
NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

A medRxiv PREPRINT

Winko W. An

Division of Developmental Medicine
Boston Children's Hospital
Boston, MA, USA
wenkang.an@childrens.harvard.edu

Charles A. Nelson

Division of Developmental Medicine
Boston Children's Hospital
Boston, MA, USA
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Cambridge, MA, USA
charles.nelson@childrens.harvard.edu

Carol L. Wilkinson *

Division of Developmental Medicine
Boston Children's Hospital
Boston, MA, USA
carol.wilkinson@childrens.harvard.edu

July 5, 2022

ABSTRACT

1 **Background:** Fragile X syndrome (FXS) is the most prevalent form of inherited intellectual disability
2 and is the most common monogenetic cause of autism. Previous studies have linked the structural
3 and functional alterations in FXS with impaired sensory processing and sensory hypersensitivity,
4 which may hinder the early development of cognitive functions such as language comprehension.
5 In this study, we compared the P1 response in event-related potential (ERP) and its habituation to
6 repeated auditory stimuli in male children (2-7 years old) with and without FXS, and examined their
7 association with clinical measures in these two groups.

8 **Methods:** We collected high-density electroencephalography (EEG) data in an auditory oddball
9 paradigm from 12 children with FXS and 11 age- and sex-matched typically developing (TD) children.
10 After standardized EEG pre-processing, we conducted a spatial principal component (PC) analysis
11 and identified two major PCs — a frontal PC and a temporal PC. Within each PC, we compared the
12 P1 amplitude and inter-trial phase coherence (ITPC) between the two groups, and performed a series
13 of linear regression analysis to study the association between these EEG measures and several clinical
14 measures, including assessment scores for language development, non-verbal skills, and sensory
15 hypersensitivity.

16 **Results:** At the temporal PC, both early and late standard stimuli evoked a larger P1 response (p
17 = 0.0037, $p < 0.0001$, respectively) and higher ITPC ($p = 0.0402$, $p = 0.0027$) in FXS than in TD.

*Corresponding author

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

18 We observed habituation of ITPC in both groups at the frontal PC ($p = 0.0149$ for FXS; $p = 0.0244$
19 for TD). Linear regression analysis showed that within the FXS group reduced frontal P1 response
20 to late standard stimuli and increased habituation were associated with better languages scores. No
21 associations were observed with non-verbal skills or sensory hypersensitivity.

22 **Conclusion:** We identified P1 amplitude and ITPC in the temporal region as a contrasting EEG
23 phenotype between the FXS and the TD groups. P1 response and habituation in the frontal region
24 may be reflective of the language outcome in male children with FXS. These EEG measures are
25 potential biomarkers for early diagnosis and future language development in patients with FXS.

26 **Keywords** Fragile X syndrome · autism · EEG · ERP · phase coherence · neural habituation · language · biomarker

27 1 Introduction

28 Fragile X syndrome (FXS) is a genetic condition that affects approximately 1 in 4,000 males and 1 in 8,000 females
29 (Rais et al., 2018). It is the most prevalent form of inherited intellectual disability and is the most common monogenetic
30 cause of autism (Crawford et al., 2001; Hersh et al., 2011). FXS results from an expansion (>200 repeats for full
31 mutation) and hyper-methylation of a CGG trinucleotide repeat in the *FMRI* (Fragile X messenger ribonucleoprotein 1)
32 gene, and individuals with this mutation exhibit developmental and behavioral challenges including delays in learning,
33 speech and language delay, sensory issues, hyperactivity, and anxiety (NICHD, 2021). The long repeat of the CGG
34 sequence prevents the expression of the encoded FMRP protein, which leads to alterations in the development of
35 synapses, including thin and elongated dendritic spines with increased density, and immature synaptic connections,
36 as evidenced by studies with FXS animal models and postmortem studies of FXS individuals (Rudelli et al., 1985;
37 Comery et al., 1997; Hinton et al., 1991; Irwin et al., 2002). It might also prevent activity-based synapse maturation and
38 synaptic pruning, which are essential in developing normal cognitive functions (reviewed in Schneider et al. (2009) and
39 Knoth and Lippé (2012)).

40 The structural and functional alterations in FXS have been linked with atypical neural processing and arousal
41 modulation problems (Barnea-Goraly et al., 2003). Previous research using rodent models with *FMRI* knockout (KO)
42 mice revealed cortical hyperexcitability due to impaired inhibition and altered neural synchrony (Gonçalves et al., 2013;
43 Zhang et al., 2014). A decreased level of gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) receptors and GABAergic input, and
44 increased GABA catabolism were observed in multiple regions in the *FMRI* KO mouse brain (Idrissi et al., 2005; Selby
45 et al., 2007; D'Hulst et al., 2009). This deficit of GABAergic inhibition impacts multiple components of the sensory and
46 cognitive system, including the auditory brainstem (McCullagh et al., 2020), amygdala (Olmos-Serrano et al., 2010),
47 and the auditory cortex (Song et al., 2021), and may underlie the auditory hypersensitivity and auditory processing
48 alterations commonly seen in FXS (Castrén et al., 2003; der Molen et al., 2012a; Schneider et al., 2013; Rotschafer and
49 Razak, 2014). Notably, previous studies in autism have associated auditory processing alterations with language delays
50 (Rincón, 2008; Roberts et al., 2011), a phenotype often shared by the FXS population (Abbeduto et al., 2007; Finestack
51 et al., 2009), which suggests a tight relationship between the auditory response of the brain and language development
52 in individuals with FXS.

53 In the recent decades, noninvasive neuroimaging techniques like electroencephalography (EEG) have made it
54 possible to track dynamical brain responses without the need of complex neurosurgery, and thus have become a popular
55 tool for studying auditory brain responses. With EEG collected from the widely-used auditory oddball paradigm,
56 previous studies identified multiple components in the event-related potential (ERP) being altered in individuals with
57 FXS relative to the control group. Elevated N1 (Clair et al., 1987; Castrén et al., 2003; der Molen et al., 2012b; Knoth
58 et al., 2014; Ethridge et al., 2016) and P2 (Clair et al., 1987; der Molen et al., 2012b; Knoth et al., 2014; Ethridge et al.,
59 2016) amplitudes have been consistently reported from individuals with FXS. Habituation of N1, defined as the reduced
60 neural response (i.e., the N1 response) to repeated stimulus presentations, was shown to be weaker in FXS compared
61 to age-matched comparison groups (Castrén et al., 2003; der Molen et al., 2012a; Ethridge et al., 2016). Similar to

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

62 the findings in ERPs, greater response and weaker habituation were also observed in gamma (>30Hz) oscillatory
63 power and inter-trial phase coherence (ITPC) in individuals with FXS (Ethridge et al., 2016). Nonetheless, most of
64 these studies have focused on the adult population; very little is known about the developmental aspect of these neural
65 signatures in FXS. Wunderlich et al. (2006) explored the maturation of auditory ERP in infants and young children, and
66 discovered that the waveform and scalp distribution of auditory ERP change as a function of age. For example, the P1
67 component, which is prominent in preschoolers and young children, is diminished in adults (Wunderlich et al., 2006;
68 Kuuluvainen et al., 2016). This is possibly the reason why none of the aforementioned studies reported significant
69 findings in P1 response. Additionally, the association between EEG signals and early language development in FXS
70 remains unclear. To our knowledge, only one study by Wilkinson and Nelson (2021) addressed this question, and
71 reported a positive relationship between resting-state gamma power and language scores in male children with FXS.
72 This finding is important from a clinical perspective, because therapeutics (both behavioral and pharmacologic) will
73 ideally be provided near the age of diagnosis (~3 years of age). More EEG biomarkers that could sensitively, robustly,
74 and timely predict future language outcomes in FXS children are therefore desirable for the implementation of early
75 intervention.

76 To fill these gaps in research, this study recorded EEG data in a passive auditory oddball paradigm from preschool
77 and school aged boys with or without FXS and collected clinical and behavioral measures. First, we compared the
78 amplitude and short-term habituation of the P1 response and its corresponding ITPC between the two participant groups.
79 We hypothesized that the FXS boys would have greater amplitude and less habituation in these measures than their
80 age-matched typically developing peers. Second, to investigate the clinical relevance of these EEG measures, we
81 examined how they are associated with language development, non-verbal skills, and sensory hypersensitivity.

82 **2 Materials and Methods**

83 **2.1 Participants**

84 A total of 16 children (33 - 78 months old) with Fragile X syndrome (FXS) and 13 age-matched, typically developing
85 (TD) children (33 - 80 months old) were recruited for participation. The uneven number of participants between groups
86 was a result of the COVID-19 interruption. All FXS participants had documented full mutation of the *FMR1* gene.
87 Given that female FXS patients have variable expression of the *FMR1* encoded protein and thus variable phenotypes,
88 they were excluded from this study (n = 1 in the FXS group). Three boys with FXS did not perform or complete the
89 EEG experiment of this study. Additional exclusion criteria across both groups (FXS and TD) included a history of
90 prematurity (<35 weeks gestational age), low birth weight (<2000g), known birth trauma, known genetic disorders
91 (other than FXS), unstable seizure disorder, current use of anticonvulsant medications, and uncorrected hearing or
92 vision problems. Only children from families whose primary language is English (> 50% of the time at home) were
93 included. Some participants were on stable doses of medications (Oxybutin (1 TD); Melatonin (2 FXS); Miralax (1
94 TD); Sertraline (1 FXS)). More information about the participants can be found in Table. 1.

95 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Boston Children's Hospital / Harvard Medical School
96 (IRB#P00025493). Written informed consent was obtained from all guardians upon their children's participation in the
97 study.

98 **2.2 EEG collection and experiment design**

99 The EEG was recorded in a dimly lit, sound-attenuated, electrically shielded room. Participants either sat in their
100 caregiver's lap or sat independently in a chair, high-chair or stroller depending on their preference, and the caregiver
101 was instructed to avoid social interactions or speaking with their child. During the experiment, EEG data were collected
102 using a 128-channel HydroCel Geodesic Sensor Net (Version 1, EGI Inc, Eugene, OR) connected to a DC-coupled
103 amplifier (Net Amps 300, EGI Inc, Eugene, OR) with impedance of all electrodes kept below 100 kΩ. Data were

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

	FXS N = 12	TD N = 11	p value
Age, mean in months (SD)	50.68 (16.66)	49.03 (12.82)	0.7914
Maternal Education , n (%)			
<4-year college degree	1 (7.69)	0 (0)	
4-year college degree	4 (30.77)	4 (36.36)	
>4-year college degree	8 (61.54)	7 (63.64)	
Paternal Education, n (%)			
<4-year college degree	4 (30.77)	0 (0)	
4-year college degree	2 (15.38)	5 (45.45)	
>4-year college degree	7 (53.85)	6 (54.55)	
Household Income, n (%)			
<\$40,000	0 (0)	0 (0)	
\$40-70,000	3 (23.08)	0 (0)	
\$70-100,000	3 (23.08)	3 (27.27)	
\$100-140,000	2 (15.38)	4 (36.36)	
>\$140,000	4 (30.77)	4 (36.36)	
Race			
White	9 (69.23)	6 (54.55)	
African American	0 (0)	1 (9.10)	
Asian	1 (7.69)	1 (9.10)	
Mixed	1 (7.69)	3 (27.27)	
Ethnicity, n (%)			
Hispanic or Latino	3 (23.08)	0 (0)	
Clinical Measures, mean (SD)			
Nonverbal Developmental Quotient	58.56 (15.56)	112.49 (16.59)	<0.0001
PLS Auditory Comprehension	69.54 (15.09)	118.64 (9.88)	<0.0001
PLS Expressive Communication	68.77 (17.15)	122.09 (8.78)	<0.0001
VAS Receptive Language	9.15 (3.56)	14.55 (1.51)	<0.0001
VAS Expressive Language	6.62 (3.50)	15.55 (1.37)	<0.0001
Sensory Profile	23.36 (6.58)	23.56 (5.10)	0.9437

Table 1: Sample characteristics

104 sampled at 1000 Hz with reference to the electrode Cz. A sequence of 800 tones were played with 1000-ms inter-
 105 stimulus interval at 70dB from a speaker while the child was watching a silent movie for compliance (Figure. 1). These
 106 tones were all 50 ms in duration, and could be either 1000-Hz or 2000-Hz. The 1000-Hz tones, deemed as the more
 107 frequent “standard” (STs) stimuli, appeared for 87.5% of the time, while the 2000-Hz tones, deemed as the less frequent

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

108 “deviant” stimuli, accounted for the rest 12.5%. The number of STs preceding a deviant was either 4, 5, 6, or 7, varying
109 with equal probability.




Figure 1: Experimental design of the auditory oddball paradigm. Each standard or deviant stimulus was 50ms in duration. Inter-stimulus interval was 1 second. The first and the fifth standard stimuli after each deviant stimulus were deemed as the “ST1” and the “ST5” conditions, respectively.

110 2.3 EEG pre-processing

111 Raw EEG data were exported from NetStation (version 4.5, EGI Inc, Eugene, OR) and were batch preprocessed with
112 the Harvard Automated Preprocessing Pipeline for EEG plus Event-Related Software (HAPPE+ER) (Monachino et al.,
113 2021), a MATLAB-based EEG processing pipeline. The processing steps in HAPPE+ER are as follows. Line noise
114 was first removed using CleanLine via a multi-taper regression approach. Signals were then resampled to 250 Hz and
115 low-pass filtered (100 Hz). Bad channels, including those with flat line, residual line noise, and other excessive noise
116 evaluated by a joint probability method, were removed and interpolated. A subsequent wavelet-thresholding artifact
117 removal pipeline (Castellanos and Makarov, 2006) — an algorithm that parses signals into frequency components and
118 identifies artifacts based on the distributions of these components — was implemented to remove noise in the frequency
119 domain. After band-pass filtering (1 – 30 Hz), continuous EEG data were then segmented into epochs between 200 ms
120 before and 500 ms after the onset of each stimulus, and were baseline corrected by the average over the pre-stimulus
121 period (-200 to 0 ms). Only those epochs associated with the first (ST1) and the fifth (ST5) standard tone after each
122 deviant were retained in this study. It should be noted that “ST5” was chosen for analysis for two reasons. First, it
123 is more distant from “ST1” than any earlier standards, and thus is expected to elicit more habituation effects. And
124 second, the number of trials in “ST5” (n = 92) is closer to the number of trials in “ST1” (n = 100) compared to any later
125 standards (n < 65). Epochs with residual artifacts, evaluated by their amplitude and joint probability, were removed by
126 HAPPE+ER. We excluded participants with fewer than 20 trials in either ST1 or ST5 condition — 12 participants in the
127 FXS group and 11 participants in the TD group remained in this analysis after the overall EEG pre-processing. In order
128 to control for the difference in number of trials between ST1 and ST5, we randomly downsampled the condition with
129 more trials to match with the other condition.

130 2.4 EEG analysis

131 An overview of the EEG analysis is shown in Figure. 2. In brief, a spatial principal component analysis was performed
132 on preprocessed EEG data, and the principal components were applied on the original multi-channel EEG signals as
133 spatial filters to derive PC-transformed time courses. Event-related potential and inter-trial phase coherence measures
134 were calculated from these time courses, which were later studied for their association with clinical measures of different
135 domains.

136 2.4.1 Principal Component Analysis

137 A spatial principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted to identify representative spatial patterns in neural
138 activation following the steps in previous studies (Ethridge et al., 2012, 2015, 2016). EEG data were first averaged
139 across trials, conditions and participants for a grand average EEG matrix, whose dimensions are number of time points
140 by number of channels. A spatial PCA processed each time point as an observation and each channel as a variable,

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME




Figure 2: A schematic diagram for all the analyses in this study. For intelligibility, only 16 out of 128 channels are displayed in “Preprocessed EEG” and “Grand averaged EEG”. Each line in “PC-transformed time course” represents the average ERP of an individual.

PCA, principal component analysis; a.u., arbitrary unit; STFT, short-time Fourier transform; ITPC, inter-trial phase coherence; CBPT, cluster-based permutation test; PLS, Preschool Language Scales; VAS, Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales; SPC, Sensory Profile Child; MSEL, Mullen Scales of Early Learning.

141 and generated a series of mutually orthogonal principal components (PCs) that could sequentially explain most of the
 142 variance in the data. The number of PCs equals the number of time points (i.e., more than 100), and most of them
 143 carry a negligible amount of variance explained. In order to determine the number of PCs that should be included for
 144 further analysis, we ran a parallel analysis (Franklin et al., 1995) implemented in MATLAB (Shteingart, 2022), which
 145 identified two PCs as being significant with more than 95% confidence (Figure. 3). We deemed the one with high
 146 weights in the frontal region as the “frontal PC”, and the one with high weights in the temporal regions as the “temporal
 147 PC”. All subsequent analyses were performed in these two PCs independently.

148 2.4.2 Event-related potentials

149 The PCs derived from the previous step were used as spatial filters to scale and integrate signals from all channels in
 150 each trial, for each condition and each participant. This reduced the 128-channel EEG data to one single time course for
 151 each trial. Event-related potential (ERP) analysis was conducted with these PC-transformed time courses instead of the
 152 original multi-channel signals.

153 We specifically focused on the P1 component of an ERP in this study, which is the first positive deflection in
 154 the average EEG waveform after the stimulus onset. Considering that the ERP waveform changes during childhood
 155 (Wunderlich et al., 2006), and that we are uncertain about the exact latency for P1 in children with FXS, we did not use
 156 a pre-defined time window for P1 calculation. Instead, we performed a non-parametric cluster-based permutation test
 157 (Maris and Oostenveld, 2007) for each condition and group. This method searched for continuous time intervals in
 158 which ERP is statistically above zero at around 100ms, and we defined the P1 window as the union of such intervals
 159 over both conditions and both groups. The amplitude of P1 was then calculated as the peak in each participant’s

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

160 PC-transformed time course within this window. Habituation of P1 was defined as the difference in P1 amplitude
161 between ST1 and ST5 (i.e., ST1 - ST5) as we expected to observe a reduced P1 amplitude in ST5 compared to ST1.

162 2.4.3 Inter-trial phase coherence

163 Inter-trial phase coherence (ITPC) examines the consistency in oscillatory phase across all the trials in a condition. It
164 can be calculated with the following equation:

$$ITPC(f, t) = \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X_i(f, t)}{|X_i(f, t)|} \right| \quad (1)$$

165 where $X_i(f, t)$ denotes the Short-Time Fourier Transform (STFT) of a given time course $x(t)$, and n denotes the
166 number of trials in a condition. The value of ITPC ranges between 0 and 1, with 0 indicating totally random phase
167 distribution and 1 indicating perfect phase synchronization.

168 We applied a STFT with a 32-point Hann window, 95% overlap between windows, and a 256-point fast Fourier
169 Transform. We chose a narrow window to capture transient phase changes at the cost of spectral resolution, because
170 the exact frequency of peak phase coherence is not the interest of this study. After a time-frequency map of ITPC
171 was calculated for one condition, we applied the P1 window derived from the ERP analysis in the previous step, and
172 searched for the maximum ITPC value within that time window and across all the frequencies (2 – 30Hz), which is the
173 ITPC measure we used for further analysis. As in the ERP analysis, habituation of ITPC was defined as the difference
174 in ITPC between ST5 and ST1.

175 2.5 Clinical measures

176 Receptive and expressive language abilities were evaluated by the Preschool Language Scale - 5th Edition (PLS)
177 (Zimmerman et al., 2011), a comprehensive developmental language assessment standardized for children aged 0 – 83
178 months. The Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales - 3rd Edition (VAS) (Sparrow et al., 2018), a parent-report measure
179 assessing communication, social, motor, and daily living skills commonly used in clinical trials, was also administered.
180 Standard scores and v-scaled scores were used for PLS and VAS, respectively. Non-verbal skills were evaluated by
181 the Mullen Scales of Early Learning (MSEL) (Mullen, 1989), a standardized assessment of development for children
182 0 – 69 months of age; a nonverbal developmental quotient (NVDQ) was calculated for all FXS participants and TD
183 participants under 70 months of age based on their fine motor and visual reception scores. We also included the Child
184 Sensory Profile-2 (SPC) (Dunn, 2014) to evaluate sensory processing patterns. We calculated a customized score for
185 sensory hypersensitivity by summing the raw score of 13 selected questions in the Child Sensory Profile-2 caregiver
186 questionnaire — these questions were picked from the Auditory Processing, Visual Processing and Touch Processing
187 sections, and from the Avoiding and Sensitivity quadrants, which are highly pertinent to the sensory hypersensitivity
188 characteristic that we are interested to study in patients with FXS. The exact questions selected for SPC calculation are
189 listed in Supplementary Material Table S1. Two FXS and two TD participants did not complete the SPC questionnaire,
190 thus were excluded from this part of the analysis. A summary of clinical measures is shown in Table 2.

191 2.6 Linear regression analysis

192 The association between EEG and behavior was explored with a series of linear regression analyses. We used an
193 ordinary least squares (OLS) model to search for a linear relationship between dependent variables (i.e., behavioral
194 measures) and independent variables (i.e., EEG measures) interacted with group identify (i.e. FXS or TD). We also
195 included the age of participants as a covariate to parse out any effect of age on EEG or behavior. The equation for this
196 OLS model (Model 1) is as follows:

$$\text{behavior} \sim \text{age} + \text{EEG} * \text{group} \quad (2)$$

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

	Domain	Clinical measure	Subtest or scores
Included in this study	Language	Preschool Language Scales - 5th edition	Auditory comprehension (standard score)
			Expressive communication (standard score)
		Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales - 3rd edition	Receptive (v-scaled score)
	Expressive (v-scaled score)		
	Non-verbal	Mullen Scales of Early Learning	Non-verbal developmental quotient
	Sensory	Child Sensory Profile-2	13 selected questions (see Supplementary Material)
Not included in this study		Aberrant Behavior Checklist	

Table 2: Behavioral data collected from participants

197 We used the built-in functions in R (R Core Team, 2020) to calculate the beta coefficient of each term in the model.
 198 In cases where the interaction term has a significant beta value ($p < 0.05$), i.e., the two groups have different effects,
 199 we conducted a marginal effect analysis on the previous OLS model to estimate the effect within each group. If no
 200 significant interaction was observed, we discarded the interaction term and estimated the effect with a new OLS model
 201 with age and group being covariates (Model 2):

$$\text{behavior} \sim \text{age} + \text{group} + \text{EEG} \quad (3)$$

202 With this general framework for regression analysis, we examined the association between each pair of EEG and
 203 behavioral measures. There are four EEG measures in this study: 1) P1 amplitude of ST5, 2) P1 habituation, 3) ITPC
 204 of ST5, and 4) ITPC habituation; and there are six clinical measures: 1) auditory comprehension in PLS (PLS-R), 2)
 205 expressive communication in PLS (PLS-E), 3) receptive language in VAS (VAS-R), 4) expressive language in VAS
 206 (VAS-E), 5) NVDQ in MSEL, and 6) sensory sensitivity and avoiding in SPC. In total, twenty-four models were
 207 estimated for each spatial PC to study its clinical correlate.

208 2.7 Statistical analysis

209 We conducted a series of two-tailed two-sample t-tests to compare the demographics, behavioral scores, and EEG
 210 measures within each condition between the FXS and the TD group. Between ST1 and ST5 conditions, we conducted
 211 right-tailed paired t-tests on EEG measures within each group.

212 For the linear regression analysis, we applied the Bonferroni correction to control for family-wise error rate. A
 213 factor of 2 was applied to p values in SPC and NVDQ models (i.e., for the two types of EEG measures, P1 and ITPC,
 214 analyzed in this study); a factor of 4 was applied to p values in PLS and VAS models (i.e., for the two types of EEG and
 215 the two types of language assessments). No correction was applied between EEG amplitude and habituation, or among
 216 different domains of clinical measures, as they each formed an independent hypothesis.

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

217 **3 Results**

218 **3.1 Sample description**

219 Demographic data, including the MSEL non-verbal developmental quotient (NVDQ), PLS and VAS language scores,
220 and Child Sensory Profile-2 (SPC) scores are shown in Table 1. The FXS and the TD groups are age-matched ($p =$
221 0.7914), but have substantially different NVDQ, and receptive and expressive language abilities ($p < 0.0001$ for all). The
222 SPC scores are comparable between the two groups ($p = 0.9437$).

223 **3.2 Neural response and habituation**

224 Brain responses to repeated tones within a passive auditory oddball paradigm were analysed using a spatial principal
225 component (PC) analysis. Two significant PCs were identified in the parallel analysis, one with high weights in the
226 frontal region (i.e., the frontal PC; Figure. 3A) and the other with high weights in the temporal regions (i.e., the temporal
227 PC; Figure. 3B). The PC-transformed time courses for the frontal PC show a clear ERP waveform with a P1 peak at
228 around 100ms in both FXS and TD. The average ITPC associated with P1 is stronger in ST1 than in ST5 in both groups.
229 In the temporal PC, however, only the FXS group shows a strong P1 response in both ST1 and ST5; the TD group does
230 not show a clear P1 peak within the P1 window.

231 The P1 amplitude in the frontal PC is comparable between FXS and TD in both the ST1 ($p = 0.7593$, Cohen's $d =$
232 0.127) and the ST5 ($p = 0.4190$, Cohen's $d = 0.337$) conditions (Figure 4A). No significant difference in P1 amplitude
233 between ST1 and ST5 (i.e., the habituation effect) was identified in either FXS ($p = 0.4386$, Cohen's $d = 0.046$) or TD
234 ($p = 0.6293$, Cohen's $d = 0.107$) (Figure 4A). The ITPC is also similar between groups in both conditions in the frontal
235 PC (Figure 4B). However, we observed habituation effects in ITPC in both the FXS ($p = 0.0149$, Cohen's $d = 0.711$) and
236 the TD ($p = 0.0244$, Cohen's $d = 0.709$) group (Figure 4B).

237 The EEG measures in the temporal PC show a contrasting pattern than those in the frontal PC. The FXS group
238 exhibit a more prominent P1 amplitude than the TD group in both the ST1 ($p = 0.0037$, Cohen's $d = 1.328$) and the ST5
239 ($p < 0.0001$, Cohen's $d = 2.357$) conditions (Figure 4C). Their ITPC measures are also significantly different in ST1 (p
240 $= 0.0402$, Cohen's $d = 0.893$) and ST5 ($p = 0.0027$, Cohen's $d = 1.383$) (Figure 4D). No significant habituation effects
241 were observed in this PC.

242 **3.3 Relationship between EEG and behavior**

243 We examined the relationship between EEG and clinical measures through a series of linear regression analyses.
244 Table 3 shows the results of linear regression analyses where an interaction term for EEG and group identify were
245 included (Model 1), along with age as a covariate. Further analyses of significant interactions are described below.
246 For regressions where the interaction term was not significant, a simplified regression (Model 2) was performed
247 (Supplementary Material Table S2); however, no significant associations between EEG and clinical measures were
248 observed.

249 **3.3.1 EEG and language**

250 The models for language scores (i.e., PLS-R, PLS-E, VAS-R and VAS-E) generally show significant or marginally
251 significant interactions between P1 measures (i.e., P1 amplitude of ST5 and P1 habituation) and group identity (Table
252 3), indicating that the two groups may have different P1-behavior relationships. Accordingly, we analyzed the marginal
253 effects of the model for FXS and TD separately to reveal such group-level differences. Results show that the frontal P1
254 amplitude of ST5 is negatively correlated with all language scores only in the FXS group, among which its relationship
255 with PLS-E and VAS-E survived correction for multiple comparisons (Table 4). Additionally, the frontal P1 habituation

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME




Figure 3: The (A) frontal and (B) temporal principal component (PC) and their associated event-related potential (ERP) and inter-trial phase coherence (ITPC) for the FXS and the TD group. Dashed lines represent the stimulus onset; the red and blue shaded areas denote standard error of the mean; the grey shaded areas denote the P1 window identified by a non-parametric statistical analysis; crosses in the ITPC plots indicate where maximum ITPC was identified for each participant
a.u., arbitrary unit

256 showed strong, positive association with VAS-R ($p = 0.0055$) and VAS-E ($p = 0.0004$), also only in FXS. These linear
257 relationships are depicted in Figure 5 and 6.

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME




Figure 4: Comparison of (A) frontal P1, (B) frontal ITPC, (C) temporal P1, and (D) temporal ITPC between conditions and groups

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

258 **3.3.2 EEG and non-verbal skills / sensory hypersensitivity**

259 We also examined the relationship between EEG and NVDQ or SPC score. Neither Model 1 nor Model 2 revealed
260 significant association between NVDQ / SPC score and any of the EEG measures. Only the temporal ITPC was found to
261 be marginally correlated with NVDQ before correction for multiple comparisons ($p = 0.0791$, Table 3). These findings
262 suggest that the strong association with EEG discovered in Section 3.3.1 may be specific to language development.

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

	PLS-R		PLS-E		VAS-R		VAS-E		NVDO		SPC		
	r2 or beta (SE)	p value	r2 or beta (SE)	p value	r2 or beta (SE)	p value	r2 or beta (SE)	p value	r2 or beta (SE)	p value	r2 or beta (SE)	p value	
Frontal P1 amplitude	Adjusted r2	0.82			0.56		0.82		0.75		-0.14		
	Variables												
	Intercept	85.32 (9.38)	<0.0001	94.24 (8.20)	<0.0001	10.49 (2.01)	<0.0001	8.73 (1.73)	<0.0001	77.18 (13.49)	<0.0001	17.74 (5.60)	0.0064
	Age	-0.12 (0.19)	0.5192	-0.23 (0.16)	0.1721	0.55 (0.04)	0.5805	0.02 (0.03)	0.5805	0.3640	0.08 (0.11)	0.4757	
Frontal P1 habituation	Group [TD]	39.27 (9.38)***	0.0005	37.00 (8.20)***	0.0002	4.55 (0.01)*	0.0351	5.66 (1.73)**	0.0041	38.73 (12.24)**	0.0054	1.08 (5.93)	0.8577
	EEG-Group [TD]	-0.55 (0.27)+	0.0571	-0.78 (0.24)**	0.0035	-0.14 (0.06)*	0.0247	-0.18 (0.05)**	0.0015	-0.31 (0.36)	0.4024	-0.07 (0.16)	0.6611
	Adjusted r2	0.8		0.85		0.57		0.82		0.74		-0.17	
	Variables												
Frontal ITPC	Intercept	79.77 (10.02)	<0.0001	85.80 (9.42)	<0.0001	8.75 (2.02)	0.0004	6.43 (1.79)	0.0020	73.99 (14.21)	0.0001	18.73 (6.60)	0.0124
	Age	-0.21 (0.18)	0.2774	-0.34 (0.17)+	0.0629	0.01 (0.04)	0.8689	0.00 (0.03)	0.9599	-0.31 (0.27)	0.2617	0.09 (0.11)	0.4498
	Group [TD]	48.79 (5.20)***	<0.0001	52.94 (4.90)***	<0.0001	5.48 (1.05)***	<0.0001	9.00 (0.93)***	<0.0001	52.16 (6.86)***	<0.0001	0.40 (2.91)	0.8922
	EEG-Group [TD]	0.22 (0.16)	0.1938	0.34 (0.16)*	0.0430	0.09 (0.03)*	0.0120	0.10 (0.03)**	0.0022	0.14 (0.21)	0.5071	-0.02 (0.11)	
Frontal ITPC habituation	Adjusted r2	0.78		0.81		0.43		0.7		0.78		-0.12	
	Variables												
	Intercept	80.32 (11.04)	<0.0001	88.53 (11.05)	<0.0001	9.63 (2.47)	0.0010	7.36 (2.43)	0.0069	69.51 (13.30)	0.0001	16.49 (5.87)	0.0132
	Age	-0.34 (0.23)	0.1454	-0.52 (0.23)*	0.0318	-0.01 (0.05)	0.8861	-0.04 (0.05)	0.4136	-0.58 (0.30)+	0.0711	0.04 (0.12)	0.7151
Temporal P1 amplitude	Group [TD]	54.81 (15.38)**	0.0021	55.72 (15.39)**	0.0018	7.91 (3.44)*	0.0332	10.29 (3.39)**	0.0068	82.98 (17.54)***	0.0002	3.91 (9.72)	0.6928
	EEG-Group [TD]	24.44 (36.65)	0.5129	25.04 (36.67)	0.5029	-0.41 (8.21)	0.9610	5.05 (8.07)	0.5390	68.58 (43.87)	0.1354	16.24 (18.35)	0.3902
	Adjusted r2	0.78		0.81		0.41		0.7		0.75		-0.17	
	Variables												
Temporal P1 habituation	Intercept	82.10 (11.87)	<0.0001	91.29 (11.90)	<0.0001	9.24 (2.67)	0.0026	7.89 (2.60)	0.0068	80.77 (16.51)	0.0001	19.12 (6.94)	0.0148
	Age	-0.25 (0.21)	0.2444	-0.44 (0.21)*	0.0493	-0.01 (0.05)	0.9084	-0.03 (0.05)	0.5849	-0.42 (0.30)	0.1752	0.08 (0.12)	0.4869
	Group [TD]	49.08 (5.75)***	<0.0001	52.27 (5.77)***	<0.0001	5.60 (1.29)***	0.0004	9.02 (1.26)***	<0.0001	49.81 (7.24)***	<0.0001	0.23 (3.05)	0.9413
	EEG-Group [TD]	6.13 (37.74)	0.8727	-4.03 (37.82)	0.9162	5.32 (8.48)	0.5384	0.55 (8.27)	0.9476	-28.72 (46.86)	0.5476	-6.45 (19.28)	0.7425
Temporal ITPC	Adjusted r2	0.78		0.82		0.4		0.69		0.73		-0.04	
	Variables												
	Intercept	73.12 (15.39)	0.0001	91.73 (15.43)	<0.0001	9.47 (3.56)	0.0155	8.11 (3.45)	0.0297	76.08 (21.23)	0.0021	23.08 (7.46)	0.0074
	Age	-0.22 (0.19)	0.2586	-0.44 (0.19)*	0.0344	-0.02 (0.04)	0.7271	-0.03 (0.04)	0.5373	-0.33 (0.28)	0.2573	0.07 (0.10)	0.4529
Temporal ITPC habituation	Group [TD]	57.38 (11.25)***	0.0001	55.01 (11.27)***	0.0001	5.90 (2.60)*	0.0351	8.96 (2.52)**	0.0021	55.50 (15.27)**	0.0019	-1.27 (5.19)	0.8094
	EEG-Group [TD]	0.44 (0.52)	0.4068	-0.05 (0.52)	0.9320	0.03 (0.12)	0.8207	-0.01 (0.12)	0.9509	-0.06 (0.66)	0.9313	-0.22 (0.24)	0.3716
	Adjusted r2	0.83		0.83		0.44		0.7		0.74		0.02	
	Variables												
Temporal ITPC habituation	Intercept	77.95 (9.38)	<0.0001	86.12 (10.02)	<0.0001	9.37 (2.33)	0.0007	7.47 (2.31)	0.0044	72.24 (14.38)	0.0001	17.66 (5.23)	0.0042
	Age	-0.23 (0.17)	0.1810	-0.38 (0.18)*	0.0471	-0.01 (0.04)	0.7637	-0.02 (0.04)	0.5999	-0.31 (0.26)	0.2541	0.12 (0.09)	0.2226
	Group [TD]	52.17 (5.03)***	<0.0001	54.46 (5.37)***	<0.0001	5.78 (1.25)***	0.0002	9.15 (1.24)***	<0.0001	54.36 (7.14)***	<0.0001	-0.16 (2.67)	0.9544
	EEG-Group [TD]	-0.50 (0.34)	0.2900	-0.48 (0.36)	0.2020	-0.10 (0.08)	0.2547	-0.06 (0.08)	0.4677	-0.47 (0.46)	0.3197	0.15 (0.17)	0.3836
Temporal ITPC habituation	Adjusted r2	0.78		0.81		0.46		0.69		0.78		0.19	
	Variables												
	Intercept	78.09 (12.70)	<0.0001	89.72 (12.72)	<0.0001	7.75 (2.76)	0.0112	7.62 (2.82)	0.0143	60.38 (15.14)	0.0009	12.48 (5.41)	0.0358
	Age	-0.28 (0.19)	0.1605	-0.41 (0.19)*	0.0458	-0.04 (0.04)	0.4133	-0.03 (0.04)	0.5013	-0.45 (0.25)+	0.0878	0.07 (0.09)	0.4127
Temporal ITPC habituation	Group [TD]	59.74 (18.04)**	0.0037	62.96 (18.06)**	0.0025	7.31 (3.92)+	0.0776	8.83 (4.01)*	0.0403	84.52 (20.53)***	0.0006	19.77 (7.88)*	0.0241
	EEG-Group [TD]	17.77 (30.57)	0.5678	0.10 (30.61)	0.9974	9.81 (6.63)	0.1554	1.52 (6.80)	0.8249	65.05 (34.94)+	0.0791	21.61 (12.47)	0.1037
	Adjusted r2	0.82		0.83		0.44		0.7		0.81		0.05	
	Variables												
Temporal ITPC habituation	Intercept	76.75 (9.66)	<0.0001	86.69 (10.28)	<0.0001	9.66 (2.35)	0.0006	7.92 (2.35)	0.0033	66.98 (12.43)	<0.0001	15.46 (5.25)	0.0101
	Age	-0.19 (0.17)	0.2952	-0.37 (0.19)+	0.0595	-0.02 (0.04)	0.6922	-0.02 (0.04)	0.5754	-0.24 (0.23)	0.3058	0.13 (0.09)	0.1642
	Group [TD]	49.76 (5.18)***	<0.0001	52.27 (5.50)***	<0.0001	5.82 (1.26)***	0.0002	8.73 (1.26)***	<0.0001	54.75 (6.26)***	<0.0001	0.30 (2.70)	0.9117
	EEG-Group [TD]	-49.83 (28.79)+	0.0997	-19.88 (30.61)	0.5238	-7.86 (7.01)	0.2762	1.70 (7.01)	0.8114	-50.92 (33.47)	0.2640	-18.85 (13.79)	0.1919

Table 3: Regression analysis results for the ordinary least squares model with an interaction term between EEG and group identify. Significant p values for the interaction term that survived the Bonferroni correction are in bold. +p< 0.1; *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

	PLS-R			PLS-E		VAS-R		VAS-E	
		dy/dx	p value	dy/dx	p value	dy/dx	p value	dy/dx	p value
Frontal P1 amplitude	FXS	-0.55 (0.27)*	0.0428	-0.78 (0.24)***	0.0009	-0.14 (0.06)*	0.0147	-0.18 (0.05)***	0.0002
	TD	0.00 (0.30)	0.9954	0.10 (0.26)	0.7104	-0.07 (0.06)	0.2623	0.00 (0.06)	0.9587
Frontal P1 habituation	FXS	0.22 (0.16)	0.1779	0.34 (0.16)*	0.0301	0.09 (0.03)**	0.0055	0.10 (0.03)***	0.0004
	TD	-0.13 (0.27)	0.6423	-0.10 (0.26)	0.6972	-0.01 (0.05)	0.8587	-0.02 (0.05)	0.6178

Table 4: Marginal effect results for the ordinary least squares model with an interaction term. Significant p values that survived the Bonferroni correction are in bold.

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001




Figure 5: Association between the frontal P1 amplitude of ST5 and (A) PLS-R, (B) PLS-E, (C) VAS-R, and (D) VAS-E in Model 1. The lines and shaded areas denote the prediction lines and their 95% confidence interval estimated by the marginal effect. The scattered dots represent individual data. The p value of marginal effect for each group is shown in the legend.

263 **4 Discussion**

264 In this study, we compared the amplitude and habituation of the auditory P1 response and its corresponding inter-trial
 265 phase coherence (ITPC) between male children with and without FXS, after performing a spatial principal component
 266 analysis (PCA) on their EEG data. We also examined the association between these EEG measures and several clinical

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME




Figure 6: Association between the frontal P1 habituation and (A) PLS-R, (B) PLS-E, (C) VAS-R, and (D) VAS-E in Model 1. The lines and shaded areas denote the prediction lines and their 95% confidence interval estimated by the marginal effect. The scattered dots represent individual data. The p value of marginal effect for each group is shown in the legend.

267 measures that assessed sensory sensitivities, language abilities, and non-verbal development. The results show that
 268 though the two groups exhibit comparable P1 amplitude and ITPC in the frontal PC, male children with FXS have
 269 stronger temporal P1 and ITPC. No difference in habituation pattern was found between the two groups. In terms of the
 270 clinical correlate, we discovered a strong association between language abilities and the amplitude and habituation of
 271 the frontal P1 in individuals with FXS.

272 4.1 Interpretation of PCA results

273 The spatial PCA identified two significant PCs in our EEG data — one with high weights in the frontal region, and the
 274 other with high weights in the lateralized temporal regions (Figure 3). The heightened P1 amplitude observed in the
 275 temporal PC in the FXS group can be understood in two ways. First, elevated N1 and P2 responses have previously been
 276 reported as a robust EEG phenotype in individuals with FXS (Clair et al., 1987; Castrén et al., 2003; Knoth et al., 2014;
 277 Ethridge et al., 2016), and both have been linked to auditory hypersensitivity and auditory processing alterations in FXS
 278 (Schneider et al., 2013; Rotschafer and Razak, 2014). Therefore, the strong temporal P1 response observed in FXS in
 279 this study could possibly be caused by impaired inhibition in the auditory cortex. Second, the topographical location
 280 of peak N1 has been shown to change with development; prior to the age of six it is largely temporal (Bruneau et al.,

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

281 1997) and then this shifts to central regions in older ages (Tonquist-Uhlén et al., 1995; Knoth and Lippé, 2012). Given
282 the adjacency of P1 and N1 sources in the auditory cortex (Yvert et al., 2005), we expect a similar temporal-to-central
283 developmental trajectory in the topographical pattern of P1 in children. With this hypothesis, the findings in this study
284 might have reflected a delayed development of the auditory brain in children with FXS, which is part of the global
285 developmental delay known in this population (Roberts et al., 2016; Wheeler et al., 2021). Either interpretation points
286 to the fact that children with FXS may have altered (impaired or delayed) auditory processing than their age-matched
287 TD peers.

288 4.2 ERP and ITPC differences between groups

289 Different from our hypothesis, no habituation of P1 amplitude was observed in either group in this study (Figure 4A &
290 C). Previous research adopted a similar experimental setup using repeated auditory stimuli, and reported habituation of
291 N1 in the control group, but not in FXS patients (Castrén et al., 2003; der Molen et al., 2012a). However, the participants
292 in these studies were either adults or older children (7 - 13 years) compared to our cohort. Given that the waveform
293 of auditory ERP changes throughout childhood (Wunderlich et al., 2006), the results from these studies may not be
294 directly transferable to the current one. More importantly, despite that N1 and P1 share many commonalities, they
295 are substantially different in their sensitivity to stimulus presentation rate. According to the neural adaptation theory
296 (Kudela et al., 2018), both would reduce their intensity if a train of stimuli were played. However, P1 would recover to
297 its full amplitude if the stimuli are apart by as short as a few hundred milliseconds (Picton, 2010), while the recovery of
298 N1 takes more than 10 seconds (Cowan et al., 1993). Since the inter-stimulus interval (ITI) was set at 1000ms in this
299 experiment, there was sufficient time for P1 to return to its baseline amplitude, which might have explained the absence
300 of P1 habituation in here. Future studies with a shorter ITI (a few hundred milliseconds) are warranted.

301 In spite of the null findings in P1 amplitude habituation, we observed strong habituation of frontal ITPC in both
302 groups (Figure 4B). Biomedical signals, like EEG, have three important characteristics — amplitude, frequency, and
303 phase. Even though event-related potential (ERP) is a popular choice of neural signature for studying human brains, it
304 mainly accounts for the “amplitude” aspect of a signal. ITPC, on the other hand, utilizes time-frequency decomposition
305 to examine synchrony of instantaneous phase across trials at different frequencies, which discards the magnitude
306 information through normalization (see Equation 1) and focuses more on “phase” and “frequency”. Therefore, it may
307 provide information that is not available in the aggregate ERP waveform (Makeig et al., 2004). Additionally, ITPC was
308 found to be a more stable neural marker than evoked spectral power in terms of inter-subject variability (Engel et al.,
309 2020) and test-retest reliability (Legget et al., 2017), possibly because it is independent of amplitude (Legget et al.,
310 2017). In developmental neuroscience, ITPC is relatively less studied than ERP, yet previous studies report weaker
311 gamma ITPC (Ethridge et al., 2016, 2019) and reduced habituation of low-frequency (theta-alpha band) ITPC (Ethridge
312 et al., 2016) in individuals with FXS compared to those without FXS, demonstrating the clinical relevance of ITPC
313 measures as a potential biomarker in FXS research. Here, we report habituation of frontal ITPC in both FXS and TD
314 groups (Figure 4B), and heightened temporal ITPC in FXS compared to TD (Figure 4D). Cortical phase synchrony
315 is considered to be modulated by cognitive demands (Nash-Kille and Sharma, 2014), and it has been associated with
316 various cognitive processes like information processing (Tass et al., 1998), feature binding (Palva et al., 2005), and
317 neural computation (Fries, 2005). Therefore, the results in this study suggest a relatively lower cognitive demand for
318 information processing after a few repetitions of the same standard stimulus, a mechanism that is shared by, but also
319 altered in boys with FXS. More future studies on ITPC in FXS children are needed to confirm these findings.

320 4.3 Clinical correlations of brain measures

321 We observed a pronounced linear relationship between language scores and P1 amplitude (Figure 5) and habituation
322 (Figure 6) in the FXS group; weaker P1 response to late standard stimuli (i.e., ST5) as well as stronger habituation of
323 P1 is associated with higher receptive and expressive language abilities. At the time when ST5 is played, the same
324 standard stimulus has been repeated for four times. The level of information novelty in ST5 is extremely low. Therefore,

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

325 it is cognitively advantageous that our neural system reacts weakly to yet another standard stimulus, so that neural
326 resources can be preserved for other cognitive processes. Huber and O'Reilly (2003) proposed a short-term synaptic
327 depression model to explain this phenomenon. In this model, the response to a recently identified object is suppressed,
328 while any new object, for its high salience, triggers stronger neural activities. This mechanism of neural habituation
329 was considered to aid perceptual processing of a novel object (Huber and O'Reilly, 2003). Later, an EEG study by
330 Jacob and Huber (2020) confirmed the benefit of this habituation mechanism in working memory and novelty detection.
331 Furthermore, a recent behavioral study by Marino and Gervain (2019) linked the novelty detection ability of infants
332 measured at 9 months with their future language outcomes at 12, 14, 18, and 24 months. These previous works suggest
333 a beneficial role of neural habituation in language learning, laying the foundation for understanding our findings in the
334 FXS group. In the TD group, however, we did not observe a strong impact of habituation on language scores. This
335 result could be interpreted from two angles. First, the range of language scores in the TD group is much narrower than
336 that in the FXS group. Thus, it is mathematically more difficult to achieve significance in linear regression models
337 from the TD group, especially given our small sample size (da Silva and Seixas, 2017). Second, the children in the TD
338 group have an intact, unimpaired neural system to support their early language learning. After the critical language
339 period, further language development in these participants may become less sensitive to the cognitive advantages gained
340 from neural habituation, but rather be driven by other aspects of learning such as language exposure, home support, or
341 non-verbal skills. However, for individuals still in early language acquisition and development (like our study's FXS
342 group), auditory habituation may play a more important role.

343 The neural markers we examined in this study have the potential to become reliable biomarkers for early diagnosis
344 and outcome prediction in FXS. In a recent review, Kenny et al. (2022) summarized the EEG studies on FXS in the
345 past decades, and suggested a few EEG features, including the N1 amplitude, gamma oscillatory power, and gamma
346 phase-locking, as promising translational biomarkers for evaluating the efficacy of FXS treatment. Here, we add the
347 P1 amplitude and habituation to this list of promising candidates. The passive auditory oddball paradigm is excellent
348 for studying neurodevelopment in children or infants, as it requires no attention or reaction from the participants. The
349 repeated standard stimuli used in this paradigm can elicit differential neural response in the FXS and the TD group,
350 which can be effectively captured by an unsupervised learning algorithm like PCA. The pronounced P1 amplitude in
351 the temporal regions observed in our participants with FXS could be employed as a marker for early diagnosis of this
352 syndrome, if the same pattern can be found in infants. Similarly, P1 amplitude and habituation have the potential to
353 be markers for predicting language outcomes in young patients with FXS, which will facilitate the implementation of
354 early intervention and therapeutics for these patients. They may also serve as an outcome measure for clinical trials to
355 evaluate the efficacy of treatment. Futures studies on a younger population are therefore desirable.

356 4.4 Limitations

357 This study is bound to certain limitations. The sample size in this study is small compared to other EEG studies with
358 adults. Collecting data, especially high-quality EEG data, from children with FXS can be challenging, as they often
359 are sensitive to being touched (especially on their heads), have limited expressive language, and have difficulty sitting
360 in one place. We were successful in obtaining high quality EEG data in 80% of the FXS participants eligible for this
361 study (12/15). To do this, we communicated with parents ahead of visits in order to implement participant-specific
362 behavioral strategies, visual schedules, and positive reinforcements. Careful considerations should always be made to
363 accommodate the needs of these participants, which usually takes a long time for training and accumulating experience.
364 Hence we expect studies with much larger sample sizes to happen through multi-site collaborative research. Another
365 limitation of this study was the inclusion of only full-mutation males with FXS. Understanding the neurobiology of
366 females with FXS is important, as the mosaic expression of FMRP in this group may allow for improved understanding
367 of the role of FMRP in neurodevelopment and provide insight into therapeutic strategies focused on genetic therapy.
368 However, given the increased heterogeneity within females with FXS, larger samples will be needed.

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

369 **5 Conclusion**

370 We analyzed the auditory evoked response to repeated sounds in male children with or without FXS, and examined
371 the neural correlate to early language development. The P1 amplitude and inter-trial phase coherence in the temporal
372 regions were found to be increased in individuals with FXS compared to their age-matched typically developing peers.
373 Additionally, the P1 amplitude and habituation in the frontal region were strongly associated with language scores in
374 the FXS group. These findings suggest that the auditory P1 might be a potential biomarker for early diagnosis of FXS,
375 and for predicting language outcomes in children with this syndrome.

376 **Conflict of Interest Statement**

377 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that
378 could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

379 **Author Contributions**

380 CAN and CLW contributed to conception and design of the study. CLW recruited participants and collected the data.
381 WWA performed the data analysis and data visualization. WWA and CLW wrote the draft of the manuscript. All
382 authors contributed to manuscript revision, read, and approved the submitted version.

383 **Funding**

384 Support for this work was provided by: FRAXA Research Foundation, Autism Science Foundation, The Pierce Family
385 Fragile X Foundation, Thrasher Research Fund, Society for Developmental Behavioral Pediatrics, Harvard Catalyst
386 Medical Research Investigator Training Award, the Rosamund Stone Zander Translational Neuroscience Center at
387 Boston Children's Hospital, and the National Institutes of Health (1T32MH112510, 1K23DC017983-01A1).

388 **Acknowledgments**

389 We thank all the families who participated in this study. We also thank Jack Keller, Megan Lauzé, John Fitzgerald,
390 Megan Hartney and the Translational Neuroscience Center Human Neurobehavioral Core at Boston Children's Hospital
391 for their assistance in data collection of FXS and age-matched controls. We also thank Graham Holt for his EEG
392 technical support.

393 **Supplemental Data**

394 Supplementary materials are available for this manuscript.

395 **Data Availability Statement**

396 The data sets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable
397 request.

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

398 **References**

- 399 Abbeduto, L., Brady, N., and Kover, S. T. (2007). Language development and fragile x syndrome: profiles, syndrome-
400 specificity, and within-syndrome differences. *Mental retardation and developmental disabilities research reviews* 13,
401 36–46. doi:10.1002/MRDD.20142
- 402 Barnea-Goraly, N., Eliez, S., Hedeus, M., Menon, V., White, C. D., Moseley, M., et al. (2003). White matter tract
403 alterations in fragile x syndrome: Preliminary evidence from diffusion tensor imaging. *American Journal of Medical*
404 *Genetics Part B: Neuropsychiatric Genetics* 118B, 81–88. doi:10.1002/AJMG.B.10035
- 405 Bruneau, N., Roux, S., Guérin, P., Barthélémy, C., and Lelord, G. (1997). Temporal prominence of auditory evoked
406 potentials (n1 wave) in 4-8-year-old children. *Psychophysiology* 34, 32–38. doi:10.1111/J.1469-8986.1997.TB02413.
407 X
- 408 Castellanos, N. P. and Makarov, V. A. (2006). Recovering eeg brain signals: artifact suppression with wavelet enhanced
409 independent component analysis. *Journal of neuroscience methods* 158, 300–312. doi:10.1016/J.JNEUMETH.2006.
410 05.033
- 411 Castrén, M., Pääkkönen, A., Tarkka, I. M., Ryyänen, M., and Partanen, J. (2003). Augmentation of auditory n1 in
412 children with fragile x syndrome. *Brain topography* 15, 165–171. doi:10.1023/A:1022606200636
- 413 Clair, D. M. S., Blackwood, D. H., Oliver, C. J., and Dickens, P. (1987). P3 abnormality in fragile x syndrome.
414 *Biological psychiatry* 22, 303–312. doi:10.1016/0006-3223(87)90148-X
- 415 Comery, T. A., Harris, J. B., Willems, P. J., Oostra, B. A., Irwin, S. A., Weiler, I. J., et al. (1997). Abnormal dendritic
416 spines in fragile x knockout mice: maturation and pruning deficits. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
417 *of the United States of America* 94, 5401–5404. doi:10.1073/PNAS.94.10.5401
- 418 Cowan, N., Winkler, I., Teder, W., and Näätänen, R. (1993). Memory prerequisites of mismatch negativity in the
419 auditory event-related potential (erp). *Journal of experimental psychology. Learning, memory, and cognition* 19,
420 909–921. doi:10.1037//0278-7393.19.4.909
- 421 Crawford, D. C., Acuña, J. M., and Sherman, S. L. (2001). Fmr1 and the fragile x syndrome: human genome
422 epidemiology review. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics* 3, 359–371.
423 doi:10.1097/00125817-200109000-00006
- 424 da Silva, M. A. S. and Seixas, T. M. (2017). The role of data range in linear regression. *The Physics Teacher* 55, 371.
425 doi:10.1119/1.4999736
- 426 der Molen, M. J. V., der Molen, M. W. V., Ridderinkhof, K. R., Hamel, B. C., Curfs, L. M., and Ramakers, G. J.
427 (2012a). Auditory and visual cortical activity during selective attention in fragile x syndrome: a cascade of processing
428 deficiencies. *Clinical neurophysiology* 123, 720–729. doi:10.1016/J.CLINPH.2011.08.023
- 429 der Molen, M. J. V., der Molen, M. W. V., Ridderinkhof, K. R., Hamel, B. C., Curfs, L. M., and Ramakers, G. J.
430 (2012b). Auditory change detection in fragile x syndrome males: a brain potential study. *Clinical neurophysiology*
431 123, 1309–1318. doi:10.1016/J.CLINPH.2011.11.039
- 432 D’Hulst, C., Heulens, I., Brouwer, J. R., Willemsen, R., Geest, N. D., Reeve, S. P., et al. (2009). Expression of the
433 gabaergic system in animal models for fragile x syndrome and fragile x associated tremor/ataxia syndrome (fxtas).
434 *Brain research* 1253, 176–183. doi:10.1016/J.BRAINRES.2008.11.075
- 435 Dunn, W. (2014). *Sensory Profile 2* (London: Pearson Education, Inc)

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

- 436 Engel, D., Schütz, A., Krala, M., Schwenk, J. C., Morris, A. P., and Bremmer, F. (2020). Inter-trial phase coherence
437 of visually evoked postural responses in virtual reality. *Experimental Brain Research* 238, 1177–1189. doi:
438 10.1007/S00221-020-05782-2/FIGURES/10
- 439 Ethridge, L. E., Hamm, J. P., Pearlson, G. D., Tamminga, C. A., Sweeney, J. A., Keshavan, M. S., et al. (2015). Event-
440 related potential and time-frequency endophenotypes for schizophrenia and psychotic bipolar disorder. *Biological*
441 *psychiatry* 77, 127–136. doi:10.1016/J.BIOPSYCH.2014.03.032
- 442 Ethridge, L. E., Hamm, J. P., Shapiro, J. R., Summerfelt, A. T., Keedy, S. K., Stevens, M. C., et al. (2012). Neural
443 activations during auditory oddball processing discriminating schizophrenia and psychotic bipolar disorder. *Biological*
444 *psychiatry* 72, 766–774. doi:10.1016/J.BIOPSYCH.2012.03.034
- 445 Ethridge, L. E., Stefano, L. A. D., Schmitt, L. M., Woodruff, N. E., Brown, K. L., Tran, M., et al. (2019). Auditory
446 eeg biomarkers in fragile x syndrome: Clinical relevance. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience* 13, 60. doi:
447 10.3389/FNINT.2019.00060/BIBTEX
- 448 Ethridge, L. E., White, S. P., Mosconi, M. W., Wang, J., Byerly, M. J., and Sweeney, J. A. (2016). Reduced habituation
449 of auditory evoked potentials indicate cortical hyper-excitability in fragile x syndrome. *Translational Psychiatry* 6.
450 doi:10.1038/tp.2016.48
- 451 Finestack, L. H., Richmond, E. K., and Abbeduto, L. (2009). Language development in individuals with fragile x
452 syndrome. *Topics in language disorders* 29, 133–148. doi:10.1097/TLD.0B013E3181A72016
- 453 Franklin, S. B., Gibson, D. J., Robertson, P. A., Pohlmann, J. T., and Fralish, J. S. (1995). Parallel analysis: a method
454 for determining significant principal components recommended citation. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 6, 99–106
- 455 Fries, P. (2005). A mechanism for cognitive dynamics: neuronal communication through neuronal coherence. *Trends in*
456 *Cognitive Sciences* 9, 474–480. doi:10.1016/J.TICS.2005.08.011
- 457 Gonçalves, J. T., Anstey, J. E., Golshani, P., and Portera-Cailliau, C. (2013). Circuit level defects in the developing
458 neocortex of fragile x mice. *Nature Neuroscience* 2013 16:7 16, 903–909. doi:10.1038/nn.3415
- 459 Hersh, J. H., Saul, R. A., and on Genetics, C. (2011). Health Supervision for Children With Fragile X Syndrome.
460 *Pediatrics* 127, 994–1006. doi:10.1542/peds.2010-3500
- 461 Hinton, V. J., Brown, W. T., Wisniewski, K., and Rudelli, R. D. (1991). Analysis of neocortex in three males with the
462 fragile x syndrome. *American Journal of Medical Genetics* 41, 289–294. doi:10.1002/AJMG.1320410306
- 463 Huber, D. E. and O'Reilly, R. C. (2003). Persistence and accommodation in short-term priming and other perceptual
464 paradigms: temporal segregation through synaptic depression. *Cognitive Science* 27, 403–430. doi:10.1016/
465 S0364-0213(03)00012-0
- 466 Idrissi, A. E., Ding, X. H., Scalia, J., Trenkner, E., Brown, W. T., and Dobkin, C. (2005). Decreased gaba(a) receptor
467 expression in the seizure-prone fragile x mouse. *Neuroscience letters* 377, 141–146. doi:10.1016/J.NEULET.2004.
468 11.087
- 469 Irwin, S. A., Idupulapati, M., Gilbert, M. E., Harris, J. B., Chakravarti, A. B., Rogers, E. J., et al. (2002). Dendritic
470 spine and dendritic field characteristics of layer v pyramidal neurons in the visual cortex of fragile-x knockout mice.
471 *American Journal of Medical Genetics* 111, 140–146. doi:10.1002/AJMG.10500
- 472 Jacob, L. P. and Huber, D. E. (2020). Neural habituation enhances novelty detection: an eeg study of rapidly presented
473 words. *Computational brain behavior* 3, 208–227. doi:10.1007/S42113-019-00071-W

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

- 474 Kenny, A., Wright, D., and Stanfield, A. C. (2022). Eeg as a translational biomarker and outcome measure in fragile x
475 syndrome. *Translational Psychiatry* 2022 12:1 12, 1–12. doi:10.1038/s41398-022-01796-2
- 476 Knoth, I. S. and Lippé, S. (2012). Event-related potential alterations in fragile x syndrome. *Frontiers in Human*
477 *Neuroscience* 6, 1–17. doi:10.3389/FNHUM.2012.00264/BIBTEX
- 478 Knoth, I. S., Vannasing, P., Major, P., Michaud, J. L., and Lippé, S. (2014). Alterations of visual and auditory evoked
479 potentials in fragile x syndrome. *International journal of developmental neuroscience : the official journal of the*
480 *International Society for Developmental Neuroscience* 36, 90–97. doi:10.1016/J.IJDEVNEU.2014.05.003
- 481 Kudela, P., Boatman-Reich, D., Beeman, D., and Anderson, W. S. (2018). Modeling neural adaptation in auditory
482 cortex. *Frontiers in Neural Circuits* 12, 1–11. doi:10.3389/FNCIR.2018.00072/BIBTEX
- 483 Kuuluvainen, S., Leminen, A., and Kujala, T. (2016). Auditory evoked potentials to speech and nonspeech stimuli
484 are associated with verbal skills in preschoolers. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience* 19, 223–232. doi:
485 10.1016/J.DCN.2016.04.001
- 486 Legget, K. T., Hild, A. K., Steinmetz, S. E., Simon, S. T., and Rojas, D. C. (2017). Meg and eeg demonstrate similar
487 test-retest reliability of the 40 hz auditory steady-state response. *International journal of psychophysiology* 114,
488 16–23. doi:10.1016/J.IJPSYCHO.2017.01.013
- 489 Makeig, S., Debener, S., Onton, J., and Delorme, A. (2004). Mining event-related brain dynamics. *Trends in cognitive*
490 *sciences* 8, 204–210. doi:10.1016/J.TICS.2004.03.008
- 491 Marino, C. and Gervain, J. (2019). The novelty effect as a predictor of language outcome. *Frontiers in Psychology* 10,
492 258. doi:10.3389/FPSYG.2019.00258/BIBTEX
- 493 Maris, E. and Oostenveld, R. (2007). Nonparametric statistical testing of eeg- and meg-data. *Journal of Neuroscience*
494 *Methods* 164, 177–190. doi:10.1016/j.jneumeth.2007.03.024
- 495 McCullagh, E. A., Rotschafer, S. E., Auerbach, B. D., Klug, A., Kaczmarek, L. K., Cramer, K. S., et al. (2020).
496 Mechanisms underlying auditory processing deficits in fragile x syndrome. *The FASEB Journal* 34, 3501–3518.
497 doi:10.1096/FJ.201902435R
- 498 Monachino, A., Lopez, K., Pierce, L., and Gabard-Durnam, L. (2021). The happe plus event-related (happe+er)
499 software: A standardized processing pipeline for event-related potential analyses. *bioRxiv* , 2021.07.02.450946doi:
500 10.1101/2021.07.02.450946
- 501 Mullen, E. (1989). *Infant Mullen Scales of Early Learning* (Springer, New York, NY). doi:10.1007/978-0-387-79948-3_
502 1570
- 503 Nash-Kille, A. and Sharma, A. (2014). Inter-trial coherence as a marker of cortical phase synchrony in children with
504 sensorineural hearing loss and auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder fitted with hearing aids and cochlear implants.
505 *Clinical neurophysiology : official journal of the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology* 125, 1459.
506 doi:10.1016/J.CLINPH.2013.11.017
- 507 [Dataset] NICHD (2021). What are the symptoms of fragile x syndrome?
- 508 Olmos-Serrano, J. L., Paluszkiwicz, S. M., Martin, B. S., Kaufmann, W. E., Corbin, J. G., and Huntsman, M. M. (2010).
509 Defective gabaergic neurotransmission and pharmacological rescue of neuronal hyperexcitability in the amygdala in
510 a mouse model of fragile x syndrome. *Journal of Neuroscience* 30, 9929–9938. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1714-10.
511 2010

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

- 512 Palva, J. M., Palva, S., and Kaila, K. (2005). Phase synchrony among neuronal oscillations in the human cortex. *Journal*
513 *of Neuroscience* 25, 3962–3972. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4250-04.2005
- 514 Picton, T. W. (2010). *Human auditory evoked potentials* (Plural Publishing, Inc), 1st edn.
- 515 R Core Team (2020). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical
516 Computing, Vienna, Austria
- 517 Rais, M., Binder, D. K., Razak, K. A., and Ethell, I. M. (2018). Sensory processing phenotypes in fragile x syndrome.
518 *ASN Neuro* 10, 1–19. doi:10.1177/1759091418801092
- 519 Rincón, P. L. N. D. (2008). Autism: alterations in auditory perception. *Reviews in the neurosciences* 19, 61–78.
520 doi:10.1515/REVNEURO.2008.19.1.61
- 521 Roberts, J. E., McCary, L. M., Shinkareva, S. V., and Bailey, D. B. (2016). Infant development in fragile x syndrome:
522 Cross-syndrome comparisons. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders* 46, 2088–2099. doi:10.1007/
523 S10803-016-2737-1
- 524 Roberts, T. P., Cannon, K. M., Tavabi, K., Blaskey, L., Khan, S. Y., Monroe, J. F., et al. (2011). Auditory magnetic
525 mismatch field latency: a biomarker for language impairment in autism. *Biological psychiatry* 70, 263–269.
526 doi:10.1016/J.BIOPSYCH.2011.01.015
- 527 Rotschafer, S. E. and Razak, K. A. (2014). Auditory processing in fragile x syndrome. *Frontiers in Cellular Neuroscience*
528 8, 19. doi:10.3389/FNCEL.2014.00019/BIBTEX
- 529 Rudelli, R. D., Brown, W. T., Wisniewski, K., Jenkins, E. C., Laure-Kamionowska, M., Connell, F., et al. (1985). Adult
530 fragile x syndrome: Clinico-neuropathologic findings. *Acta neuropathologica* 67, 289–295. doi:10.1007/BF00687814
- 531 Schneider, A., Hagerman, R. J., and Hessel, D. (2009). Fragile x syndrome – from genes to cognition. *Developmental*
532 *disabilities research reviews* 15, 333–342. doi:10.1002/DDRR.80
- 533 Schneider, A., Leigh, M. J., Adams, P., Nanakul, R., Chechi, T., Olichney, J., et al. (2013). Electrocortical changes
534 associated with minocycline treatment in fragile x syndrome. *Journal of psychopharmacology* 27, 956–963. doi:
535 10.1177/0269881113494105
- 536 Selby, L., Zhang, C., and Sun, Q. Q. (2007). Major defects in neocortical gabaergic inhibitory circuits in mice lacking
537 the fragile x mental retardation protein. *Neuroscience letters* 412, 227–232. doi:10.1016/J.NEULET.2006.11.062
- 538 [Dataset] Shteingart, H. (2022). Parallel analysis (pa) to for determining the number of components to retain from pca. -
539 file exchange - matlab central
- 540 Song, Y. J., Xing, B., Barbour, A. J., Zhou, C., and Jensen, F. E. (2021). Dysregulation of gabaa receptor-mediated
541 neurotransmission during the auditory cortex critical period in the fragile x syndrome mouse model. *Cerebral cortex*
542 32, 197–215. doi:10.1093/CERCOR/BHAB203
- 543 Sparrow, S. S., Cicchetti, D. V., and Saulnier, C. A. (2018). *Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales* (Pearson Education,
544 Inc.), 3rd edn.
- 545 Tass, P., Rosenblum, M. G., Weule, J., Kurths, J., Pikovsky, A., Volkman, J., et al. (1998). Detection of n:m phase
546 locking from noisy data: Application to magnetoencephalography. *Physical Review Letters* 81, 3291–3294
- 547 Tonquist-Uhlén, I., Borg, E., and Spens, K. E. (1995). Topography of auditory evoked long-latency potentials in normal
548 children, with particular reference to the n1 component. *Electroencephalography and clinical neurophysiology* 95,
549 34–41. doi:10.1016/0013-4694(95)00044-Y

NEURAL RESPONSE TO REPEATED AUDITORY STIMULI AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH EARLY LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN WITH FRAGILE X SYNDROME

- 550 Wheeler, A. C., Gwaltney, A., Raspa, M., Okoniewski, K. C., Berry-Kravis, E., Botteron, K. N., et al. (2021).
551 Emergence of developmental delay in infants and toddlers with an fmr1 mutation. *Pediatrics* 147. doi:10.1542/PEDS.
552 2020-011528/180884
- 553 Wilkinson, C. L. and Nelson, C. A. (2021). Increased aperiodic gamma power in young boys with fragile x syndrome is
554 associated with better language ability. *Molecular Autism* 12, 1–15. doi:10.1186/S13229-021-00425-X/TABLES/4
- 555 Wunderlich, J. L., Cone-Wesson, B. K., and Shepherd, R. (2006). Maturation of the cortical auditory evoked potential
556 in infants and young children. *Hearing Research* 212, 185–202. doi:10.1016/j.heares.2005.11.010
- 557 Yvert, B., Fischer, C., Bertrand, O., and Pernier, J. (2005). Localization of human supratemporal auditory areas
558 from intracerebral auditory evoked potentials using distributed source models. *NeuroImage* 28, 140–153. doi:
559 10.1016/J.NEUROIMAGE.2005.05.056
- 560 Zhang, Y., Bonnan, A., Bony, G., Ferezou, I., Pietropaolo, S., Ginger, M., et al. (2014). Dendritic channelopathies
561 contribute to neocortical and sensory hyperexcitability in fmr1/y mice. *Nature Neuroscience* 2014 17:12 17,
562 1701–1709. doi:10.1038/nn.3864
- 563 Zimmerman, I. L., Steiner, V. G., and Pond, R. E. (2011). *Preschool Language Scale* (Pearson Education, Inc), 5th edn.