Mobile version of the Battery for the Assessment of Auditory Sensorimotor and Timing Abilities (BAASTA): Implementation and adult norms

Simone Dalla Bella[1,2,3], Nicholas E.V. Foster[1,2,3], Hugo Laflamme[1,2,3], Agnès Zagala[1,2,3], Kadi Melissa[1,2,3], Naeem Komeilipoor[1,2,3], Mélody Blais[4], Simon Rigoulot[1,5] & Sonja A. Kotz[6,7]

1. International Laboratory for Brain, Music, and Sound Research (BRAMS), Montreal, Canada
2. Dept. of Psychology, University of Montreal, Montreal, Canada
3. Centre for Research on Brain, Language and Music (CRBLM), Montreal, Canada
4. Euromov, University of Montpellier, Montpellier, France
5. Dept. of Psychology, University of Quebec at Trois-Rivières, Trois-Rivières, Canada
6. Dept. of Neuropsychology & Psychopharmacology, Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands
7. Dept. of Neuropsychology, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig, Germany

Word count: 7504 (without abstract)

Running head: Tablet version for BAASTA

* Corresponding authors

Simone Dalla Bella
International Laboratory for Brain, Music and Sound Research (BRAMS)
Dept. of Psychology, University of Montreal
Pavillon Marie-Victorin
CP 6128 Succursale Centre-Ville
Montréal, QC, H3C 3J7
Canada
E-mail: simone.dalla.bella@umontreal.ca
Phone: +1 514 343-6111 #44069
Website: https://dallabellaLAB.ca/; http://www.brams.org/

Sonja A. Kotz
Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience
Dept. of Neuropsychology & Psychopharmacology
P.O. 616
6200 MD Maastricht
The Netherlands
E-mail: sonja.kotz@maastrichtuniversity.nl
Phone: +31 43 3881653

Abstract

Timing and rhythm abilities are complex and multidimensional skills that are highly widespread in the general population. This complexity can be partly captured by the Battery for the Assessment of Auditory Sensorimotor and Timing Abilities (BAASTA). The battery, consisting of 4 perceptual and 5 sensorimotor tests (finger tapping), has been used in healthy adults and in clinical populations (e.g., Parkinson's disease, ADHD, developmental dyslexia, stuttering), and shows sensitivity to individual differences and impairment. However, major limitations for the generalized use of this tool are the lack of reliable and standardized norms and of a version of the battery that can be used outside the lab. To circumvent these caveats we put forward a new version of BAASTA on a tablet device capable of ensuring lab-equivalent measurements of timing and rhythm abilities. We present normative data obtained with this version of BAASTA from over 100 healthy adults between the ages of 18 and 87 years in a test-retest protocol. Moreover, we propose a new composite score to summarize rhythm capacities, the Beat Tracking Index (BTI), with excellent test-retest reliability. BTI derives from two BAASTA tests (beat alignment, paced tapping), and offers a swift and practical way of measuring rhythmic abilities when research imposes strong time constraints. This mobile BAASTA implementation is more inclusive and far-reaching, while opening new possibilities for reliable remote testing of rhythmic abilities by leveraging accessible and cost-efficient technologies.

Introduction

Accurately perceiving the timing of auditory events is crucial for human adaptation to environmental demands. It enables us to cross a busy street safely, coordinate movements while dancing, and learn new skills such as speaking or playing a musical instrument. By extracting temporal regularities from external events, we can swiftly adjust and effectively coordinate our actions. The timing capacities that underlie auditory-motor skill learning play a critical role across the lifespan in both healthy and atypical populations (Dalla Bella et al., 2018; Rodriguez-Fornells et al., 2012; Trainor & Cirelli, 2015; Zatorre et al., 2007). Timing abilities are apparent in fine-grained beat perception in music, and the ability to move in synchrony with its regular rhythms. Musical features such as its regular temporal structure (rhythmic complexity, syncopation), but also its pitch structure (harmonic complexity) (Matthews et al., 2019; Witek et al., 2014) are particularly conducive to movement. This connection may be rooted in brain areas involved in motor control and audition (e.g., basal ganglia, motor, and pre-motor as well as temporal cortical areas) that are activated when we listen to rhythmic sequences without actually moving (Chen et al., 2008; Grahn & Brett, 2007; Janata et al., 2012; Kotz et al., 2018; Zatorre et al., 2007).

The majority of individuals are well equipped to process event timing, extract temporal regularities in the environment, and synchronize movement to an external beat (e.g., Damm et al., 2020; Grondin, 2010; Patel & Iversen, 2014; Sowiński & Dalla Bella, 2013; Tranchant et al., 2016). Among healthy individuals, however, there is considerable variability that manifests along a spectrum of huge individual differences in beat perception and synchronization (Fiveash et al., 2022; Sowiński & Dalla Bella, 2013; Tranchant et al., 2016). While many can extract the beat underlying a simple and complex rhythmic auditory sequence, some – “beat-deaf” or “poor synchronizers” – struggle with these tests. These rhythm difficulties can take different forms and might be characterized by both poor rhythm

perception and production (Palmer et al., 2014; Phillips-Silver et al., 2011), or show selective impairment of production (Sowiński & Dalla Bella, 2013) and/or perception (Bégel et al., 2017). Finally, poor timing and rhythmic abilities are found in clinical populations, including neurodegenerative and neurodevelopmental disorders (Allman & Meck, 2012; Lense et al., 2021), Parkinson's disease (Benoit et al., 2014; Grahn & Brett, 2009; Merchant et al., 2008), ADHD (Noreika et al., 2013; Puyjarinet et al., 2017), and speech and language impairments (Bégel et al., 2022; Corriveau & Goswami, 2009; Falk et al., 2015; Ladányi et al., 2020). Disrupted timing and rhythm abilities, when appearing early in life, may contribute to atypical developmental symptoms (Lense et al., 2021); they are also related to impaired performance in the elderly (e.g., motor disorders; Dalla Bella, 2020; Dalla Bella et al., 2017). Thus, a better characterization of timing and rhythm disorders in clinical populations is likely to play an important role in identifying risk factors in development (Ladányi et al., 2020) and in personalized intervention strategies (Dalla Bella et al., 2018; Dotov et al., 2019).

Capturing the complexity of timing and rhythmic abilities is a challenging task. These abilities are typically multidimensional, and are underpinned by a complex cognitive architecture involving several dimensions (e.g., beat-based, memory-based processes; Bonacina et al., 2019; Bouwer et al., 2020; Fiveash et al., 2022; Kasdan et al., 2022; Tierney & Kraus, 2015). This complexity is difficult to capture through isolated tasks and instead requires multiple assessments, as provided by comprehensive test batteries. Multiple tests afford precise measurement of timing and rhythm abilities, and the detection of individual profiles (Dalla Bella et al., 2023), allowing isolation of the locus of impairment in individuals with rhythm disorders. Existing batteries for testing timing and rhythm abilities include both perceptual and sensorimotor tasks. The perceptual and performance dimensions of timing and rhythm abilities are not always correlated (Dalla Bella, Farrugia, et al., 2017; Fujii & Schlaug, 2013), suggesting that both abilities should tested to obtain a comprehensive profile of these

abilities. Examples of tasks are perceptual judgments (e.g., deciding whether a metronome is aligned or not to a musical beat; Beat Alignment Test; Iversen & Patel, 2008), or finger tapping tests (Repp, 2005; Repp & Su, 2013). To systematically probe timing and rhythm abilities, batteries of perception and production tests have been devised such as the Battery for the Assessment of Auditory Sensorimotor and Timing Abilities (BAASTA, Dalla Bella, Farrugia, et al., 2017), and the Harvard Beat Alignment Test (H-BAT, Fujii & Schlaug, 2013). Here we will focus on BAASTA, which is an exhaustive battery including four perceptual tests and five sensorimotor tests (via finger tapping). One of the advantages of BAASTA is that it covers various timing and rhythm abilities, providing dedicated behavioral tests widely used in a wealth of studies (e.g., paced and unpaced finger tapping, detection of anisochronies, and beat alignment). The battery is sensitive to individual differences in timing and rhythm abilities. It can distinguish between individuals with and without musical training or informal music experience (Dalla Bella et al., 2023), as well as impaired rhythm perception and performance in healthy and patient populations (e.g., Bégel et al., 2017, 2022; Benoit et al., 2014; Dalla Bella et al., 2023; Dalla Bella, Farrugia, et al., 2017; Falk et al., 2015; Fiveash et al., 2022; Hidalgo et al., 2021; Oschkinat et al., 2022; Puyjarinet et al., 2017, 2022; Verga et al., 2021; Zagala et al., 2021). Hence, the battery can serve as a screening tool for rhythm disorders, and pave the way to individualized rhythm-based interventions (Dalla Bella et al., 2018).

Despite these advantages, BAASTA so far presents a few shortcomings. The battery is currently implemented for lab usage, thanks to tapping pads or sensors ensuring high temporal precision (≤ 1ms); this makes it quite unsuitable for use outside the lab, remotely, in a school, or for clinical use at a patient's bedside. Interestingly, there have been developments of rhythmic tasks on mobile devices such as tablets and smartphones (Puyjarinet et al., 2017; Zanto et al., 2019), which are appealing and inclusive solutions for testing cognitive functions

(Koo & Vizer, 2019). The problem with using off-the-shelf devices such as tablets or smartphones, however, is that they are not conceived as measurement tools in the first place. Timing inaccuracies resulting from unwanted delays (e.g., in the audio output, or between touch detection and recording) and imprecision due to the low sampling rate of the device touchscreen (between 60 and 240 Hz; Kousa, 2017) are common. A second shortcoming of BAASTA, and more generally with tests measuring timing and rhythmic abilities, is the lack of normative data across the lifespan. This limits our capacity to define cut-off scores for impaired performance and necessitates further data collection from a matched control group in separate studies. Finally, running participants through the full set of BAASTA tests is particularly time consuming (i.e., approximately 2 hours). Even though it may be justified in some cases to run all tests to obtain a thorough assessment of rhythmic abilities, this might be impractical or even unfeasible in clinical or educational setting.

Therefore, the objective of the current study is two-fold. Given the aforementioned limitations of mobile devices to record rhythmic performance, we first present a new solution, implementing BAASTA on a tablet device that ensures lab-comparable high accuracy and precision (Zagala et al., 2021). A prototype of this BAASTA tablet version was already used in several prior studies in healthy adults, children, and clinical populations (Bégel et al., 2018, 2022; Dauvergne et al., 2018; Puyjarinet et al., 2017, 2019). A further goal is i) to provide norms for BAASTA-tablet collected data from a group of over 100 adults across the lifespan (from 18 to over 80 years), ii) obtain test-retest reliability metrics for the battery, and iii) propose a composite score (i.e., the Beat Tracking Index), which can be obtained by just running two BAASTA tests (see also, Puyjarinet et al., 2017) to summarize perceptual and sensorimotor rhythmic abilities within a minimal amount of time.

Materials and methods

Participants

A total of 116 adults, between 18 and 87 years of age and recruited in the Montreal area, started the experiment. Of these participants, 108 (74 female; 98 right-handed, 9 left-handed and 1 ambidextrous) completed the experiment. The other 8 participants (6.9% of the total) could not complete the experiment, or their data was discarded for technical reasons (intermittently recorded data), and consequently were not included in the analysis. We divided the final participants into four age groups: 18-21 years (n = 27; 18 female; M = 19.5 years; SD = 1.0), 22-29 years (n = 29; 19 female; M = 23.8 years; SD = 1.7), 30-54 years (n = 26; 16 female; M = 39.7 years; SD = 7.5), and 55-87 years (n = 26; 21 female; M = 67.9 years; SD = 8.5). The age range in each group was determined to ensure a comparable sample size in each group, based on the tested participants. There was no difference in gender proportion across these age groups ($X^2(3) = 2.56$, $p = 0.46$). We recruited participants who were fluent in English or French, and who were non-musicians (i.e., individuals who did not consider themselves as musicians). Most participants (n = 72) indicated French as their first language; other first languages were Arabic (7), Spanish (7), English (6), Mandarin/Cantonese (4), Portuguese (3), Marathi (2), Bengali (1), Créole (1), Persian (1), Romanian (1), Russian (1), Telugu (1), and Turkish (1). Participants had a mean of 0.3 years of formal musical training (SD = 0.7 years; range: 0-4 years), and 1.5 years of total musical experience including both formal and informal musical activities (SD = 2.8 years; range: 0-19.5). Age groups did not differ in both measures of musical experience ($p \approx 1$). Exclusion criteria for participating in the study were a history of alcohol or drug consumption, brain concussions, and reported visual or hearing deficits. All participants took part in a first testing session (*Test*) and 93 of them participated in a second session (*Re-test*) (64 female). The proportion of the participants in the Re-test across the age groups was comparable to that of the Test session. In the Re-test

session 21 participants were in the 18-21 age group (15 female), 24 in the 22-29 group (15 female), 23 in the 30-54 group (14 female), and 25 in the 55-87 group (20 female). The study was approved by the ethics committee (certificate n.: CERAS-2018-19-096D) of the University of Montreal. Informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Procedure and tests

Testing of participants involved two separate sessions (Test, Re-Test) conducted in sound-proof rooms at the BRAMS laboratory at the University of Montreal. In each session, we tested participants' sensorimotor and timing abilities with the Battery for the Assessment of Auditory and Sensorimotor Timing Abilities (BAASTA; Dalla Bella, Farrugia, et al., 2017). The administration of the full BAASTA took approximately 2 to 2.5 hours in each session, and the sessions were separated by approximately 30 days. In a separate screening session, prior to Test and Re-Test, participants filled in a short questionnaire on basic demographic information and their musical experience.

Measures of perceptual and sensorimotor timing abilities

BAASTA includes 4 perceptual tasks and 5 production timing tasks. Perceptual tasks involved the discrimination of single durations (Duration discrimination), the detection of deviations from temporal regularity (beat isochrony) in tone and musical sequences (Anisochrony detection with tones, with music), and the detection of the alignment between the musical beat and a superimposed metronome sound (Beat Alignment Test). Sensorimotor tasks were finger tapping tests in the absence of stimulation (Unpaced tapping), synchronizing to the beat of tone and music sequences (Paced tapping with tones, with music), continuing tapping at the pace of a metronome (Synchronization-continuation), and adapting tapping to a tempo change (Adaptive tapping). The tasks were implemented via an app on a tablet device

(see below for details), which recorded participants' responses. Auditory stimuli were delivered via headphones (Beyer dynamic DT 770 PRO or DT 990 PRO). The sound pressure level was adapted for each participant at the beginning of the testing to achieve a comfortable level. The level was adjusted if needed in tasks across the battery, if explicitly requested by the participants. As BAASTA is formed by two sets of tasks (perceptual and sensorimotor), the order of the sets was counter-balanced across participants; in the analyzed data set, 62 participants (57%) received perceptual tasks followed by sensorimotor tasks, while 46 (43%) received the opposite order. Task order within each set was fixed (Duration discrimination, Anisochrony detection with tones and music, BAT, for perceptual tasks; Unpaced tapping and Paced tapping to tones and music, for motor tasks). Each task was preceded by instructions and, except for the Unpaced tapping task, at least one practice trial. In addition, perceptual tasks included examples of stimuli (e.g., with or without a duration difference, anisochrony, or beat misalignment).

Perceptual tasks. In the *Duration discrimination* test we presented two tones (frequency = 1 kHz) successively, one at a standard duration (600 ms) and the other at a comparison duration (between 600 and 1000 ms). Participants judged whether the second tone lasted longer than the first. In the *Anisochrony detection with tones* task we tested the detection of a time shift in an isochronous tone sequence. We presented sequences of 5 tones (1047 Hz, tone duration = 150 ms; mean Inter-Onset Interval – IOI = 600 ms). Sequences were isochronous (i.e., with a constant IOI) or not (the 4th tone was presented earlier than expected by up to 30% of the IOI). Participants judged whether the sequence was regular or not. In the *Anisochrony detection with music* task, we assessed the detection of a time shift in a musical sequence, namely an excerpt of two bars from Bach's "Badinerie" orchestral suite for flute (BWV 1067) played with a piano timbre (inter-beat interval, IBI = 600 ms). As before, participants judged the regularity of the sequence. We tested beat perception with the *Beat*

Alignment Test (BAT). We used 72 stimuli based on 4 regular musical sequences, including 20 beats each (beat = quarter note): two fragments from Bach's "Badinerie", and 2 from Rossini's "William Tell Ouverture". The stimuli were played with a piano timbre at three different tempi (with 450, 600, and 750-ms IBIs). A metronome (i.e., woodblock sound) is superimposed onto the music, and it was either aligned or non-aligned (out of phase, or with a different period) relative to the musical beat. Participants judged if the metronome was aligned or not with the musical beat. In all perceptual tasks except BAT, we used an adaptive two-alternative forced-choice staircase procedure (Leek, 2001; Levitt, 1971; Dalla Bella, Farrugia, et al., 2017, for an implementation in BAASTA). The staircase protocol started with a large difference between standard and comparison stimuli (i.e., change in duration, IOI, or IBI). The difference changed adaptively during the trial, conditional to the participant's response, and controlled by a 2 down / 1 up staircase procedure. Two consecutive positive responses to a difference were needed to reduce it by half in the following trial. A negative response led to a reverse in the change, and the difference was multiplied by a factor of 1.5. Every time the direction of a difference change reversed from up to down or from down to up, the value of the difference at which this occurred was recorded as a turnaround point. The trial ended after eight turnaround points and the threshold was calculated by averaging the last four. The obtained threshold corresponded to a probability of 70.7% for the 2 down / 1 up relative to the psychometric curve (Levitt, 1971). Notably, for each staircase sequence of stimuli there were 3 catch trials in which there was no change, which served to ensure that the participants paid attention during the task.

Sensorimotor tasks. In all sensorimotor tasks participants responded by tapping with the index finger of their dominant hand. To measure the participants' preferred tapping rate and its variability in the *Unpaced tapping* task, we asked the participants to tap at their most natural rate for 60 seconds. In two additional unpaced conditions, we asked the participants to

tap as fast or as slow as possible for 60 seconds. The unpaced tapping task at preferred tapping rate was repeated twice, at the very beginning and at the very end of the sensorimotor tasks. In the *Paced tapping with tones* task participants tapped to the sounds of a metronome (60 isochronously presented piano tones; tone frequency = 1319 Hz). There were three trials, each at one of 3 different tempi (600, 450, and 750-ms IOI). In the *Paced tapping with music* task participants tapped to the beat of two musical excerpts taken from Bach's "Badinerie" and Rossini's "William Tell Overture" (64 quarter notes; IBI = 600 ms). Participants repeated the paced tapping trials twice for each stimulus sequence (except 5 participants who did not perform the repetition due to a technical error). To test continuation tapping at the rate provided by a metronome, in the *Synchronization-continuation* task participants tapped with an isochronous sequence of 10 piano tones (at 600, 450, and 750 ms IOI), and continued tapping at the same rate, for a duration corresponding to 30 IOIs after the sequence stopped. Participants repeated the task twice at each tempo (except 5 participants). To assess the ability to adapt to a tempo change in a synchronization-continuation task, in the *Adaptive tapping* task participants tapped to an isochronous sequence (10 piano tones), at the end of which (last 4 tones) the tempo either increased, decreased (by 30 or 75 ms), or was kept constant (40% of the trials). Participants tapped to the tones in the sequence, and were instructed to adapt to the tempo change, and to continue tapping at the new tempo after the stimulus stopped. Moreover, at the end of the trial, participants judged whether they perceived a change in stimulus tempo (acceleration, deceleration) or not. In this task there were 10 experimental blocks of 6 trials each, presented in random order.

BAASTA tablet application

In previous studies, BAASTA was implemented as a computer version, making use of different software programs (Max MSP, and Matlab) and MIDI percussion pads (e.g., Benoit

et al., 2014; Dalla Bella, Farrugia, et al., 2017). Here the battery took the form of an application on a tablet device (Samsung Galaxy Tab E running Android 7.1). The application supporting the tablet version of BAASTA will be available via the BeatHealth S.A. company (https://www.beathealth.tech/) on a Pay-Per-Use (PPU) basis. Participants' responses in the perceptual tests were communicated verbally to the experimenter who entered them on the tablet device. Finger tapping performance was collected by having participants tap within a green rectangle (10.0 by 8.8 cm) on the tablet touchscreen (see Figure 1). As tablet devices are not precise measurement tools by design, we paid particular attention that the recording of unpaced and paced tapping timing complies with the highest lab standards. Timing inaccuracy in tapping tasks on tablet can arise from a delay in the audio output, the temporal uncertainty arising from the sampling rate of touch detection, and the processing delay between the touch detection and the recording of a tap (Zagala et al., 2021). These shortcomings are mostly due to the precision of the device touchscreen (sampling rate between 60 and 240 Hz) which is much coarser than lab measurements (1000 Hz or more). These issues are circumvented in the present BAASTA tablet implementation by relying on an audio recording of the sound the taps produce when they reach the touchscreen (see International Patent No WO 2020/128088 A1 ; Dalla Bella & Andary, 2020), affording high temporal precision (≤1ms).



Figure 1. Photo of BAASTA testing with the Paced tapping task on tablet.

Data pre-processing and quality checks of BAASTA tablet application

Audio data collected via the BAASTA tablet app in sound-proof rooms at BRAMS laboratory were pre-processed and submitted to quality checks. As the recording of tapping data on tablet is based on audio recordings, the characteristics of the audio environment in which testing is carried out (sound-proof room in the laboratory vs. less-controlled environments for remote testing, such as schools, hospitals, at home) can potentially influence the measures of timing and synchronization. Moreover, the tapping strength and the ensuing sound can affect the capacity to detect the tapping time relative to the stimulus sound. Hence, data quality checks play an essential role to ensure that collected data are reliable and meet high measurement standards even when data collection cannot be realized in optimal lab sound-proof conditions. The sound recordings include a mixture of the tapping sounds and the stimuli, and are pre-processed by the following steps to obtain the tap times for scoring (Dalla Bella & Andary, 2020): find stimulus alignment; apply band-pass filter; find times of energy peaks; find alignment between peaks and touchscreen events; and perform windowed matching to select only the energy peaks that match a touchscreen event. Subsequently, two diagnostic values were used to identify trials with potentially poor quality of tap detection. The first diagnostic value was the “match score”, defined as the percentage of touchscreen taps that were matched with a corresponding audio tap event. A value less than 100% can indicate overly faint tapping, and/or presence of excessive external noise in the recording such as talking, bumping of the testing apparatus, or vibration from nearby equipment. The second diagnostic value was the “match IQR”, defined as the interquartile range of the time differences between each corresponding pair of touchscreen and audio events. A value above 10 ms can indicate a misalignment of touchscreen events to energy peaks prior to matching, or signal-to-noise issues as described for the match score. A match score below 90% (because the tap scoring is tolerant to a small number of missing taps) or a match IQR exceeding 10 ms

caused a trial to be flagged for manual review, and for subsequent exclusion if poor data quality was confirmed.

Analyses of BAASTA data

For Duration discrimination, Anisochrony detection with tones and with music, we averaged the threshold obtained from the staircase procedure in the two trials. The threshold was expressed in percent of the standard duration or interval. Staircases including more than 1 false alarm among the 3 catch trials (i.e., the participant reported a difference when there was none) were rejected. In the BAT, we calculated the sensitivity index (*d'*) based on the proportions of Hits (correct detections) for misaligned metronomes, and of False alarms (when a misalignment was erroneously reported for aligned metronomes) for the entire set of 72 stimuli. Moreover, we calculated *d'* separately for each of the 3 tempi (medium, fast, and slow). Tapping data in all tasks were pre-processed following the same procedures adopted for computer-collected data (Dalla Bella, Farrugia, et al., 2017; Sowiński & Dalla Bella, 2013). We discarded taps leading to inter-tap intervals (ITIs) smaller than 100 ms (artifacts) and outliers. A tap was an "outlier" if the ITI between the actual tap and the preceding tap was smaller than Q1 – 3*Interquartile range (IQR) or greater than Q3 + 3*IQR, where Q1 is the first quartile and Q3 is the third quartile (as in Dalla Bella et al., 2017). We calculated the mean inter-tap interval (ITI, in ms) and the coefficient of variation of the ITI (CV ITI – namely, the (*SD* of the ITI) / mean ITI) as a measure of motor variability. Moreover, we computed measures of phase synchronization in the Paced tapping tasks using circular statistics (Berens, 2009; Fisher, 1993; for use in BAASTA see Dalla Bella, Farrugia, et al., 2017). Tap times in each sequence were coded as unitary vectors with angles relative to the pacing event (tone or musical beat) on a polar scale, where 360° corresponds to the inter-stimulus interval. We obtained the mean resultant vector *R* from the unit vectors

corresponding to all the taps in a sequence. We used two measures of phase synchronization: consistency and accuracy. Consistency corresponds to the length of vector *R*, ranging from 0 to 1, where 0 refers to a uniform distribution of angles around the circle (i.e., lack of synchronization), and 1 to maximum consistency (no variability). Accuracy corresponds to the angle of vector R (θ or relative phase, in degrees), and it indicates whether participants tapped before (negative angle) or after (positive angle) the pacing event. Accuracy was calculated only if participants' synchronization performance was above chance (null hypothesis = random distribution of data points around the circle), as assessed with the Rayleigh test for circular uniformity (Fisher, 1995; Wilkie, 1983). The null hypothesis is rejected when *R* vector length is sufficiently large according to this test. Vector length values were submitted to a logit transformation (e.g., Falk et al., 2015) before conducting further analyses. In both Paced tapping and Synchronization-continuation tasks, the results in the two trials were averaged.

In the Adaptive tapping task an adaptation index (as in Schwartze et al., 2011) was calculated separately for acceleration trials (i.e., faster tempi with final sequence IOIs < 600 ms) and deceleration trials (slower tempi with final sequence IOIs > 600 ms). When the value of the adaptation index is 1, the adaptation is perfect; lower and higher values than 1 indicate under correction and over correction, respectively, relative to the new metronome tempo. In the same task we calculated the sensitivity index (d') for detecting tempo changes based on the proportions of Hits (when a tempo acceleration or deceleration was correctly detected) and False Alarms (when a tempo acceleration or deceleration was reported while there was no change or the opposite change).

Statistical analyses

Statistical analyses were performed in R (version 4.2.2; R Core Team, 2022). The measure score distribution shapes were described in terms of skewness and excess kurtosis

(i.e., kurtosis – 3) using the *moments* package in R. In order to reduce reliance on normal distributions in the task scores, robust rank-based versions of t-tests, ANOVAs and regressions were used where possible, using the *Rfit* package in R (Kloke & McKean, 2012). Each BAASTA variable was first tested for an effect of gender, and then separately for the effects of age (in years) and age group (categorically) using the *rfit* function. Probability values were calculated from the resulting t statistic for effects of gender and age, and as an omnibus test via the "drop in dispersion test" for the effect of age group (Kloke & McKean, 2012).

In several tasks, additional comparisons were made to test for score differences across tempi or task conditions (unpaced initial vs. final; music 1 vs music 2). As these were within-participant comparisons, they were tested using mixed-effects models including a random participant intercept using the R packages *lmerTest* (Kuznetsova et al., 2017) and *lme4* (Bates et al., 2015), yielding F and p values calculated from Wald tests using Kenward-Roger approximated degrees of freedom (Halekoh & Højsgaard, 2014).

Calculation of the Beat Tracking Index (BTI)

Beat Tracking Index (BTI; for usage in a previous study, Puyjarinet et al., 2017) is a global measure of beat tracking skills computed by considering the performance of both the BAT and Paced tapping tasks from BAASTA. The source data to compute the BTI were the overall sensitivity index (d') obtained from the BAT, and synchronization consistency in paced tapping averaged across the two music conditions (i.e., "Sensitivity index (d') for all trials" in the BAT, and "Consistency (logit of vector length), music 1", and "Consistency (logit of vector length), music 2" in Paced tapping). First, values were converted to z-scores according to each measure's mean and standard deviation across all participants (see Table 3 and Table 7), where z-score = (value – mean)/SD. A combined music score was obtained by

taking the mean of each participant's "music 1" and "music 2" z-scores. Finally, the BTI was calculated by averaging each participant's BAT z-score with their combined music score.

Test-retest reliability

We compared the first and the second testing sessions by Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test (*wilcox.test* R function, "paired"). Rejection of the null hypothesis implies a significant difference between the two sessions and reveals a systematic error that may result from an experimental bias such as the effect of weariness or learning. Correlation of scores between the two sessions was calculated by Spearman rank correlation (using *cor.test* R function). To control for sources of error due to chance (random error; e.g., biological variability), we calculated the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC3,1) using the *icc* function from the *irr* R package (Gamer et al., 2019). The ICC3,1 is considered a good index of test-retest reliability with the same experimenter because it does not include the variance associated with systematic error (bias) (Brozek & Alexander, 1947; Fleiss, 1986; Weir, 2005). The ICC is commonly used as a measure of relative reliability, namely, the consistency of the relative position of one individual in a group (Vaz et al., 2013). Following Cicchetti (1994), ICC values were interpreted as ≥ 0.75, excellent; 0.40–0.74, fair to good; and < 0.40, poor. The other form of reliability is absolute reliability (Fleiss, 1986; Weir, 2005), which deals with the degree to which measurements vary and provides an index of the expected trial-to-trial noise in the data. SEM, SEM%, and coefficient of reliability (CR, also referred to as the smallest real difference, or minimum difference) were used to assess absolute reliability. The SEM is expressed in the same unit as the measurement of interest and quantifies the variability between the two sessions. It is calculated as the square root of the within-subjects error variance. CR represents the 95% confidence interval, a value for which any retest score outside that interval would be interpreted to represent a change beyond the measurement error of the test (Weir, 2005). It is calculated by multiplying the SEM by 2.77 (√2 times 1.96). For

comparison between tasks in different units, the SEM% and CR% were calculated by dividing the SEM or the CR by the mean of all measurements from both sessions and multiplied by 100.

Results

Preliminary analyses

Data were submitted to quality checks and preliminary analyses. Following a manual review of tapping trials based on automatic diagnostic measures, a total of 7 trials were excluded from scoring because of talking in the middle of the trial, and one trial was excluded because of background noise that interfered with audio-based tap detection. The mean match score of tapping trials submitted to scoring was 98.9, and the mean match IQR was 5.0. After the subsequent application of scoring criteria (see Methods, "Analyses of BAASTA data"), score completeness (percent of participants having a score on a given measure included for analysis) was 91-94% for Duration discrimination and Anisochrony detection, 100% for BAT, 95-99% for Unpaced tapping, 90-100% for Paced tapping to tones[1], 83-99% for Paced tapping to music[1], 100% for Synchronization-continuation, 97% for Adaptive tapping, and 94% for the BTI. In sum, diagnostic scores indicate that the data entering in the calculation of the norms were of high quality.

We ran preliminary analyses on the final dataset to test whether there were effects of gender on any task measures, finding only a greater hit rate for males on the BAT medium tempo trials ($t(106) = 2.14$, $p = .035$). As no further gender effects were found on the main BAT d' measures ($p > .15$), nor across any other measures ($p > .09$), data were not separated by gender for subsequent analyses.

Norm tables

We analyzed data collected at the Test phase to generate norm tables. The measures of timing and rhythmic abilities reported in the tables are summarized in Table 1, with reference to the tables in which the norms are presented. The table also includes additional measures which are not reported in the norm tables, but that can be found in more detailed tables in Supplementary Materials. The norm tables report skewness and excess kurtosis for the distributions, the mean and SD, as well as percentile scores (0, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 100th percentile) for the overall group of participants, and separately for the four age groups (18 to 21, 22 to 29, 30 to 54, and 55 to 87 years). Significant differences between the four age groups are indicated in the tables, as well as between tempos or other comparisons within the same task (unpaced initial vs. final; music 1 vs music 2). Finally, a significant regression between the reported scores and age is also indicated. Normative data for perceptual tasks are presented in Table 2 (Duration discrimination, Anisochrony detection with tones, Anisochrony detection with music) and Table 3 (BAT). Data for sensorimotor tasks are reported in Tables 4 through 11 (Table 4-5: Unpaced tapping; Table 6-8: Paced tapping with tones and with music; Table 9: Synchronization continuation; Table 10: Adaptive tapping). More detailed tables for each task and measures, including all percentile scores (from 0 through 100), and values of statistical tests are available in the Supplementary materials. It can be seen that age group differences are found only in very few cases, namely in Anisochrony detection with tones ($F(3,96) = 3.51$, $p < .05$), Unpaced tapping (for tapping rate only, in fast tapping condition, $F(3,103) = 3.11$, $p < .05$), Paced tapping (consistency, with tones, IOI= 450ms, $F(3,103) = 2.95$, $p < .05$; with music 1, $F(3,102) = 2.94$, $p < .05$; and with music 2, $F(3,98) = 3.95$, $p = .01$). Differences among tempo trials were found in the BAT ($F(2,214) = 24.47$, $p < .001$), Paced tapping with tones (variability, $F(2,212.4) = 17.60$, $p < .001$; consistency, $F(2,212.5) = 4.12$, $p < .05$; and accuracy, $F(2,200.5) = 8.45$, $p < .001$), and

Synchronization continuation (variability, $F(2,214.0) = 4851.15$, $p < .001$), showing a general tendency to perform better at medium or slow tempos. Moreover, we found differences between the initial and last trials in Unpaced tapping (for rate, in the spontaneous condition, $F(1,103.2) = 11.32$, $p = .001$), and between the two musical stimuli in Paced tapping (consistency, $F(1,101.8) = 9.90$, $p < .01$; and accuracy, $F(1,91.3) = 47.06$, $p < .001$), showing that synchronization is more difficult for music 2 than for music 1. Finally, a significant regression between the scores and age was found in most tasks, namely in Anisochrony detection with tones ($t(107) = 2.47$, $p < .05$) and with music ($t(107) = 2.43$, $p < .05$), in the BAT (fast tempo trials, $t(107) = -2.48$, $p < .05$), in Unpaced tapping (variability, in spontaneous tapping, $t(107) = -2.05$, $p < .05$; and fast tapping, $t(107) = -2.06$, $p < .05$), Paced tapping (consistency in tapping with tones with IOI = 450ms, $t(107) = 2.32$, $p < .05$; accuracy in tapping with tones with IOI = 450ms, $t(107) = 2.11$, $p < .05$; consistency in tapping to music 2, $t(107) = 2.84$, $p < .01$), in Synchronization-continuation (rate, at the fastest tempo, $t(107) = 3.00$, $p < .01$; variability, at the slower tempo, $t(107) = -2.39$, $p < .05$), and in Adaptive tapping (adaptation index, for deceleration trials, $t(107) = -2.17$, $p < .05$).

Composite score: Beat Tracking Index

Individual performances for all participants in the Test phase for the sensorimotor and perceptual components of the BTI are presented in Figure 2 (panel A). These perceptual and sensorimotor components are positively related ($R^2 = .17$; $F(1,99) = 20.0$; $p < .001$). However, the dispersion of the individual performances around the regression line is quite wide, and in some cases high performance on the perceptual component is associated with poor performance on the sensorimotor component, or vice-versa. Hence one of the component and associated tasks may be more capable than the other to capture poor or good performance in a rhythmic task. Calculating a composite score – the BTI (see distribution, Figure 2, Panel B) –

can thus allow maximizing the capacity to capture individual variability. Normative scores for the BTI are provided in Table 11.



Figure 2. The Beat Tracking Index (BTI). A) Relation between the BTI perceptual and sensorimotor components by participant. Shaded area indicates 95% confidence interval of the linear regression. B) Distribution of the BTI score. Shaded area indicates binned value frequencies and smooth line indicates smoothed kernel density estimate.

Table 1

Description of BAASTA Measures

Variable name	Task	Task category	Outcome measure	Norm table	Full table
DurDisc_threshold	Duration discrimination	Perceptual	Threshold (% of IOI)	Table 2	Table S1
Anisochrony_tones_threshold	Anisochrony detection with tones	Perceptual	Threshold (% of IOI)	Table 2	Table S2
Anisochrony_music_threshold	Anisochrony detection with music	Perceptual	Threshold (% of IOI)	Table 2	Table S3
BAT_all_dprime	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	Sensitivity index (d') for all trials	Table 3	Table S4
BAT_fast_dprime	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	Sensitivity index (d') for fast tempo trials	Table 3	Table S5
BAT_med_dprime	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	Sensitivity index (d') for medium tempo trials	Table 3	Table S6
BAT_slow_dprime	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	Sensitivity index (d') for slow tempo trials	Table 3	Table S7
BAT_all_hits	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	Hit rate for all trials	—	Table S8
BAT_fast_hits	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	Hit rate for fast tempo trials	—	Table S9
BAT_med_hits	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	Hit rate for medium tempo trials	—	Table S10
BAT_slow_hits	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	Hit rate for slow tempo trials	—	Table S11
BAT_all_fa	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	False alarm rate for all trials	—	Table S12
BAT_fast_fa	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	False alarm rate for fast tempo trials	—	Table S13
BAT_med_fa	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	False alarm rate for medium tempo trials	—	Table S14
BAT_slow_fa	Beat Alignment Test	Perceptual	False alarm rate for slow tempo trials	—	Table S15
Unpaced_spontaneous_right_mean_iti	Unpaced tapping	Sensorimotor	Rate (ITI in ms) of spontaneous tapping, initial trial	Table 4	Table S16

Variable name	Task	Task category	Outcome measure	Norm table	Full table
Unpaced_spontaneous_final_right_mean_iti	Unpaced tapping	Sensorimotor	Rate (ITI in ms) of spontaneous tapping, final trial	Table 4	Table S17
Unpaced_fast_mean_iti	Unpaced tapping	Sensorimotor	Rate (ITI in ms) of fast tapping	Table 4	Table S18
Unpaced_slow_mean_iti	Unpaced tapping	Sensorimotor	Rate (ITI in ms) of slow tapping	Table 4	Table S19
Unpaced_spontaneous_right_CV_iti	Unpaced tapping	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI) of spontaneous tapping, initial trial	Table 5	Table S20
Unpaced_spontaneous_final_right_CV_iti	Unpaced tapping	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI) of spontaneous tapping, final trial	Table 5	Table S21
Unpaced_fast_CV_iti	Unpaced tapping	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI) of fast tapping	Table 5	Table S22
Unpaced_slow_CV_iti	Unpaced tapping	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI) of slow tapping	Table 5	Table S23
Paced_metro_450_mean_CV_iti	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI), fast tempo	Table 6	Table S24
Paced_metro_600_mean_CV_iti	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI), medium tempo	Table 6	Table S25
Paced_metro_750_mean_CV_iti	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI), slow tempo	Table 6	Table S26
Paced_metro_450_vecLenLogit	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Consistency (logit of vector length), fast tempo	Table 7	Table S27
Paced_metro_600_vecLenLogit	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Consistency (logit of vector length), medium tempo	Table 7	Table S28
Paced_metro_750_vecLenLogit	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Consistency (logit of vector length), slow tempo	Table 7	Table S29
Paced_metro_450_vecDirPct	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Accuracy (vector direction %), fast tempo	Table 8	Table S30
Paced_metro_600_vecDirPct	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Accuracy (vector direction %), medium tempo	Table 8	Table S31
Paced_metro_750_vecDirPct	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Accuracy (vector direction %), slow tempo	Table 8	Table S32
Paced_metro_450_mean_vector_direction	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Accuracy (vector direction degrees), fast tempo	—	Table S33
Paced_metro_600_mean_vector_direction	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Accuracy (vector direction degrees), medium tempo	—	Table S34
Paced_metro_750_mean_vector_direction	Paced tapping with tones	Sensorimotor	Accuracy (vector direction degrees), slow tempo	—	Table S35

Variable name	Task	Task category	Outcome measure	Norm table	Full table
Paced_music_badine_mean_CV_iti	Paced tapping with music	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI), music 1	Table 6	Table S36
Paced_music_ross_mean_CV_iti	Paced tapping with music	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI), music 2	Table 6	Table S37
Paced_music_badine_vecLenLogit	Paced tapping with music	Sensorimotor	Consistency (logit of vector length), music 1	Table 7	Table S38
Paced_music_ross_vecLenLogit	Paced tapping with music	Sensorimotor	Consistency (logit of vector length), music 2	Table 7	Table S39
Paced_music_badine_vecDirPct	Paced tapping with music	Sensorimotor	Accuracy (vector direction %), music 1	Table 8	Table S40
Paced_music_ross_vecDirPct	Paced tapping with music	Sensorimotor	Accuracy (vector direction %), music 2	Table 8	Table S41
Paced_music_badine_mean_vector_direction	Paced tapping with music	Sensorimotor	Accuracy (vector direction degrees), music 1	—	Table S42
Paced_music_ross_mean_vector_direction	Paced tapping with music	Sensorimotor	Accuracy (vector direction degrees), music 2	—	Table S43
SyncCont_metro_450_mean_mean_iti	Synchronization-continuation	Sensorimotor	Rate (ITI in ms), fast tempo	Table 9	Table S44
SyncCont_metro_600_mean_mean_iti	Synchronization-continuation	Sensorimotor	Rate (ITI in ms), medium tempo	Table 9	Table S45
SyncCont_metro_750_mean_mean_iti	Synchronization-continuation	Sensorimotor	Rate (ITI in ms), slow tempo	Table 9	Table S46
SyncCont_metro_450_mean_CV_iti	Synchronization-continuation	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI), fast tempo	Table 9	Table S47
SyncCont_metro_600_mean_CV_iti	Synchronization-continuation	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI), medium tempo	Table 9	Table S48
SyncCont_metro_750_mean_CV_iti	Synchronization-continuation	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI), slow tempo	Table 9	Table S49
Adaptive_plus_75_dprime2	Adaptive tapping	Sensorimotor	Sensitivity index (d') of perceiving tempo deceleration (IOI + 75ms)	Table 10	Table S50
Adaptive_plus_30_dprime2	Adaptive tapping	Sensorimotor	Sensitivity index (d') of perceiving tempo deceleration (IOI + 30ms)	Table 10	Table S51
Adaptive_minus_75_dprime2	Adaptive tapping	Sensorimotor	Sensitivity index (d') of perceiving tempo acceleration (IOI - 75ms)	Table 10	Table S52
Adaptive_minus_30_dprime2	Adaptive tapping	Sensorimotor	Sensitivity index (d') perceiving a tempo acceleration (IOI - 30ms)	Table 10	Table S53
Adaptive_iso_600_CV_iti	Adaptive tapping	Sensorimotor	Variability (CV of ITI) of continuation tapping (isochronous condition)	Table 10	Table S54

Variable name	Task	Task category	Outcome measure	Norm table	Full table
Adaptive_adaptation_index_acceleration	Adaptive tapping	Sensorimotor	Adaptation index (acceleration trials)	Table 10	Table S55
Adaptive_adaptation_index_deceleration	Adaptive tapping	Sensorimotor	Adaptation index (deceleration trials)	Table 10	Table S56
BTI	BTI	Composite	Beat Tracking Index	Table 11	Table S57

Table 2

Norms for Thresholds of Duration Discrimination and Anisochrony Detection

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
			Duration discrimination – Threshold (% of IOI)						
All	101 (70)	0.89	0.71	29.1 (12.7)	7.6	19.3	26.9	35.4	67.6
Age 18 to 21	25 (16)	1.21	2.81	26.4 (9.7)	10.3	19.7	26.0	30.4	58.1
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	0.56	-0.05	29.2 (11.5)	11.8	20.7	29.8	35.6	59.3
Age 30 to 54	25 (16)	0.95	-0.14	30.9 (17.0)	8.5	18.4	26.7	43.1	67.6
Age 55 to 87	22 (19)	-0.11	-1.06	29.9 (12.0)	7.6	19.8	32.4	38.9	48.6
			Anisochrony detection with tones – Threshold (% of IOI) ≈						
All *	100 (69)	0.41	-0.69	12.4 (5.1)	3.8	8.4	11.6	16.3	24.0
Age 18 to 21 †	26 (18)	0.47	-0.74	12.2 (5.5)	3.8	8.1	11.1	16.4	23.2
Age 22 to 29	26 (16)	0.41	-0.85	10.9 (4.3)	4.7	7.5	10.1	14.1	19.6
Age 30 to 54	23 (15)	0.37	-0.88	11.4 (4.3)	5.3	8.1	10.5	14.5	19.8
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	-0.01	-0.87	15.2 (5.3)	4.4	11.3	14.4	19.0	24.0
			Anisochrony detection with music – Threshold (% of IOI) ≈						
All *	98 (68)	0.95	0.11	12.0 (7.1)	3.2	6.5	10.6	15.9	32.0
Age 18 to 21	26 (18)	1.17	0.36	11.0 (7.6)	3.6	5.1	7.8	13.9	29.2
Age 22 to 29	25 (17)	1.25	1.25	11.0 (5.4)	4.1	7.7	9.7	12.3	26.1
Age 30 to 54	24 (14)	0.82	-0.58	11.7 (7.8)	3.2	5.2	9.5	15.9	27.9
Age 55 to 87	23 (19)	0.74	0.07	14.6 (7.0)	4.7	9.9	13.4	19.1	32.0

Note. Additional details for Duration discrimination task are presented in Table S1, and for the Anisochrony detection task in Tables S2-S3. * Significant age regression ($p < .05$). † Significant difference among age groups ($p < .05$). ≈ No difference between Anisochrony detection conditions ($p > .05$).

Table 3

Norms for Beat Alignment Test Sensitivity Index

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
Beat Alignment Test – Sensitivity index (d') for all trials									
All	108 (74)	-0.23	-0.40	2.76 (1.03)	0.05	2.15	2.71	3.46	4.42
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	-0.86	0.41	3.02 (1.06)	0.42	2.62	2.93	3.82	4.42
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	0.16	-1.03	2.83 (1.10)	0.89	2.13	2.54	3.82	4.42
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-0.58	0.06	2.69 (1.07)	0.05	2.22	2.84	3.31	4.42
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	0.22	-0.39	2.51 (0.87)	1.06	1.88	2.58	3.03	4.42
Beat Alignment Test – Sensitivity index (d') for fast tempo trials ‡									
All *	108 (74)	-0.24	-0.44	2.22 (0.87)	0.29	1.74	2.27	2.79	3.54
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	-1.16	1.34	2.46 (0.80)	0.29	2.19	2.57	3.07	3.54
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-0.13	-0.91	2.31 (0.96)	0.29	1.60	2.32	3.54	3.54
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-0.20	-0.09	2.12 (0.83)	0.29	1.67	2.06	2.52	3.54
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	0.24	-0.25	1.98 (0.82)	0.59	1.66	1.98	2.34	3.54
Beat Alignment Test – Sensitivity index (d') for medium tempo trials ‡									
All	108 (74)	-0.72	0.68	2.43 (0.87)	-0.62	1.91	2.38	3.07	3.54
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	-1.65	2.47	2.61 (1.04)	-0.62	2.32	2.79	3.54	3.54
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-0.17	-0.89	2.44 (0.84)	0.59	1.77	2.38	3.07	3.54
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-0.36	-0.22	2.30 (0.93)	0.00	1.78	2.35	2.79	3.54
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	0.11	-0.88	2.36 (0.63)	1.31	1.92	2.38	2.79	3.54

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
Beat Alignment Test – Sensitivity index (d') for slow tempo trials ‡									
All	108 (74)	-0.83	-0.18	2.65 (0.91)	-0.15	2.06	2.79	3.54	3.54
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	-1.00	-0.03	2.83 (0.86)	0.59	2.22	3.07	3.54	3.54
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-0.83	0.17	2.73 (0.83)	0.44	2.06	2.79	3.54	3.54
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-1.05	0.05	2.62 (1.08)	-0.15	2.10	3.07	3.54	3.54
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	-0.20	-1.33	2.42 (0.86)	1.02	1.52	2.68	3.07	3.54

Note. Additional details for the Beat Alignment Test are presented in Tables S4-S15.

* Significant age regression ($p < .05$). ‡ Significant difference between tempo conditions ($p < .05$).

Table 4

Norms for Unpaced Tapping Rate

Group	N (N female)	Skewness	Excess kurtosis	Mean (SD)	Percentiles 0	25	50	75	100
Unpaced tapping – Rate (ITI in ms) of spontaneous tapping, initial trial ‡									
All	106 (72)	3.22	18.96	685.3 (243.0)	233.9	549.4	643.8	777.8	2341.5
Age 18 to 21	26 (17)	0.51	-0.11	721.1 (225.8)	336.3	536.1	684.6	876.4	1304.6
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	0.78	1.13	661.1 (152.7)	386.4	549.0	645.1	745.1	1109.7
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	2.76	9.19	718.9 (394.5)	233.9	477.9	629.1	842.5	2341.5
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	0.38	-1.24	641.0 (102.2)	488.8	560.2	607.9	736.5	839.5
Unpaced tapping – Rate (ITI in ms) of spontaneous tapping, final trial ‡									
All	104 (72)	4.86	35.75	626.6 (177.3)	250.6	556.7	593.4	677.2	2025.4
Age 18 to 21	26 (17)	0.62	-0.42	626.3 (119.6)	459.0	536.3	590.5	709.8	896.7
Age 22 to 29	28 (19)	0.49	-0.23	605.0 (88.9)	450.3	550.1	594.6	658.2	814.9
Age 30 to 54	25 (16)	4.10	16.56	655.9 (297.4)	401.7	570.3	586.7	648.2	2025.4
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	0.56	2.73	621.8 (145.8)	250.6	542.6	613.9	699.4	1058.6
Unpaced tapping – Rate (ITI in ms) of fast tapping									
All	107 (73)	0.96	1.03	333.9 (134.5)	161.0	223.0	296.2	440.4	876.1
Age 18 to 21 †	27 (18)	0.44	-0.83	345.3 (132.7)	176.2	238.6	310.5	452.9	652.1
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	1.63	3.36	334.3 (153.5)	168.8	223.1	296.2	426.4	876.1
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	1.01	-0.27	276.6 (105.0)	161.0	197.8	243.2	307.1	520.4
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	0.16	-1.13	380.7 (126.0)	195.5	269.9	363.0	466.3	603.3

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
			Unpaced tapping – Rate (ITI in ms) of slow tapping						
All	103 (71)	1.18	0.66	1230.1 (465.8)	564.3	922.4	1069.4	1374.5	2708.4
Age 18 to 21	25 (16)	0.86	-0.09	1325.9 (394.6)	835.7	1008.0	1244.8	1473.6	2338.6
Age 22 to 29	28 (19)	2.14	4.73	1107.3 (440.5)	687.6	820.2	961.1	1160.9	2708.4
Age 30 to 54	25 (16)	0.63	-0.99	1351.7 (545.3)	599.9	924.8	1207.3	1760.0	2416.7
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	1.42	1.58	1150.3 (448.8)	564.3	935.3	1039.0	1276.3	2413.1

Note. Additional details for the Unpaced tapping task are presented in Tables S16-S23.

† Significant difference among age groups (p<.05). ‡ Significant difference between initial and final spontaneous conditions ($p < .05$).

Table 5

Norms for Unpaced Tapping Variability

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
Unpaced tapping – Variability (CV of ITI) of spontaneous tapping, initial trial ≈[a]									
All *	106 (72)	5.59	34.90	0.057 (0.039)	0.027	0.041	0.050	0.060	0.343
Age 18 to 21	26 (17)	4.17	17.00	0.066 (0.059)	0.036	0.043	0.053	0.062	0.343
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	4.32	18.88	0.062 (0.046)	0.035	0.044	0.054	0.059	0.288
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	0.57	-0.61	0.051 (0.015)	0.031	0.040	0.049	0.061	0.085
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	2.68	8.97	0.049 (0.016)	0.027	0.042	0.047	0.052	0.114
Unpaced tapping – Variability (CV of ITI) of spontaneous tapping, final trial ≈[a]									
All	104 (72)	2.26	6.60	0.052 (0.018)	0.029	0.042	0.048	0.058	0.136
Age 18 to 21	26 (17)	1.91	4.03	0.054 (0.020)	0.031	0.042	0.049	0.058	0.123
Age 22 to 29	28 (19)	2.24	5.52	0.055 (0.022)	0.032	0.044	0.050	0.059	0.136
Age 30 to 54	25 (16)	2.24	6.56	0.049 (0.018)	0.029	0.037	0.045	0.055	0.117
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	1.17	1.20	0.049 (0.012)	0.032	0.042	0.045	0.053	0.082
Unpaced tapping – Variability (CV of ITI) of fast tapping ≈[b]									
All *	107 (73)	2.67	8.64	0.061 (0.029)	0.027	0.044	0.052	0.065	0.209
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	2.56	5.98	0.067 (0.039)	0.036	0.046	0.058	0.068	0.209
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	1.87	3.90	0.065 (0.025)	0.036	0.048	0.060	0.067	0.152
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	2.46	6.15	0.056 (0.028)	0.032	0.041	0.049	0.057	0.162
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	1.37	1.80	0.053 (0.019)	0.027	0.042	0.047	0.062	0.111

Group	N (N female)	Skewness	Excess kurtosis	Mean (SD)	Percentiles 0	25	50	75	100
Unpaced tapping – Variability (CV of ITI) of slow tapping ≈[b]									
All	103 (71)	7.46	64.15	0.064 (0.061)	0.022	0.043	0.052	0.068	0.620
Age 18 to 21	25 (16)	4.23	17.18	0.085 (0.115)	0.022	0.045	0.053	0.076	0.620
Age 22 to 29	28 (19)	3.06	10.60	0.056 (0.031)	0.029	0.041	0.048	0.056	0.189
Age 30 to 54	25 (16)	1.66	3.37	0.055 (0.026)	0.023	0.037	0.053	0.065	0.140
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	0.71	0.03	0.060 (0.019)	0.032	0.047	0.057	0.070	0.109

Note. Additional details for the Unpaced tapping task are presented in Tables S16-S23.

* Significant age regression ($p < .05$). ≈[a] No difference between initial and final spontaneous conditions ($p > .05$). ≈[b] No difference between fast and slow conditions ($p > .05$).

Table 6

Norms for Paced Tapping to Tones and Music, Tapping Variability

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
Paced tapping with tones – Variability (CV of ITI), fast tempo ‡									
All	107 (73)	1.00	1.41	0.053 (0.015)	0.029	0.042	0.051	0.060	0.109
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	1.63	3.31	0.056 (0.015)	0.038	0.046	0.054	0.061	0.109
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	0.93	0.57	0.053 (0.014)	0.031	0.046	0.052	0.060	0.091
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	0.43	-0.88	0.052 (0.015)	0.029	0.038	0.049	0.065	0.086
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	0.78	0.88	0.049 (0.013)	0.032	0.037	0.049	0.057	0.085
Paced tapping with tones – Variability (CV of ITI), medium tempo ‡									
All	108 (74)	0.62	-0.01	0.046 (0.011)	0.024	0.038	0.044	0.055	0.080
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	0.90	1.14	0.048 (0.009)	0.036	0.041	0.047	0.053	0.076
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	0.62	0.14	0.046 (0.012)	0.024	0.037	0.045	0.056	0.080
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	0.63	-0.64	0.047 (0.012)	0.029	0.039	0.043	0.055	0.071
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	0.51	-0.85	0.044 (0.010)	0.030	0.036	0.042	0.051	0.066
Paced tapping with tones – Variability (CV of ITI), slow tempo ‡									
All	107 (73)	0.51	-0.28	0.050 (0.013)	0.027	0.039	0.049	0.059	0.089
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	1.02	0.82	0.052 (0.013)	0.033	0.044	0.047	0.058	0.089
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	0.25	-0.76	0.051 (0.012)	0.034	0.039	0.050	0.059	0.077
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	0.27	-1.21	0.050 (0.013)	0.031	0.040	0.049	0.063	0.072
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	0.48	-0.62	0.049 (0.014)	0.027	0.038	0.049	0.059	0.079

Group	N (N female)	Skewness	Excess kurtosis	Mean (SD)	Percentiles 0	25	50	75	100
Paced tapping with music – Variability (CV of ITI), music 1 ≈									
All	106 (72)	3.34	17.42	0.055 (0.026)	0.028	0.039	0.047	0.064	0.223
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	0.69	-0.75	0.054 (0.018)	0.028	0.041	0.047	0.068	0.090
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	0.19	-1.01	0.055 (0.018)	0.028	0.037	0.054	0.068	0.092
Age 30 to 54	24 (14)	2.78	7.30	0.059 (0.043)	0.030	0.039	0.045	0.057	0.223
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	1.38	2.03	0.052 (0.017)	0.029	0.040	0.046	0.060	0.106
Paced tapping with music – Variability (CV of ITI), music 2 ≈									
All	102 (70)	3.63	18.32	0.057 (0.031)	0.026	0.039	0.051	0.065	0.257
Age 18 to 21	24 (17)	1.80	2.91	0.060 (0.026)	0.031	0.044	0.055	0.068	0.137
Age 22 to 29	28 (18)	0.74	-0.06	0.057 (0.018)	0.034	0.043	0.054	0.069	0.102
Age 30 to 54	25 (15)	2.56	6.39	0.063 (0.052)	0.026	0.034	0.044	0.079	0.257
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	0.20	-0.81	0.049 (0.011)	0.030	0.039	0.050	0.054	0.070

Note. Additional details for the Paced tapping tasks are presented in Tables S24-S43.

‡ Significant difference among tempo conditions ($p < .05$). ≈ No difference between music conditions ($p > .05$).

Table 7

Norms for Paced Tapping to Tones and Music, Synchronization Consistency

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
Paced tapping with tones – Consistency (logit of vector length), fast tempo ‡[a]									
All *	107 (73)	-1.66	3.82	2.77 (0.86)	-0.98	2.38	2.94	3.36	4.00
Age 18 to 21 †	27 (18)	-2.52	8.30	2.58 (0.87)	-0.98	2.28	2.75	3.07	3.52
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-1.00	1.16	2.60 (0.93)	-0.25	2.08	2.85	3.22	4.00
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-1.29	0.69	2.82 (1.01)	0.25	2.60	3.16	3.52	3.97
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	-0.13	-0.12	3.11 (0.43)	2.09	2.78	3.16	3.39	3.94
Paced tapping with tones – Consistency (logit of vector length), medium tempo ‡[a]									
All	108 (74)	-1.23	1.76	2.97 (0.78)	0.10	2.70	3.05	3.49	4.28
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	-1.23	1.36	2.93 (0.68)	1.01	2.74	2.96	3.43	3.81
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-0.96	0.93	2.98 (0.73)	0.84	2.61	3.05	3.47	3.95
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-0.96	0.49	2.78 (0.97)	0.10	2.17	3.01	3.39	4.16
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	-1.73	4.79	3.19 (0.72)	0.59	2.91	3.29	3.63	4.28
Paced tapping with tones – Consistency (logit of vector length), slow tempo ‡[a]									
All	107 (73)	-1.65	3.17	2.94 (0.95)	-0.78	2.73	3.10	3.52	4.41
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	-1.95	4.10	2.99 (0.89)	0.12	2.77	3.14	3.53	4.29
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-1.79	3.75	2.98 (0.84)	0.05	2.83	3.08	3.43	4.07
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-1.18	0.97	2.84 (1.00)	0.02	2.52	3.18	3.46	4.18
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	-1.65	3.44	2.94 (1.10)	-0.78	2.76	3.08	3.58	4.41

Group	N (N female)	Skewness	Excess kurtosis	Mean (SD)	Percentiles 0	25	50	75	100
Paced tapping with music – Consistency (logit of vector length), music 1 ‡[b]									
All	106 (72)	-1.30	0.74	2.78 (1.52)	-1.81	2.53	3.25	3.84	4.76
Age 18 to 21 †	27 (18)	-1.02	0.03	2.60 (1.70)	-1.81	1.34	3.11	3.86	4.76
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-0.63	-0.99	2.18 (1.80)	-1.03	0.78	2.84	3.40	4.42
Age 30 to 54	24 (14)	-1.80	2.38	3.23 (1.37)	-0.97	3.10	3.78	3.99	4.44
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	-1.19	2.06	3.21 (0.68)	1.07	2.96	3.29	3.61	4.15
Paced tapping with music – Consistency (logit of vector length), music 2 ‡[b]									
All *	102 (70)	-0.90	0.09	2.35 (1.71)	-2.74	1.46	2.76	3.77	4.59
Age 18 to 21 †	24 (17)	-0.49	-0.88	1.92 (1.61)	-1.54	0.82	2.39	3.09	3.99
Age 22 to 29	28 (18)	-0.42	-0.83	1.62 (2.05)	-2.74	0.37	1.67	3.38	4.27
Age 30 to 54	25 (15)	-0.98	0.40	2.96 (1.41)	-0.93	2.10	3.45	4.08	4.59
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	-1.60	3.71	2.98 (1.20)	-1.18	2.34	3.13	3.82	4.59

Note. Additional details for the Paced tapping tasks are presented in Tables S24-S43.

* Significant age regression ($p < .05$). † Significant difference among age groups ($p < .05$). ‡[a] Significant difference among tempo conditions ($p < .05$). ‡[b] Significant difference between music conditions ($p < .05$).

Table 8

Norms for Paced Tapping to Tones and Music, Synchronization Accuracy

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
Paced tapping with tones – Accuracy (vector direction %), fast tempo ‡[a]									
All	97 (65)	-0.43	-0.23	-7.1 (5.9)	-24.6	-10.6	-6.8	-2.8	3.2
Age 18 to 21	23 (15)	-1.02	0.94	-7.9 (5.9)	-24.6	-9.8	-6.8	-4.6	1.1
Age 22 to 29	25 (15)	-0.14	-0.99	-7.5 (6.1)	-18.8	-12.3	-7.9	-3.4	3.0
Age 30 to 54	24 (15)	0.23	-0.48	-7.4 (5.0)	-17.4	-10.9	-7.8	-4.4	3.2
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	-0.70	-0.37	-5.8 (6.4)	-21.4	-10.1	-4.2	-0.1	2.4
Paced tapping with tones – Accuracy (vector direction %), medium tempo ‡[a]									
All	106 (73)	-0.94	0.58	-6.5 (5.6)	-24.9	-9.9	-5.5	-2.4	3.2
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	-0.61	-0.66	-7.3 (5.3)	-19.1	-10.7	-6.1	-2.8	0.8
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-0.82	-0.15	-6.4 (5.7)	-20.7	-10.1	-4.6	-2.5	1.8
Age 30 to 54	24 (15)	-1.14	0.82	-6.4 (5.4)	-21.7	-9.0	-5.4	-1.9	-0.6
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	-1.22	1.98	-6.1 (6.1)	-24.9	-8.9	-5.2	-1.6	3.2
Paced tapping with tones – Accuracy (vector direction %), slow tempo ‡[a]									
All	104 (70)	-0.36	0.02	-5.3 (4.7)	-17.6	-8.3	-4.6	-2.1	5.8
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	-0.85	-0.05	-6.3 (5.1)	-17.6	-9.0	-4.9	-2.5	1.2
Age 22 to 29	28 (18)	0.20	-0.56	-3.8 (3.8)	-10.8	-6.2	-3.6	-1.5	4.6
Age 30 to 54	24 (14)	-0.29	-0.15	-3.9 (5.1)	-14.9	-6.4	-3.9	-1.1	5.8
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	-0.13	-1.07	-7.0 (4.3)	-14.6	-10.5	-7.1	-4.0	-0.4

Group	N (N female)	Skewness	Excess kurtosis	Mean (SD)	Percentiles 0	25	50	75	100
Paced tapping with music – Accuracy (vector direction %), music 1 ‡[b]									
All	99 (70)	0.54	1.54	0.3 (5.4)	-15.5	-2.6	-0.4	3.0	16.2
Age 18 to 21	25 (17)	-0.11	2.56	0.5 (5.7)	-15.5	-0.9	0.5	2.2	16.1
Age 22 to 29	25 (18)	0.45	0.01	0.2 (6.6)	-11.0	-4.5	0.4	3.3	16.2
Age 30 to 54	23 (14)	1.66	2.79	0.2 (5.2)	-7.4	-2.5	-0.9	0.9	16.2
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	0.39	-0.17	0.3 (4.1)	-7.8	-2.4	0.3	2.2	9.5
Paced tapping with music – Accuracy (vector direction %), music 2 ‡[b]									
All	90 (62)	-0.66	0.77	-3.4 (6.6)	-25.0	-6.7	-2.4	0.4	10.5
Age 18 to 21	19 (13)	-1.10	1.83	-4.1 (7.4)	-25.0	-6.8	-2.3	0.2	8.8
Age 22 to 29	23 (15)	-0.48	-0.52	-4.0 (7.6)	-18.4	-7.3	-2.2	0.9	7.6
Age 30 to 54	24 (15)	-0.35	0.08	-2.0 (6.6)	-17.9	-5.1	-1.5	1.9	10.5
Age 55 to 87	24 (19)	-0.69	0.15	-3.8 (4.9)	-15.8	-6.5	-2.8	-0.8	3.9

Note. Additional details for the Paced tapping tasks are presented in Tables S24-S43.

‡[a] Significant difference among tempo conditions ($p < .05$). ‡[b] Significant difference between music conditions ($p < .05$).

Table 9

Norms for Synchronization-Continuation, Tapping Rate and Variability

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
Synchronization-continuation – Rate (ITI in ms), fast tempo ‡[a]									
All *	108 (74)	0.17	4.10	448.8 (21.6)	374.6	437.5	449.4	459.8	545.7
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	2.09	6.26	451.1 (24.6)	417.4	436.5	447.3	459.1	545.7
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-1.02	0.88	443.4 (21.0)	387.2	433.0	449.8	456.3	477.9
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-1.32	2.79	444.2 (21.1)	374.6	435.8	447.6	459.3	480.6
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	0.13	-0.98	457.3 (17.0)	428.8	444.7	456.0	468.0	485.0
Synchronization-continuation – Rate (ITI in ms), medium tempo ‡[a]									
All	108 (74)	0.43	3.74	596.5 (26.1)	511.7	581.1	599.7	606.4	713.1
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	2.32	7.14	597.7 (29.2)	564.4	578.8	599.5	604.8	713.1
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-0.80	0.46	592.7 (31.7)	511.7	589.9	602.8	608.7	658.4
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	0.04	-0.34	594.5 (19.7)	553.7	580.6	595.3	607.6	638.6
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	0.65	-0.03	601.6 (21.3)	563.0	588.8	595.9	615.1	652.6
Synchronization-continuation – Rate (ITI in ms), slow tempo ‡[a]									
All	108 (74)	-0.28	0.61	749.3 (40.2)	609.0	720.2	750.5	776.4	849.4
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	0.21	-0.25	761.2 (36.3)	687.9	740.0	760.3	786.9	837.6
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-0.53	-0.55	749.2 (37.0)	672.1	729.8	755.6	772.8	808.3
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-0.31	0.27	742.7 (52.9)	609.0	709.6	750.4	768.3	849.4
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	0.34	-0.92	743.9 (31.4)	685.4	719.5	735.0	770.7	802.0

Group	N (N female)	Skewness	Excess kurtosis	Mean (SD)	Percentiles 0	25	50	75	100
Synchronization-continuation – Variability (CV of ITI), fast tempo ‡[b]									
All	108 (74)	1.00	0.58	0.048 (0.015)	0.025	0.037	0.046	0.054	0.092
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	0.50	-0.32	0.051 (0.016)	0.025	0.041	0.048	0.062	0.087
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	1.13	-0.04	0.052 (0.018)	0.032	0.039	0.047	0.054	0.092
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	0.91	0.16	0.044 (0.013)	0.028	0.035	0.042	0.050	0.075
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	0.35	-0.77	0.045 (0.012)	0.026	0.035	0.044	0.053	0.071
Synchronization-continuation – Variability (CV of ITI), medium tempo ‡[b]									
All	108 (74)	1.05	1.16	0.046 (0.014)	0.025	0.035	0.044	0.054	0.094
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	1.49	2.88	0.048 (0.014)	0.030	0.039	0.046	0.054	0.094
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	0.94	0.83	0.046 (0.015)	0.025	0.035	0.044	0.056	0.090
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	0.50	-0.97	0.046 (0.014)	0.028	0.035	0.041	0.058	0.075
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	1.41	2.31	0.042 (0.012)	0.027	0.033	0.039	0.048	0.081
Synchronization-continuation – Variability (CV of ITI), slow tempo ‡[b]									
All *	108 (74)	1.22	2.59	0.048 (0.014)	0.024	0.039	0.046	0.054	0.106
Age 18 to 21	27 (18)	1.60	2.78	0.053 (0.017)	0.028	0.044	0.049	0.057	0.106
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	0.60	-0.03	0.048 (0.012)	0.026	0.040	0.047	0.054	0.076
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	0.48	-0.03	0.049 (0.015)	0.024	0.039	0.049	0.054	0.085
Age 55 to 87	26 (21)	0.43	-1.18	0.042 (0.009)	0.031	0.035	0.039	0.050	0.058

Note. Additional details for the Synchronization-continuation task are presented in Tables S44-S49.

* Significant age regression ($p < .05$). ‡[a] Significant difference of rate among tempo conditions ($p < .05$). ‡[b] Significant difference of variability among tempo conditions ($p < .05$).

Table 10

Norms for Adaptive Tapping, Sensitivity Index and Tapping Variability

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
Adaptive tapping – Sensitivity index (d') of perceiving tempo deceleration (IOI + 75ms)									
All	105 (72)	-1.74	2.72	3.63 (0.74)	0.82	3.40	4.14	4.14	4.14
Age 18 to 21	26 (17)	-1.06	0.41	3.47 (0.74)	1.45	3.00	3.78	4.14	4.14
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-1.87	2.25	3.68 (0.86)	1.25	3.78	4.14	4.14	4.14
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-2.47	6.50	3.70 (0.75)	0.82	3.62	4.14	4.14	4.14
Age 55 to 87	24 (20)	-1.05	0.06	3.66 (0.58)	2.22	3.37	3.78	4.14	4.14
Adaptive tapping – Sensitivity index (d') of perceiving tempo deceleration (IOI + 30ms)									
All	105 (72)	0.23	-0.02	1.84 (0.98)	-0.36	1.27	1.83	2.53	4.14
Age 18 to 21	26 (17)	0.40	-0.64	1.69 (1.19)	-0.36	0.84	1.57	2.16	4.14
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	0.69	0.94	1.75 (0.83)	0.30	1.27	1.71	2.22	4.14
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-0.79	0.62	2.01 (0.88)	-0.23	1.63	2.07	2.56	3.27
Age 55 to 87	24 (20)	0.54	0.11	1.93 (1.01)	0.00	1.25	1.78	2.54	4.14
Adaptive tapping – Sensitivity index (d') of perceiving tempo acceleration (IOI - 75ms)									
All	105 (72)	-2.21	6.27	3.79 (0.54)	1.04	3.57	4.14	4.14	4.14
Age 18 to 21	26 (17)	-1.56	1.77	3.75 (0.55)	2.09	3.62	3.96	4.14	4.14
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-1.65	1.38	3.92 (0.39)	2.91	3.78	4.14	4.14	4.14
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-2.01	4.09	3.61 (0.74)	1.04	3.34	3.78	4.14	4.14
Age 55 to 87	24 (20)	-1.20	0.26	3.86 (0.39)	2.96	3.78	4.14	4.14	4.14

Group	N (N female)	Skewness	Excess kurtosis	Mean (SD)	Percentiles 0	25	50	75	100
Adaptive tapping – Sensitivity index (d') perceiving a tempo acceleration (IOI - 30ms)									
All	105 (72)	-0.09	-0.07	1.69 (0.88)	-0.36	1.21	1.83	2.31	4.14
Age 18 to 21	26 (17)	0.76	0.56	1.54 (0.83)	0.00	0.88	1.42	1.80	3.78
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	0.09	0.18	1.79 (0.97)	-0.36	1.21	1.83	2.31	4.14
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	-0.44	-0.94	1.56 (0.92)	0.00	1.00	1.70	2.28	2.87
Age 55 to 87	24 (20)	-1.04	0.57	1.86 (0.78)	0.00	1.54	2.07	2.31	2.96
Adaptive tapping – Variability (CV of ITI) of continuation tapping (isochronous condition)									
All	105 (72)	2.39	8.42	0.057 (0.020)	0.031	0.044	0.052	0.064	0.166
Age 18 to 21	26 (17)	1.12	1.03	0.058 (0.015)	0.035	0.047	0.054	0.065	0.099
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	1.70	3.10	0.059 (0.019)	0.037	0.046	0.054	0.065	0.122
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	2.07	4.52	0.062 (0.029)	0.033	0.044	0.050	0.069	0.166
Age 55 to 87	24 (20)	0.22	-0.28	0.049 (0.010)	0.031	0.043	0.050	0.055	0.072
Adaptive tapping – Adaptation index (acceleration trials)									
All	105 (72)	2.18	8.00	1.442 (0.597)	0.403	1.120	1.355	1.624	4.547
Age 18 to 21	26 (17)	0.17	-0.46	1.432 (0.417)	0.767	1.107	1.427	1.689	2.404
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	2.05	5.37	1.407 (0.655)	0.403	1.132	1.236	1.502	3.880
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	2.47	7.69	1.495 (0.770)	0.580	1.063	1.335	1.631	4.547
Age 55 to 87	24 (20)	1.20	1.55	1.439 (0.501)	0.784	1.143	1.375	1.534	2.889
Adaptive tapping – Adaptation index (deceleration trials)									
All *	105 (72)	-0.36	5.15	1.263 (0.522)	-1.169	1.009	1.256	1.565	3.334
Age 18 to 21	26 (17)	0.54	0.42	1.390 (0.338)	0.826	1.187	1.367	1.561	2.287
Age 22 to 29	29 (19)	-2.18	6.33	1.186 (0.599)	-1.169	1.060	1.268	1.490	1.910
Age 30 to 54	26 (16)	0.92	1.40	1.347 (0.660)	0.309	1.006	1.209	1.682	3.334

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
Age 55 to 87	24 (20)	0.34	-0.89	1.128 (0.381)	0.536	0.809	1.098	1.500	1.936

Note. Additional details for the Adaptive tapping task are presented in Tables S50-S56.

* Significant age regression ($p < .05$).

Table 11

Norms for Beat Tracking Index

					Percentiles				
Group	**N (N female)**	**Skewness**	**Excess kurtosis**	**Mean (SD)**	**0**	**25**	**50**	**75**	**100**
				BTI – Beat Tracking Index					
All	101 (69)	-0.56	0.19	-0.001 (0.801)	-2.190	-0.501	0.090	0.612	1.406
Age 18 to 21	24 (17)	-0.79	0.94	0.040 (0.766)	-2.146	-0.336	0.141	0.511	1.193
Age 22 to 29	28 (18)	-0.29	-0.68	-0.174 (0.985)	-2.190	-0.775	-0.145	0.718	1.276
Age 30 to 54	24 (14)	-0.71	0.29	0.129 (0.798)	-1.805	-0.198	0.193	0.624	1.406
Age 55 to 87	25 (20)	0.06	-0.32	0.028 (0.594)	-1.154	-0.252	-0.004	0.460	1.358

Note. Additional details for the Beat Tracking Index are presented in Table S57.

Test-retest reliability measures

Measures of test-retest reliability are reported in Table 12 for all the variables reported in each task and for BTI scores. Systematic error tests reveal only a few cases in which we observed a significant change of the performance from Test to Re-test, namely in the BAT (improvement at medium tempo only), Unpaced tapping (improvement of variability at spontaneous tapping, increased rate of slow tapping), Paced tapping with tones (improvement at medium tempo only), Synchronization-continuation (decreased rate at slow tempo), and Adaptive tapping (slight worsening of variability of continuation tapping in the isochronous condition). Scores at Test and Re-test are always significantly correlated, as shown by Spearman's rank correlation (*rho* ranging between 0.28 and 0.82). Perceptual tasks show good test-retest reliability altogether (ICC from 0.47 to 0.77). In particular, the sensitivity index for BAT shows excellent test-retest reliability (ICC = 0.77). Similarly, most of the scores in sensorimotor tasks display good test-retest reliability, but with a few exceptions. Synchronization consistency in Paced tapping music (with both musical stimuli) display excellent test-retest reliability (with ICC = 0.76, average across the two musical stimuli). In contrast, poor test-retest reliability is observed for variability (CV ITI) in Unpaced tapping, Paced tapping with music (but not with tones), and Synchronization-continuation (at the slow tempo). Notably, the BTI boasts excellent test-retest reliability (ICC = 0.87). This is not surprising as the scores entering in calculation of the BTI show themselves good to excellent test-retest reliability.

Table 12

Test-Retest Reliability

				Relative reliability indices			Absolute reliability indices			
Task	**Variable**	**Session 1 Mean (SD)**	**Session 2 Mean (SD)**	**Wilcoxon p**	**rho**	**ICC**	**SEM**	**SEM%**	**CR**	**CR%**
Beat Alignment Test	Sensitivity index (d') for all trials	2.81 (1.01)	2.84 (0.99)	0.587	0.72 *	0.77	0.48	16.89	1.32	46.81
Beat Alignment Test	Sensitivity index (d') for fast tempo trials	2.27 (0.87)	2.24 (0.87)	0.662	0.60 *	0.67	0.50	22.32	1.39	61.86
Beat Alignment Test	Sensitivity index (d') for medium tempo trials	2.45 (0.83)	2.60 (0.84)	0.025 *	0.71 *	0.73	0.42	16.64	1.17	46.14
Beat Alignment Test	Sensitivity index (d') for slow tempo trials	2.68 (0.89)	2.69 (0.87)	0.804	0.68 *	0.70	0.49	18.12	1.35	50.23
Duration discrimination	Threshold (% of IOI)	28.2 (11.9)	30.0 (14.1)	0.149	0.67 *	0.64	7.85	26.97	21.75	74.77
Anisochrony detection with tones	Threshold (% of IOI)	11.7 (4.9)	11.5 (4.9)	0.259	0.74 *	0.76	2.42	20.92	6.72	57.98
Anisochrony detection with music	Threshold (% of IOI)	11.4 (6.9)	12.3 (6.8)	0.366	0.52 *	0.47	4.97	41.93	13.78	116.22
Unpaced tapping	Variability (CV of ITI) of spontaneous tapping, initial trial	0.056 (0.034)	0.050 (0.016)	0.019 *	0.55 *	0.22	0.02	44.42	0.06	123.14
Unpaced tapping	Variability (CV of ITI) of fast tapping	0.062 (0.031)	0.056 (0.022)	0.112	0.28 *	0.12	0.02	42.33	0.07	117.34
Unpaced tapping	Variability (CV of ITI) of slow tapping	0.057 (0.026)	0.055 (0.041)	0.103	0.44 *	0.32	0.03	51.49	0.08	142.73
Unpaced tapping	Rate (ITI in ms) of spontaneous tapping, initial trial	693.9 (251.8)	671.7 (255.6)	0.167	0.47 *	0.72	133.14	19.50	369.06	54.05

Task	Variable	Session 1 Mean (SD)	Session 2 Mean (SD)	Relative reliability indices			Absolute reliability indices			
				Wilcoxon p	rho	ICC	SEM	SEM%	CR	CR%
Unpaced tapping	Rate (ITI in ms) of fast tapping	333.1 (132.2)	342.1 (114.7)	0.144	0.68 *	0.63	75.13	22.26	208.25	61.69
Unpaced tapping	Rate (ITI in ms) of slow tapping	1214.3 (453.4)	1101.2 (385.0)	0.002 *	0.65 *	0.65	238.20	20.57	660.26	57.03
Paced tapping with tones	Variability (CV of ITI), fast tempo	0.052 (0.015)	0.052 (0.016)	0.896	0.75 *	0.77	0.01	14.29	0.02	39.62
Paced tapping with tones	Variability (CV of ITI), medium tempo	0.046 (0.012)	0.045 (0.014)	0.049 *	0.76 *	0.69	0.01	15.76	0.02	43.69
Paced tapping with tones	Variability (CV of ITI), slow tempo	0.050 (0.013)	0.050 (0.015)	0.355	0.75 *	0.71	0.01	15.22	0.02	42.18
Paced tapping with tones	Accuracy (vector direction %), fast tempo	-7.1 (6.0)	-7.0 (5.7)	0.891	0.70 *	0.63	3.55	-50.39	9.85	-139.67
Paced tapping with tones	Accuracy (vector direction %), medium tempo	-6.4 (5.3)	-4.6 (4.9)	0.002 *	0.55 *	0.47	3.59	-65.43	9.96	-181.35
Paced tapping with tones	Accuracy (vector direction %), slow tempo	-5.4 (4.8)	-4.5 (5.5)	0.064	0.62 *	0.57	3.33	-67.45	9.24	-186.97
Paced tapping with tones	Consistency (logit of vector length), fast tempo	2.77 (0.85)	2.81 (0.90)	0.964	0.62 *	0.60	0.56	20.01	1.55	55.47
Paced tapping with tones	Consistency (logit of vector length), medium tempo	2.95 (0.81)	3.11 (0.85)	0.008 *	0.65 *	0.58	0.53	17.40	1.46	48.24
Paced tapping with tones	Consistency (logit of vector length), slow tempo	2.95 (0.95)	2.95 (0.85)	0.955	0.68 *	0.66	0.53	17.86	1.46	49.51
Paced tapping with music	Variability (CV of ITI), music 1	0.054 (0.026)	0.054 (0.048)	0.203	0.64 *	0.23	0.03	63.34	0.09	175.57
Paced tapping with music	Variability (CV of ITI), music 2	0.056 (0.030)	0.053 (0.022)	0.184	0.77 *	0.57	0.02	31.36	0.05	86.94

Task	Variable	Session 1 Mean (SD)	Session 2 Mean (SD)	Relative reliability indices			Absolute reliability indices			
				Wilcoxon p	rho	ICC	SEM	SEM%	CR	CR%
Paced tapping with music	Accuracy (vector direction %), music 1	0.6 (4.9)	1.0 (4.2)	0.133	0.60 *	0.47	3.33	411.61	9.22	1140.94
Paced tapping with music	Accuracy (vector direction %), music 2	-2.7 (6.0)	-2.1 (5.3)	0.233	0.67 *	0.52	3.92	-161.99	10.86	-449.02
Paced tapping with music	Consistency (logit of vector length), music 1	2.86 (1.48)	2.78 (1.65)	0.691	0.78 *	0.79	0.73	25.74	2.01	71.35
Paced tapping with music	Consistency (logit of vector length), music 2	2.46 (1.63)	2.61 (1.56)	0.103	0.81 *	0.74	0.81	32.10	2.26	88.98
Synchronization-continuation	Variability (CV of ITI), fast tempo	0.048 (0.015)	0.049 (0.015)	0.325	0.66 *	0.58	0.01	20.28	0.03	56.21
Synchronization-continuation	Variability (CV of ITI), medium tempo	0.044 (0.013)	0.044 (0.012)	0.315	0.61 *	0.66	0.01	16.73	0.02	46.38
Synchronization-continuation	Variability (CV of ITI), slow tempo	0.047 (0.013)	0.049 (0.025)	0.370	0.63 *	0.31	0.02	35.24	0.05	97.68
Synchronization-continuation	Rate (ITI in ms), fast tempo	449.2 (21.9)	448.3 (23.0)	0.724	0.68 *	0.75	11.19	2.49	31.01	6.91
Synchronization-continuation	Rate (ITI in ms), medium tempo	597.9 (26.1)	597.9 (26.9)	0.753	0.65 *	0.79	12.33	2.06	34.17	5.71
Synchronization-continuation	Rate (ITI in ms), slow tempo	748.9 (39.5)	761.9 (39.8)	0.007 *	0.52 *	0.43	29.08	3.85	80.61	10.67
Adaptive tapping	Adaptation index (acceleration trials)	1.434 (0.599)	1.421 (0.535)	0.769	0.47 *	0.62	0.35	24.67	0.98	68.39
Adaptive tapping	Adaptation index (deceleration trials)	1.254 (0.405)	1.205 (0.495)	0.457	0.41 *	0.44	0.34	27.62	0.94	76.56

Task	Variable	Session 1 Mean (SD)	Session 2 Mean (SD)	Relative reliability indices			Absolute reliability indices			
				Wilcoxon p	rho	ICC	SEM	SEM%	CR	CR%
Adaptive tapping	Variability (CV of ITI) of continuation tapping (isochronous condition)	0.056 (0.020)	0.058 (0.021)	0.020 *	0.75 *	0.80	0.01	15.89	0.02	44.04
Adaptive tapping	Sensitivity index (d') perceiving a tempo acceleration (IOI - 30ms)	1.77 (0.87)	1.74 (0.98)	0.742	0.53 *	0.52	0.64	36.61	1.78	101.49
Adaptive tapping	Sensitivity index (d') of perceiving tempo acceleration (IOI - 75ms)	3.79 (0.54)	3.76 (0.56)	0.476	0.51 *	0.71	0.30	7.83	0.82	21.69
Adaptive tapping	Sensitivity index (d') of perceiving tempo deceleration (IOI + 30ms)	1.89 (0.97)	1.99 (0.91)	0.332	0.54 *	0.56	0.63	32.26	1.74	89.42
Adaptive tapping	Sensitivity index (d') of perceiving tempo deceleration (IOI + 75ms)	3.65 (0.75)	3.67 (0.64)	0.854	0.38 *	0.50	0.49	13.44	1.36	37.26
BTI	Beat Tracking Index	0.033 (0.820)	-0.011 (0.865)	0.266	0.82 *	0.87	0.31	— [a]	0.85	— [a]

* $p < .05$. [a] The SEM% and CR% are not presented for the BTI because its values are centered on zero. ICC: intra-class correlation coefficient; CR: coefficient of reliability.

Discussion

The goals of the present study were to present a mobile solution for BAASTA (app on a tablet device) introduced in previous studies (Bégel et al., 2018, 2022; Dauvergne et al., 2018; Puyjarinet et al., 2017, 2019), affording an accurate measure of perceptual and sensorimotor timing abilities. Moreover, we provide norms and test-retest reliability measures for this version of the battery, and propose a composite score extracted from two main BAASTA tests acting as a summary metrics of rhythmic abilities. The first two goals address the need for a portable and reliable solution when testing timing and rhythmic abilities outside of the lab, and for normative data from a healthy adult population. The last goal addresses the problem inherent in BAASTA's testing time (around 2 hours), which may prevent the use of the full battery when only a general estimate of rhythmic abilities is needed.

Since mobile devices have limitations regarding the measurement of motor performance using a touchscreen, we paid particular attention to provide a method capable of lab-quality recording performance. The proposed method is based on audio analysis, by exploiting the capacity of mobile devices to record sound in the nearby environment, including the tapping sound on the touchscreen (Dalla Bella & Andary, 2020). This solution benefits from the high resolution of the recorded auditory signal, affords high temporal precision (≤1ms), is device-independent (for a similar web-based implementation, see also Anglada-Tort et al., 2022), and does not require prior calibration. A previous comparison study showed that this tablet version of BAASTA can successfully replicate the results obtained with paced tapping on a lab computer (Zagala et al., 2021). Despite these advantages, however, one of the shortcomings of relying on auditory recordings is the sensitivity of the measurement to ambient noise. Even though BAASTA tests should be ideally administered in a sound-proof room, this condition may be harder to meet when the tests are performed outside of the lab (in a school class, hospital), or in more ecological settings. Thus, we developed methods

affording data quality checks for ensuring the reliability of the collected data when BAASTA-tablet is used in less-than-ideal testing settings. To this aim, we proposed two metrics (match score and match IQR) which can attest whether data quality is excellent, identify any trials needing reviewing, and provide a basis to select the best quality trials in situations where we know that the quality of audio recordings may be affected (e.g., testing in ecological settings). These quality checks, provided on a trial-by-trial basis, are critical for BAASTA users to make informed decisions about the data before they are included in further analyses or used for diagnosis purposes in clinical studies.

To our knowledge, this is the first battery of timing and sensorimotor tests to be validated on a mobile device in the adult population across the lifespan. Norms play an important role in defining cut-off scores for impaired performance in various clinical groups, and for ensuring comparability across the lifespan and studies. The norms are provided for four age groups of comparable sample size. Even though we observed between-group age differences only in a few cases, we found relations between most BAASTA tasks and age (as a continuous dimension). These findings suggest that age should be considered to compare data collected in future studies with the battery, by choosing the appropriate age group and/or testing condition or stimulus material. Test-retest reliability measures reveal differences among BAASTA tasks, spanning from good to excellent reliability. For example, among perceptual tests, the BAT (Iversen & Patel, 2008), and among sensorimotor tests, paced tapping to music (e.g., Repp, 2005; Repp & Su, 2013), both display excellent test-retest reliability (with ICC ~ 0.76). Only one measure across tasks revealed quite low test-retest reliability, namely motor variability (CV of ITI; e.g., ICC < 0.35 in unpaced tapping tests, or in individual conditions in paced tapping with music or synchronization-continuation). This suggests that measures such as accuracy/consistency in paced tapping are preferable over other measures (e.g., motor variability) to provide a robust assessment of rhythmic abilities, in

particular when re-testing is a critical part of the experimental design (e.g., in longitudinal protocols, clinical trials).

Notably, the aforementioned tasks showed excellent test-retest reliability (BAT and paced tapping with music) and are also those found to capture most variability in rhythmic capacities across different BAASTA tests as shown in a recent machine-learning study (Dalla Bella et al., 2023). This finding supports the choice of the two tasks to compute a composite score – the BTI – as a global measure of rhythmic abilities (see also, Puyjarinet et al., 2017 for a first presentation of the BTI). Two measures from these tasks (i.e., the sensitivity index from BAT, and synchronization consistency from paced tapping with music) are significantly related, but quite weakly (< 20% of accounted variance; a stronger correlation was found in children with neurodevelopmental disorders, Puyjarinet et al., 2017). In a few cases, participants show dissociations between the two tasks. That the performance in beat perception and synchronization tasks can sometimes dissociate is not a novel finding, as shown in single-case evidence of poor synchronization to the beat in the presence of spared beat perception (Sowiński & Dalla Bella, 2013), or the opposite dissociation (Bégel et al., 2017). Altogether these findings suggest that the mechanisms underlying beat perception and production (Cannon & Patel, 2021; Patel & Iversen, 2014) may not be completely overlapping. Having a perceptual and a sensorimotor score both contribute to a composite score like the BTI is particularly appealing to capture individual differences in rhythmic abilities (see also Fiveash et al., 2022), while maximizing the chances of detecting poor performance in each of the components. In a previous study, we used BTI to express individual differences in rhythmic abilities in children and adults with and without neurodevelopmental disorders (ADHD; Puyjarinet et al., 2017). BTI could successfully capture relations between rhythm abilities and executive functions, showing that among children and adults with ADHD, those with the lowest scores in BTI (poor beat trackers) had

poorer performance in flexibility and inhibition tasks. Owing to BTI's excellent test-retest reliability (ICC = 0.87) and efficiency (< 15 minutes of testing, with a minimal set of conditions), we advise a more extensive use of this metric. Using only two BAASTA tests, with a gain in time over 80% relative to the full battery (two hours; Dalla Bella, Farrugia, et al., 2017) is also particularly appropriate in situations where testing time is very limited, such as in large clinical studies, in which rhythmic abilities are tested among many other cognitive capacities.

In sum, the adaptation of BAASTA for use on a mobile device, the availability of norms for the adult population, and the possibility of using BTI as a valuable composite score is expected to increase the use of the battery in adult healthy individuals to quantify individual differences (e.g., Dalla Bella et al., 2023; Fiveash et al., 2022), and in clinical populations with poor timing and rhythmic abilities (e.g., Parkinson, Benoit et al., 2014; Grahn & Brett, 2009; ADHD, Puyjarinet et al., 2017; speech and language impairement, Bégel et al., 2022; Corriveau & Goswami, 2009; Falk et al., 2015; Ladányi et al., 2020; Lense et al., 2021; Autism Spectrum Disorder, Allman et al., 2011). A mobile solution for assessing timing and rhythmic abilities, particularly appealing due to its portability and accessibility to the public, facilitates remote testing of participants with disabilities who cannot reach the laboratory, while ensuring high data reliability (with the caveats linked with the use of audio signal). This development is in line with a more general tendency to exploit technological applications for assessment and intervention purposes (e.g. of mobile medicine, (Cerrato & Halamka, 2019), recently extending to musical assessment and rhythmic training (for reviews, Agres et al., 2021; Dalla Bella, 2022). Eventually, it is expected that mobile tasks like the ones presented in BAASTA will be integrated in mobile applications devoted to rhythm-based training programs, with the purpose of personalizing the intervention (e.g., Dotov et al., 2019).

Acknowledgements and funding information

The research was funded by a maturation grant from French SATT AxLR (YOURHYTHM project), and by funding from a Discovery Grant (RGPIN-2019-05453) from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), and by the Canada Research Chair program (CRC in music auditory-motor skill learning and new technologies) to SDB. We wish to thank Camille Gaillard, Paulina Herrera, Gabrielle Tessier, Anais Bédard, Justine Daoust and Mathilde Rochette for their help in participant recruitment and data collection.

Conflicts of interest

SDB is on the board of the BeatHealth company dedicated to the design and commercialization of technological tools for assessing rhythm capacity such as BAASTA tablet and implementing rhythm-based interventions. Other authors have no competing interest to disclose.

Open practices statement

The anonymized data collected in this experiment and used to generate BAASTA norms are linked to this preprint. The experiment was not preregistered.

Footnote

1. In the paced tapping tasks, accuracy is not calculated when a participant's tapping consistency is extremely low (i.e., when the Rayleigh test is not significant), causing some accuracy scores to be absent for participants at the lower margin of performance.

References

Agres, K. R., Schaefer, R. S., Volk, A., van Hooren, S., Holzapfel, A., Dalla Bella, S., Müller, M., de Witte, M., Herremans, D., Ramirez Melendez, R., Neerincx, M., Ruiz, S., Meredith, D., Dimitriadis, T., & Magee, W. L. (2021). Music, Computing, and Health: A Roadmap for the Current and Future Roles of Music Technology for Health Care and Well-Being. *Music & Science*, *4*, 2059204321997709. https://doi.org/10.1177/2059204321997709

Allman, M. J., & Meck, W. H. (2012). Pathophysiological distortions in time perception and timed performance. *Brain*, *135*(3), 656–677. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awr210

Allman, M. J., Pelphrey, K. A., & Meck, W. H. (2011). Developmental neuroscience of time and number: Implications for autism and other neurodevelopmental disabilities. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, *6*, 7. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2012.00007

Anglada-Tort, M., Harrison, P. M. C., & Jacoby, N. (2022). REPP: A robust cross-platform solution for online sensorimotor synchronization experiments. *Behavior Research Methods*, *54*(5), 2271–2285. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01722-2

Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *67*, 1–48. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01

Bégel, V., Benoit, C.-E., Correa, A., Cutanda, D., Kotz, S. A., & Dalla Bella, S. (2017). "Lost in time" but still moving to the beat. *Neuropsychologia*, *94*, 129–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.11.022

Bégel, V., Dalla Bella, S., Devignes, Q., Vandenbergue, M., Lemaître, M.-P., & Dellacherie, D. (2022). Rhythm as an independent determinant of developmental dyslexia. *Developmental Psychology*, *58*(2), 339–358. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001293

Bégel, V., Verga, L., Benoit, C.-E., Kotz, S. A., & Dalla Bella, S. (2018). Test-retest reliability of the Battery for the Assessment of Auditory Sensorimotor and Timing Abilities (BAASTA). *Annals of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine*, *61*(6), 395–400. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rehab.2018.04.001

Benoit, C.-E., Dalla Bella, S., Farrugia, N., Obrig, H., Mainka, S., & Kotz, S. A. (2014). Musically cued gait-training improves both perceptual and motor timing in Parkinson's disease. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *8*, 494. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00494

Berens, P. (2009). CircStat: A MATLAB Toolbox for Circular Statistics. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *31*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v031.i10

Bonacina, S., Krizman, J., White-Schwoch, T., Nicol, T., & Kraus, N. (2019). How Rhythmic Skills Relate and Develop in School-Age Children. *Global Pediatric Health*, *6*, 2333794X19852045. https://doi.org/10.1177/2333794X19852045

Bouwer, F. L., Honing, H., & Slagter, H. A. (2020). Beat-based and Memory-based Temporal Expectations in Rhythm: Similar Perceptual Effects, Different Underlying Mechanisms. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *32*(7), 1221–1241. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01529

Brozek, J., & Alexander, H. (1947). Components of variation and the consistency of repeated measurements. *Research Quarterly*, *18*(2), 152–166.

Cannon, J. J., & Patel, A. D. (2021). How Beat Perception Co-opts Motor Neurophysiology. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *25*(2), 137–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.11.002

Cerrato, P., & Halamka, J. (2019). *The Transformative Power of Mobile Medicine: Leveraging Innovation, Seizing Opportunities and Overcoming Obstacles of mHealth*. Elsevier Science.

Chen, J. L., Penhune, V. B., & Zatorre, R. J. (2008). Listening to musical rhythms recruits motor regions of the brain. *Cerebral Cortex*, *18*(12), 2844–2854. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhn042

Cicchetti, D. V. (1994). Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology. *Psychological Assessment*, *6*, 284–290. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.6.4.284

Corriveau, K. H., & Goswami, U. (2009). Rhythmic motor entrainment in children with speech and language impairments: Tapping to the beat. *Cortex*, *45*(1), 119–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2007.09.008

Dalla Bella, S. (2020). The use of rhythm in rehabilitation for patients with movement disorders. In L. L. Cuddy, S. Belleville, & A. Moussard (Eds.), *Music and the Aging Brain* (pp. 383–406). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-817422-7.00015-8

Dalla Bella, S. (2022). Rhythmic serious games as an inclusive tool for music-based interventions. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1517*(1), 15–24. https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14878

Dalla Bella, S., & Andary, S. (2020). *High-Precision Temporal Measurement of Vibro-Acoustic Events in Synchronisation With a Sound Signal on a Touch-Screen Device.* (World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Patent No. No WO 2020/128088 A1).

Dalla Bella, S., Benoit, C.-E., Farrugia, N., Keller, P. E., Obrig, H., Mainka, S., & Kotz, S. A. (2017). Gait improvement via rhythmic stimulation in Parkinson's disease is linked to rhythmic skills. *Scientific Reports*, *7*, 42005. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep42005

Dalla Bella, S., Dotov, D., Bardy, B., & Cochen de Cock, V. (2018). Individualization of music-based rhythmic auditory cueing in Parkinson's disease. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1423*, 308–317. https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.13859

Dalla Bella, S., Farrugia, N., Benoit, C.-E., Begel, V., Verga, L., Harding, E., & Kotz, S. A. (2017). BAASTA: Battery for the Assessment of Auditory Sensorimotor and Timing Abilities. *Behavior Research Methods*, *49*(3), 1128–1145. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0773-6

Dalla Bella, S., Janaqi, S., Benoit, C.-E., Farrugia, N., Bégel, V., Verga, L., Harding, E. E., & Kotz, S. A. (2023). *Unravelling individual rhythmic abilities using machine learning*. bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.03.25.533209

Damm, L., Varoqui, D., De Cock, V. C., Dalla Bella, S., & Bardy, B. (2020). Why do we move to the beat? A multi-scale approach, from physical principles to brain dynamics. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *112*, 553–584. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2019.12.024

Dauvergne, C., Bégel, V., Gény, C., Puyjarinet, F., Laffont, I., & Dalla Bella, S. (2018). Home-based training of rhythmic skills with a serious game in Parkinson's disease: Usability and acceptability. *Annals of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine*, *61*(6), 380–385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rehab.2018.08.002

Dotov, D. G., Cochen de Cock, V., Geny, C., Ihalainen, P., Moens, B., Leman, M., Bardy, B., & Dalla Bella, S. (2019). The role of interaction and predictability in the spontaneous entrainment of movement. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *148*(6), 1041–1057. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000609

Falk, S., Müller, T., & Dalla Bella, S. (2015). Non-verbal sensorimotor timing deficits in children and adolescents who stutter. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*, 847. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00847

Fisher, N. I. (1993). *Statistical Analysis of Circular Data*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511564345

Fiveash, A., Dalla Bella, S., Bigand, E., Gordon, R. L., & Tillmann, B. (2022). You got rhythm, or more: The multidimensionality of rhythmic abilities. *Attention, Perception & Psychophysics*, *84*(4), 1370–1392. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-022-02487-2

Fleiss, J. L. (1986). *The Design and Analysis of Clinical Experiments*. Wiley.

Fujii, S., & Schlaug, G. (2013). The Harvard Beat Assessment Test (H-BAT): A battery for assessing beat perception and production and their dissociation. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *7*, 771. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00771

Gamer, M., Lemon, J., & Singh, I. F. P. (2019). *irr: Various Coefficients of Interrater Reliability and Agreement* (0.84.1). https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/irr/index.html

Grahn, J. A., & Brett, M. (2007). Rhythm and beat perception in motor areas of the brain. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *19*(5), 893–906. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2007.19.5.893

Grahn, J. A., & Brett, M. (2009). Impairment of beat-based rhythm discrimination in Parkinson's disease. *Cortex*, *45*(1), 54–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2008.01.005

Grondin, S. (2010). Timing and time perception: A review of recent behavioral and neuroscience findings and theoretical directions. *Attention Perception and Psychophysics*, *72*(3), 561–582. https://doi.org/10.3758/APP.72.3.561

Halekoh, U., & Højsgaard, S. (2014). A Kenward-Roger Approximation and Parametric Bootstrap Methods for Tests in Linear Mixed Models – The R Package pbkrtest. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *59*, 1–32. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v059.i09

Hidalgo, C., Zécri, A., Pesnot-Lerousseau, J., Truy, E., Roman, S., Falk, S., Dalla Bella, S., & Schön, D. (2021). Rhythmic Abilities of Children With Hearing Loss. *Ear and Hearing*, *42*(2), 364–372. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000926

Iversen, J., & Patel, A. D. (2008). *The Beat Alignment Test (BAT): Surveying beat processing abilities in the general population*. 10th International Conference on Music Perception and Cognition (ICMPC10), Sapporo, Japan. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Beat-Alignment-Test-(BAT)%3A-Surveying-beat-in-Iversen-Patel/7f5ff64802ccadc9c572f4952bf833a732557005

Janata, P., Tomic, S. T., & Haberman, J. M. (2012). Sensorimotor coupling in music and the psychology of the groove. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *141*(1), 54–75. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024208

Kasdan, A. V., Burgess, A. N., Pizzagalli, F., Scartozzi, A., Chern, A., Kotz, S. A., Wilson, S. M., & Gordon, R. L. (2022). Identifying a brain network for musical rhythm: A functional neuroimaging meta-analysis and systematic review. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *136*, 104588. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2022.104588

Kloke, J. D., & McKean, J. W. (2012). Rfit: Rank-based Estimation for Linear Models. *The R Journal*, *4*(2), 57–64.

Koo, B. M., & Vizer, L. M. (2019). Mobile Technology for Cognitive Assessment of Older Adults: A Scoping Review. *Innovation in Aging*, *3*(1), igy038. https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igy038

Kotz, S. A., Ravignani, A., & Fitch, W. T. (2018). The Evolution of Rhythm Processing. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *22*(10), 896–910. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2018.08.002

Kousa, M. (2017). *Design, implementation and evaluation of a low-cost, high accuracy feedback latency measurement system* [Aalto University]. Retrieved from: http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:aalto- 201712188209

Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *82*, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13

Ladányi, E., Persici, V., Fiveash, A., Tillmann, B., & Gordon, R. L. (2020). Is atypical rhythm a risk factor for developmental speech and language disorders? *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews. Cognitive Science*, *11*(5), e1528. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1528

Leek, M. R. (2001). Adaptive procedures in psychophysical research. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *63*(8), 1279–1292. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03194543

Lense, M. D., Ladányi, E., Rabinowitch, T.-C., Trainor, L., & Gordon, R. (2021). Rhythm and timing as vulnerabilities in neurodevelopmental disorders. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, *376*(1835), 20200327. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0327

Levitt, H. (1971). Transformed up-down methods in psychoacoustics. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *49*, 467–477. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1912375

Matthews, T. E., Witek, M. A. G., Heggli, O. A., Penhune, V. B., & Vuust, P. (2019). The sensation of groove is affected by the interaction of rhythmic and harmonic complexity. *PloS One*, *14*(1), e0204539. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0204539

Merchant, H., Luciana, M., Hooper, C., Majestic, S., & Tuite, P. (2008). Interval timing and Parkinson's disease: Heterogeneity in temporal performance. *Experimental Brain Research*, *184*(2), 233–248. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-007-1097-7

Noreika, V., Falter, C. M., & Rubia, K. (2013). Timing deficits in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD): Evidence from neurocognitive and neuroimaging studies. *Neuropsychologia*, *51*(2), 235–266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.09.036

Oschkinat, M., Hoole, P., Falk, S., & Dalla Bella, S. (2022). Temporal malleability to auditory feedback perturbation is modulated by rhythmic abilities and auditory acuity. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *16*, 885074. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2022.885074

Palmer, C., Lidji, P., & Peretz, I. (2014). Losing the beat: Deficits in temporal coordination. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, *369*(1658), 20130405. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0405

Patel, A. D., & Iversen, J. R. (2014). The evolutionary neuroscience of musical beat perception: The Action Simulation for Auditory Prediction (ASAP) hypothesis. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, *8*, 57. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnsys.2014.00057

Phillips-Silver, J., Toiviainen, P., Gosselin, N., Piche, O., Nozaradan, S., Palmer, C., & Peretz, I. (2011). Born to dance but beat deaf: A new form of congenital amusia. *Neuropsychologia*, *49*(5), 961–969. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.02.002

Puyjarinet, F., Bégel, V., Geny, C., Driss, V., Cuartero, M.-C., De Cock, V. C., Pinto, S., & Dalla Bella, S. (2022). At-Home Training With a Rhythmic Video Game for Improving Orofacial, Manual, and Gait Abilities in Parkinson's Disease: A Pilot Study. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *16*, 874032. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2022.874032

Puyjarinet, F., Bégel, V., Gény, C., Driss, V., Cuartero, M.-C., Kotz, S. A., Pinto, S., & Dalla Bella, S. (2019). Heightened orofacial, manual, and gait variability in Parkinson's

disease results from a general rhythmic impairment. *NPJ Parkinson's Disease*, *5*, 19. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41531-019-0092-6

Puyjarinet, F., Bégel, V., Lopez, R., Dellacherie, D., & Dalla Bella, S. (2017). Children and adults with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder cannot move to the beat. *Scientific Reports*, *7*(1), 11550. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-11295-w

R Core Team. (2022). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.* https://www.R-project.org

Repp, B. H. (2005). Sensorimotor synchronization: A review of the tapping literature. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *12*(6), 969–992. https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03206433

Repp, B. H., & Su, Y.-H. (2013). Sensorimotor synchronization: A review of recent research (2006-2012). *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *20*(3), 403–452. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-012-0371-2

Rodriguez-Fornells, A., Rojo, N., Amengual, J. L., Ripollés, P., Altenmüller, E., & Münte, T. F. (2012). The involvement of audio-motor coupling in the music-supported therapy applied to stroke patients. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1252*, 282–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06425.x

Schwartze, M., Keller, P. E., Patel, A. D., & Kotz, S. A. (2011). The impact of basal ganglia lesions on sensorimotor synchronization, spontaneous motor tempo, and the detection of tempo changes. *Behavioral Brain Research*, *216*(2), 685–691. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2010.09.015

Sowiński, J., & Dalla Bella, S. (2013). Poor synchronization to the beat may result from deficient auditory-motor mapping. *Neuropsychologia*, *51*(10), 1952–1963. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2013.06.027

Tierney, A., & Kraus, N. (2015). Evidence for Multiple Rhythmic Skills. *PLoS One*, *10*(9), e0136645. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0136645

Trainor, L. J., & Cirelli, L. (2015). Rhythm and interpersonal synchrony in early social development. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1337*, 45–52. https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12649

Tranchant, P., Vuvan, D. T., & Peretz, I. (2016). Keeping the Beat: A Large Sample Study of Bouncing and Clapping to Music. *PloS One*, *11*(7), e0160178. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0160178

Vaz, S., Falkmer, T., Passmore, A. E., Parsons, R., & Andreou, P. (2013). The case for using the repeatability coefficient when calculating test-retest reliability. *PloS One*, *8*(9), e73990. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0073990

Verga, L., Schwartze, M., Stapert, S., Winkens, I., & Kotz, S. A. (2021). Dysfunctional Timing in Traumatic Brain Injury Patients: Co-occurrence of Cognitive, Motor, and Perceptual Deficits. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 731898. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.731898

Weir, J. P. (2005). Quantifying test-retest reliability using the intraclass correlation coefficient and the SEM. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, *19*(1), 231–240. https://doi.org/10.1519/15184.1

Witek, M. A. G., Clarke, E. F., Wallentin, M., Kringelbach, M. L., & Vuust, P. (2014). Syncopation, body-movement and pleasure in groove music. *PloS One*, *9*(4), e94446. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094446

Zagala, A., Foster, N. E. V., & Dalla Bella, S. (2021). Commentary: A Tablet-Based Assessment of Rhythmic Ability. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 607676. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.607676

Zanto, T. P., Padgaonkar, N. T., Nourishad, A., & Gazzaley, A. (2019). A Tablet-Based Assessment of Rhythmic Ability. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 2471. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02471

Zatorre, R. J., Chen, J. L., & Penhune, V. B. (2007). When the brain plays music: Auditory-motor interactions in music perception and production. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *8*(7), 547–558. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2152