# A novel protocol for magnetoencephalographic mapping of speech motor control regions during speech production

Ioanna Anastasopoulou[1]*,

Douglas O. Cheyne[2,3], Pascal van Lieshout[2], Kirrie Ballard[4], Peter Wilson[5],

Blake W Johnson[1]*

[1]Macquarie University, School of Psychological Sciences, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

[2]University of Toronto, Department of Speech-Language Pathology, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

[3]Hospital for Sick Children Research Institute, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

[4]University of Sydney, Discipline of Speech Pathology, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

[5]Australian Catholic University, Healthy Brain and Mind Research Centre, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

* Corresponding authors

Email: ioanna.anastasopoulou@hdr.mq.edu, blake.johnson@mq.edu.au

**Running head**: Speech motor control mapping

**Keywords**: magnetoencephalography (MEG), speech movement tracking, speech production, speech motor control, speech mapping, non-invasive methods

## Abstract

Neuroimaging protocols for mapping of expressive speech centres employ several standard speech tasks including object naming, rhyming, and covert word production (Agarwal et al., 2019). These tasks reliably elicit activation of distributed speech centres in prefrontal, precentral and cingulate motor cortices and are widely used for presurgical mapping and in research studies of language production. In the present study we used an alternative speech protocol employing reiterated productions of simple disyllabic nonwords (VCV; Anastasopoulou et al., 2022; van Lieshout et al., 2007). Here we show that this task elicits highly focal and highly lateralised activations of speech motor control areas centred on the precentral gyrus and adjacent portions of the middle frontal gyrus. 10 healthy adults, 19 typically developing children and 7 children with CAS participated in the study. MEG scans were carried out with a whole-head MEG system consisting of 160 first-order axial gradiometers with a 50 mm baseline (Model PQ1160R-N2, KIT, Kanazawa, Japan). MEG data were acquired with analog filter settings of 0.03 Hz high-pass, 1,000 Hz low-pass, 4,000 Hz sampling rate. Measurements were carried out with participants in supine position in a magnetically shielded room (Fujihara Co. Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). Time-aligned speech acoustics were recorded in an auxiliary channel of the MEG setup at the same sample rate as the MEG recordings. Brain activity was recorded while participants produced reiterated utterances of /ipa/ and /api/, at normal and speeded rates in addition to a button press task (right index finger) to elicit activity in the hand region of sensorimotor cortex (e.g. Johnson et al., 2020). MEG data were co-registered with individual structural MRI scans obtained in a separate scanning session. Source reconstruction was performed with synthetic aperture magnetometry (SAM) beamformer implemented in Matlab (Jobst et al., 2018) and group statistics performed with permutation tests ($p < 0.05$). Button press map shows clusters encompassing dorsal precentral and postcentral gyri (Brodmann areas 4 and 6), corresponding to hand sensorimotor cortices. Speech map shows clusters encompassing precentral gyrus immediately ventral to hand motor cortex (BA6), and an immediately adjacent portion of the posterior middle frontal gyrus. Both button press and speech result in a robust desynchronisation restricted within a frequency band of about 13-30 Hz (beta band). Our results show that the reiterated speech task results in robust beta-band desynchronisation in a highly focal region of the precentral gyrus, located immediately ventral to the hand motor region of the precentral gyrus. In adults, speech motor -related brain activity was predominantly observed in the left hemisphere. Typically developing children, on the other hand, exhibited bilateral activation and in the case of individuals with CAS exhibited only right-hemisphere activation. Taken together the present findings provide a non-invasive and highly selective window on a crucial node of the

expressive speech network that has previously been accessed only with invasive electrophysiological means and lesion studies.

## Introduction

Since the advent of modern functional neuroimaging techniques, an important clinical and scientific aim has been to develop and refine methodologies for imaging brain function during overt speaking. From a basic science perspective these methods are integral to achieving an understanding of the brain regions and networks that interact with speech comprehension systems, generate speech plans, and ultimately send movement commands to some 100 muscles associated with the articulators of the vocal tract. In a biomedical context expressive speech mapping methods are an important component of neurosurgical planning where any potential for damage to brain speech centres would inevitably have devastating and irreversible consequences for the postoperative communicative and cognitive capabilities of the patient.

Currently, two main neuroimaging techniques are used for non-invasive mapping of expressive speech function. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) relies on now fairly ubiquitous MRI scanning technology and is dominant to a considerable degree in both clinical and experimental contexts. Here our focus is on magnetoencephalography (MEG), a more specialised technology that relies on less widely available scanning equipment. Its use for expressive language mapping is accordingly restricted to the limited number of clinical sites and laboratories with access to an MEG scanner: there are currently about 20 of these sites in the United States, and several hundred worldwide.

Progress in expressive language and other types of brain mapping will likely continue to require both scanning techniques as they have well-known, distinctive, and in many ways complementary advantages and disadvantages. Notably, fMRI relies on an indirect measure of neuronal activity (the hemodynamic response to neuronal metabolism) which is relatively spatially precise but temporally sluggish. Conversely, MEG has direct access to the magnetic fields generated by neuronal activities. Neuromagnetic fields accordingly provide high temporal resolution for brain activity, an important consideration in the context of a rapid and dynamic behaviour like speech; however the spatial specification (localisation) of electromagnetic fields is a physically complex problem, and in practice spatial resolution can vary from completely ambiguous to sub-centimeter precision, depending largely on how extensive and complex are the configurations of active neural generators in a given behaviour or task. Speech is a complex behaviour that draws on multiple brain centres and systems, and hence in clinical contexts MEG expressive speech mapping precision is often limited to an assessment of hemispheric lateralisation, rather than for a more detailed specification of any brain region(s) within hemispheres.

A fairly extensive array of well-defined speaking tasks/protocols are now available for MEG mapping of expressive brain function, the selection of which depends on clinical and laboratory experience and preference as well as the specific clinical or experimental aims of a given neuroimaging session (see Agarwal, 2019 for a review of comparable speech protocols used for fMRI expressive language mapping). These tasks include, in rough descending order of the overall linguistic/cognitive task demands: sentence reading; semantic word judgements (e.g. abstract/concrete); word recognition; picture naming; verb generation; word reading (single words, phrases, or lists); nonword repetition; and non-linguistic oromotor gestures. See Appendix 1 for a list of MEG studies (organised by speech task) of expressive language function published since 2015; see also Munding et al. (2015) for a review and list of MEG expressive language studies published prior to 2015). There is considerable overlap in the brain regions activated by different speech tasks (Agarwal et al., 2019), but in general it can be stated that tasks that require access to high level memorial and cognitive/linguistic operations tend to activate distributed areas of prefrontal, temporal and parietal cortex, including Broca's area in the left hemisphere (Bowyer et al., 2005; Doesburg et al., 2016; Kadis et al., 2011; Youssofzadeh & Babajani-Feremi, 2019; Correia et al., 2020). At the other end of the spectrum of task complexity, non-word/pseudoword and oromotor tasks are intended to limit the requirements for semantic, syntactic and attentional processing and elicit neural activity that is more restricted to brain regions associated with phonological, phonetic and sensorimotor processes (Frankford et al., 2021).

The present MEG study was designed to assess speech motor cortex activations elicited by a *reiterated non-word speech production task* that is commonly used to investigate speech motor control by behavioural means but that has rarely been used in neuroimaging studies of expressive language. To our knowledge, only one early fMRI study has explicitly investigated expressive speech mapping using reiterated non-lexical speech. Riecker et al. (2000) measured brain activity with fMRI from healthy, right-handed native German speakers. Participants were required to produce monosyllables ("ta" and "stra"), a non-lexical syllable sequence ("pataka"), a lexical item ("Tagebau") and horizontal tongue movements. Participants were instructed to produce the test items in a monotonous manner at a self-paced comfortable speaking rate during measurement periods extending to 1 min, and to refrain from covert verbalisation during the inter-trial rest periods. These authors reported that all speech-rest contrasts resulted in significant activations restricted to the ventral portion of the peri-Rolandic sensorimotor cortices. Bilateral activations were found for tongue movements, "ta", "stra" and "Tagebau", while "pataka" showed only left hemispheric activation. The authors concluded that that the highly focal and

restricted neural activations associated with reiterated speech may reflect the "chunking" or organisation of coarticulated syllable strings into a single output unit, which places fewer demands on neural resources relative to production of smaller or single ("individualised") units of speech or action.

As noted above, MEG source reconstruction is more amenable to restricted and focal than to widespread and distributed source configurations; it follows that a speech task that favours the former configurations will provide a more precise and informative mapping of expressive language function than existing protocols that remain largely limited to a specification of hemispheric laterality. In the following, we describe our MEG results for expressive language mapping using reiterated nonword tasks in healthy adults, and contrast these with mapping results from typically developing children. We also describe results from a group of children with Childhood Apraxia of Speech (CAS), a developmental motor speech disorder that is believed to result from a central deficit in the ability to program the syllable sequences and transitions that are required for successful performance of reiterated speech tasks.

## Methods

***Participants.*** Three groups were recruited for this study. Eleven healthy adults (4 females, mean age = 35.5 years; Standard Deviation [SD] = 15.0, range 19.8 – 64.6), 19 typically developing (TD) children (8 females, mean age =11.0 years; SD = 2.5, range 7.5 – 16.7) and seven children with Childhood Apraxia of Speech (CAS) (7 males, mean age = 8.9 years, SD = 2.2, range = 6.8 - 12.8. All procedures were approved by the Macquarie University Human Subjects Research Ethics Committee.

***Speech and motor assessments.*** All children passed a pure-tone hearing screening for the frequencies of 1000, 2000, and 4000 Hz at 20 dB and 500 Hz at 25 dB. All child participants completed a battery of speech, expressive and receptive language, and motor assessments: The Sounds-in-Words subtest of the Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation–Third Edition (GFTA-3; Goldman & Fristoe, 2015); the Receptive and Expressive Language components of the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals Fifth Edition (CELF-5; Wiig, Secord, & Semel, 2013); nonverbal components of the Reynolds Intellectual Assessment Scales (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 2003); Verbal Motor Production Assessment for Children (VMPAC-R, Hayden, & Namasivayam, 2021); the Single-Word Test of Polysyllables (Gozzard, Baker, & McCabe, 2004, 2008). This test consists of a 50-item picture-naming task designed to assess articulation, sound, and syllable sequencing, as well as lexical stress accuracy (i.e., prosody) (Murray et al., 2015), and the Movement Assessment Battery for Children Second Edition (ABC-2, Henderson et al., 2007). Further, caregivers completed two questionnaires: the Developmental Coordination Disorder Questionnaire (DCDQ, Wilson et al.,2009) and the Handedness Questionnaire (HQ, Oldfield, 1971, Veale, 2014).

***CAS diagnosis and group assignment.*** Two certified speech pathologists (authors I.A. and K.B) independently reviewed assessment videos of children with CAS. They assessed each child based on their perceptual evaluation of their speech samples, following this procedure. In order to receive a CAS diagnosis in our study, participants needed to exhibit (a) the three features established by consensus in the ASHA Technical Report (2007b) and (b) a minimum of four out of the 10 features outlined in Strand's 10-point checklist (Shriberg, Potter, et al., 2009, Murray et al., 2015) across at least three assessment tasks, as detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Assessment tasks and diagnostic features used for assigning an expert diagnosis of Childhood Apraxia of Speech and Developmental Coordination Disorder

| CAS | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ASHA consensus-based feature list** | **Strand's 10-point checklist** | **Assessment tasks taken into account for the diagnosis** |
| Inconsistent errors on consonants and vowels in repeated productions of syllables or words | Difficulty achieving initial articulatory configurations and transitions into vowels (within-in speech groping, false starts, restarts, and hesitations) | Single-Word Test of Polysyllables (Gozzard, Baker, & McCabe, 2004, 2008) |
| Lengthened and disrupted coarticulatory transitions between sounds and syllables | Syllable segregation | Diadochokinetic task /pataka/ from the VMPAC assessment (Hayden, & Namasivayam, 2021) |
| Inappropriate prosody, especially in the realization of lexical or phrasal | Lexical stress errors or equal stress | GFTA Sentences (GFTA-3; Goldman & Fristoe, 2015) |
| | Vowel or consonant distortions including distorted substitutions | CELF Sentences (CELF-5; Wiig, Secord, & Semel, 2013) |
| | Groping (nonspeech, oral groping) | |
| | Intrusive schwa | |
| | Voicing errors | |
| | Slow rate | |
| | Increased difficulty with longer or more phonetically complex words | |

Table 2 displays the assessment results for the presence or absence of Childhood Apraxia of Speech (CAS) features in each of the 10 participants. Out of these 10 individuals, 8 participants (80%) were diagnosed with CAS, as per the criteria outlined by ASHA (2007b) and Shriberg, Potter, et al. (2009). Additionally, two children (4%) met the CAS criteria and concurrently exhibited symptoms of dysarthria. The remaining two children within the cohort of 10 did not exhibit any features associated with apraxia of speech. The interrater reliability was determined to be 87.5%.

Table 2:Presence of childhood apraxia of speech (CAS) features for individual participants.

| PN | Difficulty achieving initial articulatory configurations and transitions into vowels (within-in speech groping, false starts, restarts, and hesitations) | Syllable segregation | Lexical stress errors or equal stress | Vowel or consonant distortions including distorted substitutions | Slow rate | Increased difficulty with longer or more phonetically complex words | Inconsistent errors on consonants and vowels in repeated productions of syllables or words | Lengthened and disrupted coarticulatory transitions between sounds and syllables | Inappropriate prosody, especially in the realization of lexical or phrasal stress | CAS diagnosis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1154 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | CAS |
| 1155 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | CAS |
| 1162 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | CAS |
| 1164 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | CAS |
| 1168 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | CAS |
| 1170 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | CAS |
| 1174 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | CAS + DYS |
| 1181 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | CAS + DYS |
| 1175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
| 1180 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |

Note: 1 = feature was present; 0 = feature was absent, PN = participant number. The identification of specific features relied on the consensus reached by two licensed Speech-Language Pathologists (SLPs) who evaluated the children.

Descriptive statistics comparing three groups, namely a group of 19 children with typical development referred to as the TD group, a group of 7 children diagnosed with Childhood Apraxia of Speech (CAS) referred to as the CAS group, and 7 age-matched controls selected from the TD cohort, are presented in Table 3. Notably, no statistically significant differences were observed between the CAS group and the age-matched control group in terms of age, nonverbal IQ, as well as expressive and receptive language abilities as measured by the CELF-5 assessment (Wiig, Secord, & Semel, 2013). Subsequent future analyses will focus on separately assessing expressive and receptive language skills to determine whether participants with CAS exhibit difficulties in either expressive or receptive language domains.

Statistically significant results were obtained for articulation skills assessment, encompassing both word and sentence contexts as evaluated by the Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation-3 (GFTA-3; Goldman & Fristoe, 2015). In addition, all constituent components of the Verbal Motor Production Assessment Checklist (VMPAC; Hayden & Namasivayam, 2021) yielded statistically significant findings. The VMPAC serves as a diagnostic instrument designed to assess oral motor and sequencing functions in both speech and nonspeech tasks, facilitating a systematic examination of neuromotor integrity within the speech system of children aged 3 to 12 years exhibiting speech production disorders (Hayden & Square, 1999). Final scores on the VMPAC are expressed as percentages on a scale ranging from 0 to 100 (Tukel et al., 2015).

Furthermore, outcomes derived from the Movement Assessment Battery for Children Second Edition (MABC-2, Henderson et al., 2007) demonstrated statistically significant distinctions between the cohorts, suggestive of the presence of features associated with Developmental Coordination Disorder (DCD) in children with CAS.

Table 3: Demographics and motor, speech, and language results by group

| | Groups | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Demographics and motor, speech, and language results** | **TD (n = 19)** | **TD (age matched) (n = 7)** | **CAS (n =7)** |
| Age in months **(n.s.)** | 11.03 (2.45) | 9.06 (1.78) | 8.54 (2.03) |
| Sex **(p < .01)** | 11M, 8F | 4M,3F | 7M,0F |
| Nonverbal IQ **(n.s.)** | 73.2 (17.10) | 82.14 (22.40) | 81.74 (22.74) |
| Expressive and Receptive Language (CELF-5) **(n.s.)** | 20.75 (6.8) | 15.43 (7.79) | 10.43 (7.46) |
| Articulation in Words (GFTA-3) **(p < .001)** | 102.68 (9.02) | 100.86 (13.70) | 59.43(14.58) |
| Articulation in Sentences (GFTA-3) **(p < .001)** | 107.42 (8.93) | 110 (10.12) | 64.43(16.75) |
| VMPAC GMC % **(p < .01)** | 100 (0) | 100 (0) | 84.29 (12.72) |
| VMPAC FOMC % **(p < .001)** | 99.33 (1.01) | 98.77 (1.35) | 91.63 (4.06) |
| VMPAC SEQN % **(p < .05)** | 99.67 (1.46) | 99.06 (2.46) | 95.65 (3.55) |
| VMPAC CSP % **(p < .001)** | 100 (0) | 100 (0) | 81.67 (8.2) |
| VMPAC SPC % **(p < .05)** | 87.76 (15.27) | 100 (0) | 100 (0) |
| MACB-2 SS Total **(p < .01)** | 82.42 (9.51) | 80.29 (10.95) | 63.86 (12.27) |

Note: Group averages listed with standard deviations in parentheses; n.s = non-significant; TD typically developing children; CAS = Childhood Apraxia of Speech; CELF-5 = Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals–Fifth Edition (Wiig et al., 2013); Articulation in Words and Articulation in Sentences from the GFTA-3 = Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation–Third Edition (Goldman & Fristoe, 2015); VMPAC GMC = Gross Motor Control subtest; VMPAC FOMC = Focal Oromotor Control subtest; VMPAC SEQ = Sequencing; VMPAC CSP = Connected Speech; VMPAC SPC = Speech Characteristics; % = percentage; MACB-2 SS Total = Movement Assessment Battery for Children -2 standard score total.

***MEG acquisition.*** Neuromagnetic brain activity was recorded with a KIT-Macquarie MEG160 (Model PQ1160R-N2, KIT, Kanazawa, Japan) whole-head MEG system consisting of 160 first-order axial gradiometers with a 50-mm baseline (Kado et al., 1999; Uehara et al., 2003). MEG data were acquired with analogue filter settings as 0.3 Hz high-pass, 200 Hz low-pass, 1000 Hz sampling rate and 16-bit quantization precision. Measurements were carried out with participants in supine position in a magnetically shielded room (Fujihara Co. Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). Five head position indicator coils (HPI) were attached in the head in an elastic cap, and their positions were measured at the beginning and at the end of the experiment, with a maximum displacement criterion of < 5 mm in any direction. The coils' positions with respect to the three anatomical landmarks (nasion, right and left preauricular landmarks) were measured using a handheld digitiser (Polhemus FastTrack; Colchester, VT).

Participant's head shapes and fiducial positions were digitized using the Polhemus FastTrack system (Polhemus FastTrack; Colchester, VT), enabling later co-registration with anatomical MRIs (Gross et al., 2013; Mersov et al., 2016). To quantify head movement, marker coil positions affixed to an elastic cap were measured twice; at the beginning and the end of the session; with a maximum displacement criterion of less than 5 mm in any direction.

T1-weighted anatomical magnetic resonance images (MRIs) were acquired for all adult participants in a separate scanning session using a 3T Siemens Magnetom Verio scanner with a 12-channel head coil. Those anatomical images were obtained using 3D GR\IR scanning sequence with the following acquisition parameters: repetition time, 2000 ms; echo time, 3.94 ms; flip angle, 9 degrees; slice thickness, 0.93 mm; field of view, 240 mm; image dimensions, 512 × 512 × 208. For child participants we used a "surrogate" MRI approach which warps a template brain to each subject's digitized head shape using the iterative closest point algorithm implemented in SPM8 (Litvak et al., 2011) and the template scalp surface extracted with the FSL toolbox (Jenkinson et al., 2012; see Cheyne et al., 2014; Johnson et al., 2022). Time-aligned audio speech recordings were recorded in an auxiliary channel of the MEG setup with the same sample rate (1000 Hz) as the MEG recordings.

***Speech movement tracking and high-fidelity acoustic recordings.*** All participants were fitted with MEG-compatible speech movement tracking coils place on the upper and lower lips, tongue body, and jaw (Alves et al., 2016; Anastasopoulou et al., 2022). Further, high fidelity speech recordings were simultaneously recorded with an optical microphone (Optoacoustics, Or-Yehuda, Israel) fixed on the MEG dewar at a distance of 20 cm away from the mouth of the speaker; and digitised using a Creative sound blaster X-Fi Titanium HD sound card with 48 kHz sample rate and 24-bit quantization precision.

The analyses of the present paper utilise only speech onset/offset events identified from the acoustic recordings of the MEG auxiliary channel. Analyses of the speech tracking and high-fidelity acoustic data are presented in Chapter 5 (and Anastasopoulou et al., 2023 preprint) and are not further discussed here.

***Experimental protocol.*** Four non-word productions were used as experimental stimuli, consisting of two disyllabic sequences with a V1CV2 structure, /ipa/ and /api/, each produced at normal and faster rates. These stimuli have been used in previous studies to investigate speech motor control strategies in both normal and disordered populations investigating speech motor control strategies in normal and in disordered populations (van Lieshout et al. 1997; van Lieshout et al. 2002; van Lieshout et al. 2007; van Lieshout, 2017). Non-word stimuli were chosen to avoid familiarity issues and are commonly used in speech motor control research to investigate normal and pathological function (Case & Grigos, 2020). The general experimental protocol for speech and button press conditions is diagrammed in Figure 1. Each participant repeated all tasks in ten trials, with each trial lasting approximately 12 seconds. They were instructed to take a deep breath and, for the normal rate production, to utter the non-words in a comfortable, conversational rate. For the faster rate, they were instructed to produce the stimuli at a faster rate while maintaining accuracy (van Lieshout et al., 2002). A short break was provided after each trial. Participants were asked to minimize head movement as much as possible and avoid blinking their eyes during speech production (Mersov et al., 2016).




**Figure 1. Experimental procedures**. **A.** Speech task. Instructions were displayed for 30s, followed by a 5s fixation cross '+' and breath intake in preparation for the speech production trial set. During a trial set participants produced the indicated nonword in a reiterated fashion for 12s. 10 consecutive trial sets were performed for each nonword stimulus. **B.** Button press task. Instructions were displayed for about 30s followed by a fixation cross, during which participants performed self-paced button pressed with the index finger of their dominant (right) hand at a rate of about 1 per 2 seconds for a total of about 90 trials.

## Analysis

**Button press condition.** MEG data were segmented into 1.5 s epochs comprising -0.5 sec to +1.0 sec with respect to button press onset, and about 90 trials per averaged epoch. Epoched data sets were digitally filtered from 0.3-100 Hz and a 50 Hz notch filter. SAM pseudo-t beamformer was computed using using a frequency range of 15-25 Hz (beta band), a sliding active window of 0.6 to 0.8 sec and a baseline window of 0.0 to 0.2 sec (first two seconds of inter trial set rest period) over 10 steps with a step size of 0.01 sec and pseudo-z beamformer normalisation (3 ft/sqrt (Hz) RMS noise). Active and baseline windows were chosen to encompass the known times of maximal event-related synchronisation (ERS) and event-related desynchronisation (ERD) respectively of MEG motor rhythms in a button press task (see for e.g. Cheyne et al., 2014; and Johnson et al., 2022). Statistical analysis of group beamformer images was performed with cluster-based permutation testing (2048 permutations, omnibus correction for multiple comparisons). Voxel locations at the centre of significant clusters were used to generate group mean "virtual sensor" time frequency plots with a time range of -0.5 to +1.0 sec from the button press onset and a frequency range of 1-100 Hz.

**Speech conditions.** Speech trial set onsets were identified and marked from the speech channel of the MEG recordings. MEG data were segmented with an epoch of -10 sec to + 5 sec from the onset of each trial set, selected to encompass the final 5 sec of the previous trial set, the 5 sec inter-trial set rest period, and the first five sec of the current trial set (speech – rest – speech). To maximize the signal-to-noise ratio of the averaged data, all four speech conditions were averaged, for a total of 40 trial sets/averaged epoch (4 speech conditions * 10 speaking/resting trial sets). All epoched data were digitally filtered with a bandpass of 0.3-100 Hz and a 50 Hz notch filter.

Source reconstruction was performed using the scalar synthetic aperture magnetometry (SAM) beamformer implemented in the BrainWave MATLAB toolbox (Jobst et al., 2018). SAM pseudo-t beamformer was computed using a frequency range of 15-25 Hz, a sliding active window of 0 to 1.0 sec (first second of current speech trial set) and a baseline window of -5 to -3 sec (first two seconds of inter trial set rest period) over 10 steps with a step size of 0.2 sec and pseudo-z beamformer normalisation (3 ft/sqrt (Hz) RMS noise). Statistical analysis of group beamformer images was performed with cluster-based permutation testing (alpha = 0.05, 512-1024 permutations, omnibus correction for multiple comparisons). Voxel locations at the centre of significant clusters were used to generate group mean "virtual sensor" time frequency plots with a time range of -10 to +5 sec from the trial set onset and a frequency range of 1-100 Hz.

## Results

***Button press data***. Group statistical analyses of SAM-beamformer images for the button-press condition are summarised in Table 4, and the corresponding group mean maps are shown in Figure 3. As expected, all groups show a single significant cluster located near the hand region of the left precentral gyrus, contralateral to the right-handed button press. As is typically observed for button press tasks, all groups also showed mirrored right hemisphere activations in homologous regions of the right hemisphere motor cortex (not shown), although these clusters were smaller in magnitude and did not reach statistical significance for any of the groups. Relative to adults, the cluster centre *Z* coordinate locations (superior-inferior direction) for the TD groups were 23 mm inferior, while the CAS group was 12 mm inferior to the adults. This discrepancy is largely due to the fact that the precise voxel maximum for the fairly extensive clusters of the adult data was located superior to the anatomic location of the hand knob. For the TD groups, the group mean maps of Figure 3 suggests that activations are somewhat deeper and located in the sulci anterior and posterior to the precentral gyrus, relative to the maps for adults and CAS children, which show prominent activations on the crests of the pre- and post-central gyri: however the present analyses do not permit inferences concerning whether these are true group differences (Sassenhagen and Drashkow, 2019).

Group mean virtual sensor time-frequency plots were generated from the button press coordinates listed in Table 4 and are plotted in the left panel of Figure 4. The following time-frequency features can be observed in the plots for all four groups: (1) A short discrete burst of gamma-band (circa 60-80+ Hz) synchronisation at or shortly before the button press; (2) Beta-band (circa 13-30 Hz) desynchronisation beginning about 300 ms before the button press and persisting for about 300-400 ms after the button press; (4) Beta-band synchronisation (beta “rebound”) beginning about 500-600 ms after the button press and persisting until the end of the analysis epoch; theta-band (circa 3-7 Hz) synchronisation beginning about 200-300 ms prior to the button press and persisting until 500-600 ms post-button press. All of these temporal-spectral features are known characteristics of neuromagnetic brain responses in a self-paced button press task for both adults and children and have been described in numerous previous publications (e.g. Cheyne et al., 2014; Johnson et al., 2020).

Overall we conclude that the cluster-based permutation analyses show a differential SAM beamformer effect ($p < .05$) for all four groups, corresponding to clusters in the observed data at a spatial location corresponding to the known anatomic location of the hand region of sensorimotor cortices in the left hemisphere, contralateral to the right hand used for the button press task. Further, virtual sensor time-spectrograms generated from the cluster centre locations

for each group are entirely representative of and in accord with well-known and well-characteristed neuromagnetic brain responses in a self-paced button press task.

**Table 4. Centre coordinates of significant clusters for button press condition from cluster-based permutation analysis of SAM-beamformer source maps**. Cluster alpha = 0.05, 512-1024 permutations, omnibus correction for multiple comparisons. Locations are in Talairach coordinate system. L = left hemisphere. Group mean maps are shown in Figure 3.

| | Tal Coordinates (mm) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group | X | Y | Z | Mag (nAm) | Brain Region |
| Adults | -34 | -13 | 66 | 6.0 | L Precentral Gyrus BA4 |
| TD 11-16 yo | -30 | -17 | 43 | 7.0 | L Precentral Gyrus BA4 |
| TD 7-10 yo | -34 | -16 | 43 | 6.6 | L Precentral Gyrus BA4 |
| CAS | -34 | -21 | 54 | 6.5 | L Precentral Gyrus BA4 |

***Speech data***. Group mean statistical analyses of SAM-beamformer images for the speech condition are shown in Figure 2 and the corresponding group mean images are plotted on the fsaverage brain in Figure 3.

Beginning with the adult group, the statistical maps (Figure 2) show a single extensive cluster in the left hemisphere which is centred on the left medial frontal gyrus (MFG; BA6). Comparison of the group mean button press and speech maps (Figure 3) indicates that the speech-related MFG activity map is immediately anterior to the prefrontal gyrus, and that the maps extends posteriorly to encompass a region of the precentral gyrus immediately ventral to the hand area of the precentral gyrus mapped by the button press response.

The virtual sensor time-frequency spectrogram generated from the MFG voxel at the speech cluster centre is shown in Figure 4 (top right panel). The following features can be observed in this plot: (1) Substantial high-frequency broadband noise during the speech trial sets, attributable to muscle activity that is an inevitable artifact of overt speech task; (2) prominent mu/beta band (about 10-25 Hz) desynchronisation that is continuous during the speech trial sets, and also for about 2 seconds prior to the speech trial set onset, reflecting motor preparatory activity that is characteristic of the mu/beta bands (Cheyne, 2013). Relative to the button press response, where the beta band range is about 13-30 Hz, with a mid-frequency about 22-23 Hz, the speech spectrogram displays a lower frequency range (about 10-25 Hz) with a mid-frequency of about 18 Hz. (3) Theta band (circa 3-7 Hz) synchronisation which roughly tracks the time course of the mu/beta desynchronisation. (For aid in interpretation we note that the speech spectrograms are baselined to the first two seconds of the inter-trial set rest period, - 5 to -3 sec. This baseline affects the visual appearance of the spectrogram during the immediately preceding

time period, where the high-frequency noise and mu/beta-band desynchronisation appear to stop about 1 sec before the end of the speech trial set.)




Adults (N = 11)

| Cluster | Tal Coordinates (mm) X | Y | Z | Mag (nAm) | Brain Region |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | -42 | 2 | 50 | -9.58 | L MFG BA6 |

TD 11-16 yo (N = 10)

| Cluster | Tal Coordinates (mm) X | Y | Z | Mag (nAm) | Brain Region |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | -34 | -10 | 24 | -8.57 | L insula BA 13 |
| 2 | 38 | 1 | 24 | -7.96 | R Precent gyr BA6 |
| 3 | -26 | 9 | 24 | -7.41 | L insula BA 13 |

TD 7-10 yo (N = 9)

| Cluster | Tal Coordinates (mm) X | Y | Z | Mag (nAm) | Brain Region |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 34 | -10 | 39 | -7.73 | R MFG BA6 |
| 2 | -26 | -10 | 32 | -6.97 | L sub gyral |
| 3 | 14 | 9 | 27 | -6.25 | R Cing gyr BA24 |

CAS (N = 7)

| Cluster | Tal Coordinates (mm) X | Y | Z | Mag (nAm) | Brain Region |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 30 | 5 | 24 | -8.3 | R Precent gyr BA6 |

**Figure 2. Group statistical maps for speech condition.** Cluster-based permutation analysis of SAM-beamformer source maps. Cluster alpha = 0.05, 512-1024 permutations, omnibus correction for multiple comparisons. Locations are in Talairach coordinate system. L = left hemisphere, R = right hemisphere, MFG = medial frontal gyrus, BA = Brodmann area. Multiple sources are numbered according to source magnitude.




**Figure 3: Group mean SAM beamformer maps.** All plots are shown on fsaverage brain and correspond to the significant left and right hemisphere clusters shown in Table 4 and Figure 2. *Left panel*: Anatomical landmarks. 1 –Hand region of precentral gyrus (hand knob), 2 – Hand region of postcentral gyrus 3 – Middle precentral gyrus, 4 – Middle frontal gyrus, 5 – Rolandic fissure, 6 –Precentral gyrus, 7 – Postcentral gyrus. *Right panels*: Thresholded group mean SAM beamformer maps for button press and speech conditions.




**Figure 4. Group virtual sensor time-frequency spectrograms.** All virtual sensor plots correspond to the centre voxels of significant left and right hemisphere clusters shown in Table 4 and Figure 2. Where more than 2 significant clusters were obtained, virtual sensors for only the first two (largest magnitude) clusters are plotted. Button press data are baselined to the full epoch, speech data are baselined -5 to -3 sec to emphasise beta band desynchronisation. BP = button press onset, OFF = speech trial set offset, ON = speech trial set onset. Arrows indicate gamma band synchronisation around the time of button press onset.

Relative to the adult results, the Figure 2 statistical maps for both groups of TD children show distinctive patterns of significant clusters. First, both TD groups show significant clusters in both cerebral hemispheres, while the adult cluster is restricted to the left hemisphere. Second, the voxel centres of all TD clusters are relatively inferior ($z$ = 24-39 mm) to that of the adult group ($z$ = 50 mm). Third, the TD clusters appear relatively deeper (absolute $x$ of 2 largest magnitude clusters = 26-38 mm) than the adult cluster (absolute $x$ = 42).

Group discrepancies in the precise locations of clusters are difficult to interpret from the present data. On the one hand, reasonable between-group agreement of source locations for the button press response supports adequacy of source modelling for all groups: in this case all groups showed good agreement for *x* and *y* coordinates, while the *z* discrepancy is explainable from the larger and more extensive source configuration in the adults. On the other hand, group discrepancies may be expected to arise from at least three sources: first, adult source modelling was based on individual MRI scans, while the child models were derived from template brains; second, the cluster-based analysis indicates both more extensive and stronger (larger magnitude) sources for the adults than for the children, resulting in a group difference in source signal-to-noise ratio that may affect model comparisons; third and perhaps most significantly for this comparison, it is well-known that adaptive beamformers perform suboptimally in the case of correlated bilateral sources, since linear dependencies between the neuronal source timeseries are utilised by these algorithms to minimize the output power (e.g. Kuznetsova et al., 2021).

Overall, these considerations preclude any clear inferences concerning group differences in the precise locations of speech-related sources. Within the stated limitations, the results of the statistical cluster-based analyses suggest the following: for adults, a differential SAM beamformer effect ($p < .05$) corresponds to a single cluster in the observed data at a spatial location in the precentral gyrus of the left hemisphere immediately inferior to the known anatomic location of the hand region of sensorimotor cortices, and co-extensive with the region of the medial frontal gyrus that is immediately anterior to this middle region of the pre-central gyrus; in contrast, for both TD child groups, the differential SAM beamformer effects ($p < .05$) correspond to bilateral clusters in both cerebral hemispheres, at relatively lateralised locations on a mid-line (in the sagittal plane) roughly corresponding to the location of the central sulcus/ pre- and post-central gyri in both hemispheres.

Time-frequency spectrograms generated from centre voxel locations in left and right hemisphere clusters for the TD groups are shown in the centre panels of Figure 4. For both groups and both hemispheres the plots show speech-related neural activity that is comparable to that described for the adults above: mu/beta desynchronisation during speech, and for several seconds prior to the onset of the speech trial set. One temporal-spectrographic feature of the children’s data is not observed in the adult data: a distinct low frequency band (circa 7-10 Hz) of synchronisation that roughly follows the time course of the speech-related mu/beta-band desynchronisation. In contrast for the adults, a comparable but less distinct pattern of speech-related synchronisation is seen at lower frequencies confined to the theta band (circa 3-7 Hz).

In contrast to the typically developing children, the cluster analysis of the CAS group shows only a single, small, right hemisphere cluster (Figure 2). The virtual sensor at this location (bottom right panel of Figure 4) shows a speech-related pattern of low frequency (7-10 Hz) synchronisation that is also observed in the TD groups. However, unlike the prominent beta patterns in both adults and TD children, no discernable pattern of speech-related beta-band desynchronisation is observed in this plot.

The lack of speech-related beta-band desychronisation in the group mean time-frequency spectrogram is entirely representative of the seven individuals within the group. Figure 5 shows that only one individual (S1154) showed speech-related desynchronisation in a narrow mu frequency (circa 10-12 Hz) band. Of the seven, six show speech-related synchronisation in the sub-mu 7-10 Hz band. No individuals show the speech-related beta-band desynchronisation that is prominent in the adults and both TD groups.




**Figure 5. Time-frequency spectrograms for CAS individuals**. Six of the seven CAS children show speech-related synchronisation in a sub-mu (circa 7-10) Hz frequency band (red arrows). A single participant (S1154) shows speech-related desynchronisation narrowly concentrated within the mu band (circa 10-12 Hz; blue arrow). All plots are generated from the centre voxel of the CAS cluster shown in Figure 2. OFF = speech trial set offset, ON = speech trial set onset.

## Discussion

In this study, our aim was to use an innovative non-invasive approach and a novel speech paradigm to pinpoint the specific brain regions that are responsible for controlling speech motor functions. The findings of our study suggest that our metrics have the potential to serve as a clinically accessible tool for assessing the lateralization of low- levels speech activity in the brain during a reiterated nonword paradigm. In particular, we showed that specific frequency spectral band changes occur in two brain regions, the middle precentral gyrus, and the posterior part of the middle frontal gyrus.

Speech production requires high spatiotemporal accuracy of the articulatory movements, motor planning and control of the vocal tract muscles in order for the individuals to produce fluent speech. The rapid speed with which all the above neurocomputations unfold so that the planned sequences of motor commands before articulation are ready to produce up to six to nine syllables per second; which are the average number of syllables that a typically developing adult can produce; (Kent, 2000) poses a high challenge for the human brain (Silva et al., 2022).

The classic Broca-Geschwind model (citations) of speech production proposes that a single region in the left posterior inferior frontal gyrus (IFG) named as Broca's area is responsible for speech motor planning. Speech motor planning involves the identification of the spatiotemporal parameters for a targeted speech sound sequences or the direction, force, timing, and coordination of speech movements (Van der Merwe, 2009; Van Der Merwe, 2021). According to Geschwind (1970), Broca's area is responsible for transforming the phonological representations into motor command sequences which afterward will be executed by the motor cortex and associated cortical areas (Silva et al., 2022). Recent evidence, however, has challenge Broca's area implication on speech motor control since patients with surgical resection of this area or focal stroke, fail to be diagnosed with Broca's aphasia (citations). Furthermore, accumulating evidence suggests that Broca's area is associated not with speech motor control, but with high-level language processes including syntax (citations), working memory (citations), word selection (citations), sequencing (citations) (see also recent review by Hickok & Venezia, 2023).

Establishing the cortical areas which are implicated in speech and language network is fundamental for scientists and clinicians to understand how humans with typical development process speech and language, as well how the network is affected in patients with epilepsy, stroke and brain tumours (see recent review by Bowyer et al., 2020).

**References:**

Van Lieshout, PHHM., & Moussa, W. (2000). The assessment of speech motor behaviors using electromagnetic articulography. *The Phonetician.*2000;81(1): 9–22. P

Van Lieshout, P., Hulstijn, W., Alfonso, P. J., & Peters, H. F. (1997). Higher and lower order influences on the stability of the dynamic coupling between articulators. In W. Hulstijn, H. F. Peters, & P. van Lieshout (Eds.), *Speech production: Motor control, brain research and fluency disorders* (pp. 161–170). Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishers.

Uehara, G., Adachi, Y., Kawai, J., Shimogawara, M., Higuchi, M., Haruta, Y., Ogata, H., & Kado, H. (2003). Multi-channel SQUID systems for biomagnetic measurement. *IEICE transactions on electronics*, *86*(1), 43-54.

Pearson, L., & Pouw, W. (2021, November 2). Gesture-vocal coupling in Karnatak music performance: A neuro-bodily distributed aesthetic entanglement. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/3x7au

Goldstein, L., & Fowler, C. A. (2003). Articulatory Phonology: A phonology for public language use. In *Phonetics and Phonology in Language Comprehension and Production* (Originally published 2003, Vol. 6, pp. 159–208). Berlin, New York: DE GRUYTER MOUTON. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110895094.159

Kriegeskorte, N., Mur, M., & Bandettini, P. (2008). Representational similarity analysis - connecting the branches of systems neuroscience. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, *2*, 4–4. https://doi.org/10.3389/neuro.06.004.2008

Dash D, Ferrari P, Wang J. Decoding speech evoked jaw motion from non-invasive neuromagnetic oscillations. In: 2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN), Glasgow, UK. (2020), p. 1–8. doi: 10.1109/IJCNN48605.2020.9207448

Sassenhagen, J. & Draschkow, D. (2019). Cluster-based permutation tests of MEG/EEG data do not establish significance of effect latency or location. *Psychophysiology*, *56*, e13335. https://doi-org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/10.1111/psyp.13335

Kuznetsova, Aleksandra, Yulia Nurislamova, and Alexei Ossadtchi (2021). Modified covariance beamformer for solving MEG inverse problem in the environment with correlated sources. *NeuroImage*, *228*, 117677. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117677.