

Jack E. Taylor^{1,2}, Guillaume A. Rousselet², Sara C. Sereno²

¹Department of Psychology, Goethe University Frankfurt


²School of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of Glasgow

JackEdTaylor.github.io/
pwv-poster/

Introduction

- Previous findings suggest the N1 ERP component elicited by words is sensitive to prediction effects, with smaller N1s for predicted words. [1,2,3]
- This pattern may be explained by a simple *predictive coding* model, where N1 amplitude scales with prediction error. [4]
- We tested this account via the interaction between context congruency (*prediction magnitude*) and predictability (*prediction certainty*). [5]

Power Analysis



Preprocessing

- 0.1-40 Hz 4th Order Butterworth filter (double-pass, zero-phase).
- Artefact Subspace Reconstruction to remove non-stationary artefacts ($\sigma=20$). [6]
- FastICA [7] and ICLabel [8] for automated eye and muscle artefact removal (>80% thresh.).



Conclusions

Planned analyses failed to find evidence for the simple Predictive Coding hypothesis.

Exploratory analysis found strong evidence against this account.


A simple Predictive Coding account, without elaboration, is insufficient to account for the word N1.

N=68 participants completed two tasks while EEG was recorded (64-Channel BioSemi Actiview at 512 Hz).






Planned Analysis

Identify Per-Participant Maximal Electrodes and Time Points from Localiser Task



Extract and Model Trial-Level N1 Amplitudes from Picture-Word Task




- Pre-registered analyses failed to support the predictive coding hypothesis.
- Exploratory Bayesian analysis found strong evidence against the hypothesis.

Exploratory Timecourse Analysis

- We fit per-sample mixed-effects models to all data from the left occipitotemporal ROI.

- Consistent with the planned analysis, the interaction remained negative throughout the N1.



References

- [1] Sereno, S., C., Hand, C. J., Shahid, A., Mackenzie, I G., & Leuthold, H. (2019) Early EEG correlates of word frequency and contextual predictability in reading. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 35(5), 625640. DOI:10.1080/23273798.2019.1580753
- [2] Kim, A. & Gilley, P. M. (2013). Neural mechanisms of rapid sensitivity to syntactic anomaly. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, Article 45. DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00045
- [3] Chen, Y., Davis, M. H., Pulvermüller, F., & Hauk, O. (2013). Task modulation of brain responses in visual word recognition as studied using EEG/MEG and fMRI. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7, Article 376. DOI:10.3389/fnhum.2013.00376
- [4] Gagl, B., Sassenhagen, J., Haan, S., Gregorova, K., Richlan, F., Fiebach, C. J. (2019). An orthographic prediction error as the basis for efficient visual word recognition. *NeuroImage*, 214(2020), Article 116727. DOI:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.116727

- [5] Feldman, H. & Friston, K. (2010). Attention, uncertainty, and free-energy. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 4, Article 215. DOI:10.3389/fnhum.2010.00215

- [6] Chang, C. Y., Hsu, S. H., Pion-Tonachini, L., Jung, T. P. (2020). Evaluation of Artifact Subspace Reconstruction for automatic artifact components removal in multi-channel EEG recordings. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 67(4), 1114-1121. DOI:10.1109/TBME.2019.2930186

- [7] Hyvärinen, A. (1999). Fast and robust fixed-point algorithms for independent component analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 10(3), 626634. DOI:10.1109/72.761722

- [8] Pion-Tonachini, L., Kreutz-Delgado, K., & Makeig, S. (2019). ICLabel: An automated electroencephalographic independent component classifier, dataset, and website. *NeuroImage*, 198, 181-197. DOI:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.05.026