Neural activity in human brainstem adapts to sound-level statistics

Björn Herrmann[1,2,3*], Sonia Yasmin[3], Kurdo Araz[3], David W. Purcell[4], & Ingrid S. Johnsrude[3,4]

[1] Rotman Research Institute,
Baycrest, M6A 2E1, North York, ON, Canada

[2] Department of Psychology,
University of Toronto, M5S 1A1, Toronto, ON, Canada

[3] Department of Psychology and Brain & Mind Institute,
The University of Western Ontario, N6A 3K7, London, ON, Canada

[4] School of Communication Sciences & Disorders,
The University of Western Ontario, N6A 5B7, London, ON, Canada

* Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Björn Herrmann, Rotman Research Institute, Baycrest, 3560 Bathurst St, North York, ON, M6A 2E1, Canada. E-mail: bherrmann@research.baycrest.org

Abstract

Optimal perception requires adaptation to sounds in the environment. Adaptation involves representing the acoustic stimulation history in neural response patterns, for example, by altering response magnitude or latency as sound-level statistics change. Neurons in the auditory brainstem of rodents are sensitive to acoustic stimulation history and sound-level statistics, but the degree to which the human brainstem exhibits such neural adaptation is unclear. In six electroencephalography experiments with over 125 participants, we demonstrate that acoustic stimuli within a time window of at least 40 ms are represented in response latency of the human brainstem. We further show that human brainstem responses adapt to sound-level statistical information, but that neural sensitivity to sound-level statistics is less reliable when acoustic stimuli need to be integrated over periods of ~40 ms. Our results provide evidence of adaptation to sound-level statistics in the human brainstem and of the timescale over which sound-level statistics affect neural responses to sound. The research delivers an important link to studies on neural adaptation in non-human animals.

Keywords: Human brainstem, Wave V, sound-level statistics, electroencephalography, neural adaptation

Introduction

Optimal sound perception requires an individual to adapt flexibly to their changing acoustic environments[1-5]. One crucial mechanism underlying such flexibility is neural adaptation. Neural adaptation describes a decrease in neural response magnitude and/or an increase in response latency with sustained or repeated acoustic stimulation[6-8]. Adaptation provides a means by which the history of acoustic information is represented in neural circuits, which, in turn, influences neural responses to future sounds. Through adaptation, neural circuits represent when when a sound has occurred in time[9-11] as well as statistical properties of entire acoustic feature dimensions, such as spectral variance[12-14] or the modal/mean sound level of acoustic environments[15-17].

Work in rodents demonstrates that auditory nerve fibers and neurons in the brainstem and auditory cortex are capable of adapting to environmental sound-level statistics[15,18-23]. Work in humans has documented adaptation to sound-level statistics and sensitivity to violations of expected sound levels in primary and secondary auditory cortices[16,24-27]. However, it is currently unclear whether neurons at lower stages of the human auditory system, such as the brainstem, adapt to ambient sound-level information and, if so, over what timescale statistical information is represented in neural responses. In a series of electroencephalography (EEG) experiments, we evaluate neural adaptation in the human brainstem to statistical structures of acoustic environments.

Investigations of neural adaptation often rely on manipulations of the interval duration between two sounds[10,28]. The longer the interval between two sounds, the more time neurons will have to recover from adaptation after responding to the first sound. Accordingly, responses to the second sound are faster and larger as the interval between the two sounds increases[9-11,29-34]. Adaptation of human brainstem responses appears to manifest most prominently in the response latency, while the response amplitude appears to adapt less[35-38]; but see[33].

When neural response properties change in response to recent stimulation, this may reflect simply the interval since the last sound, or it may reflect something more complex about the history of stimulation, spanning a period incorporating several sounds. The latter case is more relevant for adaptation to sound statistics. Some previous studies have demonstrated that the latency of human brainstem responses adapts to the stimulation history beyond the influence of the directly preceding sound[28,39], whereas others have found weak longer-term adaptation of neurons in the human

brainstem[40]. In a few instances, human brainstem activity has been shown to integrate previous sound stimulation over several hundreds of milliseconds[28,39], suggesting that the human brainstem may be capable of representing sound-level statistical information.

The current study investigates whether brainstem responses in humans, similar to rodents[15,21,22], adapt to sound-level statistics. In order to investigate neural adaptation to sound-level statistics one must first establish the extent to which acoustic stimulation history is represented in brainstem responses, given a specific experimental setup. For example, human brainstem neurons demonstrate adaptation over a longer window for high- compared to low-level sounds[35,41]. Accordingly, we first conduct three EEG experiments (two detailed in the Supplemental Materials) to establish with our experimental setup to what extent brainstem responses in human listeners adapt to stimulation history. We use regular, predictable sound sequences to investigate adaptation of brainstem responses (two experiments), and then use irregular, unpredictable sound sequences (one experiment) to exclude the possibility that prediction-related processes (and not neural adaptation) underpin sensitivity of brainstem responses to acoustic stimulation history. These three experiments enable us, in three subsequent experiments, to investigate whether neurons in the human brainstem adapt to sound-level statistics. This will reveal the time scale over which sound-level statistical information is represented in human brainstem responses.

Results

Human brainstem activity is sensitive to stimulation history incorporating several sounds

A prerequisite for adaptation to sound-level statistical context is the capacity of neurons to represent the sound history over several stimuli in their activity patterns. To investigate whether the human brainstem is sensitive to sound history, we adapted a paradigm that has been successfully utilized to investigate adaptation of the human auditory cortex[42,43]. In Experiment I, normal-hearing younger adults (N=17) listened to click sequences presented at 60 dB sensation level (SL) that continuously "accelerated" and "decelerated": the click onset-to-onset interval decreased logarithmically from 60 ms to 10 ms and then increased back to 60 ms (Figure 1A). Analyses focused on the Wave V potential at a latency of around 6.6 ms (Figure 1B), which is known to originate from the brainstem[41,44-47]. Wave V

amplitude and latency were binned by the preceding onset-to-onset interval, and responses were averaged within bins. Wave V amplitude increased (t_{16} = 2.421, p = 0.028, r_e = 0.518) and latency decreased (t_{16} = -9.621, p = 4.7×10^{-8}, r_e = 0.923) with increasing time since the previous click, as expected (Figure 1B/C).



Figure 1: Stimulus design and results for Experiment I. A: Onset-to-onset intervals (logarithmic y-axis) of accelerating and decelerating click sequences. **B:** Response time courses to clicks, separately for different onset-to-onset intervals to a preceding click. Topographical distribution reflects the mean Wave V (~6.6 ms). **C:** Wave V amplitude and latency as a function of onset-to-onset interval. Box plots and individual data points (dots) reflect the slope from a linear function fit relating Wave V amplitude/latency to onset-to-onset intervals. Wave V latency and amplitude were sensitive to the inter-click-interval (slope significantly different from zero, p ≤ 0.05). **D:** Response time courses for a short (13.5 ms) and a long interval (44.5 ms), separately for decelerating and accelerating sequence contexts. Topographical distribution reflects the mean Wave V. **E/F:** Wave V amplitude and latency as a function of onset-to-onset interval, separately for decelerating and accelerating contexts. Box plots and individual data points (dots) reflect the mean difference between amplitudes/latencies for decelerating and accelerating contexts. Amplitudes were larger and latencies smaller in accelerating compared to decelerating contexts (p ≤ 0.05), demonstrating longer-term influences of the acoustic stimulation on the Wave V response. Error bars reflect the standard error of the mean (removal of between-subject variance[48]). *p ≤ 0.05, n.s. – not significant

107 In order to investigate the influence of stimulation history – beyond the interval directly
108 preceding a click – on brainstem responses, trials were separated into accelerating and decelerating
109 sequence contexts (Figure 1D). Both accelerating and decelerating contexts comprise the same onset-
110 to-onset intervals and, as a result, any differences in brainstem responses between contexts could only
111 arise from the longer-term stimulation history: clicks in the accelerating context are preceded by fewer
112 clicks in the same time window compared to the decelerating context, despite the same interval directly
113 preceding any given click. Across stimuli with different preceding intervals, Wave V latency, but not
114 amplitude, was smaller in the accelerating compared to the decelerating context (latency: $F_{1,16} = 17.831$,
115 $p = 6.5\times10^{-4}$, $n_p^2 = 0.527$; amplitude: $F_{1,16} = 1.23$, $p = 0.284$, $n_p^2 = 0.071$; Figure 1E/F), demonstrating the
116 influence of longer-term stimulation history on brainstem activity. No interaction between onset-to-
117 onset interval and context (accelerating, decelerating) was observed for either latency or amplitude (ps
118 > 0.05), suggesting that the stimulation history of at least 40 ms is represented in human brainstem
119 responses (Figure 1F).

120 We replicated the effects of stimulation history on Wave V latency in Supplementary Experiment
121 A (N=28; using data from a previous study with a different focus[49]) using accelerating-decelerating click
122 sequences with onset-to-onset intervals ranging between 4 ms and 40 ms (Figure S1; Supplementary
123 Materials).

124 The effect of context on response latency may be due to the density of clicks in an extended time
125 period preceding the click for which the response was analyzed, or it may be related to some kind of
126 prediction, given the orderly presentation of stimuli we used. In Supplementary Experiment B (N=19;
127 Supplementary Materials), we pseudo-randomly vary onset-to-onset intervals between 4 ms and 40 ms
128 to examine whether the Wave V latency is indeed affected by click density in a given time period (Figure
129 S2). Click density had the same effect in this experiment as in the accelerating/decelerating experiment,
130 suggesting that Wave V latency changes are not due to any prediction-related process.

131 In sum, the results of Experiment I and Supplementary Experiments A and B show that the latency
132 of brainstem activity (Wave V) in response to a click is strongly influenced not only by the interval directly
133 preceding a click, but also by click density before that interval (see also[28,39]). In our data, preceding sound
134 information appears to be integrated over at least the preceding 40 ms (Figure 1F). Our data are
135 consistent with neural adaptation underlying changes in brainstem response latency. Such influence of

136 sound history on neural responses should enable the brainstem to be sensitive to statistical sound
137 features.

138 ***Human brainstem activity is affected by sound-level statistics***

139 In Experiment II, we investigated whether neural activity in the human brainstem is sensitive to sound-
140 level statistics. To this end, we adapted a paradigm that we have recently used to investigate adaptation
141 to sound-level statistics in the human auditory cortex[16,24]. Young, normal hearing adults (N=18) listened
142 to clicks presented every 9 ms in two statistical contexts that differed in the modal sound level: In one
143 context, the modal level was 25 dB SL, whereas in the other context, the modal level was 55 dB SL (Figure
144 2A). Critically, the sound level of a small set of target clicks (ranging from 15 to 65 dB SL) were identical
145 in both contexts (black dots in Figure 2B/C) as was the level of the click directly preceding each target
146 click (i.e., N-1). Because target and N-1 preceding clicks were identical in the 25-dB and the 55-dB
147 contexts, any differences in neural responses must be due to the longer-term sound-level statistics of
148 the stimulation.
149



Figure 2: Stimulus design and results for Experiment II. A: Example of the two sound-level contexts (distributions with either a 25-dB or a 55-dB modal sound level) utilized to investigate adaptation to sound-level statistics. **B/C:** Examples of sound-level stimulation in the two statistical contexts. Each dot represents the sound level of one click. The black dots represent the sound level of clicks that were identical in both statistical contexts and for which the sound level of the directly preceding click was also identical in both contexts. **D:** Response time courses to clicks were binned according to their sound level. Topographical distribution reflects the mean Wave V. **E/F:** Wave V amplitude and latency as a function sound level (binned into five categories). Box plots and individual data points (dots) reflect the slope from a linear function fit relating Wave V amplitude/latency to sound level. **G:** Response time courses for low (25.7 dB SL) and high sound levels (54.3 dB SL), separately for the sound-level context with a mode of 25 dB SL and a mode of 55 dB SL. Topographical distribution reflects the mean Wave V. **H/I:** Wave V amplitude and latency as a function sound level, separately for the 25-dB and the 55-dB context. Box plots and individual data points (dots) reflect the mean difference between amplitudes/latencies for the 25-dB and the 55-dB context. Latencies were smaller in the 25-dB compared to the 55-dB context ($p \leq 0.05$), demonstrating adaptation to sound-level

statistics in the human brainstem. Error bars reflect the standard error of the mean (removal of between-subject variance[48]). *$p \leq 0.05$, n.s. – not significant

We first confirmed that the sound level of clicks modulates the Wave V. All trials, independent of statistical context, were binned into five sound-level categories (centered on 20, 30, 40, 50, and 60 dB SL) and averaged. Figure 2D depicts the time courses for each sound-level category. A linear function was fit to Wave V amplitude and latency as function of sound level, separately for each participant, and the resulting linear coefficient was tested against zero. Consistent with previous work, Wave V amplitude increased ($t_{17} = 13.289$, $p = 2.1\times10^{-10}$, $r_e = 0.955$; Figure 2E) and Wave V latency decreased ($t_{17} = -11.061$, $p = 3.5\times10^{-9}$, $r_e = 0.937$; Figure 2F) with increasing sound level[32,41,50,51].

Next, we limited the analysis to target clicks – that is, the clicks for which level, and the level of the immediately preceding click were identical in both statistical contexts (25-dB and 55-dB contexts; black dots in Figure 2B). A repeated-measures ANOVA (rmANOVA) revealed that Wave V amplitude increased with click level, consistent with the previous analysis ($F_{4,68} = 59.103$, $p < 0.001$, $n_p^2 = 0.777$), but there was no effect of statistical context nor an interaction between target click level and context (both ps > 0.5; Figure 2H). Wave V latencies were earlier for clicks presented at a high compared to low level, consistent with the previous analysis ($F_{4,68} = 76.544$, $p < 0.001$, $n_p^2 = 0.818$) and were also earlier for clicks presented in the 25-dB compared to the 55-dB context ($F_{1,17} = 18.077$, $p = 5.4\times10^{-4}$, $n_p^2 = 0.515$). Again, no interaction was observed between target click level and context ($p > 0.5$; Figure 2I). Experiment II shows that the latency, but not amplitude, of the human brainstem Wave V is sensitive to sound-level statistics.

Sensitivity of the brainstem to sound-level statistics decreases with longer intervals between stimuli

In Experiment II, we used an onset-to-onset interval of 9 ms and the levels of both target and preceding clicks were constant across contexts. Given this timing, contexts could differ 18 ms prior to target clicks. In order to examine the time window over which sound-level statistics affect human brainstem responses, we conducted Experiments III (N=16) and IV (N=19) using the same experimental design as in Experiment II (Figure 2A-C), but with onset-to-onset intervals of 14 ms and 22 ms, respectively.



Figure 3: Neural adaptation to sound-level statistics for different click presentation rates. A: Wave V latencies for target clicks with different sound levels in two statistical contexts (25-dB SL and 55-dB SL contexts) and for different click presentation rates (9 ms [Experiment II], 14 ms [Experiment III], 22 ms [Experiment IV]). **B:** Overall Wave V latency for target clicks presented at different presentation rates, independent of sound level. **C:** Latency difference between statistical contexts (55-dB context minus 25-dB context) for each target click sound level (left) and averaged across target click sound levels (right). Asterisks below the bar graphs indicate a significant difference from zero (i.e., between the two statistical contexts). Error bars reflect the standard error of the mean. *p ≤ 0.05, n.s. – not significant.

Wave V latencies for the 25-dB and the 55-dB contexts for each of the three onset-to-onset intervals (9, 14, 22 ms) are shown in Figure 3A. Mean latency, independent of context, decreased with increasing onset-to-onset interval (9 ms vs. 14 ms: $t_{32} = 4.392$, $p = 1.1\times10^{-4}$, $r_e = 0.613$; 9 ms vs. 22 ms: $t_{35} = 6.266$, $p = 3.4\times10^{-7}$, $r_e = 0.727$; Figure 3B), indicating more adaptation of brainstem responses for short intervals between clicks (see also Experiment I and Supplementary Experiments A and B[28,31,41]).

The difference between statistical contexts (55-dB minus 25-dB context), indicating adaptation to sound-level statistics, was significant for 9 ms ($t_{17} = 4.252$, $p = 5.4\times10^{-4}$, $r_e = 0.718$) and 14 ms ($t_{15} = 4.381$, $p = 5.4\times10^{-4}$, $r_e = 0.749$) onset-to-onset intervals, but not for 22 ms onset-to-onset interval ($t_{18} = 1.163$, $p = 0.260$, $r_e = 0.264$; Figure 3C); although the absence of a context effect for the 22-ms interval appears to be driven by one outlier data point (Figure 3C, right), as its removal ($t_{17} = 3.428$, $p = 0.003$, $r_e = 0.639$) and a non-parametric test ($p = 0.049$, df = 18) revealed a significant difference. The effect of statistical context (55-dB minus 25-dB context) was larger for the 9 ms compared to the 22 ms onset-to-onset interval ($t_{35} = 2.721$, $p = 0.01$, $r_e = 0.418$; Figure 3C), but did not differ between onset-to-onset intervals of 9 ms and 14 ms ($t_{32} = 1.554$, $p = 0.13$, $r_e = 0.265$; Figure 3C) or 14 ms and 22 ms ($t_{33} = 1.601$, $p = 0.119$, $r_e = 0.269$; Figure 3C).

The results from Experiments II-IV demonstrate that human brainstem responses are sensitive to sound-level statistics in near continuous stimulation (i.e., for onset-to-onset intervals of 9 ms and 14 ms), but less so when sounds are more spread out in time (for the 22-ms onset-to-onset interval). That brainstem responses were sensitive to sound-level statistics for the 14 ms interval – that is, to contextual differences in sound levels 28 ms or further in the past – but less for the 22-ms interval (i.e., contextual differences of 44 ms or more) suggests that sound-level information over at least a period of 28 ms (but less than 44 ms) are represented in human brainstem responses. This is also consistent with the identified temporal evolution of neural adaptation observed in Experiments I and Supplementary Experiments A and B (i.e., integration of ~40 ms of stimulation history).

Discussion

In the current study, we conducted a series of four electroencephalography experiments and two supplementary experiments to investigate the extent to which neural units in the human brainstem represent the history of acoustic stimuli, whether the human brainstem is sensitive to sound-level statistics of acoustic environments, and the timescale over which statistical information is integrated by the brainstem. We show that acoustic stimuli within a time window of at least 40 ms are represented in human brainstem responses through neural adaptation (Experiment I and Supplementary Experiment A), while we exclude prediction-related processes as an underlying mechanism (Supplementary Experiment B). We further demonstrate that brainstem circuits represent sound-level statistics (Experiment II and III) and that the sensitivity to sound-level statistics decreases as stimuli are more spread out in time (Experiment IV). Our results provide information about the timecourses of neural adaptation in the human brainstem and are an important link to studies on neural adaptation in non-human animals.

Human brainstem responses are sensitive to stimulation history spanning several sounds

Adaptation to sound-level statistics or other properties of the acoustic environment requires that neurons represent stimulation history across several stimuli. For Experiment I and Supplementary Experiments A and B, we adapted experimental paradigms from our previous work on longer-term adaptation in the human auditory cortex[42,43] to investigate the extent to which stimulation history is

reflected in adaptation of human brainstem responses. We observed that the Wave V of the auditory evoked potential – originating from the brainstem[41,44-47] – peaked later when more clicks occurred within a preceding time window ("decelerating" sequence) compared to fewer clicks ("accelerating" sequence), despite an identical interval directly preceding each target click and identical sound levels (Experiments I and Supplementary Experiment A; Figures 1 and S1). We estimate that, given the current stimulation protocols, acoustic stimuli over a period of at least 40 ms are represented in human brainstem responses (e.g., Figure 1F). Finally, showing that the longer-term stimulation history affects the Wave V latency in sequences with clicks occurring at random, unpredictable times (Supplementary Experiment B), rules out that prediction-related processes underlie the changes in Wave V latency. Our data are more consistent with neural adaptation by, for example, affecting the spike latency of brainstem neurons[6,52].

Our results demonstrating that Wave V latency is sensitive to stimulation history are consistent with previous work, using isochronous click sequences and click trains, showing that Wave V latency increases with increasing click rate[38,41] and that Wave V latency is affected by the stimulation history spanning several sounds[28,35,39]. The degree to which the longer-term stimulation history modulates Wave V latency varies across studies[28,35,36,40] and appears to depend to some extent on the sound level at which acoustic stimuli are presented[35,41]. Louder sounds appear to have a longer-term influence on the latency of human brainstem responses than softer sounds[35]. Given this prior work, we expected to observe adaptation that reflected stimulation history in the current study. However, the variability in previous work and the potential dependence on experimental parameters, such as sound level, required a detailed investigation in Experiment I and Supplementary Experiments A and B to establish effects of stimulation history before investigating adaptation to sound-level statistics. We show here that brainstem responses represent the acoustic stimulation history in accelerating-decelerating sequences and random-interval sequences for at least 40 ms.

Human brainstem responses adapt to sound-level statistics

In three EEG experiments, we investigated the extent to which neurons in the human brainstem adapt to sound-level statistics. We utilized a paradigm in which participants listened to clicks in two contexts, where the sound level was drawn from distributions with different modal sound levels (25 dB SL and 55 dB SL) and where target clicks and clicks preceding target clicks were identical in the two contexts with

245 different modal sound levels[16,24]. Controlling the immediate history of clicks across contexts allowed us
246 to investigate the effect of longer-term sound-level statistics on brainstem responses. We observed that
247 Wave V latency, but not amplitude was affected by sound-level context, such that Wave V peaked later
248 in the 55-dB context compared to the 25-dB context (Figures 2 and 3). This context effect was present
249 when at least 28 ms of sound stimulation prior to target clicks was identical in both statistical contexts
250 (Figure 3C; Experiment III; 14 ms onset-to-onset interval), but was less reliable when at least 44 ms of
251 stimulation history prior to target clicks was identical between sound-level contexts (Figure 3C;
252 Experiment IV; 22 ms onset-to-onset interval). Our data suggest that human brainstem responses
253 represent sound-level statistics at time scales of at least 28 ms, and to a higher degree when stimuli are
254 closer together in time (9 ms onset-to-onset interval).

255 Our observation of sensitivity to sound-level statistics in the human brainstem is consistent with
256 previous findings of adaptation to sound-level statistics in rodent inferior colliculus[15,18,21,22] and auditory
257 nerve fibers[19,20], and with work on the human auditory cortex[16,24-27]. Our findings also complement a
258 broader literature showing adaptation to other features and distributions of acoustic environments, in
259 addition to sound level, such as acoustic contrast[53,54], mean and variance of interaural level[55], spectral
260 variance[6,12,13], and other complex distributional properties[14].

261 Previous work suggests that timescales of adaptation increase along the auditory pathway, with
262 shorter timescales in the brainstem compared to the auditory cortex[54]. This is consistent with the
263 relatively short timescale in the range of a few tens of milliseconds over which the human brainstem
264 integrates sound-level statistics in the current study, and previous work that demonstrates that the
265 human auditory cortex shows adaptation lasting for 10 s or more[9,10,30].

266 One difference between the current work and previous work is that we show adaptation of
267 response latency, but not amplitude, to sound-level statistics (Figure 2H). Wave V amplitude increased
268 with increasing sound level but was not sensitive to statistical context. In contrast, previous
269 investigations of adaptation to sound-level statistics report sensitivity of firing rate in non-human
270 mammals or magneto-/electroencephalographic response magnitude in humans[15,16,18,21,22,24], whereas
271 no effects of spike latency or response latency were reported; but see[6]. Although it is well known that
272 Wave V amplitude adapts less than Wave V latency[32,36], the reasons for this are unknown. One previous
273 study revealed frequency-specific adaptation of spike latency in the inferior colliculus of rats, but no

difference in latency adaptation between two statistical contexts differing in spectral variance[6]. However, in this previous study, stimulus presentation was much slower (at an onset-to-onset interval of 300 ms) and so no context effect on latency would be expected, based on the current results. Future work in rodents may investigate more closely whether spike latency also adapts to sound-level statistics to enable more direct comparisons with the current study.

Conclusions

In the current study, we investigated the extent to which neural responses in the human brainstem adapt to the acoustic stimulation history beyond the preceding stimulus and whether the sound-level statistical context is represented in the response. We also explored over which timescale statistical information is reflected in human brainstem activity. We demonstrate that acoustic stimuli within a time window of at least 40 ms are represented in the latency of human brainstem responses, likely via neural adaptation mechanisms but not through prediction-related processes. We further show that brainstem responses represent sound-level statistical information, but that this neural sensitivity to sound-level statistics decreases when acoustic information over periods beyond ~40 ms need to be integrated. Our results demonstrate the timescale of neural adaptation in the human brainstem and provide a link to studies on neural adaptation in non-human animals.

Methods and Materials

Consent and ethics approval

A hundred and twenty-eight normal hearing adults (17–32 years) participated in the six electroencephalography experiments of the current study. Demographic information about participants is provided separately for each experiment. Four of the experiments are detailed here, whereas two others – Supplementary Experiments A and B – are presented in the supplementary materials. Participants gave prior written informed consent and were paid $5 CAD per half-hour for their participation or received course credits. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, the Canadian Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans

299 (TCPS2-2014), and was approved by the Nonmedical Research Ethics Board of the University of Western
300 Ontario (protocol ID: 106570). Participants reported no neurological disease or hearing problems and
301 were naïve to the purposes of the experiment.

302 ***General procedure and acoustic stimulation setup***

303 Sounds used in the current series of experiments consisted of clicks of 0.1 ms duration (rectangle
304 function) presented at different onset-to-onset intervals and sound levels depending on the specific
305 experiment described below. Click polarity was inverted on half of the click presentations and polarity
306 inversion was tightly controlled across conditions within each experiment. Clicks were presented to the
307 right-ear via an Etymotic ER1 insert earphone, using a Fireface 400 external sound card controlled by
308 Psychtoolbox (version 3.14) in MATLAB (MathWorks Inc.). The sensation level for click trains was
309 determined for each participant using a method of limits procedure[56], and all experimental stimuli were
310 presented relative to this sensation level (see details below).

311 ***Electroencephalographic recordings and preprocessing***

312 Electroencephalographic activity was recorded using a 16-channel BioSemi (Active 2) system. Additional
313 electrodes were placed at the left and right mastoids. EEG was recorded at 16,384 Hz with an online
314 low-pass filter of 3,334 Hz. Electrodes were referenced online to a monopolar reference feedback loop
315 connecting a driven passive sensor and a common-mode-sense (CMS) active sensor, both located
316 posteriorly on the scalp.

317 MATLAB software (v7.14; MathWorks, Inc.) was used for offline data analysis. Raw data were
318 filtered with an elliptic filter to suppress line noise at 60 Hz. Data were re-referenced by averaging the
319 two mastoid channels and subtracting the average separately from each of the 16 channels. Data were
320 high-pass filtered at 130 Hz (2743 points, Hann window) and low-pass filtered at 2500 Hz (101 points,
321 Hann window). Data were divided into epochs ranging from 2 ms pre-click-onset to 10 ms post-click
322 onset. Epochs were excluded if the signal change exceeded 60 µV in the 0 to 10 ms time window in
323 either the Cz or C3 electrode. These electrodes were of particular interest because they are known to
324 capture the Wave V most strongly, given right ear acoustic stimulation[57]. The peak latency of the Wave
325 V was identified, and Wave V amplitude calculated by averaging the amplitude within a 0.2 ms time
326 window centered on Wave V latency.

327 *Experiment I*

328 **Participants.** Seventeen individuals participated in Experiment I (age range: 18–28 years; median age:
329 22 years; 11 females). Data from three additional participants were recorded but excluded at the analysis
330 stage, because Wave V was absent (N=2) or an atypically late Wave V latency was exhibited, peaking
331 later than 8.5 ms (N=1). Results were unaffected by inclusion vs. exclusion of the latter participant.

332 **Acoustic stimulation.** Participants listened to six blocks of stimulation (each about 8 min long) that
333 comprised click-train stimuli, in which the onset-to-onset interval of clicks changed from 60 ms to 10 ms
334 (in 7 logarithmically-spaced steps) and back from 10 ms to 60 ms (in 7 logarithmically-spaced steps),
335 creating an accelerating-decelerating stimulation cycle (Figure 1A; see also[42,43]). Across the six blocks,
336 participants listened to 7,200 accelerating-decelerating stimulation cycles. All clicks were presented at
337 60 dB SL.

338 **Data analysis.** Single trials were separated into an 'accelerating' context (60 ms to 10 ms) and a
339 'decelerating' context (10 ms to 60 ms). As such, each context (accelerating, decelerating) comprised
340 the same onset-to-onset intervals and, consequently, any response differences between contexts
341 cannot be attributed to the duration of interval directly preceding a click, but must be attributed to the
342 longer-term stimulation history (in which the decelerating context compared to the accelerating context
343 comprised more clicks in the same preceding time). Single-trial time courses for a unique onset-to-onset
344 interval and one of its direct neighbors (i.e., shorter and longer intervals) were binned and averaged[43,58].
345 The Wave V latency and amplitudes were calculated for each onset-to-onset interval and each context
346 (accelerating, decelerating). For statistical analyses, repeated-measured analyses of variance
347 (rmANOVA) with the factors Interval and Context (accelerating, decelerating) were calculated separately
348 for the Wave V latency and the Wave V amplitude.

349 *Experiment II*

350 **Participants.** Eighteen individuals participated in Experiment II (age range: 17–32 years; median age: 18
351 years; 15 females). None of them had participated in Experiment I. Data from two additional participants
352 were excluded because of large stimulus artifacts in the recordings (N=1) and the absence of an
353 identifiable Wave V (N=1).

354 **Acoustic stimulation.** The experimental paradigm was derived from our previous work on neural
355 adaptation to sound-level statistics in the auditory cortex[16,24]. Clicks were presented in two types of

contexts that differed with respect to the sound-level distributions from which a click's sound level was drawn: for one context, the modal sound level was 25 dB SL, for the other context it was 55 dB SL (Figure 2A). To investigate the effects of sound-level statistical context on human brainstem responses, we eliminated the confounding effects of different acoustics by ensuring that the clicks for which we analyzed neural responses as well as their local context (i.e., directly preceding clicks) were identical across contexts (i.e., 25 dB SL vs. 55 dB SL), whereas the longer-term sound-level statistics were different between the two contexts.

Participants listened to six blocks, each approximately 7 min long. In each block, 44,800 clicks were presented at a constant onset-to-onset interval of 9 ms. In each block, eight target clicks with sound levels ranging from 15 dB SL to 65 dB SL (step size: 7.143 dB SL) were each presented 960 times, yielding 7,680 target clicks per block. These stimuli were identical across all six blocks (black dots in Figure 2B/C). The 7,680 clicks immediately preceding each of these $8 \cdot 960 = 7{,}680$ target clicks were also fixed, such that for each of the 960 presentations of one of the eight sound levels, the sound level of the preceding tone took on one of 30 sound levels (range: 15 dB SL to 65 dB SL; step size: 1.724 dB SL) without replacement. Thus, the same 7,680 pairs of experimental clicks were presented in each block.

The sound levels for the remaining 29,440 clicks (out of the 44,800 clicks per block) were chosen randomly (range: 15 dB SL to 65 dB SL; step size: 0.1 dB SL) depending on the sound-level distribution (Figure 2A). For three out of the six blocks, sound levels were randomly chosen from a sound-level distribution with a 25-dB high-probability region (Figure 2B). For the other three blocks, sound levels were randomly chosen from a sound-level distribution with a 55-dB high-probability region (Figure 2C). High probability regions had a width of 10 dB centered on 25 dB SL or 55 dB SL (Figure 2A-C). The 15,360 experimental clicks (i.e., 7,680 pairs) and the 29,440 filler clicks were randomly intermixed in each block and presented such that at least one filler tone occurred between each of the 7,680 pairs of experimental clicks. Blocks with different sound-level contexts alternated, and the starting sound-level context was counter-balanced across participants. Analysis of the influence of sound-level statistical context on neural responses focused on the second click in each pair of experimental clicks: these were identical across the two sound-level distributions (black dots in Figure 2B/C).

384 **Data analysis.** The number of trials for each of the 8 sound levels in the different contexts was relatively
385 low for the analysis of the small Wave V brainstem potential (2880 trials = 960 trials × 3 blocks). In order
386 to increase the number of trials in the response average, thereby increasing the signal-to-noise ratio[16,58],
387 we averaged trials for four adjacent sound levels out of the 8 sound levels (separately for the 25-dB SL
388 context and the 55-dB SL context). For example, single trials for sounds with the 15, 22.1, 29.3, and 36.4
389 dB SL sound level were averaged. Averaging trials for four adjacent sound levels reduced the number of
390 unique sound levels from 8 to 5, while drastically increasing the number of trials in a unique response
391 average. Our choice of smoothing across different sound-level conditions also ensured that a sufficiently
392 high number of trials were averaged in Experiments III and IV, in which longer onset-to-onset intervals
393 reduced the number trials per sound level that were presented (see below). Wave V latency was
394 extracted for each sound level and statistical context, and a rmANOVA with factor Sound Level and
395 Context (25-dB SL, 55-dB SL) was calculated.

396 *Experiment III*

397 **Participants.** Sixteen individuals participated in Experiment III (age range: 18–32 years; median age: 18.5
398 years; 12 females). None of them had participated in Experiment I or II.

399 **Acoustic stimulation.** Stimulation procedures were identical to Experiment II with the following
400 exceptions. Participants listened to six blocks, each approx. 8.5 min long. In each block, 36,400 clicks
401 were presented at a constant onset-to-onset interval of 14 ms. 6,240 experimental click pairs (8 sound
402 levels × 780 trials) and 23,920 filler clicks were presented per block.

403 **Data analysis.** The same analyses as for Experiment II were carried out.

404 *Experiment IV*

405 **Participants.** Nineteen individuals participated in Experiment IV (age range: 17–23 years; median age:
406 18 years; 13 females and 5 males; one person did not provide information about their sex). None of
407 them had participated in any of the other experiments.

408 **Acoustic stimulation.** Stimulation procedures were identical to Experiment II with the following
409 exceptions. Participants listened to six blocks, each approx. 8.3 min long. In each block, 22,400 clicks
410 were presented at a constant onset-to-onset interval of 22 ms. 3,840 experimental click pairs (8 sound
411 levels × 480 trials) and 14,720 filler clicks were presented per block.

412 **Data analysis.** The same analyses as for Experiment II were carried out.

413 ***Effect sizes***

414 Throughout the manuscript, effect sizes are provided as partial eta squared (η_p^2) for repeated-measures
415 ANOVAs and as r_e ($r_{equivalent}$) for t-tests[59].

416 Acknowledgements

417 BH was supported by a BrainsCAN postdoctoral fellowship (Canada First Research Excellence Fund;
418 CFREF) and by the Canada Research Chair program.

419 Author contributions

420 The experiments were performed in the Brain and Mind Institute at the University of Western Ontario,
421 London, Canada. B.H., S.Y.., I.S.J. designed the study. B.H., S.J., K.A. recorded the data. B.H. programmed
422 the experiments and analyzed the data. S.Y. and D.P. supported data analysis. B.H., S.Y., D.P., and I.S.J.
423 interpreted the results. B.H. wrote the manuscript. All authors reviewed and revised the manuscript.

424 Competing interests

425 The authors declare no competing interests.

426 Data availability

427 The datasets generated during the current study are not publicly available because participant consent
428 for public-data sharing was not obtained. Data are available from the corresponding author on
429 reasonable request.

430 References

431 1 Barlow, H. B. in *Sensory Communication* (ed W. Rosenblith) 217-234 (MIT Press., 1961).

432 2 Kluender, K. R., Stilp, C. E. & Kiefte, M. in *Vowel Inherent Spectral Change* (eds Geoffrey Stewart
433 Morrison & Peter F. Assmann) 117-151 (Springer, 2013).
434 3 Lewicki, M. S. Efficient coding of natural sounds. *Nature* **5**, 356-363 (2002).
435 4 Wark, B., Lundstrom, B. N. & Fairhall, A. Sensory adaptation. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* **17**,
436 423-429 (2007).
437 5 Whitmire, C. J. & Stanley, G. B. Rapid Sensory Adaptation Redux: A Circuit Perspective. *Neuron* **92**,
438 298-315 (2016).
439 6 Herrmann, B., Parthasarathy, A., Han, E. X., Obleser, J. & Bartlett, E. L. Sensitivity of rat inferior
440 colliculus neurons to frequency distributions. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **114**, 2941-2954 (2015).
441 7 Nelken, I. Stimulus-specific adaptation and deviance detection in the auditory system: experiments
442 and models. *Biological Cybernetics* **108**, 655-663 (2014).
443 8 Nelken, I. & Ulanovsky, N. Mismatch Negativity and Stimulus-Specific Adaptation in Animal Models.
444 *Journal of Psychophysiology* **21**, 214-223 (2007).
445 9 Sams, M., Hari, R., Rif, J. & Knuutila, J. The Human Auditory Sensory Memory Trace Persists about
446 10 sec: Neuromagnetic Evidence. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* **5**, 363-370 (1993).
447 10 Hari, R., Kaila, K., Katila, T., Tuomisto, T. & Varpula, T. Interstimulus interval dependence of the
448 auditory vertex response and its magnetic counterpart: Implications for their neural generation.
449 *Electroencephalography and clinical Neurophysiology* **54**, 561-569 (1982).
450 11 Butler, R. A. The cumulative effects of different stimulus repetition rates on the auditory evoked
451 response in man. *Electroencephalography and clinical Neurophysiology* **35**, 337-345 (1973).
452 12 Herrmann, B., Henry, M. J. & Obleser, J. Frequency-specific adaptation in human auditory cortex
453 depends on the spectral variance in the acoustic stimulation. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **109**, 2086-
454 2096 (2013).
455 13 Garrido, M. I., Sahani, M. & Dolan, R. J. Outlier Responses Reflect Sensitivity to Statistical Structure
456 in the Human Brain. *PLoS Computational Biology* **9**, e1002999 (2013).
457 14 Kvale, M. N. & Schreiner, C. E. Short-Term Adaptation of Auditory Receptive Fields to Dynamic
458 Stimuli. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **91**, 604-612 (2004).
459 15 Dean, I., Harper, N. S. & McAlpine, D. Neural population coding of sound level adapts to stimulus
460 statistics. *Nature Neuroscience* **8**, 1684-1689 (2005).

461 16 Herrmann, B., Maess, B. & Johnsrude, I. S. Aging Affects Adaptation to Sound-Level Statistics in
462 Human Auditory Cortex. *The Journal of Neuroscience* **38**, 1989-1999 (2018).
463 17 Hildebrandt, K. J., Benda, J. & Hennig, R. M. Multiple Arithmetic Operations in a Single Neuron: The
464 Recruitment of Adaptation Processes in the Cricket Auditory Pathway Depends on Sensory Context.
465 *The Journal of Neuroscience* **31**, 14142-14150 (2011).
466 18 Dean, I., Robinson, B. L., Harper, N. S. & McAlpine, D. Rapid Neural Adaptation to Sound Level
467 Statistics. *The Journal of Neuroscience* **28**, 6430-6438 (2008).
468 19 Wen, B., Wang, G. I., Dean, I. & Delgutte, B. Dynamic Range Adaptation to Sound Level Statistics in
469 the Auditory Nerve. *The Journal of Neuroscience* **29**, 13797-13808 (2009).
470 20 Wen, B., Wang, G. I., Dean, I. & Delgutte, B. Time course of dynamic range adaptation in the auditory
471 nerve. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **108**, 69-82 (2012).
472 21 Robinson, B. L., Harper, N. S. & McAlpine, D. Meta-adaptation in the auditory midbrain under
473 cortical influence. *Nature Communications* **7**, 13442 (2016).
474 22 Bakay, W. M. H., Anderson, L. A., Garcia-Lazaro, J. A., McAlpine, D. & Schaette, R. Hidden hearing
475 loss selectively impairs neural adaptation to loud sound environments. *Nature Communications* **9**,
476 4298 (2018).
477 23 Scholl, B., Gao, X. & Wehr, M. Level Dependence of Contextual Modulation in Auditory Cortex.
478 *Journal of Neurophysiology* **99**, 1616-1627 (2008).
479 24 Herrmann, B., Augereau, T. & Johnsrude, I. S. Neural Responses and Perceptual Sensitivity to Sound
480 Depend on Sound-Level Statistics. *Scientific Reports* **10**, 9571 (2020).
481 25 Näätänen, R., Paavilainen, P., Alho, K., Reinikainen, K. & Sams, M. Do event-related potentials reveal
482 the mechanism of the auditory sensory memory in the human brain? *Neuroscience Letters* **98**, 217-
483 221 (1989).
484 26 Schröger, E. & Winkler, I. Presentation rate and magnitude of stimulus deviance effects on human
485 pre-attentive change detection. *Neuroscience Letters* **193**, 185-188 (1995).
486 27 Althen, H., Grimm, S. & Escera, C. Fast Detection of Unexpected Sound Intensity Decrements as
487 Revealed by Human Evoked Potentials. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e28522 (2011).
488 28 Lasky, R. E., Maier, M. M. & Hecox, K. Auditory Evoked Brain Stem Responses to Trains of Stimuli in
489 Human Adults. *Ear & Hearing* **17**, 544-551 (1996).

490 29 Thornton, A. R. & Coleman, M. J. The adaptation of cochlear and brainstem auditory evoked
491 potentials in humans. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology* **39**, 399-406 (1975).
492 30 Zacharias, N., König, R. & Heil, P. Stimulation-history effects on the M100 revealed by its differential
493 dependence on the stimulus onset interval. *Psychophysiology* **49**, 909-919 (2012).
494 31 Burkard, R. F. & Sims, D. The Human Auditory Brainstem Response to High Click Rates: Aging Effects.
495 *American Journal of Audiology* **10**, 1-9 (2001).
496 32 Pratt, H. & Sohmer, H. Intensity and Rate Functions of Cochlear and Brainstem Evoked Responses
497 to Click Stimuli in Man. *Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology* **212**, 85-92 (1976).
498 33 Skoe, E. & Tufts, J. Evidence of noise-induced subclinical hearing loss using auditory brainstem
499 responses and objective measures of noise exposure in humans. *Hearing Research* **361**, 80-91
500 (2018).
501 34 Yagi, T. & Kaga, K. The Effect of the Click Repetition Rate on the Latency of the Auditory Evoked
502 Brain Stem Response and its Clinical Use for a Neurological Diagnosis. *Archives of Oto-Rhino-*
503 *Laryngology* **222**, 91-97 (1979).
504 35 Ballachanda, B. B., Moushegian, G. & Stillman, R. D. Adaptation of the Auditory Brainstem Response:
505 Effects of Click Intensity, Polarity, and Position. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology* **3**,
506 275-282 (1992).
507 36 Polyakov, A. & Pratt, H. The cumulative effect of high click rate on monaural and binaural processing
508 in the human auditory brainstem. *Clinical Neurophysiology* **114**, 366-375 (2003).
509 37 Scott, M. L. & Harkins, S. W. Amplitude of the Brainstem Auditory Evoked Response: The Effect of
510 Interstimulus Interval. *International Journal of Neuroscience* **8**, 147-152 (1978).
511 38 Harkins, S. W., McEvoy, T. M. & Scott, M. L. Effects of interstimulus interval on latency of the
512 brainstem auditory evoked potential. *International Journal of Neuroscience* **10**, 7-14 (1979).
513 39 Lasky, R. E. Rate and adaptation effects on the auditory evoked brainstem response in human
514 newborns and adults. *Hearing Research* **111**, 165-176 (1997).
515 40 Wynne, D. P. *et al.* Loudness adaptation accompanying ribbon synapse and auditory nerve
516 disorders. *Brain* **136**, 1626-1638 (2013).
517 41 Don, M., Allen, A. R. & Starr, A. Effect of Click Rate on the Latency of Auditory Brain Stem Responses
518 in Humans. *Annals of Otology, Rhinology & Laryngology* **86**, 186-195 (1977).

519 42 Herrmann, B., Buckland, C. & Johnsrude, I. S. Neural signatures of temporal regularity processing in
520 sounds differ between younger and older adults. *Neurobiology of Aging* **83**, 73-85,
521 doi:https://doi.org/10.1101/522375 (2019).
522 43 Herrmann, B., Henry, M. J., Johnsrude, I. S. & Obleser, J. Altered temporal dynamics of neural
523 adaptation in the aging human auditory cortex. *Neurobiology of Aging* **45**, 10-22 (2016).
524 44 Parkkonen, L., Fujiki, N. & Mäkelä, J. P. Sources of auditory brainstem responses revisited:
525 Contribution by magnetoencephalography. *Human Brain Mapping* **30**, 1772-1782 (2009).
526 45 Møller, A. R. Neural Generators of the Brainstem Auditory Evoked Potentials. *Seminars in Hearing*
527 **19**, 11-27 (1998).
528 46 Møller, A. R. & Jannetta, P. J. Interpretation of brainstem auditory evoked potentials: results from
529 intracranial recordings in humans. *Scandinavian Audiology* **12**, 125-133 (1983).
530 47 Møller, A. R. & Jannetta, P. J. Evoked potentials from the inferior colliculus in man.
531 *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology* **53**, 612-620 (1982).
532 48 Masson, M. E. J. & Loftus, G. R. Using confidence intervals for graphically based data interpretation.
533 *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology and Aging* **57**, 203-220 (2003).
534 49 Yasmin, S., Purcell, D. W., Veeranna, S. A., Johnsrude, I. S. & Herrmann, B. A novel approach to
535 investigate subcortical and cortical sensitivity to temporal structure simultaneously. *Hearing*
536 *Research* **398**, 108080 (2020).
537 50 Verhulst, S., Jagadeesh, A., Mauermann, M. & Ernst, F. Individual Differences in AuditoryBrainstem
538 Response Wave Characteristics:Relations to Different Aspectsof Peripheral Hearing Loss. *Trends in*
539 *Hearing* **20**, 1-20 (2016).
540 51 Stockard, J. E., Stockard, J. J., Westmoreland, B. F. & Corfits, J. L. Brainstem auditory-evoked
541 responses: Normal variation as a function of stimulus and subject characteristics. *Archives of*
542 *Neurology* **36**, 823-831 (1979).
543 52 Heil, P. First-spike latency of auditory neurons revisited. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* **14**, 461-
544 647 (2004).
545 53 Rabinowitz, N. C., Willmore, B. D. B., Schnupp, J. W. H. & King, A. J. Contrast Gain Control in Auditory
546 Cortex. *Neuron* **70**, 1178-1191 (2011).

54 Lohse, M., Bajo, V. M., King, A. J. & Willmore, B. D. B. Neural circuits underlying auditory contrast gain control and their perceptual implications. *Nature Communications* **11**, 324 (2020).

55 Dahmen, J. C., Keating, P., Nodal, F. R., Schulz, A. L. & King, A. J. Adaptation to Stimulus Statistics in the Perception and Neural Representation of Auditory Space. *Neuron* **66**, 937-948 (2010).

56 Herrmann, B. & Johnsrude, I. S. Attentional State Modulates the Effect of an Irrelevant Stimulus Dimension on Perception. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* **44**, 89-105 (2018).

57 Picton, T. W. in *Human auditory evoked potentials* (ed Terence W. Picton) 213-246 (Plural Publishing, 2010).

58 Ingham, N. J. & McAlpine, D. GABAergic Inhibition Controls Neural Gain in Inferior Colliculus Neurons Sensitive to Interaural Time Differences. *The Journal of Neuroscience* **25**, 6187-6198 (2005).

59 Rosenthal, R. & Rubin, D. B. requivalent: A Simple Effect Size Indicator. *Psychological Methods* **8**, 492-496 (2003).