



**HAL**  
open science

## Proactive sensing of periodic and aperiodic auditory patterns

Johanna M Benjamin Rimmele, Benjamin Morillon, David Poeppel, Luc Arnal

► **To cite this version:**

Johanna M Benjamin Rimmele, Benjamin Morillon, David Poeppel, Luc Arnal. Proactive sensing of periodic and aperiodic auditory patterns. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 2018, 22 (10), pp.870-882. 10.1016/j.tics.2018.08.003 . hal-03583582

**HAL Id: hal-03583582**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03583582v1>**

Submitted on 21 Feb 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

# Trends in Cognitive Sciences

## Proactive sensing of periodic and aperiodic auditory patterns

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	TICS-D-18-00056R2
<b>Article Type:</b>	Opinion
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Johanna M. Rimmele, Ph.D. Frankfurt am Main, GERMANY
<b>First Author:</b>	Johanna M. Rimmele, Ph.D.
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Johanna M. Rimmele, Ph.D. Benjamin Morillon, PhD David Poeppel, PhD Luc H. Arnal, PhD
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>The ability to predict when something will happen facilitates sensory processing and the ensuing computations. Building on the observation that neural activity entrains to periodic stimulation, leading neurophysiological models imply that temporal predictions rely on oscillatory entrainment. While they provide a sufficient solution to predict periodic regularities, these models are challenged by a series of findings that question their suitability to account for temporal predictions based on aperiodic regularities. Aiming for a more comprehensive model of how the brain anticipates “when” in auditory contexts, we emphasize the capacity of motor and higher order top-down systems to prepare sensory processing in a proactive and temporally flexible manner. Focusing on speech processing, we illustrate how this framework leads to new hypotheses.</p>

1 **Highlights**

- 2 • We review research on temporal predictions (particularly in auditory contexts) and  
3 consider how recent empirical evidence challenges standard oscillatory entrainment  
4 models.
- 5 • Top-down phase resetting mediated by the motor system or higher order language or  
6 attention related systems facilitate bottom-up perceptual processing.
- 7 • A model that considers neuronal oscillations as intrinsic temporal constraints (rather than  
8 subserving a specific function) and incorporates top-down phase resetting is suggested as  
9 a parsimonious solution for both periodic and aperiodic temporal predictions.
- 10 • Assuming that temporal predictions prospectively control oscillatory constraints, the  
11 proposed perspective sets a new frame for the interpretation of neurophysiological  
12 responses to auditory and speech streams.

13



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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

# 1 **Proactive sensing of periodic and aperiodic auditory patterns**

2 Rimmele, J.M.<sup>1\*</sup>, Morillon, B.<sup>2</sup>, Poeppel, D.<sup>1,3</sup>, Arnal, L.H.<sup>4</sup>

3

4 1 Department of Neuroscience

5 Max-Planck-Institute for Empirical Aesthetics

6 Grüneburgweg 14

7 D - 60322 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

8

9 2 Aix Marseille Univ, Inserm, INS, Inst Neurosci Syst

10 27, Boulevard Jean Moulin

11 13005 Marseille, France

12

13 3 Department of Psychology and Center for Neural Science

14 New York University

15 6 Washington Place

16 New York , NY 10003

17

18 4 Department of Fundamental Neuroscience

19 University of Geneva - Biotech Campus;

20 Geneva 7 1202; Switzerland.

21

22 Correspondence: j.rimmele@ae.mpg.de (J.M. Rimmele), luc.arnal@unige.ch (L.H. Arnal)

23

24 **Keywords:** oscillation; prediction; auditory perception; speech; motor; entrainment

25

26

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 **Abstract**

2 The ability to predict when something will happen facilitates sensory processing and the ensuing  
3 computations. Building on the observation that neural activity entrains to periodic [stimulation](#),  
4 leading neurophysiological models imply that temporal predictions rely on oscillatory entrainment.  
5 While they provide a sufficient solution to predict periodic regularities, these models are challenged  
6 by a series of findings that question their suitability to account for temporal predictions based on  
7 aperiodic regularities. Aiming for a more comprehensive model of how the brain anticipates  
8 “when” [in auditory contexts](#), we emphasize the capacity of motor and higher order top-down  
9 systems to prepare sensory processing in a proactive and temporally flexible manner. [Focusing on](#)  
10 [speech processing](#), we illustrate how this framework leads to new hypotheses.

11

## 1 **Temporal predictions in auditory contexts**

2 We extract **temporal regularities** from the sensory environment to anticipate upcoming events.  
3 Although there exists an infinite number of possible temporal patterns or cues that one can exploit  
4 for prediction, the **periodic** (isochronous, often informally referred to as **rhythmic**; see glossary)  
5 occurrence of a sound is perhaps the first regularity that comes to mind. The human brain is  
6 captivated by periodic streams, and human listeners –as well as **some** other species– seem  
7 compelled to synchronize gestures to predictable rhythmic beats [1]. One possible explanation of  
8 this drive is that proactively ‘**tracking** the future’ optimizes processing of incoming information  
9 and the adaption of behavior [2]. The majority of existing data **is** compatible with the notion that  
10 the **entrainment** of neural activity to periodic stimulations is instrumental to sensory selection,  
11 facilitating the processing of events that occur around the entrained, and therefore expected beat  
12 [3]. Although periodicity is the most obvious form of temporal regularity and is used in various  
13 sonic contexts (**speech**, music), limiting the scope of temporal processing to this type of pattern (or  
14 studying it in isolation from other types of patterns) biases and restricts the generalizability of  
15 current models. **Speech**, for instance, contains quasi-periodic energy fluctuations at the syllabic  
16 rate [4]. **However**, aperiodic cues, such as provided by syntactic or semantic information, can also  
17 be used to predict upcoming speech events, e.g. the pauses that typically follow prepositional  
18 phrases [5]. **Although** generally periodic, music often contains aperiodic but trackable, regular  
19 meter at the beat or subdivision level, as featured in music from the Balkan or Africa, amongst  
20 others [6]. **Whether** there exists a principled reason to assume different neuronal mechanisms for  
21 periodic compared to other types of regularities is unclear. At any rate, invoking multiple models  
22 to account for the same process comes at the expense of **parsimony**.

23 We briefly review the main results that have contributed to neuronal (oscillatory) entrainment (Box  
24 1) as the mainstream mechanistic explanation for periodic temporal predictions. We then argue that  
25 recent evidence of perceptual facilitation by aperiodic predictions [7,8] is not compatible with  
26 classical models of oscillatory entrainment. **Crucially**, we suggest that this tension calls for a new  
27 model of how temporal predictions **modulate** intrinsic oscillations to enhance sensory processing.  
28 First, we **advance the view that** neuronal oscillations constitute a ‘processing **constraint**’ (Box 2)  
29 rather than a specific temporal prediction mechanism **operating through entrainment**. **We argue that**  
30 **this view requires introducing the notion of a flexible (e.g. aperiodic) top-down phase-reset** of  
31 neuronal oscillations into the stimulus-**driven** model. **Concerning** the putative sources of top-down

1 modulation, we suggest that in the context of temporally structured auditory sequences, the motor  
2 system constitutes a plausible candidate to generate flexible (periodic and aperiodic) temporal  
3 predictive signals and to influence perception in a top-down manner [9–13] (Box 3). We also  
4 consider other sources of temporal predictions related to distinct cognitive processes [10,14–16].  
5 Finally, focusing on speech as an informationally complex but predictable signal (containing quasi-  
6 periodic and aperiodic regularities), we exemplify how the framework we advance improves the  
7 explanatory power of classical entrainment models and generates novel testable hypotheses.

## 8 The classical entrainment model and temporal predictions

### 9 *Entrainment aligns behavior with periodic events*

10 Temporal predictions have been studied in paradigms where predictions are set-up in a bottom-up,  
11 stimulus-driven manner by periodic stimulation. Typically, auditory targets, are detected more  
12 easily when presented on-time in an isochronous sequences than when presented early or late, or  
13 preceded by a temporally random tone sequence [17]. A by-now classical view, the ‘**Dynamic**  
14 **Attending Theory**’ (DAT; [2,18]), proposed that attention is directed in time through the  
15 entrainment of neuronal oscillations to such periodic stimulation (Box 1). Oscillatory entrainment  
16 (as measured using electrophysiological recording) refers to the **phase alignment** and frequency  
17 adaptation of endogenous neuronal oscillators, to a periodic stimulation (Fig. 1 A2, Key Figure).  
18 In the DAT view, entrainment narrows the time-based attentional focus and optimizes perception  
19 [18]. This theory has strongly influenced visual, auditory, attention, music, and speech processing  
20 research [19]. However, while the DAT –and more generally oscillatory entrainment theories–  
21 provide an efficient and plausible neural mechanism to serve periodic temporal predictions, it  
22 cannot account for the brain’s capacity to generate –and benefit from– temporal predictions  
23 inferred from aperiodic patterns.

### 24 *Aperiodic temporal predictions: aperiodic but predictable streams*

25 The notion of temporal predictions is often confounded with the idea of entrainment to periodic  
26 sensory inputs. The latter mechanism, however, cannot account for temporal predictions inferred  
27 from heterochronous streams of events [8,20], **symbolic cues** (‘memory-based’ predictions, e.g. a  
28 yellow traffic light that indicates a switch to red in a few seconds), or **hazard functions**  
29 (‘probability-based’ predictions, e.g. the increasing conditional probability over time that an event

1  
2  
3  
4 1 will occur given that it has not already occurred) [21,22]. For example, aperiodic temporal  
5  
6 2 predictions occur in language (cf. last section), or in music, where many musical traditions employ  
7  
8 3 non-isochronous (aperiodic) meter, which builds up temporal expectations and can be embodied in  
9  
10 4 dance [6]. Comparing the ability of listeners to extract temporal regularities from periodic as well  
11  
12 5 as aperiodic but –implicitly– predictable sound streams, a recent study [8] showed that performance  
13  
14 6 is equally enhanced for predictable conditions (whether periodic or not) as compared to  
15  
16 7 unpredictable ones. Another study [7] compared the neural responses to periodic and aperiodic  
17  
18 8 predictions and demonstrated that periodic and aperiodic temporal predictions induce similar phase  
19  
20 9 alignment of low-frequency activity prior to an expected target (see also: [23]). These observations  
21  
22 10 contrast with entrainment models, which hypothesize that reducing stimulus periodicity should  
23  
24 11 result in reduced phase-alignment. **Importantly**, these findings suggest that a single neural substrate  
25  
26 12 could account for both **periodic and aperiodic** predictions at the sensory level (for criticism see:  
27  
28 13 [24]).

29 14 **The ‘rhythmic attending mode’** proposed by the DAT (where attention is directed in time through  
30  
31 15 the entrainment of neuronal oscillations; Fig. 1 A2) can be extended by multiple oscillators being  
32  
33 16 hierarchically organized (nested), and thus indirectly entrained to complex, multi-scale, rhythms  
34  
35 17 [18]. **Furthermore, under sustained vigilance task demands, the DAT** proposes an ‘**analytic**  
36  
37 18 **attending mode’**. **In this mode, in the absence of a periodic stimulation, low frequencies are**  
38  
39 19 **suppressed and high frequency activity subserves continuous processing by keeping the system in**  
40  
41 20 **a high-excitability state** [17]. Such models, however, cannot provide a mechanistic solution with  
42  
43 21 respect to aperiodic temporal predictions. It has been proposed that aperiodic predictions rely on  
44  
45 22 memory based ‘interval-timing traces’, to which new intervals are compared [7], an idea  
46  
47 23 compatible with intrinsic models of timing [25]. Such a mechanism does not require periodicity  
48  
49 24 but instead relies on anticipatory processes based on the learning of temporal contingencies. At the  
50  
51 25 neurophysiological level, this has been associated with ‘**ramping-based models**’ (for review [25])  
52  
53 26 where the build up of expectations is reflected in linearly increasing neuronal firing rates (**ramping**  
54  
55 27 **or ‘Climbing Neuronal Activity’, CNA**). In ramping-based models, recurrent excitatory  
56  
57 28 connections within neuronal networks integrate the spiking information to estimate interval  
58  
59 29 duration. Although involved in interval timing, **ramping activity** seems to encode stimulus  
60  
61 30 probability rather than absolute time [26]. **However, because these paradigms typically require a**  
62  
63 31 **behavioral response, it is difficult to exclude the possibility that ramping activity reflects** response  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 1 preparation, or time-dependent decision-making processes.  
5  
6

7 2 To summarize, temporal predictions are classically explained by oscillatory entrainment to periodic  
8  
9 3 sensory inputs. The facilitating effects of aperiodic predictions, however, cannot be accounted for  
10  
11 4 by entrainment, raising questions about the neural substrate of periodic and aperiodic predictions.  
12

13  
14 5 In the following, we outline an alternative approach to reconcile the findings and clarify the  
15  
16 6 connection between neuronal oscillations and predictive processing.  
17

### 18 7 *Criticisms and refinements: the entrainment hypothesis revisited*

19  
20

21 8 Whether distinct neuronal mechanisms exist for mediating periodic and aperiodic temporal  
22  
23 9 predictions, and whether the entrainment of low-frequency (<10 Hz) oscillations plays a **functional**  
24  
25 10 **role** for temporal predictions remains a matter of active debate (Box 2). One criticism about  
26  
27 11 attributing a function to the entrainment of neuronal oscillations is that correlation does not entail  
28  
29 12 causation (or specificity). That periodic auditory stimulation (as featured in speech or music, see  
30  
31 13 [4]) invariably entrains low-frequency neural oscillations does not imply that neural oscillations  
32  
33 14 play a functional role in temporal **predictions**.  
34

35 15 We propose that neural oscillations primarily constitute an intrinsic processing constraint rather  
36  
37 16 than a dedicated temporal prediction mechanism **operating through entrainment** (Box 2). **In this**  
38  
39 17 **perspective**, the entrainment model (Fig. 1 A) can be refined to account for empirical observations  
40  
41 18 involving periodic and aperiodic predictions. The ‘constraint view’ **extends** the stimulus-driven  
42  
43 19 **model by integrating the temporally flexible, internally-driven top-down alignment (top-down**  
44  
45 20 **phase reset) of neuronal oscillations to anticipated events. It assumes that** neuronal oscillations do  
46  
47 21 not constitute a temporal prediction mechanism by itself, but are part of the cortical architecture  
48  
49 22 and support a more generic, canonical function, such as the message-passing of information  
50  
51 23 throughout the cortical hierarchy [27,28]. As a consequence, neuronal oscillations reflect  
52  
53 24 processing time constants, i.e. physiological (**intrinsic**) constraints due to the oscillatory  
54  
55 25 **excitability cycles** of neuronal ensembles. The preferred oscillatory frequency of these ensembles  
56  
57 26 determines optimal temporal frames for processing. Importantly, depending on both the networks  
58  
59 27 **underpinning** a cognitive process and their inter-connectivity **and dynamics**, specific temporal  
60  
61 28 constraints emerge [29–31]. **The processing constraint view, contrasting with non-oscillatory**  
62  
63 29 **models [25,26], also accounts for empirical observations suggesting that perception is a discrete –**  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 1 rather than continuous– process [32]. For example, auditory temporal processing is optimal within  
5  
6 2 certain time windows in the delta- and theta-ranges [33–35], which reflects endogenous brain  
7  
8 3 rhythms of auditory cortex [36–38]. Temporal constraints are also reflected in our ability to  
9  
10 4 understand time-compressed speech, which breaks down at compression rates exceeding the upper  
11  
12 5 limit of the theta range [39]. Further research will elucidate whether and under what conditions  
13  
14 6 plasticity can overcome these constraints.

15  
16 7 Temporal predictions (periodic, aperiodic) operate upon endogenous constraints by predictively  
17  
18 8 aligning neuronal excitability in time to facilitate the processing of anticipated events (Fig. 1 B).  
19  
20 9 Top-down influences correspond to an anticipatory phase-reset (originating from higher-level  
21  
22 10 processes; not directly driven by low-level stimulus features) of ongoing oscillations in those  
23  
24 11 neuronal subpopulations involved in the processing of the expected event (e.g. beat or syllable)  
25  
26 12 [40]. While distinct neuronal mechanisms have been assumed for periodic (i.e., oscillatory  
27  
28 13 entrainment) and aperiodic (e.g., memory-based mechanisms) temporal predictions (for review:  
29  
30 14 [21]), we propose that entrainment of neuronal oscillations is one possible manifestation of a  
31  
32 15 common temporal prediction mechanism, in which stimulus-driven and top-down phase-resets co-  
33  
34 16 occur synchronously (Fig. 1 B). While it may not be possible to dissociate between stimulus-driven  
35  
36 17 and top-down influences during periodic stimulation, the evidence of phase-alignment in aperiodic  
37  
38 18 or contextual situations [7,40] argues in favor of the existence of internally guided, top-down  
39  
40 19 predictive phase-resets.

41 20 In the following, we discuss the evidence for top-down effects originating in different brain areas  
42  
43 21 and their role in (a)periodic temporal predictions (in the form of top-down phase resets).

## 44 45 22 **Top-down sources of temporal predictions**

46  
47  
48 23 By enabling the efficient allocation of processing resources, predicting upcoming inputs reduces  
49  
50 24 sensory uncertainty, thereby enhancing the processing of noisy (weak or ambiguous) inputs. To  
51  
52 25 reduce both external and internal noise, the brain can arguably exploit any available source of top-  
53  
54 26 down priors. Consequently, all neural systems that contribute to precise, time-related computations  
55  
56 27 might inform sensory processing in a top-down manner, without being selectively dedicated to this  
57  
58 28 function [25]. The next section describes the neural sources and mechanisms involved in reducing  
59  
60 29 sensory uncertainty in the time-domain.

1  
2  
3  
4 1 *The motor system's expertise in temporal predictions*

5  
6  
7 2 Auditory perception is carried out within functionally dissociable pathways, the ventral and dorsal  
8  
9 3 **streams** [41,42], comparable to visual perception [43]. Following predictive processing theories  
10  
11 4 [44], the dorsal pathway is related to the processing of spatial and temporal features and establishes  
12  
13 5 predictions that pertain to ‘how’ and ‘when’ something will happen.

14  
15 6 The capacity of the dorsal stream for sequence processing has been associated with the timing  
16  
17 7 capabilities of the motor system [45]. Precise temporal anticipation at the time-scale of tens to  
18  
19 8 hundreds of milliseconds is critical, as a large number of phenomena pertaining to perception and  
20  
21 9 action (i.e., speech **and music** perception and production, movements, etc.) occur at this scale.  
22  
23 10 Several studies have shown that the motor system is involved, as part of a cortico-striatal network,  
24  
25 11 in the processing of events and sequences at these time-scales (~above 300 ms) [46,47]. This is not  
26  
27 12 surprising, given the expertise of this system in monitoring the sensory feedback resulting from  
28  
29 13 motor outputs. The motor system is not only involved in motor-timing, however, but also recruited  
30  
31 14 during rhythm perception in passive listening tasks, even when attention is directed away from the  
32  
33 15 auditory stream [48–50]. These effects directly speak to the universal inclination to automatically  
34  
35 16 synchronize our movements to external rhythms [47]. Additionally, evidence for the role of the  
36  
37 17 motor system in timing is that the predictive alignment of neuronal excitability depends on sensory-  
38  
39 18 motor expertise [51] and improves with periodic-motor priming (vocally) or audio-motor training  
40  
41 19 [52].

42 20 It is therefore plausible that predictive timing in perception and action rely on similar systems,  
43  
44 21 computations, and neurophysiological mechanisms [45,53]. On this view, temporal predictions in  
45  
46 22 the auditory domain correspond to a covert form of **active sensing** [12,54]. In other words, the  
47  
48 23 **efferent motor signals** that are generated when producing audible actions are also generated  
49  
50 24 during the passive perception of temporally structured auditory streams [47,48,50,55,56]. These  
51  
52 25 signals propagate downward toward sensory systems to predictively phase-reset and align ongoing  
53  
54 26 oscillations in auditory cortex with upcoming events [11,15]. By comparing simulated and actual  
55  
56 27 sensory outcomes, prediction error responses can be computed and used to learn, correct, and  
57  
58 28 improve temporal predictions. At the neurophysiological level, temporal predictions might be  
59  
60 29 carried by beta-band (~20 Hz) motor related signals, that are also related to the representation of  
61  
62 30 temporal information [11,49,57–59] (Box 3).

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Importantly, the motor system relies on a flexible internal repertoire of actions (i.e. we can perform actions with diverse temporal dynamics) to emulate the temporal trajectory of upcoming inputs. Because of this flexibility, this model does not require distinct mechanisms for periodic versus aperiodic temporal predictions. While we assume that the specific role of motor-driven efferent signals lies in aligning the phase of ongoing oscillations in sensory regions, the operational mechanism arguably involves many other structures. For instance, it has been proposed that the specific computations underlying time estimation are carried out by subcortical structures, probably the basal ganglia or the cerebellum, depending on the specifics of the duration to be estimated, with the putamen involved in relative or beat-based duration estimation and the cerebellum in absolute or discrete duration estimation [60–62]. The inferior parietal cortex [63,64] is also possibly involved at the interface between motor-driven internal predictions and sensory processing, i.e. redirecting the modulatory efferent signals according to stimulus- and task-relevance.

13 Altogether, the experimental data suggest that the motor system is automatically recruited to track temporal regularities (whether periodic or aperiodic) and proactively enhance the processing of upcoming events. Whether the motor system’s recruitment is actually necessary for perception or just useful in noisy or adverse listening condition remains debated. Moreover, whether temporal predictions exploit efferent motor signals [65], and the underlying pathways remains to be determined [12].

19 *Alternative sources of temporal predictions*

20 The motor system, even in a broad sense, is unlikely to be the sole system that contributes to the predictive facilitation of perception in the time domain. For instance, recent findings in non-human primates demonstrate the involvement of the pulvinar in the top-down phase reset of neuronal oscillations in the primary auditory cortex [40]. Importantly, these findings provide evidence for phase-alignment to statistical regularities (pattern repetition) in the absence of relevant periodicity in the stimulation.

26 Humans exploit other forms of aperiodic temporal predictions e.g. symbolic cues that activate associated memories and infer target timing [21]. Such types of predictions –based on working or long-term memory– arguably involve the hippocampus [66]. Whether these systems predictively shape perception through top-down phase reset of neuronal oscillations has, to our knowledge, not been systematically investigated. Support for the notion of top-down phase reset comes from

1  
2  
3  
4 1 research on symbolic cues used in higher-level language processing (cf. following section) and  
5  
6 2 selective attention to certain points in time [21]. Top-down expectations, manipulated using  
7  
8 3 predictive cues or stimulus probability of occurrence, enhance performance and predictively reset  
9  
10 4 intrinsic sensory rhythms - such as alpha and theta oscillations in vision [67–69] and delta  
11  
12 5 oscillations in audition [23]. In crowded auditory settings (e.g. cocktail party experiments),  
13  
14 6 selective attention facilitates temporal tracking [70,71] by aligning excitability with stimuli in the  
15  
16 7 attended stream. Tracking the speech of one particular talker enhances the alignment between the  
17  
18 8 stimulus and low-frequency oscillations in auditory cortex and higher processing areas [71].  
19  
20 9 Similarly, prior knowledge of sound patterns that are inserted within a sound sequence, can be used  
21  
22 10 to attend selectively and align oscillatory activity to those patterns [40,72].

23  
24 11 Additional brain regions not belonging to the core motor system are involved in cueing paradigms.  
25  
26 12 In these settings, temporal predictions are typically reflected in anticipatory electrophysiological  
27  
28 13 components [25,73]. Such signals have been observed in various regions, including the anterior  
29  
30 14 cingulate cortex, premotor cortex, posterior parietal cortex, supplementary motor area (SMA), and  
31  
32 15 pre-SMA [26,74], all of which arguably contribute to proactive simulation processes. Whether  
33  
34 16 these electrophysiological signals reflect anticipatory computations locally, or whether they  
35  
36 17 actually propagate top-down to subserve the predictive modulation of sensory excitability remains  
37  
38 18 to be determined (Fig. 1 B).

### 39 19 *A/periodic predictions - Speech as relevant case*

40  
41  
42 20 Temporal processing is typically studied using highly simplified stimuli (e.g. tone sequences).  
43  
44 21 Although useful, this does not allow us to fully capture the essence of predictive processes, namely  
45  
46 22 to enhance the analysis of complex, ecological signals. Speech constitutes an informationally rich  
47  
48 23 signal from which temporal regularities at many time-scales can be used to facilitate processing. It  
49  
50 24 provides a theoretical challenge and a valuable experimental assay to investigate the substrates and  
51  
52 25 mechanisms underlying predictive processing.

### 53 54 26 *The entrainment view on speech processing*

55  
56  
57 27 Despite controversy about the extent of rhythmic structure in the speech signal [75], most  
58  
59 28 languages exhibit remarkably similar temporal modulations at around 4-8 Hz reflecting quasi-  
60  
61 29 periodic fluctuations of the amplitude envelope and implicating the syllabic scale [4,76]. Current

1  
2  
3  
4 1 data suggest that entrainment of intrinsic neuronal oscillations (theta-band, 4-8 Hz) in auditory  
5  
6 2 cortex [36,38,77–79] aligns high neural excitability phases in the output layers of auditory cortex  
7  
8 3 [77]. In this framework, entrainment to acoustic landmarks (sharp amplitude modulations; [80])  
9  
10 4 sets up temporal frames that allow the brain to segment the signal at the syllabic scale [77].  
11  
12 5 Coupling of theta and (low, 25-35 Hz) gamma rhythms [81,82] reflects the hierarchical  
13  
14 6 organization between syllabic and phonemic cues and allows for simultaneously segmenting and  
15  
16 7 extracting the syllabic and phonemic information [77]. Conclusive evidence that the observed  
17  
18 8 activity reflects oscillatory entrainment rather than iterated evoked responses or anticipatory  
19  
20 9 components remains sparse (Box 1).

### 10 *Temporal constraints in speech processing*

11 Recent experimental observations set oscillatory entrainment in a different light, intimating that a  
12  
13 12 new interpretative framework is needed to account for these phenomena. For example, that theta-  
14  
15 13 band entrainment occurs with natural as well as with time-reversed, unintelligible speech [83]  
16  
17 14 questions the initially assumed functional role of theta oscillations in comprehension, and suggests  
18  
19 15 an involvement at lower processing levels. On the other hand, although not sufficient, theta  
20  
21 16 entrainment is likely a necessary precondition to ensure speech comprehension [80]. Using  
22  
23 17 (unintelligible) compressed speech, studies have shown that introducing periods of silence (80 ms)  
24  
25 18 between periods (40 ms) of compressed speech restores comprehension [35]. This suggests that  
26  
27 19 speech comprehension is limited by the amount of time needed to decode the information into  
28  
29 20 exploitable internal representations [84].

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 21 Another criticism of a stimulus-driven entrainment account for speech is that phase alignment to  
45  
46 22 acoustic landmarks [80] needs to be continuously adjusted, because of the quasi- (but not strictly)  
47  
48 23 periodic nature of speech. Thus, the observed speech tracking requires a more flexible mechanism  
49  
50 24 [33,85].

51  
52 25 These observations are compatible with the view that intrinsic rhythms impose temporal constraints  
53  
54 26 on sensory processing [84]. This idea predicts that to be optimally processed, connected sound  
55  
56 27 sequences (e.g. speech, music) should be provided in temporal chunks of adequate length to match  
57  
58 28 hierarchical oscillatory temporal scales [77,78]. Importantly, although oscillatory constraints may  
59  
60 29 have a limited impact when stimuli are easy to process, they are relevant in noisy or adverse  
61  
62 30 listening conditions, where top-down processes are recruited to operate upon these constraints to

1  
2  
3  
4 1 optimize sensory processing.  
5  
6

7 2 *Top-down phase reset in speech processing*  
8  
9

10 3 In light of the syntactic and semantic variability of language, the timing of high-level linguistic  
11 4 information is typically more variable than that of lower-level input features [86]. Although  
12 5 syntactic/semantic information is not necessarily provided in a periodic manner, it allows  
13 6 generating probabilistic predictions of upcoming speech [87,88] and thus constitutes an aperiodic,  
14 7 symbolic source of temporal predictions. The capacity of syntactic-semantic contexts to permit  
15 8 temporal predictions and facilitate processing has been shown in early reaction time [89] or eye-  
16 9 tracking studies [90]. Linguistic corpora-based computational models showed that syntactic  
17 10 information, e.g. whether the last constituent was a noun or verb phrase, predicts pause timing in  
18 11 continuous speech [5]. That syntactic predictability crucially relies on timing abilities, is supported  
19 12 by basal ganglia patients deficits in using syntactic predictions in a temporally irregular context  
20 13 [91].  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 14 Accordingly, several studies suggest that during speech perception, motor and higher-linguistic  
32 15 processing areas predictively reset and align low-frequency activity in the auditory cortex  
33 16 [10,15,79,92]. Optimal audio-motor coupling is observed for stimuli presented within the range of  
34 17 the natural syllabic rate (i.e., ~ 4 Hz [92]) and during speech perception [10,15,79]. Comparing  
35 18 intelligible versus backward speech, these studies further show that speech tracking and  
36 19 comprehension are optimized by feedback from higher-level linguistic processes [15,16,70]. These  
37 20 top-down predictions arguably enhance the precision of speech processing through anticipatory  
38 21 top-down phase-reset of neuronal oscillations, as reflected in phase-phase and phase-amplitude  
39 22 coupling measures [10,93]. Similarly, cross-modal enhancement of speech perception by lip-  
40 23 reading is possibly mediated by higher-order frontal/motor regions through low-frequency phase  
41 24 alignment [13,93,94]. These findings suggest that predictions from multiple levels and networks  
42 25 can optimize neural entrainment to speech and intelligibility [10].  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 26 Despite these advances, whether linguistic predictions feedback to sensory processing levels  
55 27 remains unclear [95]. Furthermore, the origins of top-down linguistic predictions –whether at the  
56 28 phonological [14,96,97], lexical [96] and/or sentence level [98]– are complicated and poorly  
57 29 understood. What roles the motor cortex plays in speech perception is also actively debated [99].  
58 30 In addition to generating temporal predictions, speech motor areas presumably represent  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 phonological information [100]. To capture the essence of the motor contributions in speech  
2 comprehension, and in line with the constraint view, we argue that it is necessary to consider audio-  
3 motor coupling has a key mechanism [101].

4 In summary, predictions based on the motor system or higher-level language processing seem to be  
5 effectively used to facilitate perception and enhance speech tracking. Further research is required  
6 to elucidate the mechanisms and nature of the top-down signals provided by frontal, motor and/or  
7 other areas and how these align temporal constraints at the sensory level.

### 8 **Concluding Remarks and Future Directions**

9 We propose a parsimonious framework for auditory temporal predictions, including for predictive  
10 processing of speech. We suggest a neuronal implementation that simultaneously makes possible  
11 bottom-up (stimulus-driven) and top-down (motor-driven, language-driven) phase-reset of low-  
12 frequency oscillations in auditory cortex. On the proposed view, neuronal oscillations do not a  
13 priori subserve *specific* functions but rather constitute an intrinsic temporal constraint. Top-down  
14 phase-reset signals are generated to predictively align these internal temporal frames (excitability  
15 cycles) and improve stimulus processing. This hypothesis, meant to synthesize current debates and  
16 data on temporal predictions from research in neuroscience and psycholinguistics, is of course far  
17 from comprehensive and requires development to evaluate the details of the operations  
18 (Outstanding Questions).



1  
2  
3  
4 1 *Box 1 Entrainment of neuronal oscillations*

5  
6  
7 2 Neuronal oscillations are ubiquitous in the brain of vertebrates and are seen even in the absence of  
8  
9 3 external stimulation. Brain rhythms most likely emerge from neurons acting as self-sustained  
10  
11 4 oscillators with a natural frequency [102,103] and thus can act as pacemakers. Spontaneous  
12  
13 5 oscillations have been described in several brain areas, including delta (1-4 Hz), theta (4-10 Hz)  
14  
15 6 and gamma (30-50 Hz) oscillations in primary auditory cortex [78]. Natural frequencies arguably  
16  
17 7 arise from subthreshold oscillations in the membrane potential of neurons, or short-term depression  
18  
19 8 and facilitation at the synaptic level (which can be different for synapses of the same presynaptic  
20  
21 9 cell, allowing selective network communication) [103,104]. Importantly, band-limited oscillatory  
22  
23 10 dynamics pre-exist in auditory cortical regions [36–38] and **resonate** after the end of an auditory  
24  
25 11 rhythmic stimulation [52,105–107] supporting the notion of intrinsic oscillators.

26  
27 12 Building upon the successful application of oscillatory entrainment models to the study of circadian  
28  
29 13 rhythms [108,109], subsequent research extended such models to investigate a putative role of  
30  
31 14 neuronal oscillations in temporal attention [2]. Entrainment typically denotes that a quasi-periodic  
32  
33 15 external stimulation aligns the phase of slow (~1-10 Hz) endogenous neuronal oscillations in the  
34  
35 16 same frequency range (as measured with magneto- or electro-physiological recordings) and often  
36  
37 17 modulates behavior accordingly [17,110]. There exists a wealth of evidence that brain rhythms  
38  
39 18 coincide with the rate (~1-10 Hz) of certain cognitive domains (e.g. speech, music; [4]), and  
40  
41 19 preferred temporal rates of sensory processing [111]. Thus, it is often assumed that oscillatory  
42  
43 20 entrainment plays an instrumental role in temporal processing [17,77], and sensory selection  
44  
45 21 [3,78,112].

46  
47 22 These assumptions need careful methodological consideration. First, the use of sinusoidal  
48  
49 23 transformations (e.g. Fourier and wavelet transforms) to analyse neural time-series results in  
50  
51 24 displaying apparently –but possibly spurious– oscillatory features, thereby raising potential  
52  
53 25 interpretative issues [113]. In addition, in the context of periodic stimulation, it is challenging to  
54  
55 26 distinguish oscillatory entrainment from repetitive, event-related potentials [114,115], or  
56  
57 27 endogenous anticipatory activity (e.g. Contingent Negative Variation, CNV; [73,116]). To  
58  
59 28 disentangle these processes, it is important to develop novel experimental paradigms isolating  
60  
61 29 exogenously driven from endogenously driven neural effects (see [7,11,19]).

1  
2  
3  
4 1  
5  
6  
7 2 *Box 2 Neuronal functions and processing constraints*

8  
9  
10 3 One striking feature of current neuroscience research is that the operationalization of cognitive  
11 4 functions (e.g. consciousness, memory) coincides with the identification of dedicated oscillatory  
12 5 processes. Thus it has been implicitly assumed these processes are causally linked – and therefore  
13 6 a functional relevance has been attributed to neural oscillations. The term ‘function’, however, is  
14 7 controversial and usually undefined in cognitive neuroscience. Here we favor a ‘causal role theory’  
15 8 of physiological function, wherein a process is called a function when it causally contributes to the  
16 9 behavior of a system [117]. We distinguish between neurophysiological phenomena that underlie  
17 10 generic neuronal processes versus phenomena that causally subserve specific cognitive processes.  
18 11 The first are necessary but not involved in one specific function. They ‘constrain’ cognitive  
19 12 processes by being part of the neurophysiological architecture. In contrast, the latter are necessary  
20 13 for a specific cognitive function.

21  
22  
23 14 Even without compelling evidence, claims have been advanced that oscillations are functionally  
24 15 specific to various cognitive processes, e.g. [118]. Other accounts suggest, however, that oscillatory  
25 16 processes support a more generic, canonical function: the message-passing of information  
26 17 throughout the cortical hierarchy [27,28]. The canonical architecture imposes ‘cyclic temporal  
27 18 constraints’ on cognitive processes, as the frequency of oscillations of a neuronal population  
28 19 determines the excitability fluctuations of these neurons, thereby periodically imposing alternating  
29 20 phases of high and low excitability [78]. Because cognitive processes imply the transmission of  
30 21 information between neuronal populations, they entail specific spectral signatures possibly  
31 22 reflecting processing constraints.

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 23 The constraint interpretation accounts for many observations, including empirical evidence for  
50 24 discrete perception [32,33,35], and should perhaps be preferred to functional interpretations, as  
51 25 long as it is not possible to provide evidence otherwise. Crucially, [as we propose here](#), it accounts  
52 26 for the functional effectiveness of predictive top-down resets on sensory processing for both  
53 27 periodic and aperiodic temporal predictions.

1  
2  
3  
4 1 *Box 3 Beta-band oscillations involved in top-down predictions*

5  
6  
7 2 Beta-band activity is typically evidenced in sensory-motor areas during temporal tracking as well  
8  
9 3 as during continuous speech processing [11,49,57,59,119,120]. Recent evidence suggested that  
10  
11 4 beta-band activity in motor regions proactively tracks the timing of upcoming events and modulates  
12  
13 5 low-level auditory processes to facilitate behavioral responses [11,49,57] (Fig. I, during selective  
14  
15 6 attention to target tones, modulated at 1.5 Hz, temporal predictions are encoded in delta-beta  
16  
17 7 coupled oscillations functionally directed toward auditory regions to modulate the 3 Hz auditory  
18  
19 8 input, adapted from [11]).

20  
21 9 Beta-band signals are also involved in top-down predictions of higher level linguistic features, such  
22  
23 10 as semantic and syntactic predictions [121,122]. Therefore, it has been suggested that top-down  
24  
25 11 signals carried by beta-band oscillations indicate more than ‘mere’ temporal predictions but  
26  
27 12 communicate accurate information about the content of the expected events, as suggested by their  
28  
29 13 role in lexical/semantic predictions of upcoming words but not of the syntactic category (for  
30  
31 14 review, see [88]).

32  
33 15 However, the functional relevance and specificity of beta-band oscillations for predictive processes  
34  
35 16 remains to be clarified. One plausible account for current empirical findings is that beta-band  
36  
37 17 activity is more generically involved in feedback communication between brain areas [28]. In the  
38  
39 18 ‘predictive routing’ account, descending beta-band signals predictively pre-activate neuronal  
40  
41 19 population that are relevant for the processing of expected inputs [123]. Consistent with this view,  
42  
43 20 recordings in the macaque and human early sensory cortices support the involvement of beta-band  
44  
45 21 signals originating in deep cortical layers in the top-down propagation of information [81,124–  
46  
47 22 126].

48  
49 23 In sum, although the detailed neural mechanisms remain to be elucidated, the data supports the  
50  
51 24 notion that beta-band signals predictively modulate sensory processing. Moreover, while the nature  
52  
53 25 of the predictive information seems to depend on the source-region generating beta oscillations,  
54  
55 26 temporal predictions are specifically associated with motor-related beta activity.

## 1 Outstanding Questions

- 2 • If intrinsic neuronal oscillations constitute generic constraints that pre-exist  
3 (ontogenetically or phylogenetically), can these oscillations be experimentally evidenced  
4 prior to the emergence of **specific functions (e.g. language or sequence processing)**, for  
5 **example** in non-verbal infants or primates?
- 6 • Is **the efficiency of predictive neural alignment and ensuing** behavioral improvement solely  
7 conditioned by sensorimotor training and expertise [51]? Alternatively, could other types  
8 of plasticity, such as repeated exposure to these sequences or sensory deprivation [127]  
9 result in adapting oscillatory constraints at the sensory level?
- 10 • Are **ramping** components (e.g. CNA) a mere signature of anticipatory activity or do they  
11 play a causal role (akin to phase resets) in predictively shaping sensory processes in a top-  
12 down manner? In the latter case, what would be the nature (modulatory, driving) of the  
13 underlying mechanism?
- 14 • **In line with the notion of intrinsic timing models**, do all **neural systems that perform precise,**  
15 **time-related computations** (e.g. motor, attentional or memory systems), use similar (or  
16 shared) mechanisms to prospectively influence perceptual processes?
- 17 • **Given that hierarchically structured temporal signals (e.g. speech and music) embed**  
18 **multiple, nested levels of temporal regularities**, is the motor system involved in proactively  
19 tracking temporal regularities at all (e.g. syllabic, prosodic or phrasal) or only at specific  
20 levels?

## 21 Glossary

22 **Active sensing:** denotes the proactive contribution of sensorimotor processing to perception. One  
23 implementation relies on top-down predictions based on internal copies of movement commands  
24 (see also corollary discharge);

25 **Analytic attending mode:** in sustained vigilance settings, high frequency activity maintains a  
26 continuous high-excitability state of the system, in order to support attention;

27 **Climbing neuronal activity:** **ramping anticipatory** neuronal activity that increases until –and is

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 resolved after– an expected time point;

2 **Constraint:** in reference to neural processing, denotes aspects of the neuronal architecture that  
3 affect neuronal functions but are not specific or instrumental to a certain function;

4 **Dynamic Attending Theory:** describes how entrainment of neuronal oscillations to a periodic  
5 stimulation directs attention in time;

6 **Efferent motor signals:** signals generated by the motor system to propagate down to peripheral  
7 systems to generate overt –but also possibly covert– movements.

8 **Entrainment:** the process through which two or more self-sustained oscillators become coupled  
9 (Box 2);

10 **Functional role:** central but controversial and not well-defined concept in neuroscience; here, a  
11 ‘causal role theory’ of function is favored, where a process is called a function if it causally and  
12 specifically contributes to the functional capacity of a system. In contrast, ‘selectionist theories’  
13 define the function of a process with regard to its contribution to natural selection;

14 **Hazard functions:** describe the probability of occurrence of forthcoming events;

15 **Modulate:** processes that change the responsiveness and effectiveness of driven neuronal  
16 responses [128];

17 **Phase alignment:** neuronal oscillatory excitability phases co-occur with energy phases of a  
18 periodic stimulation;

19 **Parsimony** (see also Occam’s razor and *lex parsimoniae*): the principle that among competing  
20 hypotheses, the one underlying the fewest assumptions should be preferred.

21 **Periodic:** successive events are separated by a constant duration;

22 **Ramping-based models:** monotonic changes in firing rate encode time until a threshold is met;

23 **Resonate:** resonance is a passive phenomenon where neuronal responses reflect the stimulation  
24 frequency. This is generally distinguished from oscillatory phenomena, where neurons oscillate at  
25 a preferred frequency in the absence of a stimulation and can entrain to an external stimulation;

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 **Rhythmic:** in music (and language) terminology acoustics that contain a regular pattern with  
2 respect to timing. Although periodic patterns are always rhythmic (and rhythmicity and periodicity  
3 are often used synonymously) the reversal is not true; [129]; Oscillatory brain activity is called  
4 rhythmic (Box 1), whereas most measures analyze periodicity.

5 **Rhythmic attending mode:** entrainment of neuronal oscillations to a periodic stimulation directs  
6 attention in time;

7 **Symbolic cues:** cues that activate associated memories about the target timing;

8 **Temporal regularities:** a statistical rule that can be extracted to predict a temporal pattern;

9 **Tracking:** the neural sensory response profile reflects the energy fluctuations in the acoustic (e.g.  
10 the envelope of speech or the stimulation rate of sounds);

11 **Top-down phase-reset:** endogenous, non stimulus-driven process that aligns the phase of neuronal  
12 oscillations with an expected event to facilitate its processing;

13

14 *Acknowledgements*

15 This work was funded by the Max-Planck-Institute for Empirical Aesthetics (JR, DP) and the  
16 BrainCom Project, Horizon 2020 Framework Programme (732032) (LHA). We thank Felix  
17 Bernoulli and Sarah Brendecke for graphics support.

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 **References**

2 1 Merchant, H. *et al.* (2015) Finding the beat: a neural perspective across humans and non-  
3 human primates. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 370, 20140093  
4 2 Jones, M.R. (1976) Time, our lost dimension: toward a new theory of perception,  
5 attention, and memory. *Psychol. Rev.* 83, 323–355  
6 3 Schroeder, C.E. and Lakatos, P. (2009) Low-frequency neuronal oscillations as  
7 instruments of sensory selection. *Trends Neurosci.* 32, 9–18  
8 4 Ding, N. *et al.* (2017) Temporal modulations in speech and music. *Neurosci. Biobehav.*  
9 *Rev.* DOI: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.02.011  
10 5 Nguyen, T.T. *et al.* (2015) A latent variable model for joint pause prediction and  
11 dependency parsing, in *INTERSPEECH 2015, 16th Annual Conference of the*  
12 *International Speech Communication Association, Dresden, Germany, September 6-10,*  
13 *2015*, pp. 2719–2723  
14 6 Polak, R. (2017) Non-isochronous meter is not irregular. A review of theory and  
15 evidence. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meetings of the Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie*  
16 *2015* (Aydintan, M. *et al.*, eds), Olms  
17 7 Breska, A. and Deouell, L.Y. (2017) Neural mechanisms of rhythm-based temporal  
18 prediction: Delta phase-locking reflects temporal predictability but not rhythmic  
19 entrainment. *PLOS Biol.* 15, e2001665  
20 8 Morillon, B. *et al.* (2016) Temporal prediction in lieu of periodic stimulation. *J. Neurosci.*  
21 36, 2342–2347  
22 9 Arnal, L.H. (2012) Predicting “when” using the motor system’s beta-band oscillations.  
23 *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 6, 225  
24 10 Keitel, A. *et al.* (2017) Auditory cortical delta-entrainment interacts with oscillatory  
25 power in multiple fronto-parietal networks. *NeuroImage* 147, 32–42  
26 11 Morillon, B. and Baillet, S. (2017) Motor origin of temporal predictions in auditory  
27 attention. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* at  
28 <<http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2017/09/26/1705373114.abstract>>  
29 12 Morillon, B. *et al.* (2015) Predictive motor control of sensory dynamics in auditory active  
30 sensing. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* 31, 230–238  
31 13 Park, H. *et al.* (2016) Lip movements entrain the observers’ low-frequency brain  
32 oscillations to facilitate speech intelligibility. *eLife* 5, e14521

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 14 Mai, G. *et al.* (2016) Delta, theta, beta, and gamma brain oscillations index levels of  
2 auditory sentence processing. *NeuroImage* 133, 516–528  
3 15 Park, H. *et al.* (2015) Frontal top-down signals increase coupling of auditory low-  
4 frequency oscillations to continuous speech in human listeners. *Curr. Biol.* 25, 1649–1653  
5 16 Peelle, J.E. *et al.* (2013) Phase-locked responses to speech in human auditory cortex are  
6 enhanced during comprehension. *Cereb. Cortex* 23, 1378–1387  
7 17 Henry, M.J. and Herrmann, B. (2014) Low-frequency neural oscillations support dynamic  
8 attending in temporal context. *Timing Time Percept.* 2, 62–86  
9 18 Large, E.W. and Jones, M.R. (1999) The dynamics of attending: How people track time-  
10 varying events. *Psychol. Rev.* 106, 119–159  
11 19 Haegens, S. and Zion Golumbic, E. (2017) Rhythmic facilitation of sensory processing: a  
12 critical review. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* DOI: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.12.002  
13 20 Cope, T.E. *et al.* (2012) Temporal predictions based on a gradual change in tempo. *J.*  
14 *Acoust. Soc. Am.* 131, 4013–4022  
15 21 Nobre, A.C. and van Ede, F. (2018) Anticipated moments: temporal structure in attention.  
16 *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 19, 34–48  
17 22 Coull, J.T. (2009) Neural substrates of mounting temporal expectation. *PLoS Biol.* 7,  
18 e1000166  
19 23 Wilsch, A. *et al.* (2015) Slow-delta phase concentration marks improved temporal  
20 expectations based on the passage of time. *Psychophysiology* 52, 910–918  
21 24 Obleser, J. *et al.* (2017) What do we talk about when we talk about rhythm? *PLOS Biol.*  
22 15, e2002794  
23 25 Paton, J.J. and Buonomano, D.V. (2018) The neural basis of timing: Distributed  
24 mechanisms for diverse functions. *Neuron* 98, 687–705  
25 26 Janssen, P. and Shadlen, M.N. (2005) A representation of the hazard rate of elapsed time  
26 in macaque area LIP. *Nat. Neurosci.* 8, 234–241  
27 27 Bosman, C.A. and Aboitiz, F. (2015) Functional constraints in the evolution of brain  
28 circuits. *Front. Neurosci.* 9, 303  
29 28 Fries, P. (2015) Rhythms for cognition: Communication through coherence. *Neuron* 88,  
30 220–235  
31 29 Palmigiano, A. *et al.* (2017) Flexible information routing by transient synchrony. *Nat.*  
32 *Neurosci.* 20, 1014–1022



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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 30 Pillai, A.S. and Jirsa, V.K. (2017) Symmetry breaking in space-time hierarchies shapes  
2 brain dynamics and behavior. *Neuron* 94, 1010–1026  
3 31 Womelsdorf, T. *et al.* (2014) Dynamic circuit motifs underlying rhythmic gain control,  
4 gating and integration. *Nat. Neurosci.* 17, 1031–1039  
5 32 VanRullen, R. (2016) Perceptual cycles. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 20, 723–735  
6 33 Ghitza, O. (2016) Acoustic-driven delta rhythms as prosodic markers. *Lang. Cogn.*  
7 *Neurosci.* DOI: 10.1080/23273798.2016.1232419  
8 34 Teng, X. *et al.* (2017) Concurrent temporal channels for auditory processing: Oscillatory  
9 neural entrainment reveals segregation of function at different scales. *PLOS Biol.* 15,  
10 e2000812  
11 35 Ghitza, O. and Greenberg, S. (2009) On the possible role of brain rhythms in speech  
12 perception: Intelligibility of time-compressed speech with periodic and aperiodic  
13 insertions of silence. *Phonetica* 66, 113–126  
14 36 Giraud, A.-L. *et al.* (2007) Endogenous cortical rhythms determine cerebral specialization  
15 for speech perception and production. *Neuron* 56, 1127–1134  
16 37 Keitel, A. and Gross, J. (2016) Individual human brain areas can be identified from their  
17 characteristic spectral activation fingerprints. *PLoS Biol* 14, e1002498  
18 38 Morillon, B. *et al.* (2012) Asymmetric function of theta and gamma activity in syllable  
19 processing: an intra-cortical study. *Front. Psychol.* 3, 248  
20 39 Nourski, K.V. *et al.* (2009) Temporal envelope of time-compressed speech represented in  
21 the human auditory cortex. *J. Neurosci.* 29, 15564–15574  
22 40 Barczak, A. *et al.* (2018) Top-down, contextual entrainment of neuronal oscillations in the  
23 auditory thalamocortical circuit. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1714684115  
24 41 Kaas, J.H. and Hackett, T.A. (2000) Subdivisions of auditory cortex and processing  
25 streams in primates. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 97, 11793  
26 42 Rauschecker, J.P. and Tian, B. (2000) Mechanisms and streams for processing of “what”  
27 and “where” in auditory cortex. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 97, 11800–11806  
28 43 Goodale, M.A. and Milner, A.D. (1992) Separate visual pathways for perception and  
29 action. *Trends Neurosci.* 15, 20–25  
30 44 Friston, K. (2005) A theory of cortical responses. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.*  
31 360, 815–836  
32 45 Schubotz, R.I. (2007) Prediction of external events with our motor system: towards a new

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 framework. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 11, 211–218

2 46 Coull, J.T. (2015) A frontostriatal circuit for timing the duration of events. In *Brain*

3 *Mapping* (Toga, A. W., ed), pp. 565–570, Academic Press

4 47 Merchant, H. and Yarrow, K. (2016) How the motor system both encodes and influences

5 our sense of time. *Time Percept. Action* 8, 22–27

6 48 Chen, J.L. *et al.* (2008) Listening to musical rhythms recruits motor regions of the brain.

7 *Cereb. Cortex* 18, 2844–2854

8 49 Fujioka, T. *et al.* (2012) Internalized timing of isochronous sounds is represented in

9 neuromagnetic beta oscillations. *J. Neurosci.* 32, 1791–1802

10 50 Grahn, J.A. and Rowe, J.B. (2013) Finding and feeling the musical beat: striatal

11 dissociations between detection and prediction of regularity. *Cereb. Cortex* 23, 913–921

12 51 Doelling, K.B. and Poeppel, D. (2015) Cortical entrainment to music and its modulation

13 by expertise. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 112, E6233–E6242

14 52 Cason, N. *et al.* (2015) Bridging music and speech rhythm: rhythmic priming and audio-

15 motor training affect speech perception. *Acta Psychol. (Amst.)* 155, 43–50

16 53 Coull, J.T. *et al.* (2011) Neuroanatomical and neurochemical substrates of timing.

17 *Neuropsychopharmacol.* 36, 3–25

18 54 Schroeder, C.E. *et al.* (2010) Dynamics of active sensing and perceptual selection. *Cogn.*

19 *Neurosci.* 20, 172–176

20 55 Tian, X. and Poeppel, D. (2013) The effect of imagination on stimulation: the functional

21 specificity of efference copies in speech processing. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 25, 1020–1036

22 56 Tian, X. and Poeppel, D. (2010) Mental imagery of speech and movement implicates the

23 dynamics of internal forward models. *Front. Psychol.* 1, 166

24 57 Arnal, L.H. *et al.* (2015) Delta-beta coupled oscillations underlie temporal prediction

25 accuracy. *Cereb. Cortex* 25, 3077–3085

26 58 Iversen, J.R. *et al.* (2009) Top-down control of rhythm perception modulates early

27 auditory responses. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1169, 58–73

28 59 Saleh, M. *et al.* (2010) Fast and slow oscillations in human primary motor cortex predict

29 oncoming behaviorally relevant cues. *Neuron* 65, 461–471

30 60 Breska, A. and Ivry, R.B. (2016) Taxonomies of timing: Where does the cerebellum fit

31 in? *Curr. Opin. Behav. Sci.* 8, 282–288

32 61 Nozaradan, S. *et al.* (2017) Specific contributions of basal ganglia and cerebellum to the

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1            neural tracking of rhythm. *Cortex* 95, 156–168

2    62    Teki, S. *et al.* (2011) Distinct neural substrates of duration-based and beat-based auditory

3            timing. *J. Neurosci.* 31, 3805–3812

4    63    Bolger, D. *et al.* (2014) Metrical rhythm implicitly orients attention in time as indexed by

5            improved target detection and left inferior parietal activation. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 26, 593–

6            605

7    64    Patel, A.D. and Iversen, J.R. (2014) The evolutionary neuroscience of musical beat

8            perception: the Action Simulation for Auditory Prediction (ASAP) hypothesis. *Front.*

9            *Syst. Neurosci.* 8, 57

10   65    Crapse, T.B. and Sommer, M.A. (2008) Corollary discharge across the animal kingdom.

11            *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 9, 587–600

12   66    Aly, M. and Turk-Browne, N.B. (2017) Flexible weighting of diverse inputs makes

13            hippocampal function malleable. *Neurosci. Lett.* DOI: 10.1016/j.neulet.2017.05.063

14   67    Bonnefond, M. and Jensen, O. (2012) Alpha oscillations serve to protect working memory

15            maintenance against anticipated distracters. *Curr. Biol.* 22, 1969–1974

16   68    Cravo, A.M. *et al.* (2011) Endogenous modulation of low frequency oscillations by

17            temporal expectations. *J. Neurophysiol.* 106, 2964–2972

18   69    Samaha, J. *et al.* (2015) Top-down control of the phase of alpha-band oscillations as a

19            mechanism for temporal prediction. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 112, 8439–8444

20   70    Rimmele, J. *et al.* (2015) The effects of selective attention and speech acoustics on neural

21            speech-tracking in a multi-talker scene. *Cortex* 68, 144–154

22   71    Zion Golumbic, E.M. *et al.* (2013) Mechanisms underlying selective neuronal tracking of

23            attended speech at a “cocktail party.” *Neuron* 77, 980–991

24   72    Costa-Faidella, J. *et al.* (2017) Selective entrainment of brain oscillations drives auditory

25            perceptual organization. *NeuroImage* 159, 195–206

26   73    Walter, W.G. *et al.* (1964) Contingent negative variation: An electric sign of sensori-

27            motor association and expectancy in the human Brain. *Nature* 203, 380

28   74    Wittmann, M. (2013) The inner sense of time: how the brain creates a representation of

29            duration. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 14, 217–223

30   75    Nolan, F. and Jeon, H.-S. (2014) Speech rhythm: a metaphor? *Philos. Trans. R. Soc.*

31            *Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 369,

32   76    Pellegrino, F. *et al.* (2011) A cross-language perspective on speech information rate.

1  
2  
3  
4 1 *Language* 87, 539–558

5  
6 2 77 Giraud, A.-L. and Poeppel, D. (2012) Cortical oscillations and speech processing:  
7  
8 3 emerging computational principles and operations. *Nat. Neurosci.* 15, 511–517

9  
10 4 78 Lakatos, P. *et al.* (2005) An oscillatory hierarchy controlling neuronal excitability and  
11  
12 5 stimulus processing in the auditory cortex. *J. Neurophysiol.* 94, 1904–1911

13 6 79 Morillon, B. *et al.* (2010) Neurophysiological origin of human brain asymmetry for  
14  
15 7 speech and language. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 107, 18688–18693

16  
17 8 80 Doelling, K.B. *et al.* (2014) Acoustic landmarks drive delta–theta oscillations to enable  
18  
19 9 speech comprehension by facilitating perceptual parsing. *NeuroImage* 85, Part 2, 761–768

20 10 81 Fontolan, L. *et al.* (2014) The contribution of frequency-specific activity to hierarchical  
21  
22 11 information processing in the human auditory cortex. *Nat Commun* 5, 4694

23  
24 12 82 Gross, J. *et al.* (2013) Speech rhythms and multiplexed oscillatory sensory coding in the  
25  
26 13 human brain. *PLoS Biol* 11, e1001752

27  
28 14 83 Howard, M.F. and Poeppel, D. (2010) Discrimination of speech stimuli based on neuronal  
29  
30 15 response phase patterns depends on acoustics but not comprehension. *J. Neurophysiol.*  
31  
32 16 104, 2500–2511

33 17 84 Pefkou, M. *et al.* (2017) Theta- and beta-band neural activity reflect independent syllable  
34  
35 18 tracking and comprehension of time-compressed speech. *J. Neurosci.* DOI:  
36  
37 19 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2882-16.2017

38  
39 20 85 Canavier, C.C. (2015) Phase-resetting as a tool of information transmission. *SI Brain*  
40  
41 21 *Rhythms Dyn. Coord.* 31, 206–213

42 22 86 Scontras, G. *et al.* (2015) Syntactic complexity effects in sentence production. *Cogn. Sci.*  
43  
44 23 39, 559–583

45  
46 24 87 Jadoul, Y. *et al.* (2016) Seeking temporal predictability in speech: Comparing statistical  
47  
48 25 approaches on 18 world languages. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 10, 586

49  
50 26 88 Meyer, L. (2017) The neural oscillations of speech processing and language  
51  
52 27 Comprehension: State of the art and emerging mechanisms. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* DOI:  
53  
54 28 10.1111/ejn.13748

55 29 89 Marslen-Wilson, W. and Tyler, L.K. (1980) The temporal structure of spoken language  
56  
57 30 understanding. *Cognition* 8, 1–71

58  
59 31 90 Altmann, G.T.. and Kamide, Y. (1999) Incremental interpretation at verbs: restricting the  
60  
61 32 domain of subsequent reference. *Cognition* 73, 247–264

62  
63  
64  
65

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 91 Kotz, S.A. and Schmidt-Kassow, M. (2015) Basal ganglia contribution to rule expectancy  
2 and temporal predictability in speech. *Cortex*. 68, 48–60  
3 92 Assaneo, M.F. and Poeppel, D. (2018) The coupling between auditory and motor cortices  
4 is rate-restricted: Evidence for an intrinsic speech-motor rhythm. *Sci. Adv.* 4, eaao3842  
5 93 ten Oever, S. and Sack, A.T. (2015) Oscillatory phase shapes syllable perception. *Proc.*  
6 *Natl. Acad. Sci.* 112, 15833–15837  
7 94 Giordano, B.L. *et al.* (2017) Contributions of local speech encoding and functional  
8 connectivity to audio-visual speech perception. *eLife* 6, e24763  
9 95 McQueen, J.M. *et al.* (2016) When brain regions talk to each other during speech  
10 processing, what are they talking about? Commentary on Gow and Olson (2015). *Lang.*  
11 *Cogn. Neurosci.* 31, 860–863  
12 96 Keitel, A. *et al.* (2018) Perceptually relevant speech tracking in auditory and motor cortex  
13 reflects distinct linguistic features. *PLOS Biol.* 16, e2004473  
14 97 Sohoglu, E. and Davis, M.H. (2016) Perceptual learning of degraded speech by  
15 minimizing prediction error. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 113, E1747–E1756  
16 98 Ding, N. *et al.* (2016) Cortical tracking of hierarchical linguistic structures in connected  
17 speech. *Nat. Neurosci.* 19, 158–164  
18 99 Skipper, J.I. *et al.* (2017) The hearing ear is always found close to the speaking tongue:  
19 Review of the role of the motor system in speech perception. *Brain Lang.* 164, 77–105  
20 100 Du, Y. and Zatorre, R.J. (2017) Musical training sharpens and bonds ears and tongue to  
21 hear speech better. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1712223114  
22 101 Strauß, A. and Schwartz, J.-L. (2017) The syllable in the light of motor skills and neural  
23 oscillations. *Lang. Cogn. Neurosci.* 32, 562–569  
24 102 Kurths, J. *et al.* (2001) *Synchronization: a universal concept in nonlinear sciences*,  
25 Cambridge University Press New York.  
26 103 Llinas, R.R. (1988) The intrinsic electrophysiological properties of mammalian neurons:  
27 insights into central nervous system function. *Science* 242, 1654–1664  
28 104 Izhikevich, E.M. *et al.* (2003) Bursts as a unit of neural information: selective  
29 communication via resonance. *Trends Neurosci.* 26, 161–167  
30 105 Falk, S. *et al.* (2017) Tuning neural phase entrainment to speech. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 29,  
31 1378–1389  
32 106 Hickok, G. *et al.* (2015) The rhythm of perception: Entrainment to acoustic rhythms

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 induces subsequent perceptual oscillation. *Psychol. Sci.* 26, 1006–1013

2 107 Sanabria, D. and Correa, Á. (2013) Electrophysiological evidence of temporal preparation

3 driven by rhythms in audition. *Biol. Psychol.* 92, 98–105

4 108 Aschoff, J. (1954) Zeitgeber der tierischen Tagesperiodik. *Naturwissenschaften* 41, 49–56

5 109 Pittendrigh, C.S. (1960) Circadian rhythms and the circadian organization of living

6 systems. *Cold Spring Harb. Symp. Quant. Biol.* 25, 159–184

7 110 Ding, N. and Simon, J.Z. (2014) Cortical entrainment to continuous speech: functional

8 roles and interpretations. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 8, 311

9 111 Holcombe, A.O. (2009) Seeing slow and seeing fast: two limits on perception. *Trends*

10 *Cogn. Sci.* 13, 216–221

11 112 Lakatos, P. *et al.* (2008) Entrainment of neuronal oscillations as a mechanism of

12 attentional selection. *Science* 320, 110–113

13 113 Cole, S.R. and Voytek, B. (2017) Brain oscillations and the importance of waveform

14 shape. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 21, 137–149

15 114 Kösem, A. *et al.* (2016) High-frequency neural activity predicts word parsing in

16 ambiguous speech streams. *J. Neurophysiol.* 116, 2497

17 115 Zoefel, B. and VanRullen, R. (2016) EEG oscillations entrain their phase to high-level

18 features of speech sound. *NeuroImage* 124, 16–23

19 116 Herrmann, B. and Johnsrude, I.S. (2018) Neural signatures of the processing of temporal

20 patterns in sound. *J. Neurosci.* DOI: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0346-18.2018

21 117 Roux, E. (2014) The concept of function in modern physiology. *J. Physiol.* 592, 2245–

22 2249

23 118 Weiss, S. and Mueller, H.M. (2012) “Too many betas do not spoil the broth”: The role of

24 beta brain oscillations in language processing. *Front. Psychol.* 3,

25 119 Kulashekhar, S. *et al.* (2016) The role of cortical beta oscillations in time estimation.

26 *Hum. Brain Mapp.* 37, 3262–3281

27 120 Wiener, M. and Kanai, R. (2016) Frequency tuning for temporal perception and

28 prediction. *Time Percept. Action* 8, 1–6

29 121 Cope, T.E. *et al.* (2017) Evidence for causal top-down frontal contributions to predictive

30 processes in speech perception. *Nat. Commun.* 8, 2154

31 122 Lewis, A.G. *et al.* (2016) A predictive coding perspective on beta oscillations during

32 sentence-level language comprehension. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 10, 85

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 123 Spitzer, B. and Haegens, S. (2017) Beyond the status quo: A role for beta oscillations in  
2 endogenous content (Re)Activation. *eNeuro* 4, ENEURO.0170-17.2017  
3 124 Arnal, L.H. and Giraud, A.-L. (2012) Cortical oscillations and sensory predictions. *Trends*  
4 *Cogn. Sci.* 16, 390–398  
5 125 Bastos, A.M. *et al.* (2015) Visual areas exert feedforward and feedback influences  
6 through distinct frequency channels. *Neuron* 85, 390–401  
7 126 van Kerkoerle, T. *et al.* (2014) Alpha and gamma oscillations characterize feedback and  
8 feedforward processing in monkey visual cortex. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 111, 14332–  
9 14341  
10 127 Hertrich, I. *et al.* (2013) Tracking the speech signal – Time-locked MEG signals during  
11 perception of ultra-fast and moderately fast speech in blind and in sighted listeners. *Brain*  
12 *Lang.* 124, 9–21  
13 128 David, O. *et al.* (2006) Mechanisms of evoked and induced responses in MEG/EEG.  
14 *NeuroImage* 31, 1580–1591  
15 129 Patel, A.D. (2008) *Music, language, and the brain*, Oxford University Press.  
16 130 Wyart, V. *et al.* (2012) Rhythmic fluctuations in evidence accumulation during decision  
17 making in the human brain. *Neuron* 76, 847–858  
18

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 *Figure legends*

2 **Figure 1. Comparison between standard and top-down entrainment models.** Intrinsic  
3 oscillations impose periodic alternations of low (green) and high (red) excitability. The  
4 instantaneous phase of ongoing oscillations thus directly impacts neuronal **responsiveness**,  
5 information processing (colored circles) and behavioral outcome (middle panels, the performance  
6 outcome reflects the weighted average of excitability phases at stimuli onsets). Typically, stimuli  
7 (black rectangle) induce a bottom-up phase-reset (dashed lines; note however, that exogenous reset  
8 effects being similar for both models, are not represented for clarity). Sine waves depict the  
9 behavior of a local, intrinsic oscillator that resonates at a certain frequency (e.g. delta-theta) and  
10 constrains (i.e. biases [130]) sensory processing. Four scenarios of stimulation are presented  
11 (rows): 1- aperiodic random (non-predictable), 2- periodic predictable (at a rate compatible with  
12 the intrinsic frequency of the neuronal oscillators), 3- aperiodic but predictable (here, linearly  
13 accelerating), and 4- stimulus forewarned by a symbolic cue ('memory-based'; **indicated by**  
14 **hierarchical linguistic tree icon**). **(a) Entrainment model.** Neuronal oscillations reorganize  
15 reactively to stimulation, and are thus directly organized according to the temporal structure of the  
16 sensory sequences. Only in the case of a periodic sequence can neuronal oscillations be optimally  
17 aligned and maximize performance. **(b) Top-down reset model.** In the case of temporally  
18 predictable events (rows 2-4), top-down predictive signals (black arrows) phase-reset sensory  
19 neuronal oscillations prior to stimulus occurrence, which results in optimized performance.  
20 Climbing neuronal activity (CNA) might indicate top-down modulation of sensory processing (row  
21 4) **(c) Brain areas** that can contribute to exert predictive, top-down control of sensory processing.

22 **Figure I Motor predictions mediated by delta-beta coupled oscillations**


23



1 *Outstanding Questions*

- 2 • If intrinsic neuronal oscillations constitute generic constraints that pre-exist  
3 (ontogenetically or phylogenetically), can these oscillations be experimentally evidenced  
4 prior to the emergence of [specific functions \(e.g. language or sequence processing\)](#), for  
5 [example](#) in non-verbal infants or primates?
- 6 • Is [the efficiency of predictive neural alignment and ensuing](#) behavioral improvement solely  
7 conditioned by sensorimotor training and expertise [51]? Alternatively, could other types  
8 of plasticity, such as repeated exposure to these sequences or sensory deprivation [127]  
9 result in adapting oscillatory constraints at the sensory level?
- 10 • Are [ramping components \(e.g. CNA\)](#) a mere signature of anticipatory activity or do they  
11 play a causal role (akin to phase resets) in predictively shaping sensory processes in a top-  
12 down manner? In the latter case, what would be the nature (modulatory, driving) of the  
13 underlying mechanism?
- 14 • [In line with the notion of intrinsic timing models](#), do all [neural systems that perform precise,](#)  
15 [time-related computations](#) (e.g. motor, attentional or memory systems), use similar (or  
16 shared) mechanisms to prospectively influence perceptual processes?
- 17 • [Given that hierarchically structured temporal signals \(e.g. speech and music\) embed](#)  
18 [multiple, nested levels of temporal regularities](#), is the motor system involved in proactively  
19 tracking temporal regularities at all (e.g. syllabic, prosodic or phrasal) or only at specific  
20 levels?

21



**(c) Sources of Temporal Predictions**

