

1 **Aberrant oscillatory activity in Neurofibromatosis Type 1: An EEG study of**
2 **resting state and working memory**

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

Samantha J. Booth^a, Shruti Garg^{b,c}, Laura J. E. Brown^b, Jonathan Green^{b,c}, Gorana Pobric^a,
and Jason R. Taylor^{a,*}

^aDivision of Human Communication, Development, and Hearing, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine, and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, England, UK. ^bDivision of Psychology and Mental Health, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine, and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, England, UK. ^cChild & Adolescent Mental Health Services, Royal Manchester Children's Hospital, Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, England, UK.

**Corresponding author.* Division of Human Communication, Development, and Hearing, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine, and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, England, UK.

E-mail addresses: samantha.booth@manchester.ac.uk, shruti.garg@manchester.ac.uk, laura.brown@manchester.ac.uk, jonathan.green@manchester.ac.uk, gorana.pobric@manchester.ac.uk, and jason.taylor@manchester.ac.uk

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Neurofibromatosis Type 1 (NF1) is a genetic neurodevelopmental disorder
3 commonly associated with impaired cognitive function. Despite the well-explored functional
4 roles of neural oscillations in neurotypical populations, only a limited number of studies have
5 investigated oscillatory activity in the NF1 population.

6 **Methods:** We compared oscillatory spectral power and theta phase coherence in a
7 paediatric sample with NF1 (N=16; mean age: 13.03 years; female: n=7) to an age/sex-
8 matched typically-developing control group (N=16; mean age: 13.34 years; female: n=7)
9 using electroencephalography measured during rest and during working memory task
10 performance.

11 **Results:** Relative to typically-developing children, the NF1 group displayed higher resting
12 state slow wave power and a lower peak alpha frequency. Moreover, higher theta power and
13 frontoparietal theta phase coherence were observed in the NF1 group during working
14 memory task performance, but these differences disappeared when controlling for baseline
15 (resting state) activity.

16 **Conclusions:** Overall, results suggest that NF1 is characterised by aberrant resting state
17 oscillatory activity that may contribute towards the cognitive impairments experienced in this
18 population.

19 **Trial registration:** [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) identifier: NCT03310996 (first posted: October 16
20 2017).

21 **Keywords**

22 Electroencephalography (EEG); neurofibromatosis type 1 (NF1); oscillations; oscillatory
23 power; phase coherence; working memory.

24 **1. Background**

25 Neurofibromatosis Type 1 (NF1) is an autosomal-dominant neurodevelopmental disorder,
26 present in around 1 in 2700 births [1]. Although there is great inter-individual variability in its
27 clinical manifestations, core somatic symptoms include dermal neurofibromas and

1 pigmentary lesions [2]. In addition to somatic symptoms, social and behavioural difficulties
2 are common, with around 50% of children with NF1 meeting the diagnostic criteria for
3 attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and around 25% for autism spectrum disorder
4 (ASD) [3]. Moreover, cognitive impairments, including working memory deficits, are
5 prevalent [4] and substantially impair academic achievement [5] and impact negatively on
6 quality of life [6].

7 There remains a need to better understand the relationship between cortical function and
8 cognitive deficits in NF1 [7] to help provide target(s) for pharmacological and non-
9 pharmacological interventions (e.g., non-invasive brain stimulation [8]; neurofeedback: [9]),
10 which in turn may improve treatment outcomes and academic trajectories. Existing
11 neuroimaging research has related cognitive deficits in NF1 to brain function using functional
12 magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). Studies suggest aberrant activity compared to typically-
13 developing controls [10]. For example, increased functional connectivity between the ventral
14 anterior cingulate cortex and the insular cortex during rest may contribute to impaired
15 cognitive control [11]. Aberrant activity has also been observed during cognitive task
16 performance, including reduced task-related activity in key frontal and parietal regions during
17 working memory tasks [12,13]. Only a limited number of studies have used M/EEG to
18 investigate the neural correlates of cognitive impairments in NF1. Abnormalities in Event
19 Related Potential (ERP) components relative to typically-developing controls have been
20 reported [14,15,16,17]. For instance, reduced P1 amplitude has been observed, suggesting
21 aberrant early visual processing [14,18]. Additionally, reduced P3a amplitude has been
22 observed during a go/no-go task and is hypothesised to reflect impaired inhibition [18].
23 Furthermore, topographic differences in P3b amplitude and a shorter P3b latency relative to
24 controls have been found during working memory task performance, which the authors
25 suggest may contribute to the cognitive deficits seen in NF1 [16].

26 The high temporal resolution of M/EEG also enables the study of brain oscillations.
27 Oscillations can be seen as a 'primary' or a more direct measure of brain activity relative to
28 ERPs, therefore providing an important window into understanding cognitive processes [19].

1 As such, investigating oscillations in NF1 can provide additional insights to those gained
2 from ERP methods. Oscillatory measures are particularly well-suited to the investigation of
3 protracted processes, such as those required for working memory – a cognitive ability that is
4 impaired in NF1 [16]. In healthy adults, increased (mid-frontal) theta power is observed
5 during working memory maintenance and is hypothesised to maintain the temporal
6 relationship between items held in working memory [20, 21]. Moreover, increased theta
7 phase coherence (i.e., the consistency of phase values between brain regions [22]) between
8 frontal and parietal-temporal regions is observed during working memory maintenance and
9 is thought to facilitate integration of information between these key regions of the working
10 memory network [23,24]. The literature exploring working memory related (WM-related)
11 theta oscillations in typically-developing children is sparse [25], though there is some
12 evidence to suggest that increased theta band activity occurs during working memory
13 maintenance, like in adulthood [26,27].

14 Studies in neurodevelopmental disorders that experience overlapping cognitive
15 impairments with NF1 (e.g., ADHD/ASD [14]) have reported differences in oscillatory activity
16 during working memory performance relative to typically-developing controls
17 [27,28,29,30,31]. For instance, Jang et al. [28] found significantly reduced theta power in
18 ADHD relative to controls. Moreover, Yuk et al. [31] observed reduced phase coherence in
19 ASD between key nodes of the working memory network (i.e., frontal and parietal regions)
20 which has been hypothesised to reflect difficulty integrating information. Given that aberrant
21 activity in specific frequency bands exhibits considerable overlap across
22 neurodevelopmental disorders [32] we might also observe abnormalities in WM-related
23 oscillatory activity in the NF1 population.

24 At present there are only two existing studies investigating M/EEG oscillatory correlates
25 of cognitive impairments in NF1 [17,33]. These studies did not investigate activity during
26 working memory task performance, but instead during rest and during visual processing [17]
27 and covert attention tasks [33]. Ribeiro et al. [17] observed higher resting state theta power
28 in NF1 relative to typically-developing controls, typical alpha reactivity (i.e., higher alpha

1 power during eyes closed relative to eyes open resting state [34]), and enhanced alpha
2 power during visual processing that may provide a neural marker of attentional deficits in this
3 population. Moreover, Silva et al. [33] found elevated alpha desynchronisation during a
4 covert attention task that may reflect a compensatory mechanism to keep performance at
5 normal levels. Exploration of oscillatory activity in other cognitive domains impaired in NF1,
6 such as working memory, is lacking. Investigating oscillatory activity during working memory
7 is important as working memory underpins and shares common neural correlates with other
8 cognitive functions important to everyday functioning, such as learning [35] and attention
9 [36].

10 With this in mind, the current study compared EEG power and theta phase coherence in
11 adolescents with NF1 to an age/sex-matched typically-developing control group using EEG
12 measured during rest and during a working memory task. Consistent with previous work
13 [17], we hypothesised higher resting state spectral power in NF1, but normal power reactivity
14 during eyes open versus eyes closed resting state conditions. Our analysis of oscillatory
15 activity during working memory was largely exploratory; however, we predicted aberrant
16 theta power and frontoparietal theta phase coherence given previous WM-related EEG
17 studies in other neurodevelopmental disorders [29,31]. Finally, the association between EEG
18 measures and age, overall cognitive function, and working memory performance were also
19 explored.

20 **2. Methods**

21 The current study is an extension of the analysis presented in Pobric et al. [16]. Specifically,
22 we conducted oscillatory analyses on the same participants, using the same EEG resting
23 state and n-back data, and used some (see Section 2.2) of the same behavioural measures
24 described in Pobric et al. [16].

25
26
27

1 **2.1 Participants**

2 Thirty-two participants completed this study¹. Participants were adolescents with NF1 (n=16)
3 and age and sex-matched controls (n=16). Participants were required to meet each of the
4 eligibility criteria in **Table 1**. Parents/guardians gave oral and written consent, and
5 adolescents assent (where developmentally appropriate), prior to participation.

6 The NF1 sample were recruited through the Manchester Centre for Genomic
7 Medicine, Neurofibromatosis charities, social media platforms, and newsletters, and were
8 adolescents who satisfied the National Institute of Health's (1988) diagnostic criteria for NF1
9 [37]. The control sample (CON) were age and sex-matched at group level and recruited via
10 institutional newsletter advertisements and contacting local schools. Demographic
11 information of the sample is reported in **Table 2**. There were no significant differences
12 between groups in age ($t_{(30)} = 0.540, p=.593$) or sex ($\chi^2 = 0.00, p=1.00$)².

13

14 **Table 1.** Eligibility criteria.

Eligibility criteria		
NF1	(i)	Aged 11-16 years
	(ii)	Satisfied the National Institute of Health's NF1 diagnostic criteria
	(iii)	No history of epilepsy
	(iv)	No ongoing active treatment for any NF1 related complications (e.g., chemotherapy for optic gliomas)
	(v)	No other clinically significant unrelated illness
CON	(i)	Aged 11-16 years
	(ii)	No pre-existing medical conditions or neurodevelopmental disorders

15

16

17

18

¹ See Section 4.5 for a consideration of power.

² This remained the case for the sub-group of participants included in the resting state (CON/NF1: n=16/14) and task-specific (CON/NF1: n=16/13) analyses (**Additional file 1**).

1 **Table 2.** Participant demographics.

Demographic	Group	
	NF1	CON
Age (M±SD (range))	13.03±1.66 (11.33-16.92) years	13.34±1.61 (11.25-16.58) years
Sex (male/female)	9/7	9/7
NF1 mutation (inherited/de novo)	7/9	N/A
Medication	Melatonin (n=2) Methylphenidate (n=4)	N/A
Pre-existing clinical diagnoses	ADHD and ASD (n=3) ADHD (n=1) ASD (n=2)	N/A

2

3 **2.2 Procedure**

4 This study received ethical approval from the Greater Manchester West Research Ethics
 5 Committee (17/NW/0364) and was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.
 6 During the study visit, participants and their parents/guardians were first familiarised with the
 7 EEG equipment and study procedures. Subsequently, a battery of behavioural and cognitive
 8 assessments was administered, including parent-rated and cognitive measures that tapped
 9 into: overall cognitive function, inattention, hyperactivity, communication, daily living skills,
 10 socialisation, short-term memory, working memory, sustained attention, and attentional
 11 switching, followed by EEG. This paper focuses on parent-reported³ Adaptive Behaviour
 12 Composite (ABC) scores on the Vineland Adaptive Behaviour Scale (VABS-III) [38],
 13 performance on an adaptive auditory n-back task [16], and performance on a non-adaptive
 14 visual n-back task [16] performed during EEG (see Pobric et al. [16] for details of the other
 15 tasks performed that are not reported here).

16 VABS-II measures daily living skills, socialisation, and communication, with ABC
 17 scores reflecting standardised age equivalent overall cognitive functioning [38]. Performance
 18 on the adaptive auditory and non-adaptive visual n-back tasks measure working memory.
 19 Each trial of the n-back task began with a fixation cross (+) presented in the centre of the
 20 screen (adaptive auditory n-back: 2500ms; non-adaptive visual n-back: 2000ms, +/- random

³ Parents completed the pen-and-paper version of the Vineland ABC.

1 jitter up to 100ms in 17ms steps). This was followed by a single uppercase English
2 consonant (C, G, H, K, P, Q, T, or W) presented aurally (auditory n-back: 1000ms) or
3 visually in the centre of the screen (non-adaptive visual n-back: 500ms). Participants were
4 instructed to respond as quickly and accurately as possible with a mouse-click whenever the
5 current stimulus was the same as the one presented 'n' steps back in the sequence. No
6 responses were required for non-targets. The auditory n-back was adaptive, such that after
7 each block of 20 trials, the difficulty level of the next block was adjusted based on the
8 participant's performance to ensure participants were always training at the top of their
9 ability (see Pobric et al. [16] for further task details). In contrast, the visual n-back performed
10 during EEG recording was not designed to push participants' ability to their limit. Instead, it
11 was developed to provide a sufficient number of trials to permit investigation of
12 electrophysiological differences between the groups during working memory performance. In
13 this non-adaptive task, four fixed-order blocks were presented: 1-back, 2-back, 2-back, and
14 1-back, with self-paced breaks in between to reduce fatigue. In each block there were 100
15 trials, 25 of which were target trials (i.e., the same letter as 'n' screens back). As existing
16 studies report a load-related increase in power during working memory maintenance [39],
17 two load levels ('n' = 1 and 2) were included to permit investigation of load-dependent effects
18 on EEG measures.

19

20 **2.3 EEG acquisition**

21 EEG data were recorded using an ActiveTwo system (BioSemi, Amsterdam, Netherlands)
22 with 64 EEG channels in standard 10-10 system locations plus HEOG, VEOG, and
23 mastoids, with a sampling rate of 512Hz. During the recording, participants were asked to
24 remain still, in a comfortable/relaxed position, and to minimise eye-movements and blinking
25 where possible. Recording started with 2.5 minutes of eyes open and 2.5 minutes of eyes
26 closed resting state, in which participants were asked to simply relax and not think of
27 anything in particular. This was followed by recording during the visual n-back task.

28

1 **2.4 EEG analysis**

2 MATLAB (2019a) and SPM12 (version 7771) [40] were used to conduct data analyses.

3 Custom functions [41,42] calling several functions from EEGLAB (version 13.6.5b/v2020.0)

4 [43] and FieldTrip [44] were used.

5

6 2.4.1 Common pre-processing

7 Continuous EEG data were re-referenced to averaged mastoids, high-pass filtered (0.1Hz),

8 down sampled (256Hz), low-pass filtered (resting state: 200Hz; task-related: 120Hz), and

9 notch-filtered (48-52Hz), before epoching (resting state: arbitrary 1900ms (baseline

10 correction: 0-1900ms, i.e., mean-centring); task-related: 0-1900ms relative to stimulus

11 onset). The eyes open and eyes closed data were then concatenated (i.e., combined into

12 the same file).

13 Independent Component Analysis (ICA) was used to project blink and eye-movement

14 signals out of the data⁴. Channels containing noise unrelated to blinks (characterised by

15 large positive deflections) or eye-movements (characterised by square-wave deflections)

16 were temporarily omitted (channel TP7 was persistently bad and omitted from ICA for all

17 participants). Thirty-two components were extracted from EEG channel data only. ICA

18 components with uniquely high temporal correlations with VEOG and HEOG, and/or

19 uniquely high spatial correlations with the blink topography, were identified using custom

20 code [41] and following the procedure described in Pobric et al. [16]. The resulting weight

⁴ Note, the use of ICA for artefact signal removal does not pose a problem for phase-based analyses such as coherence [45]. ICA is an instantaneous spatial filtering method, and as such it does not distort the phases of the underlying signals. There may, however, be *apparent* changes in phase of *channel* data after removing artefact components since channels contain weighted sums of underlying neural and artefact signals (some of which have been removed). In fact, after artefact removal, channel data should be a purer measure of neural source data, including the oscillations of interest here.

1 matrix (less the artefact components) was applied to the epoched data using SPM12's
 2 'montage' function.

3 Baseline correction was then re-applied on the ICA-cleaned data. Epochs were
 4 rejected as noisy if they contained signal that exceeded a threshold (resting state: 200 μ V;
 5 task-related: 120 μ V; higher threshold for resting state data due to higher alpha power during
 6 eyes closed resting state). A channel was declared 'bad' if the threshold was exceeded on
 7 >20% of trials, and epoch rejection was re-run ignoring any bad channels. To reconstruct
 8 these noisy channels, a channel-weight interpolation matrix was created using FieldTrip's
 9 'channelrepair' function and applied to the epoched data using SPM12's 'montage' function.
 10 EEG data were then re-referenced to the common average reference. The mean number of
 11 components removed, channels interpolated, and trials remaining can be seen in **Table 3**.

13 **Table 3.** Number of components removed, channels interpolated, and trials remaining.

	No. of components removed		No. of channels interpolated		No. of trials remaining ⁵			
	M \pm SD	Min-Max	M \pm SD	Min-Max	Open/1-back		Closed/2-back	
					M \pm SD	Min-Max	M \pm SD	Min-Max
Resting-state								
CON	1.94 \pm 0.44	1-3	1.00 \pm 0.00	1-1	75.13 \pm 11.63	48-105	71.19 \pm 6.39	52-77
NF1	1.86 \pm 0.36	1-2	1.00 \pm 0.00	1-1	61.43 \pm 18.34	22-76	63.64 \pm 15.17	32-77
Task-related								
CON	1.69 \pm 0.70	1-3	1.50 \pm 1.21	1-5	130.55 \pm 50.00	46-194	111.88 \pm 47.22	38-194
NF1	1.73 \pm 0.59	1-3	1.73 \pm 1.62	1-6	132.33 \pm 46.24	28-188	113.13 \pm 53.10	38-195

14 *Abbreviations: M: mean, SD: standard deviation, Min: minimum, Max: maximum.*

15
 16 2.4.2 Resting state analysis

17 To be eligible for inclusion participants were required to have a minimum of 15 valid epochs
 18 remaining in each condition (open/closed) after artefact-contaminated trials were removed.

⁵ For task-related data, the number of trials remaining reflects the number of trials after incorrect responses were removed.

1 Two participants were excluded from the NF1 group, one due to having fewer than 15 valid
2 trials in the eyes open condition and the other due to low quality data (i.e., all channels
3 automatically marked 'bad' during the artefact detection routine). The sample used for the
4 resting state analyses therefore comprised 30 participants (n=16 CON; n=14 NF1).

5

6 2.4.3 Task-related analysis

7 Trials with incorrect responses were excluded. Subsequent analyses were conducted on
8 target and non-target trial data without distinguishing between these conditions, since n-back
9 performance requires maintenance of information during both trial types, particularly in the
10 late post-ERP time window (described below). For the same reason, the number of non-
11 target trials was not decimated to match the number of target trials (which was done in the
12 P300 analysis presented Pobric et al., [16]).

13 To be eligible for inclusion participants were required to have a minimum of 15 valid
14 epochs remaining in each load (1-/2-back) after artefact-contaminated trials and incorrect
15 trials were removed. One participant from the NF1 group was excluded owing to having
16 fewer than 15 valid trials in the 2-back load level (this was a different participant to the two
17 resting state exclusions). The sample size used for the task-related analyses therefore
18 comprised 31 participants (n=16 CON; n=15 NF1).

19

20 2.4.4 Spectral power

21 For estimation of task-related power the time-window of interest was 900-1900ms post-
22 stimulus onset (i.e., during the fixation cross of the next trial). This time-window was chosen
23 as existing studies investigating WM-related oscillatory activity typically use the maintenance
24 period of the working memory task as the time-window of interest as increased oscillatory
25 activity is observed during this period [20,24,31,46]. We followed the previous literature's
26 definition of the maintenance period as the time following a response to the stimuli,
27 determined using the average (or median) response time on the given task [31]. In the

1 current study, the average response time over 1-/2-back blocks was 627 ± 124 ms (median:
2 601ms). However, to ensure that the majority of participants had responded, 900ms was
3 chosen as the beginning of the time-window. The time window ended at 1900ms to provide
4 a sufficient number of samples for power estimation. For consistency, the same time-window
5 (in the arbitrary epoch), and therefore number of samples, was used for the estimation of
6 resting state power.

7 For each EEG channel and epoch (resting state: eyes open and eyes closed; task-
8 related: 1-back and 2-back), a Fast Fourier Transform with a Hanning window and a
9 frequency resolution of 1Hz was used to extract frequency spectra collapsed over time (900-
10 1900ms). The resulting power values were then log-transformed before averaging spectra
11 over epochs. For exploratory analysis, average log-transformed power over all EEG
12 channels was computed in canonical frequency bands: delta: 1-3Hz; theta: 4-7Hz; alpha: 8-
13 11Hz; beta: 12-29Hz; low-gamma: 30-47Hz, and high-gamma: 53-100Hz. Additionally, as
14 the literature consistently reports increased mid-frontal theta power during working memory
15 maintenance [20], we performed targeted analysis of task-related mid-frontal theta (4-7Hz)
16 power. To achieve this, log-transformed power was averaged over channels Fz, F1, and F2
17 to create a mid-frontal region of interest prior to statistical analysis. We measured absolute
18 power (i.e., power in one frequency band, independent of activity in other frequency bands),
19 as opposed to relative power (i.e., power in one frequency band divided by the amount of
20 activity in all frequency bands) to avoid the potential confound that any abnormalities in one
21 frequency band may affect the relative power of other frequency bands — a particular
22 concern in neurodevelopmental disorder studies [47].

23

24 2.4.5 Peak alpha frequency

25 Differences in peak alpha frequency (PAF) between groups were investigated. PAF was
26 defined as the frequency with the maximum power in a loose alpha range (6.5-13.5Hz) at
27 channel Pz. Pz was chosen as alpha power is typically high at this channel [48]. For analysis
28 of PAF, for each EEG channel and epoch (eyes open/closed), a Fast Fourier Transform with

1 a Hanning window and a frequency resolution of 0.25Hz was used to extract frequency
2 spectra collapsed over time (arbitrary 1900ms epoch). First, each individual's 1D spectrum
3 was adjusted to reduce 1/f noise as this flattens the spectrum and causes the alpha peak to
4 'pop out' [49]. This was achieved by fitting a second-order polynomial to the log-transformed
5 frequencies (omitting alpha and notch-filter frequencies), and the difference between the
6 spectrum and this model was computed. The resulting spectrum was smoothed with a
7 Gaussian kernel to remove spurious peaks. Next, four adjustments were made based on
8 visual inspection of each participant's spectrum: Two CON and one NF1 participant's had
9 maxima that fell on the ascending slope of the beta peak (eyes open: 12.25Hz, 13.25Hz,
10 and 12.75Hz; eyes closed: 13.25Hz, 12.75Hz), and these were adjusted to small visible
11 alpha peaks (eyes open: 11.50Hz, 10.25Hz, and 10.75Hz; eyes closed: 11.75 Hz, 11.75Hz)
12 that our algorithm had missed; and one NF1 participant's maximum fell on the descending
13 delta slope (eyes open and closed: 6.5Hz) and were adjusted to small visible alpha peaks
14 (eyes open: 7Hz, eyes closed: 7.5Hz) missed by the algorithm.

15

16 2.4.6 Theta phase coherence

17 Prior to estimating phase coherence, the task-related data were spatially filtered using the
18 Surface Laplacian, implemented using the `laplacian_perrinX` function in MATLAB [50]. The
19 Surface Laplacian reduces the influence of volume conduction, which is particularly
20 important given the electrode-level connectivity analysis performed [51]. We investigated
21 theta phase coherence in the frontoparietal network (**Figure 1**). The mid-frontal region acted
22 as a seed region and coherence was estimated between this region and left-parietal, mid-
23 parietal, and right-parietal regions [52]. Each region comprised of a set of electrodes: mid-
24 frontal (F1/Fz/F2), left-parietal (P3/P5/P7), mid-parietal (P1/Pz/P2), and right-parietal
25 (P4/P6/P8). Coherence was estimated between each possible mid-frontal – parietal
26 connection (i.e., 27 channel pairs), before averaging coherence over electrode sets,
27 resulting in three coherence estimates: mid-frontal to (1) left-parietal (ML), (2) mid-parietal
28 (MM), and (3) right-parietal (MR).

1 **[INSERT FIGURE 1]**

2
3 Theta phase was computed for the whole epoch (0-1900ms) and then phase
4 coherence was computed in the time-window of interest, 900-1500ms post-stimulus (the
5 time-window ended at 1500ms to prevent inclusion of edge effects as per epoch definition).
6 We calculated inter-site phase clustering (ISPC) [53]. ISPC over trials is a measure of the
7 consistency of phase angles between two electrodes averaged over trials. For task-related
8 data, ISPC-trials is an appropriate method given our analysis is hypothesis-driven (i.e.,
9 limited to the frontoparietal network) and not exploratory (more suited to weighted phase lag
10 index) [53]. ISPC has been used previously in studies with similar methodology [52]. Phase
11 angle time series for each channel were extracted by convolving the data with a complex
12 Morlet wavelet (4 cycles) separately for frequencies 4Hz, 5Hz, 6Hz, and 7Hz. For each time
13 point, the average vector length was calculated across trials to quantify ISPC-trials, defined
14 as:

$$15 \quad ISPC_f = \left| n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n e^{i(\phi_{xt} - \phi_{yt})} \right|$$

16 (1)

17 Where n represents the number of trials, and ϕ and ϕ_y are phase angles from channels x
18 and y at frequency f . ISPC ranges from 0 (perfectly randomly distributed phases) to 1
19 (perfect phase-locking). For each channel pair ISPC-trials was calculated for each load (1-
20 /2-back) and frequency (4-7Hz). The result was then averaged over the time-window of
21 interest (900-1500ms post-stimulus), then over frequencies, and finally over channel sets.
22 This resulted in one coherence value for each frontoparietal region pair/load combination
23 (ML, MM, MR x 1-back, 2-back) for each participant.

24

1 **2.5 Statistical analysis**

2 Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS version 25 [54]. The alpha level was set to
3 0.05. Visual inspection of Q-Q plots showed that, for each analysis, data were normally
4 distributed. For each analysis of variance discussed below, Box and Whisker plots were
5 inspected for extreme outliers. Values were considered extreme outliers if they fell outside of
6 3^{rd} quartile + $3 \times$ interquartile range and 1^{st} quartile – $3 \times$ interquartile range. Where extreme
7 outliers were identified, sensitivity analyses were run. It can be assumed that there were no
8 extreme outliers identified where sensitivity analysis is not reported.

9 In each frequency band a 2 (CON/NF1) x 2 (open/closed) analysis of variance
10 (ANOVA) was run for the scalp averaged resting state data. ANOVAs were run separately
11 for each frequency band as there is a known $1/f$ effect, whereby the means of low
12 frequencies are larger than those of high frequencies [55]. As frequency bands are
13 estimated independently, and therefore each ANOVA is performed on independent data, no
14 correction for multiple comparisons was used. Moreover, to investigate whether resting state
15 power follows the typical reactivity pattern observed in neurotypical populations [34], in each
16 frequency band a paired t -test investigated power differences between eyes open and eyes
17 closed resting state in the NF1 group. A 2 (CON/NF1) x 2 (open/closed) ANOVA was also
18 used to analyse PAF.

19 In the n-back task, maintenance of items in working memory spans trials. We
20 therefore used eyes-open resting state recordings as a baseline to investigate task-specific
21 power modulation (i.e., change from rest). To achieve this, we divided task-related power by
22 resting state power before log-transforming the data⁶ (equivalent to: $\log(\text{task power}) -$
23 $\log(\text{resting state power})$), which is referred to as *task-specific* power henceforth. In each
24 frequency band a 2 (CON/NF1) x 2 (1-/2-back) ANOVA investigated scalp-averaged task-

⁶ To calculate task-specific power and phase coherence participants needed to be eligible for both resting state and task-related analyses. This reduced the sample size from N=31 (CON/NF1: n=16/15) to N=29 (CON/NF1: n=16/13).

1 specific power. Consistent with the task-related power analyses we investigated task-
2 specific theta phase coherence by adjusting for baseline (resting state). For comparability,
3 eyes open resting state theta phase coherence was estimated using the same method as
4 task-related phase coherence (note the ‘trials’ in ISPC-trials are arbitrary in resting state).
5 Prior to statistical analysis resting state phase coherence was subtracted from task-related
6 phase coherence. A 2 (CON/NF1) x 3 (ML/MM/MR) x 2 (1-/2-back) ANOVA using task-
7 specific frontoparietal theta phase coherence was performed.

8 As existing research suggests a significant relationship between age and oscillatory
9 activity in typically-developing children that may not be present in neurodevelopmental
10 disorders [56], Pearson’s correlations were performed to investigate associations between
11 EEG measures and age, followed by statistical significance testing of the difference in r
12 between groups to determine whether the relationship between age and oscillatory activity
13 was significantly different between groups. Moreover, as individuals with NF1 typically
14 exhibit a lower average Intelligence Quotient (IQ) relative to typically-developing children
15 [6,57], and there is suggestion that oscillatory activity might be a neural marker of cognitive
16 function in neurodevelopmental disorders [56], Pearson’s correlations were performed to
17 investigate associations between EEG measures and IQ, using Vineland ABC scores as a
18 proxy. Again, this was followed by statistical significance testing of the difference in r
19 between groups to determine whether the relationship between IQ and oscillatory activity
20 was significantly different between groups. Finally, to assist interpretation of the oscillatory
21 findings, Pearson’s correlations were performed to investigate associations between EEG
22 measures and working memory performance on the adaptive auditory n-back task (which
23 was conducted separately to the EEG session), and the difference in r between groups
24 compared. To correct for multiple comparisons a 5% false discovery rate (FDR) [58]
25 correction was applied to outcomes with p -values less than 0.05. FDR was applied to the set
26 of EEG measures for each demographic/behavioural domain (i.e., five p -values).

1 **3. Results**

2 **3.1 Behavioural**

3 As expected, NF1⁷ performed significantly worse than CON on the parent-rated Vineland
4 ABC ($t_{(29)} = 3.573$, $p < .001$) and adaptive auditory n-back task (mean n-back; $t_{(30)} = 5.412$,
5 $p < .001$). Moreover, the NF1 group did not demonstrate any impairment in EEG n-back task
6 performance (hits – false alarms (%); $F_{(1,30)} = 0.094$, $p = .762$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.003$) (see **Additional file**
7 **1** for detailed reporting).

8

9 **3.2 Resting state power: higher delta and theta power in NF1**

10 **Figure 2** displays spectral power as a continuous spectrum (top), and averaged in canonical
11 frequency bands (middle), both averaged over all EEG channels, and as topographic maps
12 (bottom) during **(a)** eyes open and **(b)** eyes closed resting state.

13 Visual inspection shows that spatial distributions were similar between CON and NF1
14 in all frequency bands, but with greater magnitudes in NF1 relative to CON. Moreover,
15 greater magnitudes are seen during eyes closed relative to eyes open for delta, theta, and
16 alpha, whilst the opposite pattern is observed for low-gamma and high-gamma. The
17 difference in power between groups was significant for delta ($F_{(1,28)} = 7.135$, $p = .012$,
18 $\eta_p^2 = .203$) and theta ($F_{(1,28)} = 9.145$, $p = .005$, $\eta_p^2 = .246$), but non-significant for alpha, beta,
19 low-gamma, and high-gamma (**Table 4, Figure 2**).

20 There were significant main effects of condition for delta, theta, alpha, low-gamma,
21 and high-gamma, where power was significantly higher during eyes closed relative to eyes
22 open for delta, theta, and alpha, but power was significantly higher during eyes open relative
23 to eyes closed for low-gamma and high-gamma. The absence of significant group x

⁷ These findings remained the same when the analyses were run on the sample eligible for inclusion (see Section 2.4) in the resting state (N=30), task-related (N=31), and task-specific analyses (N=29) reported the current paper (**Additional file 1**).

1 condition interactions in these frequency bands suggests that modulation of amplitude of the
2 oscillations did not differ between groups. Planned paired *t*-tests to examine oscillatory
3 reactivity in the NF1 group showed that power was significantly higher during eyes closed
4 relative to eyes open for delta ($t_{(13)} = 5.004, p < .001, d = 1.34$), theta ($t_{(13)} = 4.296, p = .001,$
5 $d = 1.15$), and alpha ($t_{(13)} = 5.291, p < .001, d = 1.41$), whilst power was significantly higher
6 during eyes open relative to eyes closed for low-gamma ($t_{(13)} = 4.457, p = .001, d = 1.17$) and
7 high-gamma ($t_{(13)} = 4.204, p = .001, d = 1.12$). There was no significant difference in power
8 between eyes open and eyes closed for beta ($t_{(13)} = 0.285, p = .780, d = 0.08$).

9
10 **[INSERT FIGURE 2]**

11 12 **3.3 Peak alpha frequency: lower PAF in NF1**

13 **Figure 3** illustrates the alpha range of grand average **(a)** eyes open and **(b)** eyes closed
14 resting state after adjustment to reduce 1/*f* noise and the application of Gaussian smoothing.
15 There was a significant difference in PAF between groups ($F_{(1,28)} = 12.276, p = .002,$
16 $\eta_p^2 = .305$), whereby compared to CON, NF1 showed a lower PAF **(Table 4)**. There was no
17 main effect of condition, and no group x condition interaction.

18
19 **[INSERT FIGURE 3]**

20 21 22 **3.4 Task-related power: no group difference in task-specific power**

23 **Figure 4** displays *unadjusted* spectral power as a continuous spectrum (top), and averaged
24 in canonical frequency bands (middle), both averaged over all EEG channels, and as
25 topographic maps (bottom) during **(a)** 1-back and **(b)** 2-back load levels.

26 Visual inspection shows that spatial distributions were similar between CON and NF1
27 in all frequency bands, but with greater magnitudes in NF1 relative to CON. This group
28 difference in *unadjusted* spectral power was marginally significant for theta only ($F_{(1,29)} =$

1 4.092, $p=.052$, $\eta_p^2=.124$) (*unadjusted* power analyses are reported in **Additional file 2**). To
2 investigate task-specific modulation we used task-related power adjusted for resting state
3 eyes open power. Note, conclusions cannot be drawn about the absolute value of this
4 difference (i.e., whether task-related is higher or lower than resting state activity) in the
5 absence of a pre-stimulus baseline period in the n-back task. The 2 (CON/NF1) x 2 (1-/2-
6 back) ANOVA⁸ showed no significant main effects or interactions in any frequency band
7 **(Table 4)**. Thus, the marginal task-related difference in theta power disappeared when
8 accounting for resting state theta power.

9 In line with the scalp-averaged *unadjusted* power, mid-frontal *unadjusted* theta power
10 was numerically higher in NF1 than CON **(Figure 5)**⁹, though this group difference was non-
11 significant ($F_{(1,29)} = 2.850$, $p=.102$, $\eta_p^2=.089$) **(Additional file 2)**. Similarly, the 2 (CON/NF1) x
12 2 (1-/2-back) ANOVA using task-specific (*adjusted*) theta power showed no significant main
13 effects or interactions **(Table 4)**.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

⁸ One extreme outlier was identified in the NF1 group (beta 2-back) from inspection of Box and Whisker plots. After removing this participant from the beta ANOVA, the findings stayed the same (i.e., no significant main effects or interactions).

⁹ Resting state mid-frontal theta power descriptive and inferential statistics are reported in **Additional file 3**.

1 **Table 4.** Power and PAF: descriptive and inferential statistics.

	Eyes open/1-back						Eyes closed/2-back						ANOVA					
	CON		NF1		CON		NF1		Group		Condition/load		Group x Condition/load					
	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD	F	p	η ²	F	p	η ²				
Resting state																		
Delta	0.44±0.38	0.82±0.48	0.58±0.43	1.08±0.52	0.58±0.43	1.08±0.52	0.58±0.43	1.08±0.52	7.135	.012*	.203	38.371	<.001***	.578	3.299	.080	.105	
Theta	-0.67±0.39	-0.14±0.65	-0.38±0.47	0.35±0.82	-0.38±0.47	0.35±0.82	-0.38±0.47	0.35±0.82	9.145	.005**	.246	46.213	<.001***	.623	2.853	.102	.092	
Alpha	-0.93±0.73	-0.43±0.78	0.24±0.92	0.47±0.95	0.24±0.92	0.47±0.95	0.24±0.92	0.47±0.95	1.609	.215	.054	96.219	<.001***	.775	1.663	.208	.056	
Beta	-2.34±0.45	-2.22±0.48	-2.27±0.52	-2.24±0.55	-2.27±0.52	-2.24±0.55	-2.27±0.52	-2.24±0.55	0.188	.668	.007	0.266	.610	.009	0.954	.337	.033	
Low gamma	-3.77±0.44	-3.51±0.61	-4.16±0.37	-4.01±0.60	-4.16±0.37	-4.01±0.60	-4.16±0.37	-4.01±0.60	1.457	.238	.049	44.477	<.001***	.614	0.630	.434	.022	
High gamma	-4.93±0.55	-4.48±0.84	-5.50±0.45	-5.15±0.76	-5.50±0.45	-5.15±0.76	-5.50±0.45	-5.15±0.76	3.340	.078	.107	43.575	<.001***	.609	0.286	.597	.010	
PAF (Pz)	10.06±1.15	8.64±1.10	9.95±0.87	8.95±1.14	9.95±0.87	8.95±1.14	9.95±0.87	8.95±1.14	12.276	.002**	.305	0.290	.594	.010	1.313	.261	.045	
Task-specific (adjusted)																		
Delta	0.07±0.19	-0.05±0.28	0.15±0.29	-0.01±0.22	0.15±0.29	-0.01±0.22	0.15±0.29	-0.01±0.22	2.667	.114	.090	1.767	.195	.061	0.215	.646	.008	
Theta	0.04±0.20	-0.05±0.33	0.09±0.20	-0.04±0.35	0.09±0.20	-0.04±0.35	0.09±0.20	-0.04±0.35	1.374	.251	.048	0.660	.424	.024	0.168	.685	.006	
Alpha	0.00±0.33	-0.06±0.46	0.06±0.34	-0.06±0.52	0.06±0.34	-0.06±0.52	0.06±0.34	-0.06±0.52	0.398	.533	.015	0.770	.388	.028	0.508	.482	.018	
Beta	0.01±0.24	-0.04±0.19	0.09±0.26	-0.04±0.21	0.09±0.26	-0.04±0.21	0.09±0.26	-0.04±0.21	1.252	.273	.044	3.410	.076	.112	2.969	.096	.099	
Low gamma	-0.67±0.32	-0.12±0.38	0.01±0.38	-0.09±0.31	0.01±0.38	-0.09±0.31	0.01±0.38	-0.09±0.31	0.396	.535	.014	1.976	.172	.068	0.484	.492	.018	
High gamma	-0.44±0.41	-0.14±0.50	0.08±0.47	-0.14±0.45	0.08±0.47	-0.14±0.45	0.08±0.47	-0.14±0.45	0.951	.338	.034	0.990	.329	.035	1.301	.264	.046	
Mid-frontal theta (Fz/F1/F2)	0.03±0.33	-0.10±0.39	0.10±0.27	0.04±0.48	0.10±0.27	0.04±0.48	0.10±0.27	0.04±0.48	0.598	.446	.022	2.505	.125	.085	0.317	.578	.012	

2
3 Abbreviations: M: mean, SD: standard deviation. ***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05. Power is averaged over
4 all EEG electrodes unless otherwise specified. Note: the degrees of freedom for resting state (1,28)
5 and task-specific (1,27) analyses are different due to the different number of participants included in
6 each analysis.

1 [INSERT FIGURE 4]

2
3 [INSERT FIGURE 5]

4
5 **3.5 Theta phase coherence: no group difference in task-specific phase coherence**

6 Visual inspection of **Figure 6** shows that *unadjusted* frontoparietal theta phase coherence
7 was numerically higher in NF1 relative to CON in all regions of the frontoparietal network
8 during **(a)** 1-back and **(b)** 2-back loads. This group difference in *unadjusted* theta phase
9 coherence was significantly different ($F_{(1,29)} = 4.852$, $p=.036$, $\eta_p^2=.143$) (**Additional file 2**).
10 However, the 2 (CON/NF1) x 3 (ML/MM/MR) x 2 (1-/2-back) ANOVA¹⁰ using task-specific
11 (*adjusted*) theta phase coherence showed no significant main effects or interactions
12 involving the factor 'group' (**Table 5**)¹¹. Again, conclusions cannot be drawn about the
13 absolute value of this difference (i.e., whether task-related is higher or lower than resting
14 state activity) in the absence of a pre-stimulus baseline period in the n-back task. Although
15 not of primary interest, there was a significant region x load interaction ($F_{(2,54)} = 5.023$,
16 $p=.010$, $\eta_p^2=.157$). There were no other significant main effects or interactions.

17
18 [INSERT FIGURE 6]

19
20
21
22
23
24

¹⁰ Two extreme outliers were identified in the NF1 group (ML 2-back) from inspection of Box and Whisker plots. After removing these outliers, the findings remained the same (i.e., a significant region x load interaction but no other significant main effects or interactions).

¹¹ Resting state theta phase coherence descriptive and inferential statistics are reported in **Additional file 3**.

1 **Table 5.** Theta phase coherence (*adjusted*): descriptive and inferential statistics.

Descriptive statistics				
Region	Load	Group	M±SD	
Mid-frontal – left-parietal (ML)	1-back	CON	-0.014±0.028	
		NF1	-0.020±0.041	
	2-back	CON	-0.003±0.032	
		NF1	-0.014±0.055	
Mid-frontal – mid-parietal (MM)	1-back	CON	-0.003±0.023	
		NF1	0.006±0.049	
	2-back	CON	-0.003±0.034	
		NF1	-0.005±0.035	
Mid-frontal – right-parietal (MR)	1-back	CON	-0.022±0.026	
		NF1	-0.131±0.021	
	2-back	CON	-0.120±0.032	
		NF1	-0.003±0.042	
ANOVA		$F_{(1,27)/(2,54)}$	p	η_p^2
Group		0.028	.868	.001
Region		1.376	.261	.048
Load		1.505	.231	.053
Group x region		0.656	.523	.024
Group x load		0.580	.453	.021
Region x load		5.023	.010*	.157
Group x region x load		0.503	.608	.018

2 *Abbreviations: M: mean, SD: standard deviation. *p<.05. Degrees of freedom: (1,27), (2,54).*

3

4 **3.6 Correlations between EEG measures and age/cognitive measures**

5 Exploratory Pearson's correlations were run separately for each group to relate individual
6 differences in EEG oscillatory measures with age, overall cognitive function (ABC as a proxy
7 for IQ), and working memory performance (adaptive auditory n-back) (**Table 6, see**
8 **Additional file 4 for scatterplots**). Correlations were run only for EEG measures that
9 showed a significant group difference in the analyses reported above (i.e., delta and theta
10 resting state power and PAF). For correlations with resting state power, as there was a
11 significant main effect of condition for the delta and theta bands, correlations were run
12 separately for eyes open and eyes closed power. There was no significant main effect of
13 condition for PAF, so PAF was averaged over eyes open/closed prior to running
14 correlations.

1 For CON, four negative age-power correlations survived FDR correction: eyes open
2 delta ($r=-.600$, $p=.014$), eyes closed delta ($r=-.705$, $p=.002$), eyes open theta ($r=-.547$,
3 $p=.028$), and eyes closed theta ($r=-.674$, $p=.004$). The same correlations for NF1 were non-
4 significant and group differences in these correlations were non-significant. Moreover, age
5 showed a positive correlation with PAF for CON ($r=.736$, $p=.001$, survived FDR correction).
6 The same correlation for NF1 was non-significant ($r=-.241$, $p=.407$) and the group difference
7 in these correlations was significant ($z=4.238$, $p<.001$, survived FDR correction). Finally,
8 there were no significant correlations between any of the EEG measures and overall
9 cognitive function (ABC) or working memory performance.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

1 **Table 6.** Correlations between EEG measures and age, Vineland ABC (proxy for IQ), and working
 2 memory.

Demographic/ cognitive measure	Group	Resting state					
		Delta power		Theta power		PAF	
		Open	Closed	Open	Closed	Open/closed	PAF
Age (years)	CON (<i>r, p</i>)	-.600 (.014)*	-.705 (.002)*	-.547 (.028)*	-.674 (.004)*	.736 (.001)*	
	NF1 (<i>r, p</i>)	-.420 (.134)	-.341 (.233)	-.276 (.339)	-.108 (.714)	-.241 (.407)	
Vineland ABC (IQ)	CON vs. NF1 (<i>z, p</i>)	-.345 (.730)	-.745 (.456)	-.0474 (.635)	-.1.041 (.298)	4.238 (<.001)*	
	CON (<i>r, p</i>)	-.243 (.364)	-.256 (.339)	-.085 (.756)	-.205 (.445)	.127 (.639)	
Auditory n-back (working memory)	NF1 (<i>r, p</i>)	-.066 (.831)	-.040 (.897)	.144 (.638)	.082 (.790)	.149 (.627)	
	CON vs. NF1 (<i>z, p</i>)	-.0.432 (.666)	-.0.354 (.724)	-.0.431 (.666)	-.0.498 (.618)	-.0.048 (.961)	
	CON (<i>r, p</i>)	-.265 (.322)	-.220 (.414)	-.197 (.464)	-.159 (.557)	.474 (.063)	
	NF1 (<i>r, p</i>)	-.208 (.476)	-.156 (.593)	-.328 (.252)	-.245 (.399)	-.088 (.764)	
	CON vs. NF1 (<i>z, p</i>)	-.0.092 (.926)	-.0.103 (.918)	0.213 (.831)	0.140 (.888)	1.505 (.132)	

3
 4 Power is scalp-averaged over all EEG channels. PAF is measured at channel Pz. Values are
 5 Pearson's *r* with *p*-values in brackets. * Significant ($p < .05$) correlation or difference between
 6 correlations that survives FDR correction.

1 **4. Discussion**

2 This study investigated oscillatory activity during both rest and performance of a working
3 memory task in an adolescent sample with NF1 and age/sex-matched typically-developing
4 controls. Relative to controls, NF1 showed higher resting state delta and theta power, and
5 these differences were not modulated by eyes open/closed condition (no group x condition
6 interactions were found). Resting state delta and theta power showed significant negative
7 correlations with age in controls, but not in NF1. NF1 also showed lower PAF than controls,
8 and the positive age-PAF correlation found in controls was not present in NF1 (and these
9 correlations differed significantly between groups). In the working memory task, a marginal
10 group difference in theta power was observed, but this effect disappeared when controlling
11 for baseline (resting state) activity. Similarly, the significant group difference in frontoparietal
12 theta phase coherence disappeared when values were adjusted for baseline (resting state).
13 Together, these findings suggest that NF1 is characterised by aberrant resting state
14 oscillatory activity and highlight the importance of accounting for resting state (baseline)
15 differences when drawing conclusions about task-related differences in oscillatory activity
16 between groups.

17 18 **4.1 Resting state power**

19 Resting state delta and theta power were significantly higher in NF1 than in typically-
20 developing controls, in line with our hypothesis. This finding is consistent with, and builds on,
21 previous reports in the NF1 cohort [17] and in other neurodevelopmental disorders [32]. For
22 instance, Ribeiro et al. (2014) observed significantly higher theta power and a non-significant
23 trend towards higher delta power in the NF1 cohort. Moreover, a review by Newson and
24 Thiagarajan [32] of behaviourally-relevant frequency bands during resting state EEG in
25 psychiatric disorders, including ADHD, reported that one of the most dominant abnormalities
26 is increased power in slower frequencies.

27 Although the mechanisms underlying abnormally high slow wave activity in NF1 are
28 not understood [17], previous studies using animal models of disrupted myelination have

1 demonstrated that loss of myelin is associated with an increase in slow wave theta power
2 [59]. The well-documented white matter microstructure abnormalities and myelin deficits in
3 NF1 [60,61] could therefore account for the high slow wave resting state oscillatory activity
4 observed in the current study.

5 Consistent with our prediction, direct tests of oscillatory power reactivity in the NF1
6 group showed that resting state power was significantly higher during eyes closed relative to
7 eyes open in the delta, theta, and alpha bands, whilst the opposite pattern was observed in
8 the gamma band. This demonstrates that resting state power reactivity follows the typical
9 pattern observed in neurotypical populations [34] and builds on previous indirect suggestion
10 (i.e., a non-significant group x condition interaction) reported in Ribeiro et al. [17].

11 Finally, delta and theta power showed significant negative correlations with age in
12 typically-developing controls, consistent with existing literature showing that increasing age
13 is associated with a reduction in slow wave resting state power throughout development
14 [62,63]. The same correlations were non-significant for NF1, though there were no
15 significant differences in correlations between groups. However, the relatively small sample
16 size limits our ability to draw definitive conclusions about whether the relationship between
17 age and oscillatory power is atypical in NF1.

18

19 **4.2 Peak alpha frequency**

20 PAF was significantly lower in the NF1 group relative to typically-developing controls. This
21 builds on a non-significant trend towards a lower PAF observed in one previous study in NF1
22 [17] and is consistent with investigations of PAF in other neurodevelopmental disorders
23 [55,64]. PAF is thought to reflect an index of cognitive preparedness [65], attentional
24 processing [66], and memory ability [65,67]. Despite this, we did not observe a significant
25 correlation between PAF and working memory ability using performance on an auditory n-
26 back task in either the control or NF1 group. However, again, the relatively small sample
27 size was not optimal to address this, and it is possible that significant associations may be
28 found with a larger sample.

1 We observed a positive age-PAF correlation in typically-developing controls that was
2 not present in NF1, and these correlations differed significantly between groups, suggesting
3 that the relationship between PAF and age is disrupted in NF1. The age-PAF correlation in
4 the control group is in accordance with existing literature in typically-developing children,
5 where increased PAF is observed throughout childhood, stabilising at ~10Hz during late
6 adolescence/early adulthood [68]. This increase in PAF is thought to index neural network
7 maturation [69,70] that facilitates improved and efficient connectivity [63,71]. Moreover, the
8 absence of a significant PAF-age correlation in the NF1 group is consistent with previous
9 research in other neurodevelopmental disorders that has reported the absence of a
10 relationship between PAF and age [56]. It has been suggested that in neurodevelopmental
11 disorders in which overall cognitive function (i.e., IQ) is disrupted and does not reliably map
12 onto chronological age, PAF might instead be associated with IQ [56]. However, we were
13 unable to provide direct support for this suggestion as the correlation between PAF and
14 parent-rated functional ability measured by Vineland ABC was non-significant for NF1.
15 Future studies measuring PAF (and other oscillatory measures) should consider including
16 full-scale IQ testing using standardised measures and a non-NF1 developmentally delayed
17 control group to disentangle generic effects of developmental delay and condition specific
18 effects.

19

20 **4.3 Task-related power and coherence**

21 Task-related (*unadjusted*) theta power was significantly higher in the NF1 group relative to
22 typically-developing controls, but this effect disappeared when controlling for baseline
23 (resting state) activity. Likewise, the significant group difference in frontoparietal theta phase
24 coherence (NF1>CON) disappeared when values were adjusted for baseline (resting state).
25 The absence of a group difference in task-specific power and theta phase coherence may
26 suggest that the NF1 population have a generally high level of oscillatory activity, particularly
27 in low frequencies, which might explain the absence of a difference in task-specific

1 modulation. These findings are inconsistent with our hypothesis that predicted aberrant WM-
2 related theta power and phase coherence relative to controls based on existing research in
3 other neurodevelopmental disorders [27,28,31,72]. However, this dissimilarity to
4 observations in other neurodevelopmental disorders is not entirely surprising as, although
5 neurodevelopmental disorders often exhibit overlapping cognitive impairments (i.e., strong
6 clinical similarities), the underlying neurophysiology of these impairments is not always the
7 same [14]. In sum, the current study suggests that task-related oscillatory activity might not
8 be a useful EEG marker of working memory impairment in NF1. Instead, a better EEG
9 marker of working memory impairment in NF1 might be the ERP P3b component, which has
10 been found to differ in latency and topographic distribution in NF1 relative to typically-
11 developing controls [16].

12

13 **4.4 Comorbid ADHD**

14 Individuals with comorbid NF1 and ADHD exhibit a more severe cognitive deficit than
15 individuals with NF1 but without ADHD [73]. Therefore, in line with Ribeiro et al. [17], we ran
16 sensitivity analyses (**Additional file 5**) to determine whether the significant group
17 differences observed remained after removing participants with comorbid ADHD. Four of the
18 sixteen participants in the NF1 group had an ADHD diagnosis, reducing the NF1 group size
19 to 12. Following sensitivity analyses, the significant group difference in resting state theta
20 power ($p=.012$) and PAF ($p=.005$) remained. However, the group difference in resting state
21 delta power was only marginally significant ($p=.066$). Though, these sensitivity analyses
22 should be interpreted with caution owing to the reduced, and subsequently small, group size
23 and should act as a starting point for future studies using larger samples [17]. Like Ribeiro et
24 al. [17] we were unable to compare individuals with comorbid ADHD and NF1 to controls
25 due to the very small number ($n=4$) of participants with this comorbidity. Thus, future studies
26 comparing these populations would facilitate an understanding of whether this comorbidity
27 results in a different EEG profile to the one we found.

28

1 **4.5 Strengths, limitations, and future directions**

2 This study has informed the characterisation of NF1 and potential targets (e.g., abnormally
3 high slow wave power) for (non-) pharmacological interventions targeting NF1. However, this
4 contribution must be considered in light of several limitations. Our sample size was
5 comparable to existing neuroimaging studies using NF1 samples [13,14,15,17,18]; however,
6 post-hoc power analysis of Ribeiro et al.'s [17] resting state theta effect suggests that slightly
7 larger sample sizes would be needed to achieve adequate statistical power (effect size of
8 $d=0.89$, one-tailed t-test, 80% power requires $n=17$ per group calculated using G*Power
9 [74]). Further, we were likely underpowered for the examination of associations between
10 oscillatory features and age/cognitive measures. Future studies with larger sample sizes
11 would help to draw more definitive conclusions regarding individual differences in oscillatory
12 abnormalities in NF1. A second limitation of this study is that, whilst we investigated group
13 differences in single frequency bands, it may be beneficial to examine the relationships
14 between different frequency bands during working memory performance to further
15 understand the basis of working memory deficits in NF1. For instance, theta-gamma phase-
16 amplitude coupling is a neural marker associated with working memory performance [20]
17 and has provided a neural marker of poor working memory in other clinical disorders (e.g.,
18 schizophrenia, Alzheimer's Disease, and Mild Cognitive Impairment [75,76]).

19 **5. Conclusions**

20 This study investigated oscillatory activity both at rest and during performance of a working
21 memory task. We found that adolescents with NF1 display aberrant oscillatory activity
22 relative to typically-developing controls during rest. Specifically, NF1 is characterised by
23 excessive resting state oscillatory activity, particularly at lower frequencies, and a lower peak
24 alpha frequency. Moreover, we found that apparent group differences in working memory
25 task-related oscillatory power and frontoparietal coherence disappeared when accounting for
26 baseline levels from resting state. These findings provide insights that can inform the

1 characterisation of NF1, as well as the design of (non-) pharmacological interventions
2 targeting NF1, and also highlight important avenues for future research.

3 **6. Abbreviations**

4 **ADHD:** Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder

5 **ASD:** Autism spectrum disorder

6 **CON:** Control

7 **EEG:** Electroencephalography

8 **ERP:** Event-Related Potential

9 **fMRI:** Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging

10 **ICA:** Independent Components Analysis

11 **IQ:** Intelligence Quotient

12 **ISPC:** Inter-site phase clustering

13 **M:** Mean

14 **ML:** Mid-frontal – left-parietal

15 **MM:** Mid-frontal – mid-parietal

16 **MR:** Mid-frontal – right-parietal

17 **NF1:** Neurofibromatosis Type 1

18 **PAF:** Peak alpha frequency

19 **SD:** Standard deviation

20 **VABS-II:** Vineland Adaptive Behaviour Scale

21 **Vineland ABC:** Vineland Adaptive Behaviour Composite

22 **7. Declarations**

23 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

24 This study received ethical approval from the Greater Manchester West Research Ethics
25 Committee (17/NW/0364) and was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.
26 Parents/guardians gave oral and written consent, and adolescents assent (where
27 developmentally appropriate), prior to participation.

1 **Consent for publication**

2 Not applicable.

3

4 **Availability of data and materials**

5 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the
6 corresponding author on reasonable request.

7

8 **Competing interests**

9 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

10

11 **Funding**

12 Data collection was funded by the Newlife Charity for Disabled Children. The analysis and
13 write-up was conducted as part of a PhD funded by the Economic and Social Research
14 Council (ESRC), awarded to Miss Samantha Booth. The funders had no role in the study
15 design, data collection, data analysis, statistical analysis, interpretation of the data, writing of
16 the paper, or decision regarding when to submit the publication.

17

18 **Authors' contributions**

19 SB, SG, JG, GP, and JT conceptualised and designed the study. SG was responsible for
20 participant recruitment. SG, GP, and JT were responsible for data collection. SB analysed
21 the data and wrote the original manuscript draft. SB, SG, LB, GP, and JT contributed
22 towards interpretation of the data. All authors contributed towards reviewing and editing the
23 manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

24

25 **Acknowledgements**

26 We would like to thank the participants and their families for their participation, and Emily
27 Pye, JeYoung Jung, and Hemavathy Ramalingham for their roles in data collection.

1 References

- 2 1. Evans DG, Howard E, Giblin C, Clancy T, Spencer H, Huson SM, Laloo F. Birth incidence and
3 prevalence of tumor-prone syndromes: estimates from a UK family genetic register service.
4 American journal of medical genetics Part A. 2010 Feb;152(2):327-32.
- 5 2. Gutmann DH, Ferner RE, Listerhick RH, Korf BR, Wolters PL, Johnson KJ. Neurofibromatosis
6 type 1. Nature Reviews Disease Primers. 2017 Feb 23;3(1):1-7.
- 7 3. Garg S, Lehtonen A, Huson SM, Emsley R, Trump D, Evans DG, Green J. Autism and other
8 psychiatric comorbidity in neurofibromatosis type 1: Evidence from a population-based study.
9 Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology. 2013 Feb;55(2):139-45.
- 10 4. Beaussart ML, Barbarot S, Mauger C, Roy A. Systematic review and meta-analysis of executive
11 functions in preschool and school-age children with neurofibromatosis type 1. Journal of the
12 International Neuropsychological Society. 2018 Oct;24(9):977-94.
- 13 5. Crow AJ, Janssen JM, Marshall C, Moffit A, Brennan L, Kohler CG, Roalf DR, Moberg PJ. A
14 systematic review and meta-analysis of intellectual, neuropsychological, and psychoeducational
15 functioning in neurofibromatosis type 1. American Journal of Medical Genetics Part A. 2022 May
16 12.
- 17 6. Hyman SL, Shores A, North KN. The nature and frequency of cognitive deficits in children with
18 neurofibromatosis type 1. Neurology. 2005 Oct 11;65(7):1037-44.
- 19 7. Baudou E, Nemmi F, Biotteau M, Maziero S, Peran P, Chaix Y. Can the cognitive phenotype in
20 neurofibromatosis type 1 (NF1) be explained by neuroimaging? A review. Frontiers in Neurology.
21 2020 Jan 14;10:1373.
- 22 8. Krawinkel LA, Engel AK, Hummel FC. Modulating pathological oscillations by rhythmic non-
23 invasive brain stimulation—a therapeutic concept?. Frontiers in systems neuroscience. 2015 Mar
24 17;9:33.
- 25 9. Heinrich H, Busch K, Studer P, Erbe K, Moll GH, Kratz O. EEG spectral analysis of attention in
26 ADHD: implications for neurofeedback training?. Frontiers in human neuroscience. 2014 Aug
27 21;8:611.
- 28 10. Baudou E, Nemmi F, Biotteau M, Maziero S, Peran P, Chaix Y. Can the cognitive phenotype in
29 neurofibromatosis type 1 (NF1) be explained by neuroimaging? A review. Frontiers in Neurology.
30 2020 Jan 14;10:1373.

- 1 11. Loitfelder M, Huijbregts SC, Veer IM, Swaab HS, Van Buchem MA, Schmidt R, Rombouts SA.
2 Functional connectivity changes and executive and social problems in neurofibromatosis type I.
3 Brain connectivity. 2015 Jun 1;5(5):312-20.
- 4 12. Ibrahim AF, Montojo CA, Haut KM, Karlsgodt KH, Hansen L, Congdon E, Rosser T, Bilder RM,
5 Silva AJ, Bearden CE. Spatial working memory in neurofibromatosis 1: Altered neural activity and
6 functional connectivity. NeuroImage: Clinical. 2017 Jan 1;15:801-11.
- 7 13. Shilyansky C, Karlsgodt KH, Cummings DM, Sidiropoulou K, Hardt M, James AS, Ehninger D,
8 Bearden CE, Poirazi P, Jentsch JD, Cannon TD. Neurofibromin regulates corticostriatal inhibitory
9 networks during working memory performance. Proceedings of the National Academy of
10 Sciences. 2010 Jul 20;107(29):13141-6.
- 11 14. Bluschke A, von der Hagen M, Papenhagen K, Roessner V, Beste C. Response inhibition in
12 Attention deficit disorder and neurofibromatosis type 1—clinically similar, neurophysiologically
13 different. Scientific Reports. 2017 Mar 6;7(1):1-8.
- 14 15. Bluschke A, von der Hagen M, Papenhagen K, Roessner V, Beste C. Conflict processing in
15 juvenile patients with neurofibromatosis type 1 (NF1) and healthy controls—Two pathways to
16 success. NeuroImage: Clinical. 2017 Jan 1;14:499-505.
- 17 16. Pobric G, Taylor JR, Ramalingam HM, Pye E, Robinson L, Vassallo G, Jung J, Bhandary M,
18 Szumanska-Ryt K, Theodosiou L, Evans DG. Cognitive and electrophysiological correlates of
19 working memory impairments in neurofibromatosis type 1. Journal of autism and developmental
20 disorders. 2022 Apr;52(4):1478-94.
- 21 17. Ribeiro MJ, d'Almeida OC, Ramos F, Saraiva J, Silva ED, Castelo-Branco M. Abnormal late
22 visual responses and alpha oscillations in neurofibromatosis type 1: a link to visual and attention
23 deficits. Journal of neurodevelopmental disorders. 2014 Dec;6(1):1-9.
- 24 18. Ribeiro MJ, Violante IR, Bernardino I, Edden RA, Castelo-Branco M. Abnormal relationship
25 between GABA, neurophysiology and impulsive behavior in neurofibromatosis type 1. Cortex.
26 2015 Mar 1;64:194-208.
- 27 19. Bastiaansen M, Mazaheri A, Jensen O. Beyond ERPs. In The Oxford Handbook of Event-Related
28 Potential Components 2011.
- 29 20. Lisman JE, Jensen O. The theta-gamma neural code. Neuron. 2013 Mar 20;77(6):1002-16.

- 1 21. Roux F, Uhlhaas PJ. Working memory and neural oscillations: alpha–gamma versus theta–
2 gamma codes for distinct WM information?. *Trends in cognitive sciences*. 2014 Jan 1;18(1):16-25.
- 3 22. Fell J, Axmacher N. O papel da sincronização de fase nos processos de memória. *Nature*
4 *Reviews Neuroscience*. 2011;12(2):105-18.
- 5 23. Daume J, Gruber T, Engel AK, Frieze U. Phase-amplitude coupling and long-range phase
6 synchronization reveal frontotemporal interactions during visual working memory. *Journal of*
7 *Neuroscience*. 2017 Jan 11;37(2):313-22.
- 8 24. Sarnthein J, Petsche H, Rappelsberger P, Shaw GL, Von Stein A. Synchronization between
9 prefrontal and posterior association cortex during human working memory. *Proceedings of the*
10 *National Academy of Sciences*. 1998 Jun 9;95(12):7092-6.
- 11 25. Meyer M, Endedijk HM, Van Ede F, Hunnius S. Theta oscillations in 4-year-olds are sensitive to
12 task engagement and task demands. *Scientific reports*. 2019 Apr 15;9(1):1-1.
- 13 26. Michels L, Lüchinger R, Koenig T, Martin E, Brandeis D. Developmental changes of BOLD signal
14 correlations with global human EEG power and synchronization during working memory. *PLoS*
15 *One*. 2012 Jul 6;7(7):e39447.
- 16 27. Missonnier P, Hasler R, Perroud N, Herrmann FR, Millet P, Richiardi J, Malafosse A,
17 Giannakopoulos P, Baud P. EEG anomalies in adult ADHD subjects performing a working
18 memory task. *Neuroscience*. 2013 Jun 25;241:135-46.
- 19 28. Jang KM, Kim MS, Kim DW. The dynamic properties of a brain network during spatial working
20 memory tasks in college students with ADHD traits. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*. 2020 Sep
21 7;14:580813.
- 22 29. Lenartowicz A, Delorme A, Walshaw PD, Cho AL, Bilder RM, McGough JJ, McCracken JT,
23 Makeig S, Loo SK. Electroencephalography correlates of spatial working memory deficits in
24 attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: vigilance, encoding, and maintenance. *Journal of*
25 *Neuroscience*. 2014 Jan 22;34(4):1171-82.
- 26 30. Martínez-Briones BJ, Fernández-Harmony T, Garófalo Gómez N, Biscay-Lirio RJ, Bosch-Bayard
27 J. Working memory in children with learning disorders: An EEG power spectrum analysis. *Brain*
28 *Sciences*. 2020 Nov 4;10(11):817.
- 29 31. Yuk V, Urbain C, Anagnostou E, Taylor MJ. Frontoparietal network connectivity during an n-back
30 task in adults with autism spectrum disorder. *Frontiers in psychiatry*. 2020 Sep 9;11:551808.

- 1 32. Newson JJ, Thiagarajan TC. EEG Frequency Bands in Psychiatric Disorders: A Review of
2 Resting State Studies. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2018; 12: 521. Epub 2019/01/29. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00521> PMID: 30687041.
- 3
4 33. Silva G, Ribeiro MJ, Costa GN, Violante I, Ramos F, Saraiva J, Castelo-Branco M. Peripheral
5 attentional targets under covert attention lead to paradoxically enhanced alpha desynchronization
6 in neurofibromatosis type 1. *PLoS One.* 2016 Feb 16;11(2):e0148600.
- 7 34. Geller AS, Burke JF, Sperling MR, Sharan AD, Litt B, Baltuch GH, Lucas II TH, Kahana MJ. Eye
8 closure causes widespread low-frequency power increase and focal gamma attenuation in the
9 human electrocorticogram. *Clinical Neurophysiology.* 2014 Sep 1;125(9):1764-73.
- 10 35. Rawley JB, Constantinidis C. Neural correlates of learning and working memory in the primate
11 posterior parietal cortex. *Neurobiology of learning and memory.* 2009 Feb 1;91(2):129-38.
- 12 36. Kane MJ, Engle RW. The role of prefrontal cortex in working-memory capacity, executive
13 attention, and general fluid intelligence: An individual-differences perspective. *Psychonomic*
14 *bulletin & review.* 2002 Dec;9(4):637-71.
- 15 37. Neurofibromatosis NI. Conference statement. National Institutes of Health consensus
16 development conference. *Arch Neurol.* 1988 May;45(5):575-8.
- 17 38. Hill, T.L., C.A. Saulnier, D. Cicchetti, S.A.O. Gray, A.S. Carter. Vineland III. In: Volkmar, F.R. (ed)
18 *Encyclopaedia of Autism Spectrum Disorders.* New York, NY: Springer New York. p.1-4. 2017.
- 19 39. Jensen O, Tesche CD. Frontal theta activity in humans increases with memory load in a working
20 memory task. *European journal of Neuroscience.* 2002 Apr;15(8):1395-9.
- 21 40. Litvak V, Mattout J, Kiebel S, Phillips C, Henson R, Kilner J, Barnes G, Oostenveld R, Daunizeau
22 J, Flandin G, Penny W. EEG and MEG data analysis in SPM8. *Computational intelligence and*
23 *neuroscience.* 2011 Oct;2011.
- 24 41. Taylor, JR. Github. <https://www.github.com/jason-taylor>. Accessed 16 August 2022.
- 25 42. Cohen, MX. Tutorial neural time series analysis.
26 https://github.com/AndreiZn/Tutorial_neural_time_series_analysis. Accessed 16 August 2022.
- 27 43. Delorme A, Makeig S. EEGLAB: Una caja de herramientas de código abierto para el análisis de
28 la dinámica de EEG de un solo ensayo, incluido el análisis de componentes independientes. *J.*
29 *Neurosci. Métodos.* 2004;134:9-21.

- 1 44. Oostenveld R, Fries P, Maris E, Schoffelen JM. FieldTrip: open source software for advanced
2 analysis of MEG, EEG, and invasive electrophysiological data. Computational intelligence and
3 neuroscience. 2011 Oct;2011.
- 4 45. Montefusco-Siegmund R, Maldonado PE, Devia C. Effects of ocular artifact removal through ICA
5 decomposition on EEG phase. In 2013 6th International IEEE/EMBS Conference on Neural
6 Engineering (NER) 2013 Nov 6 (pp. 1374-1377). IEEE.
- 7 46. Gudi-Mindermann H, Rimmele JM, Nolte G, Bruns P, Engel AK, Röder B. Working memory
8 training in congenitally blind individuals results in an integration of occipital cortex in functional
9 networks. Behavioural brain research. 2018 Aug 1;348:31-41.
- 10 47. Wang J, Barstein J, Ethridge LE, Mosconi MW, Takarae Y, Sweeney JA. Resting state EEG
11 abnormalities in autism spectrum disorders. Journal of neurodevelopmental disorders. 2013
12 Dec;5(1):1-4.
- 13 48. Valipour S, Shaligram AD, Kulkarni GR. Detection of an alpha rhythm of EEG signal based on
14 EEGLAB. Int J Eng Res Appl. 2014 Jan;4(1):154-9.
- 15 49. Voss, R. P. '1/f noise' In music and speech.
16 <https://escholarship.org/content/qt04t64495/qt04t64495.pdf>. 1975. Accessed 16 August 2022.
- 17 50. Cohen, MX. Laplacian Perrin.
18 https://github.com/mikexcohen/AnalyzingNeuralTimeSeries/blob/main/laplacian_perrinX.m.
19 Accessed 16 August 2022.
- 20 51. Srinivasan R, Winter WR, Ding J, Nunez PL. EEG and MEG coherence: measures of functional
21 connectivity at distinct spatial scales of neocortical dynamics. Journal of neuroscience methods.
22 2007 Oct 15;166(1):41-52.
- 23 52. Anguera JA, Boccanfuso J, Rintoul JL, Al-Hashimi O, Faraji F, Janowich J, Kong E, Larraburo Y, Rolle
24 C, Johnston E, Gazzaley A. Video game training enhances cognitive control in older adults. Nature.
25 2013;501(7465):97.
- 26 53. Cohen MX. Analyzing neural time series data: theory and practice. MIT press; 2014 Jan 17.
- 27 54. IBM Corp. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp. 2017.
- 28 55. Pritchard WS. The brain in fractal time: 1/f-like power spectrum scaling of the human
29 electroencephalogram. International Journal of Neuroscience. 1992 Jan 1;66(1-2):119-29.

- 1 56. Dickinson A, DiStefano C, Senturk D, Jeste SS. Peak alpha frequency is a neural marker of
2 cognitive function across the autism spectrum. *European Journal of Neuroscience*. 2018
3 Mar;47(6):643-51.
- 4 57. Levine TM, Materek A, Abel J, O'Donnell M, Cutting LE. Cognitive profile of neurofibromatosis
5 type 1. In *Seminars in pediatric neurology* 2006 Mar 1 (Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 8-20). WB Saunders.
- 6 58. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach
7 to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)*. 1995
8 Jan;57(1):289-300.
- 9 59. Dubey M, Pascual-Garcia M, Helmes K, Wever DD, Hamada MS, Kushner SA, Kole MH.
10 Myelination synchronizes cortical oscillations by consolidating parvalbumin-mediated phasic
11 inhibition. *Elife*. 2022;11.
- 12 60. Asleh J, Shofty B, Cohen N, Kavushansky A, López-Juárez A, Constantini S, Ratner N, Kahn I.
13 Brain-wide structural and functional disruption in mice with oligodendrocyte-specific Nf1 deletion
14 is rescued by inhibition of nitric oxide synthase. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
15 *Sciences*. 2020 Sep 8;117(36):22506-13.
- 16 61. Karlsgodt KH, Rosser T, Lutkenhoff ES, Cannon TD, Silva A, Bearden CE. Alterations in white
17 matter microstructure in neurofibromatosis-1.
- 18 62. Gmehlin D, Thomas C, Weisbrod M, Walther S, Pfüller U, Resch F, Oelkers-Ax R. Individual
19 analysis of EEG background-activity within school age: impact of age and sex within a
20 longitudinal data set. *International Journal of Developmental Neuroscience*. 2011 Apr
21 1;29(2):163-70.
- 22 63. Segalowitz SJ, Santesso DL, Jetha MK. Electrophysiological changes during adolescence: a
23 review. *Brain and cognition*. 2010 Feb 1;72(1):86-100.
- 24 64. Lansbergen MM, Arns M, van Dongen-Boomsma M, Spronk D, Buitelaar JK. The increase in
25 theta/beta ratio on resting-state EEG in boys with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder is
26 mediated by slow alpha peak frequency. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological*
27 *Psychiatry*. 2011 Jan 15;35(1):47-52.
- 28 65. Angelakis E, Lubar JF, Stathopoulou S, Kounios J. Peak alpha frequency: an
29 electroencephalographic measure of cognitive preparedness. *Clinical Neurophysiology*. 2004 Apr
30 1;115(4):887-97.

- 1 66. Zhang Y, Lu Y, Wang D, Zhou C, Xu C. Relationship between individual alpha peak frequency
2 and attentional performance in a multiple object tracking task among ice-hockey players. *Plos*
3 *one*. 2021 May 27;16(5):e0251443.
- 4 67. Klimesch W, Schimke HA, Pfurtscheller G. Alpha frequency, cognitive load and memory
5 performance. *Brain topography*. 1993 Mar;5(3):241-51.
- 6 68. Marcuse LV, Schneider M, Mortati KA, Donnelly KM, Arnedo V, Grant AC. Quantitative analysis of
7 the EEG posterior-dominant rhythm in healthy adolescents. *Clinical neurophysiology*. 2008 Aug
8 1;119(8):1778-81.
- 9 69. Klimesch W, Sauseng P, Hanslmayr S. EEG alpha oscillations: the inhibition–timing hypothesis.
10 *Brain research reviews*. 2007 Jan 1;53(1):63-88.
- 11 70. Valdés-Hernández PA, Ojeda-González A, Martínez-Montes E, Lage-Castellanos A, Virués-Alba
12 T, Valdés-Urrutia L, Valdes-Sosa PA. White matter architecture rather than cortical surface area
13 correlates with the EEG alpha rhythm. *Neuroimage*. 2010 Feb 1;49(3):2328-39.
- 14 71. Rodriguez-Martinez EI, Barriga-Paulino CI, Rojas-Benjumea MA, Gómez CM. Spontaneous theta
15 rhythm and working memory co-variation during child development. *Neuroscience Letters*. 2013
16 Aug 29;550:134-8.
- 17 72. Martínez-Briones BJ, Fernández-Harmony T, Garófalo Gómez N, Biscay-Lirio RJ, Bosch-Bayard
18 J. Working memory in children with learning disorders: An EEG power spectrum analysis. *Brain*
19 *Sciences*. 2020 Nov 4;10(11):817.
- 20 73. Lidzba K, Granström S, Lindenau J, Mautner VF. The adverse influence of attention-deficit
21 disorder with or without hyperactivity on cognition in neurofibromatosis type 1. *Developmental*
22 *Medicine & Child Neurology*. 2012 Oct;54(10):892-7.
- 23 74. G*Power. <http://www.gpower.hhu.de/>. Accessed 16 August 2022.
- 24 75. Barr MS, Rajji TK, Zomorodi R, Radhu N, George TP, Blumberger DM, Daskalakis ZJ. Impaired
25 theta-gamma coupling during working memory performance in schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia*
26 *research*. 2017 Nov 1;189:104-10.
- 27 76. Goodman MS, Kumar S, Zomorodi R, Ghazala Z, Cheam AS, Barr MS, Daskalakis ZJ,
28 Blumberger DM, Fischer C, Flint A, Mah L. Theta-gamma coupling and working memory in
29 Alzheimer’s dementia and mild cognitive impairment. *Frontiers in aging neuroscience*. 2018 Apr
30 16;10:101.

1 **Figure legends**

2 **Fig. 1. Graphical representation of the channels included in each region of interest.**

3 Grey lines indicate the 27 channel pairs that coherence was computed between. Black lines
4 represent coherence averaged over electrode sets (ML: mid-frontal to left-parietal; MM: mid-
5 frontal to mid-parietal; MR: mid-frontal to right-parietal).

6
7 **Fig. 2. Grand-averaged log-transformed spectral power during rest with (a) eyes open
8 and (b) eyes closed.** Spectral power is shown as a continuous spectrum (top) and

9 averaged in canonical frequency bands (middle), both averaged over all EEG channels, and
10 as topographic maps (bottom). (Abbreviations: δ : delta, 1-3Hz; θ : theta, 4-7Hz; α : alpha, 8-
11 11Hz; β : beta, 12-29Hz; (low) γ : low-gamma, 30-47Hz; (high) γ : high-gamma, 53-100Hz.

12 Box plots: crossbars represent the median, dots represent the mean, upper and lower
13 hinges correspond to the 1st and 3rd quartile, respectively, and whiskers represent the range
14 of the data. * and ^ significant main effect of group in the delta and theta bands, respectively,
15 collapsed over condition).

16
17 **Fig. 3. Grand-averaged 1/f-adjusted log-transformed spectral power during rest. (a)**

18 **Eyes open and (b) eyes closed.** (Grey dashed vertical lines at 6.5Hz and 13.5Hz represent
19 the boundaries of the loose alpha range for PAF determination; orange and green dashed
20 vertical lines represent the mean PAF for CON and NF1, respectively; * significant main
21 effect of group collapsed over condition).

22
23 **Fig. 4. Grand-averaged log-transformed spectral *unadjusted* power during (a) 1-back
24 and (b) 2-back loads.** Spectral power is shown as a continuous spectrum (top) and

25 averaged in canonical frequency bands (middle), both averaged over all EEG channels, and
26 as topographic maps (bottom). (Abbreviations: δ : delta, 1-3Hz; θ : theta, 4-7Hz; α : alpha, 8-
27 11Hz; β : beta, 12-29Hz; (low) γ : low-gamma, 30-47Hz; (high) γ : high-gamma, 53-100Hz.

28 Box plots: crossbars represent the median, dots represent the mean, upper and lower

1 hinges correspond to the 1st and 3rd quartile, respectively, and whiskers represent the range
2 of the data. ~ marginally significant main effect of group in the theta band, collapsed over
3 load level).

4

5 **Fig. 5. Grand-averaged log-transformed mid-frontal theta (4-7Hz) *unadjusted* power**
6 **during (a) 1-back and (b) 2-back loads.** (Box plots: crossbars represents the median, dots
7 represents the mean, upper and lower hinges correspond to the 1st and 3rd quartile,
8 respectively, and whiskers represent the range of the data).

9

10 **Fig. 6. Box plots display *unadjusted* frontoparietal theta phase coherence during (a) 1-**
11 **back and (b) 2-back loads.** Mid-left (mid-frontal – left-parietal), midline (mid-frontal – mid-
12 parietal), and mid-right (mid-frontal – right-parietal). (Crossbars represent the median, dots
13 represent the mean, upper and lower hinges correspond to the 1st and 3rd quartile,
14 respectively, and whiskers represent the range of the data. *significant main effect of group
15 averaged over region and load).

16

17 **Additional files**

18 **Additional file 1**

- 19 • **Format:** Word document (.pdf)
- 20 • **Title:** Sub-sample demographic and behavioural information
- 21 • **Description:** **Table 1.** Descriptive and inferential statistics for age, sex, Vineland
22 ABC scores, and auditory n-back performance. **Table 2.** Descriptive and inferential
23 statistics for EEG visual n-back task performance (hits % – false alarms %).

24

25 **Additional file 2**

- 26 • **Format:** Word document (.pdf)
- 27 • **Title:** Statistical analysis of task-related *unadjusted* power and theta coherence

- 1 • **Description: Table 1.** Power (*unadjusted*): descriptive and inferential statistics.
- 2 **Table 2.** Theta phase coherence (*unadjusted*): descriptive and inferential statistics.

3

4 **Additional file 3**

- 5 • **Format:** Word document (.pdf)
- 6 • **Title:** Resting state analyses for mid-frontal theta power and theta phase coherence
- 7 • **Description: Table 1.** Resting state (eyes open) mid-frontal theta power: descriptive
- 8 and inferential statistics. **Table 2.** Resting state (eyes open) theta phase coherence:
- 9 descriptive and inferential statistics.

10

11 **Additional file 4**

- 12 • **Format:** Word document (.pdf)
- 13 • **Title:** Scatterplots
- 14 • **Description: Fig. 1.** Scatterplots between EEG measures and age. **Fig. 2.**
- 15 Scatterplots between EEG measures and Vineland ABC scores (IQ). **Fig. 3.**
- 16 Scatterplots between EEG measures and auditory n-back performance (working
- 17 memory).

18

19 **Additional file 5**

- 20 • **Format:** Word document (.pdf)
- 21 • **Title:** Sensitivity analysis
- 22 • **Description: Table 1.** Sensitivity analyses outcomes.

Table 4. Power and PAF: descriptive and inferential statistics.

	Eyes open/1-back		Eyes closed/2-back		ANOVA								
	CON	NF1	CON	NF1	Group			Condition/load			Group x Condition/load		
	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD	F	p	η ²	F	p	η ²	F	p	η ²
Resting state					(1,28)			(1,28)			(1,28)		
Delta	0.44±0.38	0.82±0.48	0.58±0.43	1.08±0.52	7.135	.012*	.203	38.371	<.001***	.578	3.299	.080	.105
Theta	-0.67±0.39	-0.14±0.65	-0.38±0.47	0.35±0.82	9.145	.005**	.246	46.213	<.001***	.623	2.853	.102	.092
Alpha	-0.93±0.73	-0.43±0.78	0.24±0.92	0.47±0.95	1.609	.215	.054	96.219	<.001***	.775	1.663	.208	.056
Beta	-2.34±0.45	-2.22±0.48	-2.27±0.52	-2.24±0.55	0.188	.668	.007	0.266	.610	.009	0.954	.337	.033
Low gamma	-3.77±0.44	-3.51±0.61	-4.16±0.37	-4.01±0.60	1.457	.238	.049	44.477	<.001***	.614	0.630	.434	.022
High gamma	-4.93±0.55	-4.48±0.84	-5.50±0.45	-5.15±0.76	3.340	.078	.107	43.575	<.001***	.609	0.286	.597	.010
PAF (Pz)	10.06±1.15	8.64±1.10	9.95±0.87	8.95±1.14	12.276	.002**	.305	0.290	.594	.010	1.313	.261	.045
Task-specific (adjusted)					(1,27)			(1,27)			(1,27)		
Delta	0.07±0.19	-0.05±0.28	0.15±0.29	-0.01±0.22	2.667	.114	.090	1.767	.195	.061	0.215	.646	.008
Theta	0.04±0.20	-0.05±0.33	0.09±0.20	-0.04±0.35	1.374	.251	.048	0.660	.424	.024	0.168	.685	.006
Alpha	0.00±0.33	-0.06±0.46	0.06±0.34	-0.06±0.52	0.398	.533	.015	0.770	.388	.028	0.508	.482	.018
Beta	0.01±0.24	-0.04±0.19	0.09±0.26	-0.04±0.21	1.252	.273	.044	3.410	.076	.112	2.969	.096	.099
Low gamma	-0.67±0.32	-0.12±0.38	0.01±0.38	-0.09±0.31	0.396	.535	.014	1.976	.172	.068	0.484	.492	.018
High gamma	-0.44±0.41	-0.14±0.50	0.08±0.47	-0.14±0.45	0.951	.338	.034	0.990	.329	.035	1.301	.264	.046
Mid-frontal theta (Fz/F1/F2)	0.03±0.33	-0.10±0.39	0.10±0.27	0.04±0.48	0.598	.446	.022	2.505	.125	.085	0.317	.578	.012

Abbreviations: M: mean, SD: standard deviation. ***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05. Power is averaged over all EEG electrodes unless otherwise specified. Note: the degrees of freedom for resting state (1,28) and task-specific (1,27) analyses are different due to the different number of participants included in each analysis.

Table 6. Correlations between EEG measures and age, Vineland ABC (proxy for IQ), and working memory.

Demographic/ cognitive measure	Group	Resting state				
		Delta power		Theta power		PAF
		Open	Closed	Open	Closed	Open/closed
Age (years)	CON (<i>r, p</i>)	-.600 (.014)*	-.705 (.002)*	-.547 (.028)*	-.674 (.004)*	.736 (.001)*
	NF1 (<i>r, p</i>)	-.420 (.134)	-.341 (.233)	-.276 (.339)	-.108 (.714)	-.241 (.407)
	CON vs. NF1 (<i>z, p</i>)	-0.345 (.730)	-0.745 (.456)	-0.474 (.635)	-1.041 (.298)	4.238 (<.001)*
Vineland ABC (IQ)	CON (<i>r, p</i>)	-.243 (.364)	-.256 (.339)	-.085 (.756)	-.205 (.445)	.127 (.639)
	NF1 (<i>r, p</i>)	-.066 (.831)	-.040 (.897)	.144 (.638)	.082 (.790)	.149 (.627)
	CON vs. NF1 (<i>z, p</i>)	-0.432 (.666)	-0.354 (.724)	-0.431 (.666)	-0.498 (.618)	-0.048 (.961)
Auditory n-back (working memory)	CON (<i>r, p</i>)	-.265 (.322)	-.220 (.414)	-.197 (.464)	-.159 (.557)	.474 (.063)
	NF1 (<i>r, p</i>)	-.208 (.476)	-.156 (.593)	-.328 (.252)	-.245 (.399)	-.088 (.764)
	CON vs. NF1 (<i>z, p</i>)	-0.092 (.926)	-0.103 (.918)	0.213 (.831)	0.140 (.888)	1.505 (.132)

Power is scalp-averaged over all EEG channels. PAF is measured at channel Pz. Values are Pearson's *r* with *p*-values in brackets. * Significant ($p < .05$) correlation or difference between correlations that survives FDR correction.




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6