

# Accessible and reliable neurometric testing in humans using a smartphone platform

H.J. Boele<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, C. Jung<sup>1</sup>, S. Sherry<sup>1</sup>, L.E.M. Roggeveen<sup>2</sup>, S. Dijkhuizen<sup>2</sup>, J. Öhman<sup>3</sup>, E. Abraham<sup>1</sup>, A. Uvarov<sup>4</sup>, C.P. Boele<sup>4</sup>, K. Gultig<sup>5</sup>, A. Rasmussen<sup>5</sup>, M.F. Vinueza-Veloz<sup>2,6</sup>, J.F. Medina<sup>7</sup>, S.K.E. Koekkoek<sup>2</sup>, C.I. De Zeeuw<sup>2,8</sup>, S.S.-H. Wang<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Princeton Neuroscience Institute, Princeton, USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Neuroscience, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup> Department of Clinical Sciences, Lund University, Sweden

<sup>4</sup> BlinkLab Pty LTD, Sydney, Australia

<sup>5</sup> Department of Neuroscience, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>6</sup> Department of Community Medicine and Global Health, University of Oslo, Oslo,  
Norway

<sup>7</sup> Department of Neuroscience, Baylor College of Medicine, USA

<sup>8</sup> Netherlands Institute for Neuroscience, Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences,  
Amsterdam

\*Co-corresponding authors: [hboele@princeton.edu](mailto:hboele@princeton.edu), [sswang@princeton.edu](mailto:sswang@princeton.edu)

**Running title:** Smartphone-mediated neurometric testing

**Keywords:** Eyeblick conditioning, Prepulse inhibition, Startle habituation, Smartphone-based, Neurobehavioral testing

**Abstract:** Tests of human brain circuit function typically require fixed equipment in lab environments. We have developed a smartphone-based platform for neurometric testing. This platform, which uses AI models like computer vision, is optimized for at-home use and produces reproducible, robust results on a battery of tests, including eyeblink conditioning, prepulse inhibition of acoustic startle response, and startle habituation. This approach provides a scalable, universal resource for quantitative assays of central nervous system function.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Neurobehavioral assays of brain function can reveal fundamental mechanisms  
3 underlying neuropsychiatric conditions (1,2), but typically require centrally located  
4 equipment in a laboratory test facility. Consequently, these tests are often unpleasant for  
5 participants as they require instruments attached to their face and cannot be used at scale  
6 in daily clinical practice.

7 We have developed a smartphone-based software platform, termed BlinkLab, to  
8 perform neurobehavioral testing free from facial instruments or other fixed-location  
9 equipment. This AI platform is designed to be used at home or in similar environments,  
10 independently or with the assistance of a caregiver, while following instructions from the  
11 mobile-device application. The tests include, but are not limited to, eyeblink conditioning,  
12 a form of sensory-motor associative learning, prepulse inhibition of the acoustic startle  
13 response, which measures the ability to filter out irrelevant information through  
14 sensorimotor gating, and startle habituation, which measures the ability for the intrinsic  
15 damping of repetitive stimuli.

16 The BlinkLab application combines a smartphone's ability to deliver stimuli and  
17 acquire data using computer vision with a secure cloud-based portal for data storage and  
18 analysis (**Fig. 1**). In our experiments, each audio and/or visual stimulus is presented with  
19 millisecond-precise control over parameters such as timing, amplitude and frequency. In  
20 order to maintain participant attention, an entertaining movie of choice is shown with  
21 normalized audio levels. Participants' responses are measured by the smartphone's  
22 camera and microphone, and are processed in real time using state-of-the art computer  
23 vision techniques, fully anonymized, and transferred securely (TLS 1.3) to the analysis  
24 portal.

25

## 26 MATERIALS AND METHODS

27 *Subjects/Participants:* Participants were recruited from Princeton University  
28 (United States) and Erasmus MC (The Netherlands). For Princeton University,  
29 participants were invited using the SONA system. For Erasmus MC, participants were  
30 recruited using flyers and invites. Participants were informed of the institutional  
31 guidelines, to which they gave their written consents and permissions. There were no  
32 restrictions placed on sex at birth, gender they identify with, nor race. Excluded were  
33 participants younger than 12 and those formally diagnosed with a neurodevelopmental,  
34 neuropsychiatric, or neurodegenerative condition. All procedures were approved by  
35 both the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects of Princeton University  
36 (IRB#13943) and the Medical Ethics Review Committee of Erasmus MC (# MEC- 2022-  
37 0116).

38 *Experimental setup:* The smartphone application was developed in Swift, a  
39 compiled programming language developed by Apple. The cloud-based analysis portal  
40 was developed in Symfony, a high-performance PHP framework for web development  
41 which uses PostgreSQL 14 as the database. The smartphone application was distributed  
42 using TestFlight and the AppStore. Eyelid movements were recorded with the  
43 smartphone's front-facing camera at 60 frames per second. All stimuli were controlled by  
44 the BlinkLab app. The models of iPhones used were iPhone X, iPhone 11, iPhone 13 Pro,  
45 and iPhone 13 Pro Max. The headphones used were Pioneer over-ear wired headphones.  
46 The total length of a session was approximately 15 minutes for a single eyeblink  
47 conditioning session, 12 minutes for a prepulse inhibition session, and 5 minutes for a  
48 startle habituation session (actual length depended on the total durations of the random  
49 intertrial intervals).

50 Prior to the start of the test, we assured that the participant was in a quiet  
51 environment with ambient lighting and in a comfortable position. The app continuously  
52 monitored the surrounding environment, including the light intensity using the camera,  
53 the background noise using the microphone, and the smartphone position and  
54 movements using the accelerometer. If one of the aforementioned values was out of  
55 bounds, the video paused and the app instructed the user on how to change the  
56 environment or try taking the test at another time. During the experiment, the user  
57 watched an entertaining (audio normalized) movie while the stimuli for eyeblink  
58 conditioning, prepulse inhibition, or startle habituation were delivered. For each trial,  
59 facial landmark detection algorithms were used to track and record the position of the  
60 participant's facial landmarks over time to determine amplitude and timing of the eyelid  
61 closure. Users could see a small progress bar at the bottom of the screen that showed  
62 them how far along they were in the experiment. Results were securely transferred and  
63 stored in a cloud-based analysis environment where data became immediately accessible  
64 for researchers through the BlinkLab analysis portal. Both raw and processed data is  
65 available in the most widely used data standards, as well as through BlinkLab's cloud-  
66 based analysis and visualization tools.

67

## 68 **RESULTS**

69 Eyeblick conditioning using the smartphone approach induced conditioned  
70 responses comparable with traditional stimuli such as an airpuff<sup>18</sup>. The unconditioned  
71 stimulus (US) was a 50 ms white noise pulse paired with a brief screen flash, which  
72 reliably elicited a reflexive eyelid closure and activated cerebellum-dependent learning  
73 mechanisms (3,4). The conditioned stimulus (CS) was a white 1 cm circular dot presented  
74 for 450 ms as an overlay over the movie at the screen's center (**See online materials**).

75 Repeated pairings of the CS and US in a delay paradigm on the smartphone, with an  
76 interstimulus interval (ISI) of 400 ms, resulted in a robust acquisition of eyelid  
77 conditioned responses (CR) at the end of six sessions (acquisition phase) of fifty paired  
78 CS-US trials each. The CR amplitude increased from -0.02 ( $\pm$  0.05 95% CI) in baseline  
79 session 0 to 0.35 ( $\pm$  0.09 95% CI) in session 6 ( $F(6,4044) = 74.82, p < .001$ , linear mixed  
80 model (LME)) (**Fig. 2A, Table S2**). Similarly, the CR percentage increased from 5.3 ( $\pm$  6.6  
81 95% CI) in baseline session 0 to 58.5 ( $\pm$  10.6 95% CI) in session 6 ( $F(6,4044) = 65.13, p$   
82  $< .001$ , LME)) (**Fig. 2B, Table S2**). CR timing significantly improved over the course of  
83 training, with session 6 yielding CRs with a latency to peak around the onset of the  
84 expected US at 470.46 ( $\pm$  26.53 95% CI) ms after CS onset ( $F(6,270) = 8.92, p < .001$ ,  
85 ANOVA on LME). To confirm the putative cerebellar nature of these conditioned  
86 responses, we performed two additional tests after the acquisition phase. First, we tested  
87 the effect of a probe CS that was relatively short (i.e., only 100 ms) compared to the one  
88 that was used during training (session 7). This probe CS was only presented in CS-only  
89 trials and never reinforced with a US. In line with previous reports (5,6), we found that  
90 this short probe CS was able to elicit normal CRs in terms of CR percentage ( $F(1,1169) =$   
91  $0.57, p = 0.450$ ) and CR amplitude ( $F(1,1169) = 0.68, p = 0.41$ , LME) (**Fig 2C, D, Table**  
92 **S2**). Second, we tested the effect of an extension of the interstimulus interval from 400  
93 ms to 700 ms during two additional training sessions (sessions 8 and 9). We found that  
94 the timing of eyeblink CRs adapted to the new longer ISI with a new latency to CR peak  
95 of 765.6 ( $\pm$  75.85 95% CI) ms (**Fig 2C, E, Table S2**) ( $F(2,113) = 42.21, p < .001$ , ANOVA  
96 on LME), consistent with previous studies on eyeblink conditioning (7). As a result of our  
97 smartphone approach, we were able to induce robust learning in the eyeblink  
98 conditioning paradigm and produce data that had less variability in learning curves  
99 previously reported, including in our own studies on human eyeblink conditioning

100 (compare for our smartphone approach with for instance (8–10)). The overall learning  
101 pattern now closely resembles those described previously in mouse and rabbit eyeblink  
102 conditioning literature (11–13), with a smooth, gradual increase of the CR amplitude,  
103 percentage, and timing that is adaptive to the interstimulus interval.

104 Next, we studied prepulse inhibition of the startle response, using a 50 ms white  
105 noise audio burst at 105 dB as the pulse and a similar burst ranging between 75 dB and  
106 95 dB as the prepulse. The ISI was set at 120 ms (**See online materials**). Eyelid startle  
107 responses in the pulse-only trials had an average amplitude of 0.35 ( $\pm 0.08$  95% CI), while  
108 responses in trials where the pulse was preceded by the weaker prepulse ranged  
109 between 0.07 ( $\pm 0.03$  95% CI) and 0.14 ( $\pm 0.06$  95% CI) (**Fig. 2F, G, Table S3**). We found  
110 a significant main effect of trial type ( $F(4,1434) = 99.44, p < .001$ , ANOVA on LME) and  
111 pairwise post-hoc testing revealed that the largest effects were present between the  
112 pulse and the prepulse + pulse trials (**Fig. 3, Table S3**). With prepulse inhibition values  
113 of about 70% ( $100 - (0.10/0.35) * 100$ ), our data shows a strong inhibition of the acoustic  
114 startle responses (compare our results for instance with: (14–16)).

115 Finally, we studied startle habituation using a 0.75 Hz pulse train of five white  
116 noise audio bursts at an intensity of 105 dB (**See online materials**). We found a  
117 significant reduction of the eyelid startle amplitude over the course of the stimulus  
118 pattern, starting with 0.30 ( $\pm 0.15$ ) at the first pulse and 0.13 ( $\pm 0.14$ ) at the fifth pulse  
119 (**Fig. 4, Table S4,  $F(4,612) = 18.14, p < .001$ , LME**). Post-hoc testing revealed significant  
120 effects between pulse 1 and any of the other pulses (**Table S4**).

121

## 122 DISCUSSION

123 Together, our data shows that we can now perform well-established  
124 neurobehavioral testing using accessible smartphone technology. In contrast to

125 conducting these tests in a sterile laboratory environment, we found that people  
126 performed better and had less variability in their performance by doing them on a  
127 smartphone in a comfortable home-like environment. Since these tests are reflex-based  
128 and do not require verbal or social interaction, they allow large-scale cross-cultural  
129 human studies and a foundation on cross-species translational research. It has been  
130 shown that performance in eyeblink conditioning, prepulse inhibition, and startle  
131 habituation is strongly correlated with neuropsychiatric conditions, including  
132 autism(1,2,8), schizophrenia(17,18), dementia(8,19,20), Parkinson's(21) and  
133 Huntington's disease(21–23). As such, these tests have repeatedly been suggested as a  
134 potential biomarker to diagnose and monitor (pharmaceutical) intervention of  
135 neurodevelopmental and neurodegenerative conditions. Since the new smartphone  
136 approach does not require unpleasant in-lab testing, it opens up the possibility of using  
137 these quantitative tests in clinical practice.

138

## 139 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

140 We thank all the participants in our studies.

141

## 142 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

143 HB, SK, CB, SW, AU, and CZ engage with BlinkLab Pty Ltd, the exclusive licensee of the  
144 technology, as co-founders and equity holders. The remaining authors declare no  
145 competing interests.

146

## 147 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

148 Conceptualization: HB, SS, AU, CB, SK,



149 Methodology: HB, CJ, SS, AU, CB, SK, KG  
150 Investigation: HB, CJ, SS, LR, SD, JO, EA, SK, KG  
151 Analysis: HB, CB, SK,  
152 Visualization: HB, CB, SK,  
153 Funding acquisition: HB, AU,  
154 Project administration: HB, CJ, SS, LR,  
155 Supervision: HB, AU, SK, CZ, SW  
156 Writing – original draft: HB, CJ, SS, SK,  
157 Writing – review & editing: HB, JM, CZ, SW, AR

158

## 159 **FUNDING**

160 This work was financially supported by the Princeton Accelerator Award 2021 (HJB, SSH)

161

## 162 **DATA AVAILABILITY**

163 Complete eyeblink conditioning dataset, prepulse inhibition dataset, and startle  
164 habituation dataset are publicly available at:

165 <https://github.com/506574657220426F656C650D/POC-datasets>. Data is anonymized,

166 the unique identifier for the different subjects is the `subject_id`.

167

## 168 **CODE AVAILABILITY**

169 Complete R syntax for data analysis is available at:


170 <https://github.com/506574657220426F656C650D/POC-datasets>.

## REFERENCES

- 171 1. Welsh JP, Oristaglio JT. Autism and Classical Eyeblink Conditioning: Performance Changes of the  
172 Conditioned Response Related to Autism Spectrum Disorder Diagnosis. *Front Psychiatry*.  
173 2016;7:137.
- 174 2. Cheng CH, Chan PYS, Hsu SC, Liu CY. Meta-analysis of sensorimotor gating in patients with autism  
175 spectrum disorders. *Psychiatry Res*. 2018 Apr;262:413–9.
- 176 3. Marcos Malmierca JL, Marcos de Vega A. Eyeblink conditioning with a noise burst as unconditioned  
177 stimulus. *Psicothema*. 2017 Feb;29(1):78–82.
- 178 4. Rogers RF, Fender AF, Steinmetz JE. The cerebellum is necessary for rabbit classical eyeblink  
179 conditioning with a non-somatosensory (photic) unconditioned stimulus. *Behav Brain Res*. 1999  
180 Oct;104(1–2):105–12.
- 181 5. Jirenhed DA, Hesslow G. Time course of classically conditioned Purkinje cell response is determined by  
182 initial part of conditioned stimulus. *J Neurosci*. 2011 Jun 22;31(25):9070–4.
- 183 6. Khilkevich A, Canton-Josh J, DeLord E, Mauk MD. A cerebellar adaptation to uncertain inputs. *Science*  
184 *Advances [Internet]*. 2018 May 30 [cited 2022 Nov 21];4(5):eaap9660. Available from:  
185 <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.aap9660>
- 186 7. Ebel HC, Prokasy WF. Classical eyelid conditioning as a function of sustained and shifted interstimulus  
187 intervals. *J Exp Psychol*. 1963;65:52–8.
- 188 8. Woodruff-Pak D, Steinmetz JE, editors. *Eyeblink Classical Conditioning: Volume I [Internet]*. Boston:  
189 Kluwer Academic Publishers; 2002 [cited 2022 Nov 21]. Available from:  
190 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/b108229>
- 191 9. Gerwig M, Guberina H, Esser AC, Siebler M, Schoch B, Frings M, et al. Evaluation of multiple-session  
192 delay eyeblink conditioning comparing patients with focal cerebellar lesions and cerebellar  
193 degeneration. *Behav Brain Res*. 2010 Oct 15;212(2):143–51.
- 194 10. Lowgren K, Baath R, Rasmussen A, Boele HJ, Koekkoek SKE, De Zeeuw CI, et al. Performance in  
195 eyeblink conditioning is age and sex dependent. *PloS one*. 2017;12(5):e0177849.
- 196 11. Albergaria C, Silva NT, Pritchett DL, Carey MR. Locomotor activity modulates associative learning in  
197 mouse cerebellum. *Nature neuroscience*. 2018 May;21(5):725–35.
- 198 12. McCormick DA, Thompson RF. Cerebellum: essential involvement in the classically conditioned  
199 eyelid response. *Science*. 1984 Jan 20;223(4633):296–9.
- 200 13. Heiney SA, Wohl MP, Chettih SN, Ruffolo LI, Medina JF. Cerebellar-Dependent Expression of Motor  
201 Learning during Eyeblink Conditioning in Head-Fixed Mice. *J Neurosci [Internet]*. 2014 Nov 5 [cited  
202 2019 Nov 20];34(45):14845–53. Available from:  
203 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4220020/>
- 204 14. Hoffman HS, Fleshler M. Startle Reaction: Modification by Background Acoustic Stimulation. *Science*  
205 *[Internet]*. 1963 [cited 2022 Nov 21];141(3584):928–30. Available from:  
206 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1712315>
- 207 15. Swerdlow NR, Braff DL, Geyer MA. Cross-species studies of sensorimotor gating of the startle reflex.  
208 *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 1999 Jun 29;877:202–16.


- 209 16. Braff DL, Geyer MA, Swerdlow NR. Human studies of prepulse inhibition of startle: normal subjects,  
210 patient groups, and pharmacological studies. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2001 Jul;156(2-3):234-  
211 58.
- 212 17. Braff DL, Geyer MA, Swerdlow NR. Human studies of prepulse inhibition of startle: normal subjects,  
213 patient groups, and pharmacological studies. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2001 Jul;156(2-3):234-  
214 58.
- 215 18. Coesmans M, Röder CH, Smit AE, Koekkoek SKE, De Zeeuw CI, Frens MA, et al. Cerebellar motor  
216 learning deficits in medicated and medication-free men with recent-onset schizophrenia. *J Psychiatry*  
217 *Neurosci*. 2014 Jan;39(1):E3-11.
- 218 19. Ueki A, Goto K, Sato N, Iso H, Morita Y. Prepulse inhibition of acoustic startle response in mild  
219 cognitive impairment and mild dementia of Alzheimer type. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2006  
220 Feb;60(1):55-62.
- 221 20. Woodruff-Pak DS, Papka M, Romano S, Li YT. Eyeblink classical conditioning in Alzheimer's disease  
222 and cerebrovascular dementia. *Neurobiol Aging*. 1996;17(4):505-12.
- 223 21. Valls-Solé J, Muñoz JE, Valldeoriola F. Abnormalities of prepulse inhibition do not depend on blink  
224 reflex excitability: a study in Parkinson's disease and Huntington's disease. *Clinical Neurophysiology*  
225 [Internet]. 2004 Jul 1 [cited 2022 Nov 23];115(7):1527-36. Available from:  
226 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1388245704000811>
- 227 22. Woodruff-Pak DS, Papka M. Huntington's disease and eyeblink classical conditioning: normal  
228 learning but abnormal timing. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc*. 1996 Jul;2(4):323-34.
- 229 23. Swerdlow NR, Paulsen J, Braff DL, Butters N, Geyer MA, Swenson MR. Impaired prepulse inhibition of  
230 acoustic and tactile startle response in patients with Huntington's disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg*  
231 *Psychiatry*. 1995 Feb;58(2):192-200.

## Figure 1



**Figure 1 | Architecture of smartphone-mediated neurobehavioral testing (A)** Auditory, visual, and tactile stimuli are delivered via the smartphone. The camera measures the participant's responses at 60 Hz. **(B)** Facial landmark detection algorithms are capable of detecting eyelid movements in real-time on the smartphone. Images of the face are removed to protect privacy. Contact corresponding author to request access to these images. Images are used and can be shared with permission of the participant. **(C)** The architecture of smartphone-mediated neurobehavioral testing includes a smartphone application (left), a secure database (middle), and a cloud-based analysis portal (right) that allows the remote experimenter to control experimental parameters and analyze collected data.


## Figure 2



**Figure 2 | Smartphone-mediated delay eyeblink conditioning (A)** Session averaged eyeblink traces of CS-only trials (left) and paired CS-US trials (right). Note the gradual acquisition of eyeblink conditioned responses. The first vertical dashed line indicates the onset of the CS, the second one indicates the onset of the US. The heatmap shows the average per trial for CS-only trials during the 6 acquisition sessions; heat represents the amplitude of eyelid response. **(B)** Percentage of CRs per session. Light blue lines are individual learning curves, the thick black line represents the group average. **(C)** Session averaged eyelid CRs in response to a CS with a duration of 450 ms (light blue) at the end of acquisition (session 6), a short probe CS with a duration of 100 ms (brown), and a long CS with a duration of 750 ms (dark blue). The short CS was never reinforced with the US. The long CS was reinforced with a US. **(D)** The short CS of 100 ms elicited eyeblink CRs that were indistinguishable from those evoked by the original 450 ms CS. **(E)** As a result of the ISI switch, the latency to CR peak

shifted from the onset of the old US at 400 ms to the onset of the new US at 700 ms. Abbreviations: 100 ms CS, conditional stimulus with a duration of 100 ms; 450 ms CS, conditional stimulus with a duration of 450 ms (ISI 400 ms); 750 ms CS, conditional stimulus with a duration of 750 ms (ISI 700 ms); CR, conditioned response. All error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

**Figure 3**




**Figure 3 | Smartphone-mediated prepulse inhibition of the acoustic startle response (A)**

Averaged eyelid traces for the different trial types. The presentation of a soft sound (prepulse, first vertical dashed line) 120 ms before the loud sound (pulse, second vertical dashed line) resulted in a significant inhibition of the acoustic eyelid startle response. Note that higher prepulse intensities (25% and 50%) start to evoke a small startle response to the prepulse. **(B)**

Amplitude of eyelid closure as a function of trial type. All error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

## Figure 4



**Figure 4 | Smartphone-mediated startle habituation (A)** Individual (yellow) and group averaged (black) eyelid traces during the presentation of 5 consecutive acoustic white noise pulses, showing a gradual decline in eyelid startle responses. **(B)** Amplitude of eyelid closure as a function of trial type.



## Supplementary materials for:

H.J. Boele<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, C. Jung<sup>1</sup>, S. Sherry<sup>1</sup>, L.E.M. Roggeveen<sup>2</sup>, S. Dijkhuizen<sup>2</sup>, J. Öhman<sup>3</sup>, E. Abraham<sup>1</sup>, A. Uvarov<sup>4</sup>, C.P. Boele<sup>4</sup>, K. Gultig<sup>5</sup>, A. Rasmussen<sup>5</sup>, M.F. Vinueza-Veloz<sup>2,6</sup>, J.F. Medina<sup>7</sup>, S.K.E. Koekkoek<sup>2</sup>, C.I. De Zeeuw<sup>2,8</sup>, S.S.-H. Wang<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Princeton Neuroscience Institute, Princeton, USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Neuroscience, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup> Department of Clinical Sciences, Lund University, Sweden

<sup>4</sup> BlinkLab Pty LTD, Sydney, Australia

<sup>5</sup> Department of Neuroscience, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>6</sup> Department of Community Medicine and Global Health, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

<sup>7</sup> Department of Neuroscience, Baylor College of Medicine, USA

<sup>8</sup> Netherlands Institute for Neuroscience, Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences, Amsterdam

\*Co-corresponding authors: [hboele@princeton.edu](mailto:hboele@princeton.edu), [sswang@princeton.edu](mailto:sswang@princeton.edu)

232 **ONLINE METHOD SECTION**

233

234 **Eyeblink conditioning training paradigm:** Participants (n=14, details in **Table**  
235 **S2**) completed 6-9 eyeblink conditioning sessions within a 14-day span, with no more  
236 than 2 sessions per day. The conditioned stimulus (CS) consisted of a white circular dot,  
237 1 cm in diameter, in the middle of the screen which lasted for 450 ms. The unconditioned  
238 stimulus (US) consisted of a simultaneous 105 dB, 50 ms white noise pulse and a 50 ms  
239 full screen retina flash. The CS and US were presented in a delay paradigm, which means  
240 that the CS and US have a delay in onset, but temporally overlap and co-terminate at the  
241 end. For session 1-6, the interval between CS and US onset was set at 400 ms  
242 (**Supplementary figure 2**). The interval between the trials was set randomly between 7  
243 and 20 seconds. During sessions 1-6, participants received a total of 50 trials distributed  
244 over 5 blocks. Each block consisted of 1 CS-only, 1 US-only, and 8 paired CS-US trials,  
245 semi-randomly distributed throughout the block. In session 7, participants received a  
246 short CS (100 ms) in CS-only trials to demonstrate cerebellum-dependent response  
247 timing. In sessions 8 and 9, the duration of the interstimulus interval (ISI) was suddenly  
248 extended from 400 ms to 700 ms. The longer ISI of 700 ms was used to assess the level of  
249 response timing adaptability. A training session lasted for about 15-20 minutes.

250

251 **Prepulse inhibition training paradigm:** Participants (n = 30, details in **Table**  
252 **S2**) completed a single prepulse inhibition session. One session contained 55 trials. The  
253 two stimuli were defined as: 1) a pulse consisting of a 105 dB, 50 ms white noise audio  
254 burst and 2) a prepulse, consisting of a 50 ms white noise audio burst of varying  
255 amplitude that was always softer than the pulse. We used prepulse at four intensities: 65

256 dB, 75 dB, 83 dB and 93 dB. First, a total of 5 habituation trials containing white noise  
257 bursts of various soft intensities were presented. This allowed for the participant to relax  
258 and settle into the movie. After these 5 trials, 10 blocks of 5 trials were presented. Each  
259 block consisted of a pulse only trial and 4 prepulse-pulse trials with prepulse amplitudes  
260 of respectively 5, 10, 25, and 50% of the startle amplitude. A prepulse always preceded  
261 the pulse by 120 ms (**Supplementary Figure 3**). Intertrial interval (ITI) was set at  
262 random between 10 and 25 seconds. A training session lasted for about 15-20 minutes.

263

264 **Startle habituation training paradigm:** Participants (n = 14, details in **Table S2**)  
265 completed a single startle habituation session. One session contained 10 trials. For startle  
266 habituation, we used a 0.75 Hz pulse train of five white noise audio bursts at an intensity  
267 of 105 dB (**Supplementary Figure 4**). The ITI was set at random between 20 and 40  
268 seconds. A training session lasted for about 15-20 minutes.

269

270 **Data analysis:** Individual eyeblink traces were analyzed with custom computer software  
271 (R Studio; Boston, MA, v1.3.1093). Eyelid position signals were calculated in real-time on  
272 the smartphone based on the xyz coordinate of the six landmarks around the eye. For  
273 this, we calculated the difference between the y position values of the sum of the two  
274 upper eyelid landmarks and the sum of the two lower eyelid landmarks with the x  
275 position values of the two eye corner landmarks (**Supplementary Figure 1**). For each  
276 type of trial, a single snippet was taken from the video of the eyelid position signal  
277 hereafter called an 'eyeblink trace'. Eyeblink traces were filtered in forward and reverse  
278 directions with a low-pass Butterworth filter using a cut-off frequency at 50 Hz. Trials  
279 were min-max normalized by aligning the 500 ms pre-stimulus baselines and  
280 normalizing the signal so that the amplitude of a full blink was 1 normalized eye closure.

281 This normalization was achieved by using spontaneous blinks as a reference. For each  
282 session, the maximum value was calculated and the individual traces were normalized by  
283 dividing each trace by this value. Therefore, in the normalized traces, a normalized eyelid  
284 closure of 1 corresponded with the eye being fully closed and a normalized eyelid closure  
285 of 0 corresponded with the eye being fully open.

286

287 *Eyeblink conditioning:* To quantify eyeblink conditioning, we used four outcome  
288 measures: (1) The CR amplitude, defined as the amplitude of the eyelid response in the  
289 60 ms - US offset window; (2) the CR percentage, defined as the percentage of trials within  
290 a session that contained a CR, whereby a CR was defined as an eyelid movement larger  
291 than 0.15 and with a latency to CR peak between 60 ms after CS onset and US offset; (3)  
292 the latency to CR onset in ms after CS onset, and (4) the latency to CR peak in ms after CS  
293 onset. The calculation of the CR percentage, CR amplitude, and latency to CR onset  
294 included both paired CS-US trials and CS-only trials. For latency to CR peak, we only  
295 included CS-only trials since they show the full kinetic profile of the eyeblink CR and  
296 provide a better estimate of the adaptive timing of eyeblink CRs.

297

298 *Prepulse inhibition:* The response detection window for eyelid responses to the pulse was  
299 set at 60-330 ms after pulse onset. To analyze amplitude reduction, we used the  
300 amplitude of the normalized eyelid closure at the mean peak time of significant startle  
301 responses calculated over *all* trials. In addition to responsiveness to the startle stimuli,  
302 we analyzed the effect of the prepulse itself on normalized eyelid closure in a similar  
303 fashion but used a response window of 60-180 ms after the prepulse.

304


305 *Startle habituation:* The response detection windows for startle responses were set at 60-  
306 330 ms after a startle stimulus. Response detection was done in a similar fashion as  
307 described above for eyeblink conditioning. To analyze amplitude reduction, we used the  
308 amplitude of the normalized eyelid closure at the mean peak time of significant startle  
309 responses calculated over *all* trials.

310


311 **Statistical analysis:** Statistical analysis and data visualizations were done in R Studio  
312 (V2022.02.03) using the following packages: dplyr, emmeans, ggplot2, lmerTest, nlme,  
313 tidyr, and tidyverse. We used multilevel linear mixed-effects (LME) models in R Studio  
314 because they are more robust to violations of normality assumptions, which is often the  
315 case in biological data samples. LME models can better accommodate the nested  
316 structure of our data (i.e., trial nested within session, session nested within subject,  
317 subject nested within group) and prevent data loss by using summary measures. As an  
318 added benefit, LME models are better at handling missing data points than repeated  
319 measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) models and do not require homoscedasticity as  
320 an inherent assumption. In our LME, we used session as a fixed effect, and subject as a  
321 random effect. Goodness-of-fit model comparison was determined by evaluating log  
322 likelihood ratio, BIC, and AIC values. The distribution of residuals was inspected visually  
323 by plotting the quantiles of standard normal versus standardized residuals (*i.e.* Q-Q  
324 plots). Data were considered as statistically significant if the p-value was less than 0.05.

325

## Supplementary figure 1



Photographs of the face are removed to ensure privacy protection. Please contact corresponding to request access to these images.




$$NEC = \frac{(\|LM38 - LM42\| + \|LM39 + LM41\|)}{2 * \|LM37 - LM40\|}$$

NEC = Normalized eyelid closure


**Supplementary Figure 1 | Computer vision algorithms were used to capture facial landmarks detection, including those of the eyelids.** Normalized eyelid closure (NEC) was calculated for each eye, using six landmarks for each eye. Images of the face are removed to protect privacy. Contact corresponding author to request access to these images. Images were used and can be shared with permission of the participant.

## Supplementary figure 2



**Supplementary Figure 2 | Raw eyelid traces of one participant for one eyelid conditioning session.** This figure is a screen capture of the cloud-based analysis portal and shows how we visualize the data that is collected with the smartphone. Depicted is session 6, the last session of the acquisition phase. Each colored line represents one trial. Top panel, CS only trials; Middle panel, paired CS-US trials; Bottom panel, US only trials. Note the robust conditioned eyelid responses.

## Supplementary figure 3



**Supplementary Figure 3 | Raw eyelid traces of one participant for one prepulse inhibition of the acoustic startle experiment.** This figure is a screen capture of the cloud-based analysis portal and shows how we visualize the data that is collected with the smartphone. Each colored line represents one trial. Top panel, pulse only trials (105 dB); Middle panel, prepulse + pulse trials (65 dB + 105 dB); Bottom panel, prepulse + pulse trials (75 dB + 105 dB). Note the inhibition of the eyelid startle response in the prepulse + pulse trials.



## Supplementary figure 4



**Supplementary Figure 4 | Raw eyelid traces of one participant for one startle habituation experiment.** This figure is a screen capture of the cloud-based analysis portal and shows how we visualize the data that is collected with the smartphone. Each colored line represents one trial. Five consecutive startle pulses at 105 dB were presented with an interval of 750 ms between the trials. Note the gradual decrease in eyelid startle responses.

### Supplementary table 1 | Participants per neurometric test

	<b>Eyeblink conditioning (n = 14)</b>	<b>Prepulse inhibition (n = 30)</b>	<b>Startle habituation (n = 14)</b>
<b>Age (years)*</b>	29 ( $\pm$ 13.17)	25 ( $\pm$ 13.82)	34 ( $\pm$ 17.87)
<b>Sex</b>			
Male	5 (36%)	14 (47%)	6 (43%)
Female	9 (64%)	16 (53%)	8 (57%)

\* All values: mean  $\pm$  1 standard deviation

## Supplementary table 2 | Pavlovian eyeblink conditioning (n = 14 participants)

Session	Phase	ISI duration	CS duration		CR percentage (mean ± 95% CI)	CR amplitude (mean ± 95% CI)	Latency to CR onset (ms) (mean ± 95% CI)	Latency to CR peak (ms) (mean ± 95% CI)
			CS-US	CS only				
0	Baseline	400 ms	450 ms	450 ms	5.3 (± 6.6)	-0.02(± 0.05)	156.33(± 121.24)	229(± 115.18)
1	Acquisition	400 ms	450 ms	450 ms	20.4 (± 10.0)	0.08(± 0.07)	163.47(± 34.78)	412.5(± 96.4)
2	Acquisition	400 ms	450 ms	450 ms	31.0 (± 12.5)	0.15(± 0.08)	179.11(± 27.3)	531.96(± 31.71)
3	Acquisition	400 ms	450 ms	450 ms	37.0 (± 13.1)	0.21(± 0.1)	167.19(± 29.9)	436.69(± 60.53)
4	Acquisition	400 ms	450 ms	450 ms	49.3 (± 13.0)	0.3(± 0.11)	183.24(± 27.97)	455.63(± 31.51)
5	Acquisition	400 ms	450 ms	450 ms	56.6 (±11.1)	0.36(± 0.1)	170.41(± 28.7)	492.65(± 25.28)
6	Acquisition	400 ms	450 ms	450 ms	58.5 (10.6)	0.35(± 0.09)	203.55(± 26.47)	470.46(± 26.53)
<b>Main effect session*</b>					F(6,4044) = 65.13, p < .00001	F(6,4044) = 74.82, p < .00001	F (6,1057) = 1.65, p = 0.13	F (6,270) = 8.92, p = 6.79E-09
6	Short CS	400 ms	450 ms	450 ms	58.46 (± 10.55)	0.35 (± 0.09)	203.55 (± 26.47)	470.46 (± 26.53)
7	Short CS	400 ms	450 ms	100 ms	55.77 (± 14.55)	0.34 (± 0.11)	172.81 (± 28.47)	475.53 (± 37.64)
<b>Main effect session*</b>					F(1,1169) = 0.57, p=0.45	F(1,1169) = 0.68, p=0.41	F(1,387) = 3.64, p=0.06	F(1,82) = 0.42, p=0.52
6	ISI switch	400 ms	450 ms	450 ms	58.46 (± 10.55)	0.35 (± 0.09)	203.55 (± 26.47)	470.46 (± 26.53)
8	ISI switch	700 ms	750 ms	750 ms	30.58 (± 15.43)	0.14 (± 0.15)	236.78 (± 31.24)	652.97 (± 91.6)
9	ISI switch	700 ms	750 ms	750 ms	40.23 (± 18.71)	0.22 (± 0.18)	278.32 (± 78.02)	765.6 (± 75.85)
<b>Main effect session*</b>					F(2,1522) = 65.8, p < .00001	F(2,1522) = 56.22, p < .00001	F(2,749) = 3.42, p=0.03	F(2,113) = 42.21, p < .00001

All values: mean ± 95% confidence interval

\* ANOVA on Linear Mixed-Effect model

### Supplementary table 3 | Prepulse inhibition of acoustic startle response (n = 30 participants)

Trial type	Amplitude of eyelid startle in response to pulse			Amplitude of eyelid startle in response to prepulse		
Pulse (105 dB)	0.35 (± 0.08)			0.01 (± 0.02)		
Prepulse 65 dB + Pulse	0.14 (± 0.06)			0.01 (± 0.03)		
Prepulse 75 dB + Pulse	0.1 (± 0.05)			0.02 (± 0.02)		
Prepulse 83 dB + Pulse	0.09 (± 0.04)			0.05 (± 0.03)		
Prepulse 93 dB + Pulse	0.07 (± 0.03)			0.1 (± 0.03)		
Main effect of trial type*	F(4,1434) = 99.44, p<.00001			F(4,1434) = 15.62, p<.00001		

Pairwise differences of trial type	Estimate	t-ratio	p-value**	Estimate	t-ratio	p-value**
(Pulse) vs. (PP 65 dB + Pulse)	0.203	12.758	<.0001	-0.0097	-0.724	1
(Pulse) vs. (PP 75 dB + Pulse)	0.249	15.505	<.0001	-0.0104	-0.771	1
(Pulse) vs. (PP 83 dB + Pulse)	0.258	15.873	<.0001	-0.0477	-3.483	0.0036
(Pulse) vs. (PP 93 dB + Pulse)	0.279	17.291	<.0001	-0.0912	-6.701	<.0001
(PP 65 dB + Pulse) vs. (PP 75 dB + Pulse)	0.046	2.913	0.0145	-0.0007	-0.055	1
(PP 65 dB + Pulse) vs. (PP 83 dB + Pulse)	0.054	3.423	0.0032	-0.0380	-2.82	0.0244
(PP 65 dB + Pulse) vs. (PP 93 dB + Pulse)	0.075	4.771	<.0001	-0.0814	-6.085	<.0001
(PP 75 dB + Pulse) vs. (PP 83 dB + Pulse)	0.008	0.535	0.5926	-0.0372	-2.739	0.025
(PP 75 dB + Pulse) vs. (PP 93 dB + Pulse)	0.029	1.851	0.1931	-0.0807	-5.973	<.0001
(PP 83 dB + Pulse) vs. (PP 93 dB + Pulse)	0.021	1.298	0.3889	-0.0434	-3.181	0.009

All values: mean ± 95% confidence interval

\* ANOVA on Linear Mixed-Effect model

\*\*P-value adjustment: bonferroni-holm method for 10 tests

## Supplementary Table 4 | Startle habituation (n = 14 participants)

Pulse number	Percentage eyelid startles			Eyelid startle amplitude		
Startle pulse 1	39.68 (± 22.47)			0.30 (± 0.15)		
Startle pulse 2	27.78 (± 20.4)			0.16 (± 0.14)		
Startle pulse 3	21.43 (± 20.05)			0.13 (± 0.15)		
Startle pulse 4	21.43 (± 21.12)			0.11 (± 0.14)		
Startle pulse 5	19.84 (± 19.19)			0.13 (± 0.14)		
<b>Main effect of pulse*</b>	F(4,612) = 9.85, p<.00001			F(4,612) = 18.14, p<.00001		

Pairwise differences	Estimate	t-ratio	p-value**	Estimate	t-ratio	p-value**
Startle pulses 1 vs. 2	11.9	3.215	0.0096	0.135	5.459	<.0001
Startle pulses 1 vs. 3	18.25	4.93	<.0001	0.165	6.7	<.0001
Startle pulses 1 vs. 4	18.25	4.93	<.0001	0.182	7.387	<.0001
Startle pulses 1 vs. 5	19.84	5.358	<.0001	0.164	6.665	<.0001
Startle pulses 2 vs. 3	6.35	1.715	0.4345	0.030	1.242	1
Startle pulses 2 vs. 4	6.35	1.715	0.4345	0.047	1.928	0.325
Startle pulses 2 vs. 5	7.94	2.143	0.1949	0.029	1.207	1
Startle pulses 3 vs. 4	0	0	1	0.017	0.687	1
Startle pulses 3 vs. 5	1.59	0.429	1	-0.000	-0.035	1
Startle pulses 4 vs. 5	1.59	0.429	1	-0.017	-0.722	1

All values: mean ± 95% confidence interval

\* ANOVA on Linear Mixed-Effect model

\*\*P-value adjustment: bonferroni-holm method for 10 tests