Neural Representations of Speech in Human Auditory Cortex

Jonathan Z. Simon

Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering Department of Biology Institute for Systems Research University of Maryland

http://www.isr.umd.edu/Labs/CSSL/simonlab

26 October 2017

Acknowledgements

Current Lab Members & Affiliates

Christian Brodbeck Joshua Kulasingham David Nahmias Krishna Puvvada Peng Zan

Past Lab Members & Affiliates

Nayef Ahmar Sahar Akram Murat Aytekin Francisco Cervantes Maria Chait Marisel Villafane Delgado Kim Drnec Nai Ding Victor Grau-Serrat Julian Jenkins Pirazh Khorramshahi Natalia Lapinskaya Huan Luo Aline Gesualdi Manhães Mahshid Najafi

Alex Presacco

Raul Rodriguez Jonas Vanthornhout Ben Walsh Yadong Wang Juanjuan Xiang Jiachen Zhuo

Collaborators

Pamela Abshire Samira Anderson Behtash Babadi Catherine Carr Monita Chatterjee Alain de Cheveigné Stephen David Didier Depireux

Mounya Elhilali Jonathan Fritz Stefanie Kuchinsky

Cindy Moss David Poeppel Shihab Shamma

Past Undergraduate Students

Abdulaziz Al-Turki Nicholas Asendorf Anurupa Bhonsale Sonja Bohr Elizabeth Camenga Corinne Cameron Julien Dagenais Katya Dombrowski Kevin Hogan Kevin Hogan Kevin Kahn Alexandria Miller Andrea Shome Madeleine Varmer James Williams

Funding NIH (NIDCD, NIA, NIBIB); NSF; DARPA; USDA; UMD

Outline

- Cortical Representations of Speech (via MEG)
 - Encoding vs. Decoding
- "Cocktail Party" Speech
- Recent Results
 - Attentional Dynamics
 - Aging & Cortical Representations of Speech
 - Higher Level Interference & Noise

Magnetoencephalography (MEG)

- Non-invasive, Passive, Silent Neural Recordings
- Simultaneous Whole-Head Recording (~200 sensors)
- Sensitivity
 - high: ~100 fT (10-13 Tesla)
 - low: ~10⁴ − ~10⁶ neurons
- Temporal Resolution: ~1 ms
- Spatial Resolution
 - coarse: ~1 cm
 - ambiguous



Functional Brain Imaging

Hemodynamic techniques

Functional Brain Imaging

= Non-invasive recording from human brain

Electromagnetic techniques

fMRI functional magnetic

resonance imaging

PET positron emission tomography

> fMRI & MEG can capture effects in single subjects

EEG electroencephalography

MEG magnetoencephalography









Excellent Spatial Resolution (~1 mm)

Poor Temporal Resolution (~I s)

Poor Spatial Resolution (~1 cm)

Excellent Temporal Resolution (~1 ms)

Functional Brain Imaging

Functional Brain Imaging = Non-invasive

recording from human brain

Electromagnetic techniques

Hemodynamic

techniques



Excellent Spatial Resolution (~1 mm)

Poor Temporal Resolution (~1 s)

Poor Spatial Resolution (~I **cm)**

Excellent Temporal Resolution (~I ms)

Functional Brain Imaging

Functional Brain Imaging = Non-invasive

recording from human brain

fMRI Hemodynamic functional magnetic techniques resonance imaging PET positron emission tomography fMRI & MEG can capture effects in single subjects 10.0 -7.5-5.0 EEG Electromagnetic 5.0 electroencephalography 7.5techniques 10.0-12.9-) -200.0 50.0 300.0 550.0 MEG magnetoencephalography

Excellent Spatial Resolution (~I mm)

Poor Temporal Resolution (~I s)

Poor Spatial Resolution (~1 cm) Excellent Temporal Resolution (~1 ms)

Neural Signals & MEG





Photo by Fritz Goro

- Direct electrophysiological measurement
 not hemodynamic
 - •real-time
- •No unique solution for distributed source
- •Measures spatially synchronized cortical activity
- •Fine temporal resolution (~ 1 ms)
- •Moderate spatial resolution (~ 1 cm)

MEG Auditory Field Flattened Isofield Contour Map

Instantaneous Magnetic Field



MEG Auditory Field



Strongly Lateralized

Chait, Poeppel and Simon, Cerebral Cortex (2006)

MEG Auditory Field



Chait et al., Cerebral Cortex (2006)

MEG Auditory Field



Chait et al., Cerebral Cortex (2006)

MEG & Auditory Cortex

- Non-invasive, Passive, Silent Neural Recordings
- MEG Response Patterns Time-Locked to Stimulus Events
- Robust
- Strongly Lateralized
- Cortical Origin Only





MEG Responses to Speech Modulations



MEG Responses Predicted by STRF Model



MEG Responses Predicted by STRF Model



Frequency Dependence of STRF Predictability



Ding & Simon, J Neurophysiol (2012)

Stimulus Information Encoded in Response



Correlation between stimulus envelope and reconstructed envelope (right hemisphere)

Ding & Simon, J Neurophysiol (2012)



Neural Reconstruction of Speech Envelope



Neural Reconstruction of Speech Envelope



2 s

Ding & Simon, J Neurophysiol (2012) Zion-Golumbic et al., Neuron (2013) Reconstruction accuracy comparable to single unit & ECoG recordings



Neural Representation of Speech: Temporal



Speech in Stationary Noise



Ding & Simon, J Neuroscience (2013)

Speech in Stationary Noise



Ding & Simon, J Neuroscience (2013)

Speech in Noise: Results

Neural Reconstruction of Underlying Speech Envelope



Speech in Noise: Results

Neural Reconstruction of Underlying Speech Envelope





correlation

Reconstruction Accuracy



Ding & Simon, J Neuroscience (2013)

Speech in Noise: Results

Neural Reconstruction of Underlying Speech Envelope





Ding & Simon, J Neuroscience (2013)

Correlation with Intelligiblity

Multiple Cortical Speech Representations?

Di Liberto, et al. (2015) Low-Frequency Cortical Entrainment to Speech Reflects Phoneme-Level Processing

Kayser et al. (2015) Irregular Speech Rate Dissociates Auditory Cortical Entrainment, Evoked Responses, and Frontal Alpha

Ding et al. (2015) Cortical tracking of hierarchical linguistic structures in connected speech

Cortical Speech Representations

- Neural Representations: Encoding & Decoding
- Linear models: Useful & Robust
- Speech **Envelope** only (as seen in MEG)
- Envelope Rates: ~ I I0 Hz
- Intelligibility linked to lower range of frequencies (Delta)



Competing Speech Streams

Selective Neural Encoding

Selective Neural Encoding

Unselective vs. Selective Neural Encoding

Selective Neural Encoding

Selective Encoding: Results

Identical Stimuli!

Ding & Simon, PNAS (2012)

Single Trial Speech Reconstruction

Ding & Simon, PNAS (2012)

Single Trial Speech Reconstruction

Overall Speech Reconstruction

Distinct neural representations for different speech streams

Invariance under Relative Loudness Change

- Neural representation invariant to relative loudness change
- Stream-based Gain Control, not stimulus-based

Forward STRF Model

Spectro-Temporal Response Function (STRF)

Forward STRF Model

STRF Results

attended

0

100

200

time (ms)

400

- •300 Hz 2 kHz dominant carriers
- •M50_{STRF} positive peak
- •M100_{STRF} negative peak
- •M100_{STRF} strongly modulated by attention, *but not M50_{STRF}*

Neural Sources

- •M100_{STRF} source near (same as?) M100 source: Planum Temporale
- •M50_{STRF} source is anterior and medial to M100 (same as M50?): Heschl's Gyrus

•PT strongly modulated by attention, *but not HG*

Recent Results

- Attentional Dynamics
- Aging & Cortical Representations of Speech
- High Level Interference & Noise

Recent Results

• Attentional Dynamics

- Aging & Cortical Representations of Speech
- High Level Interference & Noise

Attentional Dynamics

- Simple dynamical model of neural correlate of attentional direction
- Time resolution ~5 s (not, e.g., 60 s)

Akram et al. Neurolmage (2016)

Attentional Dynamics

- Simple dynamical model of neural correlate of attentional direction
- Time resolution ~5 s (not, e.g., 60 s)
- Less conservative in assumptions regarding actual subject behavior

Akram et al. Neurolmage (2016)

Attentional Dynamics

- Simple *dynamical* model of neural correlate of attentional direction
- Time resolution ~5 s (not, e.g., 60 s)
- Less conservative in assumptions regarding actual subject behavior
- Observable attentional (neural) dynamics

Akram et al. NeuroImage (2016)

TRF Dynamics

- Dynamical model entire TRF, including attentional modulation
- Time resolution still
 ~5 s

Recent Results

- Attentional Dynamics
- Aging & Cortical Representations of Speech
- High Level Interference & Noise

Average Responses to Pure Tone

Average Responses to Pure Tone

Average Responses to Pure Tone

Speech Over-Representation

Presacco et al., J Neurophysiol (2016a)

Speech Reconstruction by Subject

Speech Over-Representation

Presacco et al., J Neurophysiol (2016a)

Speech Reconstruction by Subject

Aging & Integration Time

Integration window (ms)

Presacco et al., J Neurophysiol (2016a)

Aging & Integration Time

Neural vs Inhibitory Control

Recent Results

- Attentional Dynamics
- Aging & Cortical Representations of Speech
- High Level Interference & Noise

- Unfamiliarity of
 Background
 - Boosts Intelligibility of Attended Speech

- Unfamiliarity of Background
 - Boosts Intelligibility of Attended Speech

- Unfamiliarity of Background
 - Boosts Intelligibility
 - of Attended Speech

- Unfamiliarity of Background
 - Boosts Intelligibility of Attended Speech
 - Also Boosts Cortical Reconstruction of Attended Speech

Presacco et al., J Neurophysiol (2016b)

Summary

- Cortical representations of speech
 - representation of envelope (up to ~10 Hz)
 - robust against a variety of noise types
 - neural representation of perceptual object
- Object-based representation at 100 ms latency (PT), but not by 50 ms (HG)
- Robust Dynamical Foreground Monitoring
- Over-Representation with Aging
 - Reconstruction depends on integration time
 - Over-Representation tracks inhibitory control
- Background familiarity: neural tracks behavior

Thank You