularities to characterize DOC. During the global effect, differences appear between MCS/UWS in HERs on the electrodes located in frontal and central regions in both hemispheres. Moreover HER variance is higher in MCS patients than in UWS patients, in right central-temporal electrodes as previously reported in resting state (Candia-Rivera et al., 2021a). HER variance is uncorrelated to HER amplitude in frontal electrodes during global effect. These results put forward that two different ongoing conscious processes might happen in MCS. A first process probed with HER variability differentiates between MCS and UWS patients, irrespective of the current stimulus type being processed. This first process originates from central and right temporal scalp areas and has been linked with social cognition, but could also correspond to a self-consciousness-state marker (Candia-Rivera et al., 2021a). Second, a modulation of HER is specifically observed in response to global auditory irregularities and is maximal in frontal sensors. This second response presents several properties related to a neural signature of conscious access to global deviant stimuli (i.e.: global effect contrast; frontal lobe contribution; latency). Such HERs modulations by conscious access to a new stimulus attribute may well correspond to a self-consciousness updating process occurring 'downstream' to conscious access (Sergent and Naccache, 2012), and enabled for instance in a *global neuronal workspace* architecture. Previous studies on HERs show that prefrontal cortex activity is related to self-consciousness processing in the default network (Azzalini et al., 2019). Various tests showed that locking EEG to heartbeats is necessary to find distinctions between patients, revealing the existence of a possible auditory-cardiac synchrony (Pérez et al., 2021; Pfeiffer and Lucia, 2017). This study gives evidence that HERs detect auditory conscious perception, in addition

to residual signs of consciousness in resting state (Candia-Rivera et al., 2021a). Nevertheless, not all MCS show higher HER amplitudes suggesting that they do not react or only react to some trials that were attenuated when averaging all trials in the time-locked analysis.

The foregoing evidence of EEG-based techniques to diagnose consciousness (Candia-Rivera et al., 2021a; Engemann et al., 2018) show promising and low-cost opportunities to develop diagnostic methods that can capture residual consciousness in non-behavioral MCS, that cannot be detected in behavioral assessments alone and require complementary neuroimaging techniques (Kondziella et al., 2020).

Funding

C.T.B. is supported by a senior fellowship from the Canadian Institute For Advance Research (CIFAR) program in Brain, Mind and Consciousness, as well as by ANR-17-EURE-0017. J.D.S. is supported by the Paris Brain Institute (France) and the program “Investissements d’avenir” ANR-10- IAIHU-06, by the CARNOT maturation grant, Title: Con&Heart to JDS, by a Sorbonne Universités EMERGENCE grant, title: Brain-body interactions, a new window for conscious evaluation in brain-injured patients, as well as a the PerBrain study funded by the European Union (ERA PerMed JTC2019 “PerBrain”). P.P. received support from a Sorbonne PhD grant ("recherches interdisciplinaires émergentes ", France).

References

Al E, Iliopoulos F, Forschack N, Nierhaus T, Grund M, Motyka P, Gaebler M, Nikulin VV, Villringer A. 2020. Heart–brain interactions shape somatosensory perception and evoked potentials. *PNAS* **117**:10575–10584. doi:10.1073/pnas.1915629117

Azzalini D, Rebollo I, Tallon-Baudry C. 2019. Visceral Signals Shape Brain Dynamics and Cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **23**:488–509. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2019.03.007

Bayne T, Hohwy J, Owen AM. 2017. Reforming the taxonomy in disorders of consciousness. *Annals of Neurology* **82**:866–872. doi:10.1002/ana.25088

Bekinschtein TA, Dehaene S, Rohaut B, Tadel F, Cohen L, Naccache L. 2009. Neural signature of the conscious processing of auditory regularities. *PNAS* **106**:1672–1677. doi:10.1073/pnas.0809667106

Candia-Rivera D, Annen J, Gosseries O, Martial C, Thibaut A, Laureys S, Tallon-Baudry C. 2021a. Neural responses to heartbeats detect residual signs of consciousness during resting state in post-comatose patients. *J Neurosci*. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1740-20.2021

Candia-Rivera D, Catrambone V, Valenza G. 2021b. The role of electroencephalography electrical reference in the assessment of functional brain–heart interplay: From methodology to user guidelines. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* **360**:109269. doi:10.1016/j.jneumeth.2021.109269

Engemann DA, Raimondo F, King J-R, Rohaut B, Louppe G, Faugeras F, Annen J, Cassol H, Gosseries O, Fernandez-Slezak D, Laureys S, Naccache L, Dehaene S, Sitt JD. 2018. Robust EEG-based cross-site and cross-protocol classification of states of consciousness. *Brain* **141**:3179–3192. doi:10.1093/brain/awy251

Giacino JT, Ashwal S, Childs N, Cranford R, Jennett B, Katz DI, Kelly JP, Rosenberg JH, Whyte J, Zafonte RD, Zasler ND. 2002. The minimally conscious state: definition and diagnostic criteria. *Neurology* **58**:349–353.

Giacino JT, Kalmar K, Whyte J. 2004. The JFK Coma Recovery Scale-Revised: measurement characteristics and diagnostic utility. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* **85**:2020–2029.

Kondziella D, Bender A, Diserens K, Erp W van, Estraneo A, Formisano R, Laureys S, Naccache L, Ozturk S, Rohaut B, Sitt JD, Stender J, Tiainen M, Rossetti AO, Gosseries O, Chatelle C. 2020. European Academy of Neurology guideline on the diagnosis of coma and other disorders of consciousness. *European Journal of Neurology* **27**:741–756. doi:10.1111/ene.14151

Laureys S, Celesia GG, Cohadon F, Lavrijsen J, León-Carrión J, Sannita WG, Sazbon L, Schmutzhard E, von Wild KR, Zeman A, Dolce G, the European Task Force on Disorders of Consciousness. 2010. Unresponsive wakefulness syndrome: a new name for the vegetative state or apallic syndrome. *BMC Medicine* **8**:68. doi:10.1186/1741-7015-8-68

Naccache L. 2018. Minimally conscious state or cortically mediated state? *Brain* **141**:949–960. doi:10.1093/brain/awx324

Nikolova N, Waade PT, Friston K, Allen M. 2021. What might interoceptive inference reveal about consciousness? doi:10.31234/osf.io/9vxdg

Oostenveld R, Fries P, Maris E, Schoffelen J-M. 2011. FieldTrip: Open Source Software for Advanced Analysis of MEG, EEG, and Invasive Electrophysiological Data. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience* **2011**:9 pages. doi:10.1155/2011/156869

Park H-D, Correia S, Ducorps A, Tallon-Baudry C. 2014. Spontaneous fluctuations in neural responses to heartbeats predict visual detection. *Nat Neurosci* **17**:612–618. doi:10.1038/nn.3671

Park H-D, Tallon-Baudry C. 2014. The neural subjective frame: from bodily signals to perceptual consciousness. *Phil Trans R Soc B* **369**:20130208. doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0208

Pérez P, Madsen J, Banellis L, Türker B, Raimondo F, Perlbarg V, Valente M, Niérat M-C, Puybasset L, Naccache L, Similowski T, Cruse D, Parra LC, Sitt JD. 2021. Conscious processing of narrative stimuli synchronizes heart rate between individuals. *Cell Rep*. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2021.109692

Pfeiffer C, Lucia MD. 2017. Cardio-audio synchronization drives neural surprise response. *Scientific Reports* **7**:14842. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-13861-8

Raimondo F, Rohaut B, Demertzi A, Valente M, Engemann DA, Salti M, Fernandez Slezak D, Naccache L, Sitt JD. 2017. Brain-heart interactions reveal consciousness in noncommunicating patients. *Annals of Neurology*. doi:10.1002/ana.25045

Schandry R, Sparrer B, Weitkunat R. 1986. From the heart to the brain: a study of heartbeat contingent scalp potentials. *Int J Neurosci* **30**:261–275.

Sergent C, Naccache L. 2012. Imaging neural signatures of consciousness: “what”, “when”, “where” and “how” does it work? *Arch Ital Biol* **150**:91–106. doi:10.4449/aib.v150i2.1270