

Title Page

Title

Altering the primacy bias – How does a prior task affect mismatch negativity (MMN)?

Author names and affiliations:

Daniel MULLENS¹⁻², Jessica WOODLEY¹, Lisa WHITSON¹⁻², Alexander PROVOST¹⁻²,
Andrew HEATHCOTE¹⁻², István WINKLER⁴⁻⁵, Juanita TODD¹⁻³.

1. School of Psychology

University of Newcastle

University Drive, Callaghan, NSW, Australia, 2308.

2. Priority Research Centre for Translational Neuroscience and Mental Health Research

University of Newcastle

University Drive, Callaghan, NSW, Australia, 2308.

3. Schizophrenia Research Institute

Darlinghurst, 2010, NS, Australia

4. Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience and Psychology

Research Centre for Natural Sciences, MTA

Victor Hugo u. 18-22, Budapest, Hungary, 1132.

5. Institute of Psychology

1
2
3 University of Szeged
4

5
6 Egyetem u. 2., Szeged, 6722
7
8
9

10
11
12 **Corresponding author:**
13

14 Juanita Todd
15

16
17
18 School of Psychology
19

20
21 University of Newcastle
22

23
24 University Drive, Callaghan, NSW, Australia, 2308.
25

26
27 Email: Juanita.Todd@newcastle.edu.au
28

29
30 Phone: +61 2 49215977
31

32
33 Fax: +61 2 49216980
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

1
2
3
4
5
6 The role in which two tones are first encountered in an unattended oddball sequence affects
7
8 how deviance detection, reflected by mismatch negativity (MMN), treats them later when the
9
10 roles reverse: a “primacy bias”. We tested whether this effect is modulated by previous
11
12 behavioural relevance assigned to the two tones. To this end, sequences in which the roles of
13
14 the two tones alternated were preceded by a go-nogo task in which tones were presented with
15
16 equal probability. Half of the participants were asked to respond to the short sounds, the other
17
18 half to long sounds. Primacy bias was initially abolished but returned dependent upon the go-
19
20 stimulus the participant was assigned. Results demonstrate a long-term impact of prior
21
22 learning on deviance detection; and that even when prior importance/equivalence is learned,
23
24 the bias ultimately returns. Results are discussed in terms of persistent go-stimulus-specific
25
26 changes in responsiveness to sound.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 “Primacy bias” refers to the effect of the role (frequent “standard” or infrequent “deviant”) in
7
8 which sounds are first encountered in an unattended oddball sequence on how these sounds
9
10 are processed later when the roles are exchanged. This effect has been demonstrated by the
11
12 mismatch negativity (MMN) component of the auditory event-related potential (ERP) (Todd,
13
14 Provost & Cooper, 2011). When a regular (e.g., repetitious) stream of sound contains a sound
15
16 that breaks that regularity (e.g., the repeating sound is occasionally exchanged for a different
17
18 sound) MMN is elicited (Näätänen, Gaillard & Mäntysalo, 1978; for recent review, see
19
20 Näätänen, Kujala & Winkler, 2011). The extraction of patterns from sound sequences occurs
21
22 rapidly, with MMN elicited to pattern violations after as few as three repetitions outside the
23
24 focus of attention (Sams, Hari, Rif & Knuutila, 1993; Cowan, Winkler, Teder & Näätänen,
25
26 1993) and after only two repetitions when the sounds are attended (Bendixen, Roeber &
27
28 Schröger, 2007). In general, the more established the repetition (and the more rare the
29
30 deviation) the larger the MMN (Giese-Davis, Miller & Knight, 1993; Näätänen, Sams,
31
32 Järvillehto & Soininen, 1983). However the primacy bias reveals that there are circumstances
33
34 in which environmental statistics are not preserved, such that MMN amplitude to a deviation
35
36 is differentially affected by probability depending upon when it occurs within the sequence.
37
38 The present study was designed to test whether this bias could reflect automatic assumptions
39
40 about the information-value of the sound.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Todd, Provost & Cooper (2011) reported evidence for a primacy bias using a two-tone
51
52 sequence in which a short and long sound alternated roles as a highly probable standard
53
54 ($p=0.875$) and as a rare deviant ($p=0.125$). The period over which roles remained stable was
55
56 varied from fast-changing every 160 tones or 0.8 mins, to slow, changing every 480 tones or
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2.4 mins. The system underlying MMN is highly dynamic and contextually sensitive
4
5 (Sussman & Winkler, 2001), so it rapidly produces MMN to the former standard when it
6
7 becomes a deviant in the new context (Winkler, Karmos & Näätänen, 1996). However, based
8
9 on tone probabilities on a longer timescale, the MMN elicited in Todd et al.'s (2011) slow
10
11 change condition should have been larger than that in the fast change condition if the
12
13 sampling window for probability extraction exceeded 0.8 mins. That is, prolonged stability in
14
15 a repetitious standard should have led to larger growth in MMN size. Surprisingly, Todd et al.
16
17 observed (and Todd, Provost, Whitson, Cooper & Heathcote, 2013, replicated) the effect of
18
19 role-stability to be a function of the order in which tones are presented. For the tone that was
20
21 the first encountered as deviant, MMN was indeed larger in slow- than fast-changing
22
23 sequences. However, for the tone that was the first standard, role-stability had no effect on
24
25 MMN size when it was later encountered as a deviant. This finding was independent of tone-
26
27 type as it was present in both the subgroup who always heard the sequence with the long
28
29 sound as the first deviant and the subgroup who always heard the sequence with the short
30
31 sound as the first deviant (Todd et al., 2011). These data appear to violate a fundamental
32
33 assumption about the MMN process – that MMN size should reflect transition statistics in the
34
35 acoustic stream (Garrido et al., 2008; Wacongne, Changeux & Dehaene, 2012). Although others
36
37 have drawn attention to the fact that context dependent factors can influence the MMN-
38
39 generating process (e.g., Sussman, Sheridan, Kreuzer, & Winkler, 2003; for a review, see
40
41 Sussman, 2007) these data revealed a profound bias of unknown origin on the deviance
42
43 detection system.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Todd et al. (2011) drew an analogy between the primacy bias and the concept of “lasting first
54
55 impressions” – that is, the resistance of one’s initial impression to re-evaluation. They also
56
57 likened the bias to a latent-inhibition like effect suggesting that initial exposure to the first
58
59
60

1
2
3 tone as a highly repetitious and uninformative sound altered subsequent learning about this
4
5 sound. Todd et al. (2013) designed a study to test the latent inhibition-related explanation of
6
7 bias. This study utilised a similar design to the first (short and long sounds alternating roles as
8
9 standard and deviant) but, the order of the first deviant was manipulated within-subject to test
10
11 the longevity (or alternately the flexibility) of the bias. In orders 1 and 3 the long sound was
12
13 the first-encountered deviant and in order 2 the short sound was the first encountered deviant.
14
15 The results of order 1 replicated the earlier finding where only MMN elicited to the first
16
17 deviant (the long sound) was larger in the slow than fast changing sequence. In order 2,
18
19 presented with only a 5 min silent break after the order 1 sequence, once again only MMN to
20
21 the first encountered deviant (this time the short sound) was modulated by speed of change.
22
23 These results confirm the rapid establishment of an order-dependent bias linked to initial
24
25 sequence structure. However, in order 3 (repetition of order 1), the bias was abolished with
26
27 MMN to both sounds larger for slow than fast changing sequences. The latent-inhibition
28
29 explanation cannot account for either the reversal of the bias between order 1 and 2 or the
30
31 lack of bias observed in order 3 (depending on the hypothetical duration of the inhibition
32
33 effect). Instead, the complete disappearance of the primacy bias in the repeat of order 1 was
34
35 interpreted as indicative of a meta-learning process. Meta-learning was proposed to account
36
37 for why stability modulation for MMN to the long deviant (1st deviant in *order 1*), fails to
38
39 occur when it is encountered second in *order 2*, yet the stability modulation observed on the
40
41 MMN to the short deviant (1st deviant in *order 2*) reappears in *order 3*. The disappearance of
42
43 primacy bias was proposed to indicate higher-order learning that may promote flexible
44
45 monitoring of all sounds in an environment with changing sound relevance.
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53
54
55 Data from both studies imply that the initial sequence structure has a profound effect on how
56
57 information about the two tones is subsequently sampled. One explanation put forward by
58
59
60

1
2
3 Todd et al. (2013) is that the bias emerges due to an automatic determination of the potential
4 information-value of the two sounds. The frequent repetition of the initial standard without
5 any linked consequence (i.e., no behavioural relevance) may result in “stamping in” high
6 confidence that this sound is of low importance. In contrast, the first encountered deviant has
7 unknown and thus comparatively higher behavioural relevance. This initial impression may
8 then alter how information about the two sounds is processed. Todd et al. (2013) further
9 suggest that the results observed in their order 3 may reflect that once the bias has operated in
10 both directions, both sounds are recognised as equally important and cortical responsiveness
11 is affected similarly for both. The present study was designed to test this hypothesis by
12 repeating the paradigm used in Todd et al. (2013), but preceded by a go-stimulus detection
13 task comprising the same two tones used in the oddball sequences. If the primacy bias is due
14 to a different attribution of behavioural relevance for the two sounds, completion of the go-
15 stimulus detection task should alter the effect through the prior assignment of (different)
16 behavioural relevance to the two sounds.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The behavioural task used was a simple go-stimulus detection task in which 50% of the
39 sounds were identical to the long sounds participants would later hear in the oddball sequence
40 while the other 50% were equivalent to the short sounds in the subsequent oddball sequence.
41 Half of the participants were asked to respond as quickly as possible to the long sound (long
42 go-stimulus group) and the other half to the short sound (short go-stimulus group). Thus both
43 sounds had (albeit opposite) behavioural relevance for both groups: the occurrence of the
44 designated go-stimulus cued the need to respond and the occurrence of the designated no-go-
45 stimulus, the need to inhibit a response. We hypothesised that if the primacy bias is due to
46 assignment of higher behavioural relevance attributed to the first deviant, then the prior task
47 would either abolish the bias (due to both sounds having behavioural relevance in the task) or
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interfere with the establishment of a bias favouring the no-go-stimulus (i.e., no short-sound
4
5 bias in order 2 for the long-prime group and no long sound bias in order 1 and 3 for the short-
6
7 prime group).
8
9

10 11 12 13 **Method**

14 15 **Participants**

16
17 A total of 30 healthy participants (aged 18-35 years; mean=22.4; SD=4.6) were recruited. Of
18
19 the total group 9 were male and all participants were recruited from the first year
20
21 Undergraduate Psychology student body at the University of Newcastle or volunteers from
22
23 the community. Volunteers were excluded if they were under 18 or over 35 years of age,
24
25 were diagnosed with or being treated for mental illness, had a first degree relative with
26
27 schizophrenia, regularly used recreational drugs, regularly consumed alcohol heavily, had a
28
29 history of neurological disorder, head injury or surgery, or a hearing impairment. Course
30
31 credit was offered for participation to students, and cash remuneration to community
32
33 volunteers. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 44 **Go-stimulus Detection Task**

45
46 Participants' encountered long (60ms) and short (30ms) 1000Hz pure tones presented
47
48 binaurally over headphones at 75dB SPL. Each sound was created with a 5ms rise/fall time,
49
50 and either a 20ms or 50ms pedestal to produce a 30ms and 60ms sound respectively. Short
51
52 and long tones were pseudorandomly presented at equal probability (50:50) with the
53
54 restriction that no more than 3 of the same sounds occurred in a row. The assigned go-
55
56 stimulus was either the short tone (short go-stimulus group) or long tone (long go-stimulus
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 group), which was alternated across participants. Participants were presented with three
4
5 blocks of 100 sounds presented at a 300 ms stimulus onset asynchrony, and were instructed to
6
7 push a button each time the go-stimulus sound was heard (150 total go-stimulus, 50 for each
8
9 block). There were 15 participants in the short go-stimulus group and 15 in the long go-
10
11 stimulus group. As Todd et al. (2011) found a relationship between auditory sensory memory
12
13 and bias, subgroups performance was matched on total Digit Span score (the sum of forwards
14
15 and backwards scores, short go-stimulus group mean = 18.58 (SD= 3.85), long go-stimulus
16
17 group mean = 18.74 (SD = 3.25), a task in which participants hear digits spoken at a rate of
18
19 one per second and have to repeat them back in forwards or backwards order (Wechsler,
20
21 1997).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Oddball Sequences**

30
31
32 The same short and long sounds were presented in two different block types characterised by
33
34 different sound probabilities. These were classified as short standard blocks where the 30ms
35
36 (short) sound was highly probable ($p=0.875$) and the 60ms (long) sound was the rare deviant
37
38 ($p=0.125$); and long standard blocks where the probabilities were reversed (60ms presented
39
40 $p=0.875$ and 30ms $p=0.125$). Figure 1 depicts the sequences. Both short and long standard
41
42 blocks were presented with slow and fast alternation rates. The slow-changing sequence
43
44 contained 1920 sounds in blocks alternating after every 480 tones which created a role-
45
46 stability period of 2.4 minutes (two repeats of each block). The fast-changing sequence
47
48 contained the same number of sounds, but the blocks alternated every 160 tones creating a
49
50 role-stability period 0.8 minutes (six repeats of each block). Each sequence lasted 9.6 minutes
51
52 in total.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The sequences were presented in two different orders as per Figure 1 and replicated the
4
5 protocol used by Todd et al (2013). The slow sequence always preceded the fast sequence. In
6
7 Order 1 and Order 3, the sequence began with the short standard blocks whilst in Order 2, the
8
9 sequence began with the long standard block first. A two-minute break was enforced between
10
11 order conditions and short 1-2 minute breaks occurred between sequences to allow
12
13 participants to move or stretch (total testing time of approximately 1 hour and 15 minutes).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Procedure**

24
25
26 All participants completed a screening interview to ensure inclusion criteria were met.
27
28 Audiometric screening using a pure tone audiometer established hearing thresholds across
29
30 500Hz to 4000Hz to check for adequate hearing (≤ 20 dB HL) and exclude participants with
31
32 hearing loss. Participants were then fitted with a Neuroscan Quickcap with tin electrodes,
33
34 which included nose and mastoid electrodes. The continuous EEG was recorded on a
35
36 Synamps 2 Neuroscience system at 1000Hz sampling rate (highpass 0.1Hz, low pass 70Hz,
37
38 notch filter 50Hz and a fixed gain of 2010). EEG data was recorded from 10 scalp electrode
39
40 locations (FZ, FCZ, CZ, PZ, F3, FC3, C3, F4, FC4, C4 in accordance with the 10-20 system
41
42 plus left mastoid, right mastoid) and referenced to the nose. Vertical and horizontal electro-
43
44 oculargrams were monitored by electrodes above and below the left eye, and 1cm from the
45
46 outer canthi of each eye to monitor blinks and unnecessary eye movements. Impedances were
47
48 reduced to below 5 k Ω before recording commenced.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Participants completed the go-stimulus detection task first and the oddball sequences
4
5 followed with the break between the task and sequences no longer than 5 minutes. Oddball
6
7 sequences were presented over headphones while the participant viewed a silent DVD with
8
9 subtitles and was asked to remain as still as possible (to minimise movement artifact in the
10
11 ERP) and to ignore the sounds and focus attention on the movie.
12
13

14 15 16 17 18 **Data Analysis** 19

20
21 Go-stimulus detection performance was quantified in terms of hits rate (correct go-stimulus
22
23 identification), false alarm rate (go-stimulus response to no-go-stimulus sounds) and
24
25 sensitivity (Snodgrass & Corwin's, 1988, logistic discrimination index). Results for the
26
27 sensitivity index were compared in a mixed model ANOVA with block (1,2,3) as the within-
28
29 subjects factor and group (Short Prime, Long Prime) as the between-subjects factor.
30
31

32
33
34
35
36 The continuous EEG was first examined offline for major artifacts and corrected for eye
37
38 blinks using the procedures in Neuroscan's Edit Software. The method applies a regression
39
40 analysis in combination with artefact averaging (Semlitsch, Anderer, Schuster, & Presslich,
41
42 1986). The average artifact response algorithm generated was assessed for adequacy (more
43
44 than 30 sweeps in the average and <5% variance) and was applied to the continuous data
45
46 files. The data was epoched from 50ms pre-stimulus to 300ms post-stimulus. Epochs
47
48 containing variations exceeding $\pm 70\mu\text{V}$ were excluded. The data was used to generate twelve
49
50 ERPs to standard tones, twelve ERPs to deviant tones and twelve difference waves per
51
52 participant (short and long version \times slow and fast sequences \times three orders). The first five
53
54 standards in a block and the first standard after each deviant were excluded from averages.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Data for two participants allocated to the short go-stimulus group was rejected due to poor
4
5 quality leaving 13 participants in this group.
6
7

8
9
10 Epochs were baseline corrected pre-stimulus and then averaged according to stimulus type.
11
12 The standard and deviant ERPs were digitally filtered with a low pass of 30Hz. Difference
13
14 waves were computed by subtracting the averaged response to each standard from the
15
16 averaged response to each deviant in each sequence. For example, the difference wave to a
17
18 30ms deviant in fast change blocks was created by subtracting the ERP to the 30ms standard
19
20 in fast change blocks from the ERP to the 30ms deviant tone in the fast change blocks. This
21
22 reduces contribution of exogenous component differences in the computation of MMN
23
24 (Jacobsen & Schröger, 2003). The difference waves were then filtered with a low pass of
25
26 20Hz (lower cut-off recommended for MMN, Kujala, Tervaniemi & Schröger, 2007). All
27
28 ERPs were re-referenced to the averaged activity at the left and right mastoid sites to
29
30 maximise signal to noise ratio (Joutsiniemi et al., 1998).
31
32
33
34
35

36 MMN was quantified in difference waveforms by finding the latency of the negative peak
37
38 within 100-250ms post-stimulus and measuring the mean voltage within a window with 10ms
39
40 on either side of the peak (a mean-peak measure). Mean-peak amplitudes at F4 were analysed
41
42 in a mixed model ANOVA using within-subjects factors of order (1,2,3), speed of change
43
44 (Fast, Slow) and tone (short, long) and a between-subjects factor of group (short go-stimulus,
45
46 long go-stimulus). Within-subjects contrasts were analysed to identify significant linear and
47
48 quadratic trends. ERPs to standard tones were overlaid for identification of periods of
49
50 apparent difference. Mean amplitude was extracted from 100-150ms and the same mixed
51
52 model ANOVA design was used to investigate effects. All significant results are reported
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 together with the η^2 effect size and the ϵ Greenhouse-Geisser corrections for sphericity where
4
5 appropriate.
6
7
8
9
10

11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

Go-stimulus Detection Task

A repeated measures ANOVA confirmed a main effect of block on sensitivity ($\epsilon = 0.72$, $F(2, 54) = 18.48$, $p < .001$). As groups did not differ significantly on any index of go-stimulus detection performance results are presented collapsed over group. Go-stimulus detection on block 1 was low on average (hit rate $m = 0.54$, $sd = 0.07$, false alarm rate $m = 0.19$, $sd = 0.07$, sensitivity $m = 2.93$, $sd = 0.52$). Performance improved dramatically for block 2 (hit rate $m = 0.82$, $sd = 0.03$, false alarm rate $m = 0.07$, $sd = 0.03$, sensitivity $m = 5.34$, $sd = 0.36$) and remained stable for block 3 (hit rate $m = 0.86$, $sd = 0.03$, false alarm rate $m = 0.08$, $sd = 0.03$, sensitivity $m = 5.64$, $sd = 0.41$). Given the rapid delivery rate of sounds the improvement in sensitivity may in part reflect adjusting to the short stimulus onset asynchrony.

MMN Results

Difference waves at F4 for short and long tones for the fast- and slow-changing sequences are presented in Figure 2 for each of the three sequence orders and both go-stimulus groups. The mean-peak amplitudes of each of the MMNs at F4 are presented in Figure 3. The omnibus repeated measures ANOVA produced a significant main effect of *speed* ($F(1,26) = 16.80$,

1
2
3 $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.39$) and an *order* \times *tone* ($\epsilon = 0.97$, $F(2,26) = 8.25$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.24$) as well as
4
5 an *order* \times *tone* \times *speed* interactions ($\epsilon = 0.87$, $F(2,54) = 3.22$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = 0.11$). Analysis of
6
7 trends additionally revealed that the three-way interaction was further modified by *group* in a
8
9 quadratic trend (*order* \times *speed* \times *tone* \times *group*, $F(1,26) = 4.55$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = 0.15$). To
10
11 explore interactions the results analysed separately within *orders*, *groups*, and *speed* are
12
13 reported below.
14
15

16
17 Analysis restricted to order 1 revealed a main effect of *speed* only ($F(1,26) = 5.70$, $p < 0.05$, η^2
18
19 $= 0.18$) with MMNs in the slow-changing sequences generally larger than in the fast-changing
20
21 sequences for both tones (see Figure 3). Analysis of order 2 data revealed a main effect of
22
23 *speed* ($F(1,26) = 14.90$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.36$) further modified by *tone* and *group* (*speed* \times *tone*
24
25 \times *group* interaction, $F(1,26) = 5.40$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.17$). This interaction is apparent in Figure
26
27 3, where the short- but not the long-go-stimulus group showed a much larger *speed* effect on
28
29 the short than the long tone MMN amplitudes. Finally in order 3, the analysis revealed a main
30
31 effect of *tone* only ($F(1, 26) = 5.05$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.16$) due to the MMN to the long tones being
32
33 larger overall in both groups. In general, it is clear that the two groups produced similar data
34
35 for orders 1 & 3 (where the sequence begins with the long deviant) but differ substantially in
36
37 their responses for order 2 (where the sequence begins with the short deviant).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Analysis restricted to the short-go-stimulus group revealed a significant main effect of *speed*
47
48 ($F(1,12) = 8.26$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.41$) and an *order* \times *tone* interaction ($\epsilon = 0.98$, $F(2,24) = 4.61$,
49
50 $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.40$). Analysis of trends revealed the former to be characterised by a linear
51
52 pattern (slow-changing larger than fast-changing MMN amplitudes) with the order \times tone
53
54 interaction defined by a quadratic trend ($F(1,12) = 6.58$, $p < 0.025$, $\eta^2 = 0.35$) that was further
55
56 modified by *speed* (*order* \times *tone* \times *speed* interaction, $F(1,12) = 6.76$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.36$).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The trends in the data are best visualised in Figure 4, where the MMN amplitudes for each
4 tone are plotted as a function of *order*, separately for the fast- and the slow-changing
5 sequences. In Figure 4, it is clear that the effect of *order* differs for the two tones as a
6 function of *speed* – the difference between slow- and fast-changing sequence MMNs to the
7 short tone clearly increases in order 2 (a quadratic trend in an *order* × *speed* interaction
8 ($F(1,12) = 15.30, p < .005, \eta^2 = 0.56$), whereas the MMN to the long tone remains unchanged
9 (no significant effects or interactions for the long tone MMNs).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Analysis within the long-go-stimulus group revealed a main effect of *speed* ($F(1,14) = 8.57,$
23 $p < 0.05, \eta^2 = 0.38$) and an *order* × *tone* interaction ($F(1,14) = 4.08, p < 0.05, \eta^2 = 0.23$). Unlike
24 the short-go-stimulus group, the long-go-stimulus group did not show any increase in MMN
25 amplitude to the 30-ms tone in the slow sequences for order 2 and the *order* × *tone*
26 interaction for this group was defined by a linear trend, only ($F(1,14) = 6.90, p < .02, \eta^2$
27 $= 0.33$). For the 30-ms tone MMN amplitude, there was a significant linear trend for *order*
28 ($F(1,14) = 6.83, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.33$) with the MMN declining over orders 1 to 3 (see Figure 4).
29 In contrast, for the long tone, there was a linear trend for *speed* ($F(1,14) = 6.84, p < .05, \eta^2$
30 $= 0.33$) with slow-changing MMN amplitudes larger than fast-changing ones across the three
31 orders.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Analyses within the fast-changing sequence data revealed no main effects or interactions. In
49 contrast, the slow-changing sequence data was characterised by an *order* × *tone* interaction
50 ($\epsilon = 0.77, F(2,52) = 12.11, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.32$) which was further modified by *group* in
51 quadratic trends (*order* × *tone* × *group* interaction, $F(1,26) = 4.50, p < 0.05, \eta^2 = 0.15$).
52
53 Although both short- and long-go-stimulus groups exhibited an *order* × *tone* interaction in
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 slow-changing sequence data ($\epsilon = 0.67$, $F(2,11) = 18.88$, $p < .005$, $\eta^2 = 0.43$, and $\epsilon = 0.84$,
4
5 $F(2,13) = 4.85$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.26$, respectively), the former was characterised by a quadratic
6
7 trend (marked by a prominent difference between the MMNs elicited by the two tones in
8
9 order 2, $F(1,12) = 20.21$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.63$), whereas the latter a linear trend (the difference
10
11 between MMN amplitudes to the two tones increasing across the orders with the MMN
12
13 amplitude for long tones increasing and that for the 30-ms tones decreasing, $F(1,14) = 7.69$,
14
15 $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.38$). The difference in trends is visible in Figure 4.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Analysis of the ERP Responses Elicited by the Standards**

23
24
25 The right frontal (F4) ERP responses to the standard tones for each order and speed are
26
27 presented in Figure 5, separately for the short- and long-go-stimulus groups. Differences
28
29 apparent in the ERP responses appeared maximal between 100 and 150 ms. Therefore, mean
30
31 amplitudes for this interval were computed. A repeated measures ANOVA revealed a *tone* \times
32
33 *speed* interaction ($F(1,27) = 25.88$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.49$). For the long tone, there was a clear
34
35 main effect of *speed* (MMN amplitudes larger for slow than for fast-changing sequences,
36
37 $F(1,27) = 14.41$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.35$) which was not modified by group. In contrast, for the 30-
38
39 ms tone, there were no significant effects or interactions, only a significant linear trend in
40
41 *order* \times *speed* ($F(1,27) = 4.42$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = 0.14$). Specifying this interaction revealed that
42
43 *speed* only impacted significantly on the amplitude of the positivity in order 3 where it is in
44
45 fact larger for the fast- than for the slow-changing sequence (paired $t_{28} = 2.83$, $p < .01$).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 **Discussion**

58
59
60

1
2
3 The primacy bias (Todd et al., 2011, 2013) is not explained by existing theories about how
4 MMN amplitude should change with environmental sound statistics. Given that MMN
5 amplitude can lead to orienting responses (Näätänen & Gaillard, 1983; Näätänen, Kujala &
6 Winkler, 2011), understanding influences on the MMN amplitude can provide insights into
7 the processes that determine resource allocation in the brain. This study was designed to
8 assess the primacy bias when the two tones are assigned roles prior to encountering them in
9 the oddball sequences. In the current study, the long and short tones were first encountered in
10 a go-nogo task where they had equal probability. So the first difference from previous studies
11 in which the bias has occurred is that neither tone is first encountered as rare. Further,
12 participants were divided into two groups differing only in terms of whether they were asked
13 to respond to occurrences of the short tone (short go-stimulus group) or to the long tone (long
14 go-stimulus group) in the initial task. Thus the other difference between the current and
15 previous studies was that both tones had behavioural relevance prior to being presented
16 within the oddball sequences: one tone required a response whereas the other that a response
17 should be withheld. Performance on the task indicated that both groups achieved equivalent
18 (and high) sensitivity in differentially responding to the tones.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The MMN data acquired in this study reveal a complex pattern of results that are only
43 partially consistent with the hypothesis that the prior task would either abolish the bias (due
44 to both sounds having behavioural relevance in the task) or interfere with the establishment of
45 a bias favouring the no-go-stimulus (i.e., no short-sound bias in order 2 for the long-prime
46 group and no long sound bias in order 1 and 3 for the short-prime group). The MMN data
47 definitely differ from that observed in Todd et al. (2013). Firstly, the typical pattern of the
48 bias characterised by a *tone x speed* interaction is absent in order 1. Instead, order 1 data were
49 characterised by MMN to both tonal deviants being larger in slow- than in fast-changing
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sequences as reflected in a main effect of the *speed* factor. As reviewed in the introduction,
4
5 the primacy bias is characterised by the absence of significant modulation of the MMN
6
7 amplitude to a deviant that was first encountered as a standard. In order 1, this would have
8
9 appeared as a null-effect of speed of alternation on the MMN to the short tone (as observed in
10
11 Todd et al., 2013). This is clearly not the case in the present study. The data are consistent
12
13 with the notion that the way the tones have been processed was altered by either: (a) first
14
15 encountering tones with equal probability (a necessary feature of the prior task); or (b) task-
16
17 related effects occurring prior to encountering the tones in the oddball sequences (a predicted
18
19 consequence of the prior task).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Group differences in how MMN was affected across the sequence orders provides evidence
28
29 supporting the interpretation that the nature of the task itself altered how the tones were
30
31 processed in the oddball sequences. Although short- and long-go-stimulus groups
32
33 demonstrated very similar data for orders 1 & 3, they responded distinctly differently in order
34
35 2 – that is, they differed significantly only in the order that has previously been observed to
36
37 promote a bias favouring MMN to the short tone. Those assigned the short sound as a go-
38
39 stimulus actually demonstrate a pattern of data consistent with the bias observed in previous
40
41 studies (Todd et al (2011, 2013). In the short-go-stimulus group, the effect of speed was
42
43 significant for the short tone only, which was the first encountered deviant in this
44
45 experimental order. This pattern is absent in the long go-stimulus group consistent with the
46
47 hypothesis that the nature of the prior task could interfere with establishing a bias favouring
48
49 the no-go stimulus. Since both groups had equivalent exposure to the two sounds, the only
50
51 manipulation distinguishing the two groups is how participants were asked to respond to
52
53 tones in the task. Those who were instructed to respond to the short tones exhibited the
54
55 primacy bias when sequence order favoured growth in MMN amplitude for this tone. Those,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 who were instructed to respond to the long tones, did not show the bias. In summary, the data
4
5 support an effect of go-stimulus type on the MMN recorded in the subsequent oddball
6
7 sequences.
8
9

10
11
12
13 An observation germane to this issue is that MMN has been demonstrated to reflect
14
15 perceptual aspects of deviance rather than being tied specifically to the physical parameters
16
17 of standards and deviants (Ross, Tervaniemi & Näätänen, 1996; Winkler et al., 1995). When
18
19 considering the process of perceptual inference more broadly, we are reminded that
20
21 generative models in the brain shape our perception: “what we perceive is that part of our
22
23 model of the world that best fits current inputs and expectations, rather than simply an
24
25 accumulation of sensory evidence” (den Ouden, Kok & de Lange, 2012, p6). Considered in
26
27 this way, the primacy bias may indicate that the generative models underlying perception can
28
29 distort sensory evidence through expectations about the sequence and/or the tones. The key
30
31 question is why the order of presentation (or rather the first role assigned to the tones) distorts
32
33 expectations.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 By what mechanisms does go-stimulus allocation affect the deviance detection process
43
44 reflected by MMN? Todd et al (2013) raise the possibility that the initial role assigned to
45
46 tones (standard versus deviant) induces the bias by allocating a differential value/relevance to
47
48 tones that has a lasting influence on sequence processing. Specifically, the initial standard is a
49
50 predictable sound that is redundant – it requires no action and does not cue anything of
51
52 relevance in the environment. The first encountered deviant, in contrast, elicits a prediction-
53
54 error signalling an event that the current model could not account for. Thus this sound is a
55
56 violation of the expectations, carries information previously not known by the system and,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 therefore, it might be important. A prediction-error signal should engage resources that
4
5 evaluate the potential need for ‘action’, changing the current model and/or responding to the
6
7 stimulus (Friston, 2005). The prior go-nogo task was expected to disrupt this automatic
8
9 allocation of differential value by explicitly assigning behavioural relevance. The absence of
10
11 bias in order 1 data is certainly consistent with prior relevance preventing a bias. The group
12
13 difference in response to order 2 is evidence that prior relevance has a more specific effect on
14
15 subsequent processing – its absence in the long-go stimulus group being consistent with a
16
17 problem establishing bias favouring a no-go stimulus. However, if this can explain the order
18
19 2 differences, it is unclear why the groups do not also show different MMN response patterns
20
21 in orders 1 & 3 for which the direction of the bias should conflict with the no-go stimulus for
22
23 the short-go-stimulus group.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Research from attentive target detection paradigms in animals indicates that assigning
32
33 behavioural relevance to a sound can produce long lasting alterations in prefrontal neuronal
34
35 responses that are linked to alterations in auditory cortical receptive fields (Fritz, David,
36
37 Radtke-Schuller, Yin & Shamma, 2010). In ferrets it has been shown that, although many
38
39 neurons revert back to pre-training responsiveness after behavioural training, a number of
40
41 neurons in prefrontal cortex (40%) actually show persistent target-specific changes in
42
43 responsiveness to sounds that can last for minutes to hours (Fritz, et al., 2010). Authors
44
45 attribute particular importance to this persistent activity noting that top-down signals from
46
47 this area can dynamically reshape receptive fields in auditory cortex in a way that reflects the
48
49 task-relevant feature’s salience, both for frequency (Elhilali et al., 2006, Fritz et al, 2005,
50
51 2010) and temporal discrimination (Fritz, et al., 2007) tasks. In particular, the receptive field
52
53 changes observed tend to enhance responsiveness to the relevant (target) feature and inhibit
54
55 response to adjacent features. It is possible that in the current study, similar task-induced
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 changes in responsiveness could have interacted with those induced by the oddball
4
5 sequences, creating the complex pattern that differentiates the short- and long-go-stimulus
6
7 groups.
8
9

10
11
12 In Todd et al. (2011) role-stability also had an impact on the ERP to standard tones. The
13 impact was consistent with small changes (increased positivity) in response to the standards
14 in slow versus fast changing sequences. However, this effect was not modified by tone type
15 leading to the conclusion that the bias primarily reflected changes in the deviant ERP. In
16 Todd et al. (2013) there were no significant differences observed in the ERP to standard
17 tones. In the present study data for the long tone resemble Todd et al. (2011) with the general
18 trend being a larger positivity in the standard ERP for slow than fast sequences regardless of
19 sequence order or go-stimulus identity. Results differ for the short tone for which the
20 positivity observed for the standard-tone response in the slow-changing sequences is
21 definitely not larger than that in fast-changing sequences; in fact it is smaller in the slow- than
22 in the fast-changing sequence in order 3. The period of difference in the standard ERP
23 precedes the period over which MMN reaches maximum amplitude (after 150ms) but could
24 certainly contribute to the early peak evident in the double-peak morphology often visible in
25 the long-tone MMN (see Figure 2). This result highlights the importance of considering
26 change in the standard ERPs as well as in the computed difference waveforms used to
27 measure the MMN. The interaction observed reflects the positivity incrementing in the slow
28 versus the fast sequences, for the long tone only. Although this could indicate a tone effect
29 (i.e., a feature of repeating longer sounds) a similar trend (larger growth in positivity in more
30 stable sequences for the sound that was the first deviant) is visible but not significant in Todd
31 et al (2011) Figure 3C. It is present both in the group who heard all sequences beginning with
32 the short sound as the first deviant as well as in those who heard the same sequences with the
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 long sound as the first deviant. It is therefore possible that the primacy bias does indeed affect
4
5 response to both standards and deviants with the latter dominating the effect.
6
7

8
9
10
11 In the present study, main effects and interactions were restricted to the slow-sequence data.
12
13 Precision in error estimation is a factor influencing predictive inferences and will have an
14
15 impact on the degree to which model adjustments are made. One interpretation of the
16
17 selective effect on slow-sequence data is that the instability in faster changing sequences
18
19 limits MMN amplitude due to overall lower precision in a less stable (noisy) environment
20
21 (Friston, 2005). The power to demonstrate differential impact of group membership or order
22
23 on fast sequence MMN may therefore be limited. It is noteworthy that significant order
24
25 effects have been demonstrated on fast-sequence MMNs previously (Todd et al., 2013).
26
27 However, in the current data there are clearly no significant effects of this type.
28
29
30
31

32
33
34
35 There are a number of limitations to consider in interpreting the present data. Firstly, the
36
37 duration of the tones was not symmetrically varied with group and order. Although the bias
38
39 has clearly been shown to exist when sequence speeds are counterbalanced (Todd et al.,
40
41 2011) and when tone orders are reversed (Todd et al, 2013), it remains unclear whether the
42
43 properties of the tones are rendered then differentially sensitive to the effects induced by the
44
45 prior task. Secondly, we have attributed the absence of bias in order 1 to performing a prior
46
47 task but it is of course possible that the bias observed previously was simply absent in this
48
49 sample. Although the effect size of the bias observed in Todd et al. (2013) was reasonably
50
51 large (Cohen's 1992, $d = 1.4$), this finding is new and though it has replicated the results of a
52
53 prior study (Todd et al. 2011) it should still be considered cautiously. Thirdly, we suggest that
54
55 animal research showing enduring effects of the behavioural relevance of sound may translate
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to the task performed by human participants in the present study. There is no direct measure
4
5 of such effects in the current study. Finally, a *tone* × *speed* interaction was observed on the
6
7 standard-stimulus ERPs in the present study raising caution about computing differences
8
9 waveforms. The practice of balancing the physical features in computing the difference
10
11 waveform risks confounding effects that are taking place in one block (where the sound is a
12
13 standard) with those in another block (where it is the deviant). This highlights the importance
14
15 of inspecting change in the original ERPs rather than only examining MMNs in isolation.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 In conclusion, the primacy bias modulation of MMN amplitude was abolished in this sample
23
24 where the unattended sound sequence had been preceded by a go-nogo task featuring the
25
26 same sounds. The data are partially consistent with the possibility that the prior task primes
27
28 the response to auditory stimuli in a way that interacts with the mechanisms that give rise to
29
30 the bias. Although it is possible that the initial disruption of the bias in order 1 could be
31
32 attributed to equivalent prior exposure to the two sounds (hence no go-stimulus group
33
34 differences), the group differentiation in order 2 indicates that the nature of the task
35
36 performed (the assigned go-stimulus) has a lasting effect on how sound sequences are
37
38 processed. These data imply a relatively long-term impact of prior learning about relevance
39
40 on responsiveness to subsequent sound.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Atiani, S., Elhilali M., Shamma S.A., Fritz, J.B. (2006) Rapid receptive-field plasticity in A1
7
8 during signal detection in noise. *Society for Neuroscience Meeting Abstracts*.
9
- 10 Atienza, M., Cantero, J. L. , Gomez, C. M. (1997). The mismatch negativity component
11
12 reveals the sensory memory during REM sleep in humans. *Neuroscience Letters*, 237,
13
14 21-24.
15
16
- 17 Bendixen, A., Roeber, U., Schröger, E. (2007). Regularity extraction and application in
18
19 dynamic auditory stimulus sequences. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 19, 1664-
20
21 1677.
22
23
- 24 Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin* 112,155–159.
25
26
- 27 Cowan, N., Winkler, I., Teder, W., Näätänen, R. (1993). Memory prerequisites of mismatch
28
29 negativity in the auditory event-related potential (ERP). *Journal of Experimental*
30
31 *Psychology-Learning Memory and Cognition*, 19, 909-921.
32
33
- 34 den Ouden, H. E. M., Kok, P., & de Lange, F. P. (2012). How prediction errors shape
35
36 perception, attention and motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3, 1-12.
37
38
- 39 Elhilali, M., Fritz, J. B., Chi, T.-S., & Shamma, S. A. (2007). Auditory cortical receptive
40
41 fields: stable entities with plastic abilities. *Journal of Neuroscience* 27, 10372-10382.
42
43
- 44 Fritz, J. B., David, S.V., Radtke-Schuller, S., Yin-P, Shamma, S.A. (2010). Adaptive,
45
46 behaviorally gated, persistent encoding of task-relevant auditory information in ferret
47
48 frontal cortex. *Nature Neuroscience* 13, 1011-1019.
49
- 50 Fritz, J. B., Elhilali, M., David, S. V., & Shamma, S. A. (2007). Does attention play a role in
51
52 dynamic receptive field adaptation to changing acoustic salience in A1? *Hearing*
53
54 *Research* 229, 186-203.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Fritz, J. B., Elhilali, M., & Shamma, S. A. (2005). Differential dynamic plasticity of A1
4 receptive fields during multiple spectral tasks. *Journal of Neuroscience* 25, 7623-
5 7635.
6
7
8
9
10 Garrido, M. I., Friston, K. J., Kiebel, S. J., Stephan, K. E., Baldeweg, T. , Kilner, J. M.
11 (2008). The functional anatomy of the MMN: a DCM study of the roving paradigm.
12 *Neuroimage*, 42, 936-944.
13
14
15
16 Giese Davis, J.E., Miller, G.A., Knight, R.A. (1993). Stimulus mismatch effects in anhedonia
17 and dysthymia, *Psychophysiology*, 30, 646 656.
18
19
20
21
22 Joutsiniemi, S. L., Ilvonen, T., Sinkkonen, J., Huotilainen, M., Tervaniemi, M., Lehtokoski,
23 A., Rinne, T. , Näätänen, R. (1998). The mismatch negativity for duration decrement
24 of auditory stimuli in healthy subjects. *Electroencephalography and Clinical*
25 *Neurophysiology*, 108, 154-159.
26
27
28
29
30 Kujala, T., Tervaniemi, M. , Schröger, E. (2007). The mismatch negativity in cognitive and
31 clinical neuroscience: theoretical and methodological considerations. *Biological*
32 *Psychology*, 74, 1-19.
33
34
35
36
37 Morey, R. (2008). Confidence Intervals from Normalized Data: A correction to Cousineau
38 (2005). *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods in Psychology*, 4, 61-64.
39
40
41 Näätänen, R., Kujala, T., & Winkler, I. (2011). Auditory processing that leads to conscious
42 perception: A unique window to central auditory processing opened by the mismatch
43 negativity and related responses. *Psychophysiology*, 48, 4-22.
44
45
46
47
48 Näätänen, R. & Gaillard, A.W.K. (1983). The N2 deflection of ERP and the orienting reflex.
49 In: A.W.K. Gaillard & W. Ritter (Eds.), *EEG Correlates of Information Processing:*
50 *Theoretical Issues*. Amsterdam: North Holland, pp. 119 141.
51
52
53
54
55 Näätänen, R, Gaillard, A.W.K & Mäntysalo, S. (1978). Early selective attention effect on
56 evoked potential reinterpreted. *Acta Psychologica*, 42, 313-329.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nääätänen, R., Paavilainen, P., Tiitinen, H., Jiang, D. , Alho, K. (1993). Attention and
4
5 mismatch negativity. *Psychophysiology*, 30, 436-450.
6
7 Nääätänen, R., Sams, M., Järvilehto, T., Soininen, K., 1983. Probability of deviant stimulus
8
9 and event related brain potentials. In: R. Sinz , M.R. Rosenzweig (Eds.),
10
11 *Psychophysiology* (pp. 397 405). VEB Gustav Fischer Verlag and Amsterdam:
12
13 Elsevier Biomedical Press.
14
15
16
17 Ross, J., Tervaniemi, M., & Naatanen, R. (1996). Neural mechanisms of the octave illusion:
18
19 electrophysiological evidence for central origin. *Neuroreport*, 8, 303-306.
20
21 Sams, M., Hari, R., Rif, J., Knuutila, J. (1993). Human auditory sensory memory trace
22
23 persists about 10 sec: Neuromagnetic evidence. *Journal of Cognitive*
24
25 *Neuropsychology*, 5, 363-370.
26
27
28 Semlitsch, H. V., Anderer, P., Schuster, P., Presslich, O. (1986). A solution for reliable and
29
30 valid reduction of ocular artifacts, applied to the P300 ERP. *Psychophysiology*, 23,
31
32 695-703.
33
34
35 Snodgrass, J. G., Corwin, J. (1988). Pragmatics of measuring recognition memory:
36
37 applications to dementia and amnesia. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*;
38
39 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 117, 34.
40
41
42 Sussman, E. (2007). A new view on the MMN and attention debate: The role of context in
43
44 processing auditory events. *J Psychophysiology*, 21, 164-175
45
46
47 Sussman, E., Sheridan, K., Kreuzer, J., Winkler, I. (2003). Representation of the standard:
48
49 stimulus context effects on the process generating the mismatch negativity component
50
51 of event-related brain potentials. *Psychophysiology*, 40, 465-471.
52
53
54
55 Sussman, E., Winkler, I. (2001). Dynamic sensory updating in the auditory system. *Cognitive*
56
57 *Brain Research*, 12, 431-439.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Todd, J., Provost, A., Cooper, G. (2011). Lasting first impressions: A conservative bias in
4
5 automatic filters of the acoustic environment. *Neuropsychologia*, 49, 3399-3405.
6
7
- 8 Todd, J., Provost, A., Whitson, L.R., Cooper, G., Heathcote, A. (2013). Not so primitive:
9
10 Context sensitive meta-learning about unattended sound sequences. *Journal of*
11
12 *Neurophysiology*, 109, 99-105.
13
14
- 15 Wacongne, C., Changeux, J.P., Dehaene, S. (2012). A neural model of predictive coding
16
17 accounting for the mismatch negativity. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 32, 3665-3678.
18
19
- 20 Wechsler, D. (1997). Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-III/Wechsler Memory Scale - Third
21
22 Edition Technical Manual. San Antonio, TX, The Psychological Corporation.
23
24
- 25 Winkler, I. (2007). Interpreting the mismatch negativity. *Journal of Psychophysiology*, 21,
26
27 147-163.
28
29
- 30 Winkler, I., Karmos, G., Näätänen, R. (1996). Adaptive modeling of the unattended acoustic
31
32 environment reflected in the mismatch negativity event related potential. *Brain*
33
34 *Research*, 742, 239-252.
35
36
- 37 Winkler, I., Tervaniemi, M., Huotilainen, M., Ilmoniemi, R., Ahonen, A., Salonen, O.,
38
39 Standertskjöld Nordenstam, C G., & Näätänen, R. (1995). From objective to
40
41 subjective: pitch representation in the human auditory cortex. *NeuroReport*, 6, 2317-
42
43 2320.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Author Notes

This research was supported by Project Grant 1002995 from the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia and through infrastructure support from the School of Psychology at the University of Newcastle, the Priority Research Centre for Translational Neuroscience and Mental Health Research and the Schizophrenia Research Institute.

Reprints

Juanita Todd

School of Psychology

University of Newcastle

University Drive, Callaghan, NSW, Australia, 2308.

Email: Juanita.Todd@newcastle.edu.au

Phone: +61 2 49215977

Fax: +61 2 49216980

Figure Captions

1
2
3
4
5
6 Figure 1. Example structure of tone sequences used by Todd et al.'s (2011, first row only)
7
8 and the present study. Cross-hatched rectangles represent blocks with a short standard and
9
10 long deviant tone and grey rectangles represent blocks with reversed tone probabilities; in
11
12 both $\text{Pr}(\text{standard})=0.875$ and $\text{Pr}(\text{deviant})=0.125$. Note that Todd et al. also used several
13
14 intermediate speeds and found no difference between results when the different speeds
15
16 occurred in different orders, and so only the slow then fast order was used in the present
17
18 study
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Figure 2. The group averaged mastoid re-referenced MMN waveforms at F4 to short (grey
26
27 line) and long (black line) deviant tones in the fast and slow change sequences for orders 1-3.
28
29


30 Figure 3. The group averaged peak amplitudes for MMN to short and long deviant sounds as
31
32 a function of change speed and block order. Results are presented separately for the Short and
33
34 Long Go-stimulus groups at F4. Error bars = Morey's (2008) corrected normalized within-
35
36 subject standard errors.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Figure 4. The group averaged peak amplitudes for MMN to short and long deviant sounds
44
45 emphasizing how block order effects on speed of change differ between groups. Error bars =
46
47 Morey's (2008) corrected normalized within-subject standard errors.
48
49
50
51
52

53 Figure 5. The group averaged ERPs to standard tones F4 to short (grey line) and long (black
54
55 line) tones in the fast and slow change sequences for orders 1-3.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Example structure of tone sequences used by Todd et al.'s (2011, first row only) and the present study. Cross-hatched rectangles represent blocks with a 30ms standard and 60ms deviant tone and grey rectangles represent blocks with reversed tone probabilities; in both $\text{Pr}(\text{standard})=0.875$ and $\text{Pr}(\text{deviant})=0.125$. Note that Todd et al. also used several intermediate speeds and found no difference between results when the different speeds occurred in different orders, and so only the slow then fast order was used in the present study

263x63mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




The group averaged mastoid re-referenced MMN waveforms at F4 to short (grey line) and long (black line) deviant tones in the fast and slow change sequences for orders 1-3.
290x140mm (300 x 300 DPI)




The group averaged peak amplitudes for MMN to short and long deviant sounds as a function of change speed and block order. Results are presented separately for the Short and Long Go-stimulus groups at F4. Error bars = Morey's (2008) corrected normalized within-subject standard errors. 216x92mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



The group averaged peak amplitudes for MMN to short and long deviant sounds emphasizing how block order effects on speed of change differ between groups. Error bars = Morey's (2008) corrected normalized within-subject standard errors.
157x173mm (300 x 300 DPI)



The group averaged ERPs to standard tones F4 to short (grey line) and long (black line) tones in the fast and slow change sequences for orders 1-3.
159x206mm (300 x 300 DPI)