

# 1 Impaired Proactive Cognitive Control in 2 Parkinson's disease

3  
4 Julius Kricheldorff<sup>1\*</sup>, Julia Ficke<sup>1</sup>, Stefan Debener<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Karsten Witt<sup>1,2</sup>

5 1 – Department of Neurology, School of Medicine and Health Science, Carl von Ossietzky  
6 University of Oldenburg

7 2 – Research Center of Neurosensory Science, Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg

8 3 – Neuropsychology Lab, Department of Psychology, Carl von Ossietzky University of  
9 Oldenburg

10 4 – Cluster of Excellence Hearing4all, Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg

11 \* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed

12 Word count: 8160

13

14        **Abstract**

15            Adaptive control has been studied in Parkinson's disease (PD) mainly in the context of proactive  
16 control and with mixed results. We compared reactive- and proactive control in 30 participants with  
17 Parkinson's disease (PD) to 30 age matched healthy control participants (HC). The  
18 electroencephalographic (EEG) activity of the participants was recorded over 128 channels while they  
19 performed a numerical Stroop task, in which we controlled for confounding stimulus-response learning.  
20 We assessed effects of reactive- and proactive control on reaction time-, accuracy- and EEG time-  
21 frequency data. Behavioral results show distinct impairments of proactive- reactive control in  
22 participants with PD, when tested on their usual medication. Participants with PD were unable to adapt  
23 cognitive control proactively and were less effective to resolve conflict using reactive control. Successful  
24 reactive and proactive control in the HC group was accompanied by a reduced conflict effect between  
25 congruent and incongruent items in midline-frontal theta power. Our findings provide evidence for a  
26 general impairment of proactive control in PD and suggest that the same may be the case for reactive  
27 control.

28            **Keywords:** Parkinson's disease, adaptive control, proactive control, reactive control, oscillations,  
29 theta

## 30 Introduction

31 Parkinson's disease (PD) is a neurodegenerative disorder primarily diagnosed and characterized by  
32 symptoms causing impaired motor functioning. PD also negatively affects multiple domains of cognition.  
33 Cognitive deficits associated with PD have been demonstrated to be an even larger detriment to quality  
34 of life of patients with PD' than motor impairments(1) . Individuals with PD display deficits in inhibition  
35 (e.g. 2,3), reinforcement learning (4), and cognitive control (5). Further, there is conflicting evidence  
36 whether individuals with PD exhibit a diminished adaptive control capacity (6). Adaptive control is the  
37 ability to adjust cognitive control to a given context and is thought to be essential for successful goal  
38 direct behavior in dynamic environments (7,8). Therefore, gaining a better understanding of how PD  
39 affects adaptive control is crucial.

40 Cognitive control describes the ability to regulate thoughts, or behavior to align with internal  
41 behavioral goals (9) and is often measured using interference tasks. For example, in the classical Stroop  
42 task (10) participants have to name the color that a particular word is printed in. This is relatively easy if  
43 the color and the word agree (congruent/no-conflict) - for example, the word RED, printed in red. The  
44 task becomes more difficult, when the color and word oppose each other (conflict/incongruent trial) - for  
45 example the word GREEN printed in the color red. Here the automatic tendency of the learned reading  
46 behavior, may interfere with the task of naming the color. Cognitive control is required to resolve the  
47 ensuing conflict/interference. Cognitive control can be measured by the strength of the interference  
48 effect. The interference effect measures the difference on reaction time or error rate between trials that  
49 contain conflicting/incongruent information versus trials containing non-conflict/congruent information.  
50 The dual mechanisms of control (DMC) framework (8,9) posits two modes of cognitive control, proactive-  
51 and reactive control. Proactive control is effortful, sustained over time and is thought to be already  
52 active before conflict is encountered. Reactive control is a "late-correction" mechanism (9). It is only  
53 engaged after encountering conflict. Proactive control is considered costly and resource intensive,  
54 making reactive control the default option (9).

## 55 Measuring Adaptive Control

56 Adaptive control (also control learning or context-control learning) describes the  
57 regulation/adaptation of cognitive control resources to stable contexts repeatedly experienced over  
58 time. A common method to measure proactive control adaptation is to compare the strength of the  
59 interference effect in lists containing primarily conflicting (MI) items, in contrasts to list containing  
60 primarily non-conflicting (MC) items (11) - termed "list-wide proportion congruency effect" (LWPCE). The

61 frequent exposure to conflict, in the MI list containing high proportion of conflicting items, should lead to  
62 the implementation of a "global control" adaptation (11). Cognitive control is sustained over the whole  
63 list/block (i.e. a temporal context) in anticipation of upcoming conflicts. Thus, participants are able to  
64 generalize the learned temporal context to other instances or items (12). This is reflected in a reduction  
65 in interference. Control shifts attention toward the response predicting stimulus feature (e.g. the color  
66 word RED), away from the conflicting feature (e.g. the color of the word green). This allows participants  
67 to respond relatively faster and more accurately in trials containing conflicting information. Moreover,  
68 typically reaction times (RTs) slow down in non-conflict trials. Since attention is shifted away from the  
69 conflicting stimulus feature (e.g. the color) it cannot facilitate the response. Thus, instead of two  
70 predictive stimulus features participants base their responses largely on one stimulus feature in the non-  
71 conflict case. In the context of MC lists control is seldom required and only applied reactively. Less  
72 control leads to more interference by the conflicting stimulus feature (slowing in RT and increase in error  
73 rates) on conflict/incongruent trials. Due to facilitation by both stimulus features RTs and error rates  
74 decrease on congruent trials. The difference in interference effects in high- (MI) versus low (MC) conflict  
75 context can be used to quantify the proactive control adaptation.

76 Reactive control adaptations can be measured by manipulating conflict proportions at the item  
77 level - termed "item-specific proportion congruency effect" (ISPCE) (11). Similar to the LWPCE, specific  
78 items are presented more often containing conflicting information (MI), and others are presented more  
79 often not containing conflicting information (MC). In contrast to the LWPCE, the temporal context (e.g.  
80 lists/blocks) is balanced in terms of conflict presentation. Hence, the manipulation occurs only "locally"  
81 on the level of the items. Due to the balanced overall presentation of conflict trials, participants are  
82 unable to predict conflict in the next item. Hence, conflict adaptation can only occur bottom-up (12) or  
83 reactively after encountering the item with its conflict identifying predictive feature. Thus, participants  
84 are not learning a "global" temporal context-association but a "local" feature-association, specific to a  
85 set of items. Reactive control is then similarly estimated by calculating the difference in interference  
86 between MC-Items and MI-Items.

87 Measurements of cognitive control adaptations are often criticized as the experimentally induced  
88 effects can also be explained by simpler stimulus-response (S-R) learning without the need to invoke  
89 adaptation of cognitive control mechanisms (for a review see 13). To isolate adaptive control processes  
90 independently of S-R learning, Braem et al. (11) recommend to induce adaptive control processes in one  
91 set of items, and measure the effects in a second set of unbiased items. Here we refer the former as

92 inducer items and the latter diagnostic items (for an overview of how to employ these manipulations in  
93 different experimental contexts, see 11).

## 94 **Adaptive Control and Parkinson's Disease**

95 The literature on adaptive control abilities in PD is ambiguous, showing both evidence in favor of  
96 intact- and impaired adaptive control. Proactive control adaptation in PD has often been assessed using  
97 congruency sequence effect (CSE) manipulations. The CSE can be considered a more local, transient  
98 measure of proactive control (11) where adaptation in response to conflict in the previous trial is  
99 evaluated (14). Participants with PD on their usual dopaminergic medication (DOPA ON), in contrast to  
100 healthy control (HC) participants, have been reported to show comparable CSE modulations on RT (15)  
101 and no CSE modulations (16,17) on RT, saccadic latencies, and N2 - and lateralized readiness potential.  
102 Global proactive control adaptation, as measured by the LWPCCE has been reported to be absent in PD in  
103 one study (6). Successful adaptation of proactive control may also depend on dopamine replacement  
104 therapy. Duthoo et al. (18) found the CSE to be impaired in participants with PD ON- their dopaminergic  
105 medication, but not OFF. In contrast, Ruitenberg et al. (19) investigating global proactive control (LWPCCE)  
106 in a Stroop paradigm, found comparable conflict adaptation of movement speed in participants with PD  
107 both ON- and OFF- their dopaminergic medication.

108 Investigations regarding reactive control abilities in PD are sparse. To our knowledge, reactive  
109 control has only been assessed by Ruitenberg et al. (20) using the ISPCE. Controlling for S-R learning  
110 effects, Ruitenberg et al. (20) reported intact control adaptations in PD as compared to HC participants,  
111 independent of dopaminergic status.

112 Presently, the literature does not support a strong argument for the absence of local- and global  
113 proactive control in PD. The heterogeneous results, in conjunction with small sample sizes, of the  
114 reported results could suggest a potential reduction of local- and global proactive control in PD.  
115 Moreover, it has yet to be established that participants with PD are able to acquire the associated  
116 context-control rules independently of S-R learning in proactive control. Past studies did not distinguish  
117 between S-R associations effects and proactive control. While the latter has been done in one study on  
118 reactive control further corroborating evidence by replication is required.

## 119 **EEG Correlates of Adaptive Control**

120 Electrophysiological recordings such as EEG have a high temporal resolution and are well suited to  
121 analyze cognitive and adaptive control predictions put forward by the DMC framework.  
122 Electrophysiological correlates of cognitive- and adaptive control effects have often been investigated

123 with event-related potentials (ERPs, for an overview see 18). Many of those ERPs have their spectral  
124 origin in the theta-band (4-8 Hz) (22). Not only the phase-locked part of theta oscillation (in other words  
125 the ERP), but to a larger degree also the non-phase locked part reflects conflict processing and is  
126 predictive of behavior (23). Theta modulation over midline-frontal electrodes are thought to  
127 communicate the need for control (22). Frontal theta has been shown to be reduced in people with PD in  
128 a number of processes/tasks, such as the startle-response (24) or interval timing (25). Moreover, with  
129 regard to conflict processing people with PD exhibit reduced response-related conflict activity at frontal  
130 electrodes relative to HC participants (26). Transient frontal theta activity has also been shown to  
131 increase in anticipation of a cognitive demanding task, indexing preparatory proactive control (27).  
132 Further, using a Simon task, Chinn et al. (28) found midline-frontal theta dynamics were modulated by  
133 proactive control adaptation (via LWPC manipulation). In a temporal context where high conflict was  
134 expected (MI), less frontal theta was observed on conflict trials as compared to the low conflict temporal  
135 context (MC). Moreover, in local proactive control adaptation (as measured by the CSE) less frontal theta  
136 was observed when a conflict trial was preceded by a conflict trial (28,29). Pastötter et al. (29) traced the  
137 origin of the theta cluster of the CSE proactive control adaptation to the left cingulate gyrus and pre-  
138 supplementary motor area using multiple-source beamformer analysis. The opposite pattern can be  
139 expected for reactive control. Jiang et al. (30) in a Stroop-like task with an ISPCE manipulation, found  
140 activity in the theta band, in a posterior cluster, to be increased in incongruent items in high-conflict  
141 versus low-conflict conditions and congruent theta in congruent items to be increased in low-conflict  
142 conditions versus high conflict conditions. Thus, proactive control adaptation may be indexed by a  
143 reduction in control resources during conflict processing as indexed by a smaller midline-frontal conflict  
144 theta effect, whereas reactive control adaptation may be characterized by a larger conflict theta effect,  
145 possibly with a more posterior distribution.

## 146 The Present Study

147 Given the heterogeneous results investigating adaptive control in PD in conjunction with  
148 methodological issues (such as sample size), the present study assesses if proactive and reactive control  
149 adaptation are affected in people with PD, using their usual medication regiment while controlling for S-  
150 R learning. We used a numerical Stroop paradigm (31), with only two response options and separate  
151 items to induce the manipulation (inducer items) and measure its effect (diagnostic items). Based on the  
152 available literature we expected reduced proactive control and intact reactive control in participants  
153 with PD in comparison to HC participants. Moreover, to distinguish reactive control effects from  
154 proactive control effects we further assessed midline-frontal theta activity. We hypothesized reduced

155 midline-frontal theta band activity to be associated with successful adaptive control and impaired  
156 adaptive control to be indexed by a failure to adequately regulate midline-frontal conflict related theta  
157 activity. Moreover, we expect patterns in theta modulation to distinguish reactive from proactive  
158 control.

## 159 **Methods**

### 160 **Ethics and Registration**

161 The study was approved by the local medical ethics committee (2020-133) in accordance with the  
162 declaration of Helsinki (32). The study design was preregistered in the German clinical trial registry  
163 (DRKS00023020).

### 164 **Participants and General Procedure**

165 We recruited 31 participants with PD and 34 healthy participants (HC) matched in age and gender.  
166 All PD patients fulfill the MDS-diagnostic criteria for PD (33). Four of the HC participants were excluded  
167 because they switched the response hand instead of using their right hand as instructed. One participant  
168 from the PD group had to be excluded as they were inattentive for large proportion of the task. The final  
169 data set included 30 participants (22 men and 8 women) in the PD group with a mean age of 64 years (SD  
170 = 9.6 years) and 30 participants (18 men and 12 women) in the control group with a mean age of 59.4  
171 years (SD = 6.8 years).

172 We only included participants who fulfilled the following criteria: a) no co-morbid neurological or  
173 psychiatric problems, b) right-handedness, c) normal or corrected to normal vision, d) MMSE <25  
174 ( $\text{mean}_{\text{PD}} = 29.2$ ,  $\text{SD}_{\text{PD}} = 1.1$ ;  $\text{mean}_{\text{HC}} = 29.1$ ,  $\text{SD}_{\text{HC}} = 1.0$ ). UPDRS-III ratings were recorded for all participants  
175 with PD (mean = 12.0, SD = 7.0). Moreover, we recorded the formal education in years of our  
176 participants (mean<sub>PD</sub> = 16.2 y, SD<sub>PD</sub> = 3.0 y; mean<sub>HC</sub> = 16.0 y, SD<sub>HC</sub> = 3.2 y).

177 The experiment took part at the out-patient clinic of the Evangelisches Krankenhaus Oldenburg.  
178 Since the recordings took part around the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic, participants and  
179 experimenters remained masked for the duration of the experiment. After being informed about the  
180 purpose of the experiment, participants gave their written informed consent and were screened with the  
181 MMSE and reported their education level in years. MDS-UPDRS-III ratings were recorded for all  
182 participants with PD. Subsequently, participants performed the experiment and EEG was recorded. In  
183 total, task and preparation lasted for about 2.5 hours.

184 **Experimental Paradigm**

185 Participants performed a numerical Stroop task with both LWPCE and ISPCE manipulations,  
186 presented in OpenSesame (34). The numerical Stroop task requires participants to select the numerically  
187 larger or smaller number between two numbers displayed on screen. Stroop-like congruency-conflict  
188 effects are introduced by manipulating the physical size of the displayed number pairs. One number was  
189 always numerically larger to the other and one number was displayed physically larger than the other.  
190 For example, in an incongruent comparison the numerically smaller number is displayed physically larger  
191 and the numerically larger number is displayed physically smaller. Our rationale for selecting the  
192 numerical Stroop task was twofold: 1) to have sufficiently many items available to have inducer and  
193 diagnostic item sets, and 2) reduce task demands and avoid for our participants having to learn multiple  
194 response options (e.g. color associated keys in the Stroop task). During each trial participants saw a  
195 fixation cross for 300-600ms (uniformly varied), followed by the two numbers (for a list of items see  
196 Table 1) presented on screen until participants indicated a response. Participants had up to 2000ms to  
197 make a response. Afterwards, a blank screen was displayed for 800ms before the next trial started.


Items		
Numerical Distance	Small Number Pairs	Large Number Pairs
1	1-2, 3-4	6-7, 8-9
2	1-3, 2-4	6-8, 7-9

198 *Table 1 List of items used in the numerical Stroop task. We used items with a numerical distance 1 and 2 also previously*  
199 *used by Dadon and Henik (35). Items were balanced in terms of numerical presentation and overall presentation. For ISPCE*  
200 *manipulation either small or large number pairs were manipulated respectively.*

201 Participants completed a total of 8 blocks with 134 trials each. Four blocks contained the LWPCE  
202 items and the other four blocks contained the ISPC items. Per Block ~70% of the items presented were  
203 inducer items (N = 94) and ~30% (N = 40) were diagnostic items. Diagnostic items contained equal  
204 proportions of congruent and incongruent items. Inducer items contained ~80% incongruent items in the  
205 MI condition and 80% congruent items in the MC condition. In the LWPCE manipulation, participants  
206 were presented with blocks containing more- (MI - 70% incongruent- 30% congruent trials) and two  
207 blocks containing fewer (MC - 30% incongruent- 70% congruent trials) incongruent items. In each of the  
208 four ISPCE blocks equal amounts of congruent and incongruent items (see Figure 1) were presented.  
209 Only the proportions of half of the items were biased. We chose to manipulate the proportion of  
210 congruency by the numerical size of the number pairs - larger number pairs (numbers > 5) versus smaller  
211 number pairs (numbers < 5; see Table 1). For example, two large number pairs were randomly selected



212 as inducer items, and the remaining two large number items were subsequently used as diagnostic  
 213 items. For half of the participants (per experimental group) the large number items contained MC  
 214 comparisons and the small items MI comparisons and vice versa for the other half of the participants.  
 215 Before performing the task, participants completed 32 trials with feedback, without the LWPCE or IWPC  
 216 manipulations, to familiarize themselves with the task.



217

218 *Figure 1 Schematic presentation of the task design. Proactive control was manipulated via the LWPCE with blocks*  
 219 *consisting of either mainly congruent (MC) and mainly incongruent (MI) inducer items (blue). Reactive control vice versa with*  
 220 *mainly congruent and incongruent inducer items, the manipulation was induced per item (large versus small number pairs).*  
 221 *Effects were measured in unbiased diagnostic items (red).*

222 Block presentation order was randomized and participants would either start with the ISPC  
 223 blocks or the LWPCE blocks. Within the LWPCE blocks we also randomized whether the MI or MC block  
 224 was presented first. Moreover, items were presented to the participants in pseudo-randomized order.  
 225 Pseudo-randomization was performed with custom-written Python scripts, implementing the algorithm  
 226 by van Casteren and Davis (36), using a mix of random shuffling and backtracking to achieve a random  
 227 presentation of the criteria we defined. Criteria were (1) diagnostic items should not be presented one  
 228 after each other (in order to have a balanced presentation of diagnostics throughout the block) (2) the  
 229 same item should not be presented more than twice in a row, (3) inducer items should not be presented  
 230 more than four times in a row, (4) the same correct response side (left or right) should not be presented  
 231 on more than three consecutive trials and (5) the same congruence should not follow be presented more  
 232 than four times in a row. Item presentation order were randomized for each participant separately  
 233 according to these rules.

## 234 Behavioral Data Analysis

235 Analysis of the behavioral data was performed in R (R-4.1.3) (37). Data visualizations were created  
236 using the ggplot2 package (38) and ggdist (39).

237 Statistical analyses of the behavioral data were performed using Bayesian mixed effect models  
238 using the brms package (40). For the RT analysis (performed on correctly answered trials) due to right-  
239 skewed distribution of RT data we used a shifted log-normal likelihood function. Trials shorter than  
240 200ms were not included in the analysis. In total 20 trials or 0.03% of the data were excluded. The ISPCE  
241 and LWPCE were analyzed in separate models. We used contrast coded dummy variables to calculate the  
242 main effects for Congruency (congruent - incongruent), Block/Item Type (MC - MI) and their interaction  
243 for each group (PD - HC) separately (see supplement – section 1). Moreover, we included random  
244 intercepts for the participants and items. Further, we included separate intercepts per group for the shift  
245 parameter of the model.

246 In order to maximize the utility of the data we collected, we used information from the inducer  
247 items to inform the prior parameter space of the diagnostic models. We fitted separate inducer models  
248 for the LWPCE- and ISPCE data. We used weakly informative priors derived at by prior predictive  
249 simulations yielding plausible RT distributions of the data (see supplement – section 2). For the  
250 diagnostic model we used the posterior distribution of the inducer model to construct informed priors  
251 for the effects not expected to differ between conditions (shift parameter, sigma, Congruency,  
252 Block/Item, and the random intercepts). We used a Gaussian distribution, with mu equal to the mean of  
253 the inducer posterior and sigma defined as the larger absolute difference, between the posterior mean  
254 and the two 95% credible interval borders of the inducer posterior. For the interaction effects we used  
255 regularized priors with a Gaussian distribution centered around zero with sigma defined as the larger  
256 absolute difference, between zero and the two 95% credible interval borders of the posterior  
257 distribution of the inducer model.

258 To evaluate the interaction effect between Congruency and Block/Item (depending on ISPCE or  
259 LWPCE analysis) in milliseconds, we used the posterior distribution to calculate the estimated marginal  
260 means for each effect (MC congruent, MC incongruent, MI congruent, MI incongruent) and group. Next,  
261 we calculated the "Conflict effect" (congruent - incongruent) for each of the two conflict conditions (MC  
262 and MI). Adaptive control was operationalized as the difference between the two conflict effects.  
263 Moreover, we compared how RT varied in congruent and incongruent trials between the two conflict  
264 conditions (i.e. MI congruent - MC congruent and MI incongruent - MC incongruent).

265 For the analysis of the error data we performed a logistic regression (Bernoulli-distribution with  
266 logit-link function) and used the same approach to fit inducer and diagnostic models as outlined for the  
267 shifted-log normal model. Priors were weakly informed so that lower error rates had a higher  
268 probability, as typically participants never make more than 10% errors during these kinds of tasks data  
269 (see supplement – section 3). Log-odds of the estimated marginal mean effects were transformed into  
270 probabilities for a more meaningful interpretation.

271 To evaluate how well a particular model factor predicted the data we calculated Bayes inclusion  
272 factors (BIF) across matched models using bridge sampling (41). We calculated the likelihood for the  
273 factors of each experimental group separately. For example, to evaluate the contribution of Congruency  
274 in group HC, we did not consider the contribution of any of the factors in the PD group. The BIF of  
275 Congruency reflects the likelihood of factor Congruency ( $H_A$ ) over the averaged likelihood of the null  
276 model and the model containing the factor Block ( $H_0$ ). BIFs and BFs smaller than 1 suggest evidence in  
277 favor of the null model (no contribution of the factor/interaction in question), whereas BIFs and BFs  
278 larger than 1 would signify evidence in favor of the alternative. We qualify evidential strength provided  
279 by the BIF by using criteria suggested by Jeffreys (42). BIFs smaller than 3 and larger than 1/3 provide  
280 insufficient evidence for either hypothesis. BIFs between 3 and 10 (or 1/3 and 1/10) provide anecdotal  
281 evidence, between 10 and 30 (1/10 and 1/30) strong evidence and anything larger than 30 (or < 1/30) is  
282 classified as substantial evidence in support of the hypothesis in question.

283 For the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling we ran four chains with 2000 warm-up  
284 iterations and 10000 iterations for each chain to sample from the posterior distribution. We assessed  
285 model convergence by confirming that the potential scale reduction factor  $\hat{R}$  for all parameter were near  
286 1 and less than 1.1 and by visual inspection of the chain trace plots. Model fit was assessed comparing  
287 the actual data with simulated data from the model's posterior predictive distribution (see supplement  
288 section 5).

### 289 Exploratory Analysis

290 After identifying a deficit for the LWPCE manipulation in the PD group, we were interested in the  
291 association between proactive control and motor status of the participants. We fitted the inducer and  
292 diagnostic model (with the previously informed priors) to the data of the participants with PD alone.  
293 Again, we assessed effects of Block, Congruency and the interaction. In contrast to the previous models  
294 we included random slopes for the main and interaction effects. The resulting model gave us participant  
295 specific posterior distributions. We calculated proactive control as the difference in Stroop effects  
296 between the two conflict conditions (MC and MI), with a posterior distribution of the differences for

297 each participant. We summarized proactive control as the mean of the resulting posterior distribution  
298 and calculated the Pearson correlation with the participant associated MDS-UPDRS motor scores. To  
299 evaluate statistical significance in this analysis we calculated p-values with a significance level alpha of  
300 0.05.

### 301 EEG Recording and Preprocessing

302 EEG was recorded continuously (actiChamp plus by Brain Vision 43) with a sampling rate of 1000  
303 Hz, from 128 active Ag/AgCl electrodes. Impedances were kept below 10k $\Omega$ . Preprocessing was  
304 performed in Matlab using the EEGLAB toolbox (44). Data were first downsampled to 250 Hz, 0.1 Hz  
305 high-pass filtered and detrended over the whole recording period for each channel separately. Noisy  
306 channels were excluded via the `pop_clean_rawdata()` function with the following criteria:  
307 FlatlineCriterion = 5, ChannelCriterion = 0.8, and LineNoiseCriterion = 5. On average we identified and  
308 removed 4.9 (SD = 4.1) bad channels per participant. Afterwards, data were re-referenced to an average  
309 reference. Line-noise was removed using EEGLABs `pop_cleanline()` function. Noisy data segments were  
310 excluded in a automatized manner with artifact subspace reconstruction (45) using the  
311 `pop_clean_rawdata()` function with the "Burstcriterion" parameter set to 80. We selected a relatively  
312 high threshold here in order to remove only excessively noisy data segments (e.g. movement occurred  
313 during the segment in question) and not eye blinks. Subsequently we used independent component  
314 analysis (Infomax algorithm) to identify and remove components reflecting eye blinks and larger muscle  
315 artifacts. Data were then epoched stimulus-locked [-1.2s, 2s] and response locked [-2s, 1.2s]. In order to  
316 decrease the effects of volume conduction, we performed a surface-Laplacian transformation using the  
317 CSD toolbox (46).

318 After preprocessing in the group with PD, we had to exclude one participant due to insufficient  
319 data quality after preprocessing (due to excessive movement during recording), and for two participants  
320 after preprocessing there were too few trials in the ISPCE task in some conditions (<40) to perform the  
321 planned regression analysis. The same was true for two participants in the LWPCE condition. Thus, the  
322 final data set in the LWPCE and ISPCE analyses of the PD group (including the participant excluded due to  
323 poor behavioral performance) consisted of 26 participants. In the HC group we could not use the data of  
324 one participant due to a technical problem during recording and had too few trials (<40 per condition)  
325 for the regression analysis in one participant in the ISPCE analysis. The final data set of the HC group  
326 consisted of 29 participants for LWPCE analysis and 28 participants in the ISPCE analysis.

## 327 EEG Data Analysis

328 Response-locked and stimulus-locked data sets were frequency transformed via fast Fourier  
329 transform (FFT) and convolved with the FFTs of a series of Morlet wavelets. We used 20 wavelets  
330 logarithmically spaced from 2 Hz to 30 Hz. Wavelet cycles were logarithmically spaced from three to ten,  
331 increasing by frequency. This allowed better band specific resolution for the higher frequencies and  
332 better time resolution for lower frequencies. After wavelet convolution data was down-sampled to  
333 125Hz for further analysis. Due to a short fixation window (600-300 ms) baseline correction was  
334 performed over the whole trial period (47). A baseline period covering 0 ms to 1000 ms (or -1000 ms to 0  
335 ms for the response locked data) was used for decibel conversion. This approach allowed us to identify  
336 transient changes in oscillatory activity.

337 After decibel conversion, we performed a GLM analysis using the ordinary least-squared solution  
338 for each participant, electrode, frequency and time point. To calculate the regression coefficients, we  
339 used functions provided by the LIMO toolbox (48). For the GLM of the EEG data, we used similar effect  
340 coded contrasts as in the behavioral analysis, with separate models for the LWPCE and ISPCE data. For  
341 each participant we had effect coded contrast for Congruency, Block/Item and their interaction. We did  
342 not distinguish between inducer and diagnostic items, as the number of trials in the diagnostic items  
343 alone, after preprocessing would have been too low. As with the behavioral data, to investigate the  
344 interaction effect between Block/Item and Congruency, marginal mean effects were calculated for each  
345 participant separately. With the marginal mean effects, we calculated the difference in Congruency  
346 (Congruent - Incongruent) for the conflict effect in each block/item (MC and MI). Adaptive control (for  
347 the ISPCE and LWPCE separately) was then analyzed by comparing the difference in conflict effects in  
348 blocks or items when proportionally more conflict is expected versus when proportionally little conflict is  
349 expected (MI - MC). To investigate the contribution of conflict-related theta activity, we then averaged  
350 the data over the theta-band (4-8 Hz). In order to correct for multiple comparisons, we used non-  
351 parametric cluster-based permutation test statistics (49) in FieldTrip (50) using dependent t-tests, a  
352 cluster-alpha of 0.05 and an alpha of 0.05, with 10000 permutations.


## 353 Results

### 354 Behavioral Results

355 Overall, we found insufficient evidence that participants with PD were slower (747 ms) compared  
356 to the HC participants (673 ms) in overall RT performance,  $t(58) = 2.11$ ,  $p = 0.039$ ,  $BF_{10} = 1.66$   
357 (see Figure 3). We found strong evidence that participants with PD performed on average more errors

358 (3.1%) than the HC participants (1.5%),  $t(58) = -3.1, p = 0.004, BF_{10} = 11.53$ . Nonetheless, overall  
 359 accuracy in the task was high across groups and we found only very limited evidence for the use adaptive  
 360 control in the analysis of the error data (the interested reader is referred to section 4 in the supplement,  
 361 for a summary of the results).

362




363

364 *Figure 2 Summary of the shifted log-normal regression analysis results. Displayed are the estimated marginal mean*  
 365 *posterior distributions for the conflict effects (incongruent - congruent) in the high conflict condition (MI), low conflict condition*  
 366 *(MC) and their difference. Results are organized row-wise by group (Control and Parkinson) and column-wise by effect (LWPCE*  
 367 *and ISPCE). Inducer model estimates are displayed in blue and diagnostic model estimates in red. The shaded areas of the*  
 368 *posterior distribution correspond to the 66% and 95% credible intervals.*

369 The results of the shifted-log normal analysis are depicted in Table 2 and Figure 2. With regard to  
370 adaptive control manipulations, the RT analysis of the inducer items of the LWPC manipulation showed  
371 an interaction effect, with reduced conflict RT in the MI versus MC condition, for both the HC  
372 participants ( $m = -47.8$  ms,  $CI = (-62.1$  ms |  $-34.3$  ms),  $BIF > 1000$ ) and the participants with PD ( $m = -35.9$   
373 ms,  $CI = (-49.6$  |  $-22.6$  ms),  $BIF > 1000$ ). The effect in the HC group was explained to a large degree by a  
374 reduction in RT to incongruent items in the MI condition ( $m = -29.9$  ms,  $CI = (-40.5$  ms |  $-19.8$  ms)) and to  
375 a lesser degree by a reduction of RT to congruent items in the MC condition ( $m = -17.9$  ms,  $CI = (-26.6$  ms  
376 |  $-9.6$  ms)). The PD group showed a similar pattern with a strong reduction in RT to incongruent items in  
377 the MI condition ( $m = -26.2$  ms,  $CI = (-36.8$  ms |  $-16.2$  ms)) and slightly less reduction of RT in congruent  
378 items in the MC condition ( $m = -9.6$  ms,  $CI = (-18.3$  ms |  $-1.3$  ms)). In the analysis of the diagnostic items,  
379 we also found decisive evidence for the presence of an interaction effect in the HC group, ( $m = -34.5$  ms,  
380  $CI = (-51.5$  ms |  $-18.2$  ms),  $BIF = 518.32$ ), with the effect being driven by a reduction in RT to incongruent  
381 items in the MI condition ( $m = -27.8$  ms,  $CI = (-39.9$  ms |  $-16.3$  ms)) but possibly no reduction of RT to  
382 congruent items in the MC condition ( $m = -6.7$  ms,  $CI = (-16.5$  ms |  $2.8$  ms)), as the credible interval was  
383 compatible with null. The interaction effect in the diagnostic items was smaller in the PD sample and  
384 provided insufficient evidence ( $m = -17.2$  ms,  $CI = (-33.7$  ms |  $-1.1$  ms,  $BIF = 1.74$ )), for the presence of  
385 interaction effect. Contrasts revealed a relative reduction in RT congruent items in the MC condition ( $m =$   
386  $-10.1$  ms,  $CI = (-19.9$  ms |  $-0.3$  ms)) but possibly no reduction in RT to incongruent items in the MI  
387 condition ( $m = -7$  ms,  $CI = (-18.5$  ms |  $4.3$  ms)) with the credible interval being compatible with null.  
388 Moreover, the difference between groups in posterior probability in RT reduction to incongruent items  
389 in the MI condition indicates that HC participants had a larger reduction with a mean of 20.8 ms and 95%  
390 of the posterior probability between 37.1 ms and 4.8 ms. Thus, it appears that relative to HC  
391 participants, participants with PD were impaired in their ability extend proactive control to diagnostic  
392 items. Figure 3B also highlights this qualitative difference between HC and participants with PD. The RT  
393 of the diagnostics items tracks the RT of the inducer items closely for the HC participants over time, but  
394 not the participants with PD.





395

396 *Figure 3 Reaction time distributions and consistency of diagnostic and inducer item reaction times over time of the*  
 397 *LWPCE- (A, B) and ISPCE data (C, D). The top row contains data for the HC participants and bottom row of the participants with*  
 398 *PD. Panel A) and C), depict the RT distribution of all items (diagnostic and inducer) by congruence for the high conflict (MI) and*  
 399 *low conflict (MC) proportion manipulation. Nodes at the bottom show the average difference in RT between congruent and*  
 400 *incongruent item by proportion manipulation. Panel B) and D) display the time course of RT averaged over quartiles by*  
 401 *congruency (congruent and incongruent) and item type (inducer and diagnostic items). The two columns distinguish the high-*  
 402 *(MI) and low (MC) conflict proportion manipulation.*



403 The analysis of the inducer items of the ISPCE analysis revealed again decisive evidence for the  
 404 presence of an interaction effect in both the HC- ( $m = -45.5$  ms,  $CI = (-59.9$  ms |  $-32.1$  ms),  $BIF > 1000$ )  
 405 and PD participant ( $m = -30.4$  ms,  $CI = (-44.2$  ms |  $-17.3$  ms),  $BIF > 1000$ ) groups. The effect in the HC  
 406 group was determined by a RT reduction to the incongruent items in the MI condition ( $m = -43.6$  ms,  $CI =$   
 407  $(-55.3$  ms |  $-32.8$  ms)) but possibly no reduction in RT to congruent item in the MC condition ( $m = -1.9$   
 408 ms,  $CI = (-10.1$  ms |  $6.2$  ms)) with null being included in the 95% credible interval. The interaction effect  
 409 in the group with PD, was explained by a relative decrease in RTs of congruent items in MC condition ( $m$   
 410  $= -16.2$  ms,  $CI = (-25.1$  ms |  $-7.6$  ms)) and a reduction in RTs of incongruent trials in the MI condition ( $m =$   
 411  $-14.2$  ms,  $CI = (-24.3$  ms |  $-4.6$  ms)). Comparing the difference between groups in posterior probability in  
 412 RT reduction to incongruent items in the MI condition showed that HC participants had a larger  
 413 reduction with a mean of 24.8 ms and 95% of the posterior probability between 41.6 ms and 8.6 ms.  
 414 Thus, while both groups show a sizable ISPCE effect on RTs in the inducer items, these appear to have  
 415 different origins. The HC participants appeared to be more effective in regulating responses to conflict  
 416 relative to the participants with PD. Further analysis of the diagnostic items provided no evidence for an  
 417 ISPCE in either group and instead anecdotal evidence favoring the null hypothesis in the HC- ( $m = -15.6$   
 418 ms,  $CI = (-32.0$  ms |  $0.2$  ms),  $BIF = 0.53$ ) and group with PD ( $m = 12.3$  ms,  $CI = (-28.7$  ms |  $3.9$  ms),  $BIF =$   
 419  $0.68$ ). Hence, we found no evidence that either group could extend reactive control beyond the items  
 420 used to induce the ISPCE manipulation. The mismatch between averaged diagnostic- and inducer RT in  
 421 both groups is highlighted in **Error! Reference source not found.B.**

Parameter	PD		HC	
	<i>M(CI) in ms</i>	<i>BIF<sub>10</sub></i>	<i>M(CI) in ms</i>	<i>BIF<sub>10</sub></i>
<b>LWPCE – Inducer Items</b>				
Congruency	62.1(52.9/72.3)	>1000	79.5(68.7/91.4)	>1000
Block PC	8.3(1.8/14.9)	0.19	6.0(-0.5/12.6)	0.04
Interaction	-35.9(-49.6 /-22.6)	>1000	-47.8(-62.1/-34.3)	>1000
<b>LWPCE – Diagnostic Items</b>				
Congruency	62.9(53.9/72.7)	>1000	79.1(68.9/90.4)	>1000
Block PC	-1.5(-8.4/5.3)	0.35	10.6(3.7/17.7)	14.80
Interaction	-17.2(-33.4/-1.1)	1.74	-34.5(-51.5/-18.2)	518.32
<b>ISPCE – Inducer Items</b>				
Congruency	58.6(49.5/69.0)	>1000	80.3(69.2/93.0)	>1000
Item PC	-1.1(-7.4/5.5)	0.03	20.9(14.1/28.1)	>1000
Interaction	-30.4(-44.2/-17.3)	>1000	-45.5(-59.9/-32.1)	>1000
<b>ISPCE – Diagnostic Items</b>				
Congruency	68.2(58.3/79.1)	>1000	76.9(66.2/88.5)	>1000
Item PC	-6.2(-13.3/0.9)	3.00	17.0(9.8/24.4)	235.78
Interaction	-12.3(-28.7/3.9)	0.68	-15.6(-32.0/0.2)	0.53


422 *Table 2 Results of the shifted log-normal regression analysis. Mean estimates and 95 percent credible intervals are*  
423 *provided in milliseconds. The factor congruency reflects the difference between incongruent and congruent items, the factor*  
424 *Block/Item PC the relative difference between MC and MI blocks/items and the interaction reflects the difference in conflict*  
425 *effects (incongruent - congruent) in the MI blocks/items relative to the MC blocks/items. BIF exceeding 1000 or smaller 0.001 are*  
426 *abbreviated for the purpose of making the table legible.*

#### 427 Exploratory Analysis - Symptoms

428 There was no statistically significant correlation between MDS UPDRS motor scores and LWPCE in  
429 the inducer items ( $r = 0.35$ ,  $p = 0.067$ ), and the diagnostic items ( $r = 0.28$ ,  $p = 0.14$ ).

#### 430 EEG Results

431 We assessed whether conflict related power in the theta band was reduced in context when high  
432 conflict is expected (MI) versus contexts when little conflict is expected (MC). Figure 4A and Figure 4B  
433 plot the conflict effect (incongruent - congruent) at the FCz channel for LWPCE. As expected, power  
434 appears to be larger, at frequencies between 4-8 Hz, on incongruent trials than congruent trials  
435 (condition specific plots of the items can be found in section 6 of the supplement). Moreover, it appears  
436 that the conflict effect is larger in the MC condition, than the MI condition particularly in the HC group.  
437 To evaluate the difference in conflict effects between conflict context manipulations further we used  
438 non-parametric, cluster-based permutation testing. The HC participants showed a significant negative  
439 cluster after stimulus presentation (0.35 s to 0.77 s;  $p = 0.0004$ ), largely over midline-frontal to frontal-  
440 right channels. A negative cluster could also be observed prior to action onset (-0.6 s to -0.05 s;  $p =$   
441  $0.002$ ), with a more midline-frontal distribution. Thus, both the response-locked (RL) and stimulus-locked  
442 (SL) data indicate reduced conflict midline-frontal theta when more conflict is expected. Looking at the  
443 same analysis in the PD group we also find significant negative clusters after stimulus presentation (0.33  
444 s to 0.71 s;  $p = 0.0088$ ) and prior to response onset (-0.6 s to -0.14 s;  $p = 0.0012$ ). Both clusters show a  
445 frontal left distribution (see figure Figure 4). Both groups show a reduction in midline-frontal conflict  
446 related theta activity when more conflict is expected. Figure 4E and Figure 4F further show the  
447 modulation by estimated marginal mean condition averaged over the electrodes identified in the  
448 significant cluster. For the HC participants it appears that conflict expectancy modulates both theta levels  
449 of congruent and incongruent trials, whereas in the PD group only incongruent trials appear to be  
450 reduced.




451

452 *Figure 4 Estimated marginal mean effects of the time-frequency regression analysis for the LWPCE manipulation. Data on*  
 453 *the left (A, C, E) are plotted in reference to stimulus onset (SL) and data on the right (B, D, F) are referenced to the response (RL).*  
 454 *Panels A and B show the time-frequency results at the FCz electrode (A, B) for the conflict effect (incongruent - congruent) by*  
 455 *conflict proportion manipulation (MI and MC) and group (HC and PD). Panels C and D depict the results of the theta band (4-8*  
 456 *Hz) cluster-permutation analysis on the difference in conflict effects between conflict proportion manipulation (MI - MC).*  
 457 *Significant clusters are marked with an asterisk symbol. The underlying color gradient depicts the averaged difference in conflict*  
 458 *theta activity over the period when the significant cluster was detected. Panels E and F depict the estimated marginal mean*  
 459 *effects in theta activity, averaged over electrodes of the significant cluster. Shaded areas depict the standard errors (SE) at each*  
 460 *sample. Marked in black is the period when the significant cluster was detected.*

461 For the ISPCE Figure 5A and Figure 5B similarly as for the LWPCE it appears that the conflict effect  
 462 at the FCz electrode is larger, at frequencies between 4-8 Hz, in the MC condition, than the MI condition

463 in the HC group. Further, cluster-based permutation tests only the HC participants showed significant  
464 differences in conflict related theta. A negative cluster was observed over midline-frontal electrodes (see  
465 Figure 5C and Figure 5D) both post stimulus onset (0.39s to 0.75s;  $p = 0.0017$ ) and prior to response (-  
466 0.44 s to -0.1s;  $p = 0.0039$ ). Thus, only the HC participant showed reduced conflict under conditions  
467 where high conflict was expected with certain items, as compared to when low conflict was associated  
468 with certain items. Estimated marginal means averaged over the significant cluster in Figure 5E and  
469 Figure 5F it appears that in the HC participants conflict expectancy modulates theta levels incongruent  
470 trials but not congruent trials.



471

472 *Figure 5 Estimated marginal mean effects of the time-frequency regression analysis for the ISPCE manipulation. Data on*  
 473 *the left (A, C, E) are plotted in reference to stimulus onset (SL) and data on the right (B, D, F) are referenced to the response (RL).*  
 474 *Panels A and B show the time-frequency results at channel FCz (A, B) for the conflict effect (incongruent - congruent) by conflict*  
 475 *proportion manipulation (MI and MC) and group (HC and PD). Panels C and D depict the results of the theta band (4-8 Hz)*  
 476 *cluster-permutation analysis on the difference in conflict effects between conflict proportion manipulation (MI - MC). Significant*  
 477 *clusters are marked with an asterisk symbol. The underlying color gradient depicts the averaged difference in conflict theta*  
 478 *activity over the period when the significant cluster was detected. In the PD panels where no significant difference was detected,*  
 479 *we display the activity between 0.3s and 0.7s and -0.6s and -0.2s for comparison. Panels E and F depict the estimated marginal*  
 480 *mean effects in theta activity, averaged over electrodes of the significant cluster in the HC group. Shaded areas depict the*  
 481 *standard errors (SE) at each sample. Marked in black is the period when the significant cluster was detected.*

## 482 Discussion

483 In the present study we sought to investigate whether adaptive control is impaired in medicated  
484 participants with PD. To this end, we created a task to investigate both proactive control- and reactive  
485 control adaptation and compared performance in participants with PD to HC participants. To avoid  
486 confounding S-R learning we distinguished between manipulation inducing item and unbiased diagnostic  
487 items. Our results show an impairment in the acquisition of general context-control associations for  
488 proactive control adaptation in PD. Further, our results also suggest a partial impairment in reactive  
489 control, as participants with PD showed evidence of reactive conflict adaptation, but in contrast to HC  
490 participants, PD individuals were unable to improve performance on conflict trials.

### 491 Interpretation Adaptive Control in PD

492 We observed a specific impairment to form general temporal context-control associations by  
493 participants with PD in the task requiring proactive control. The initial analysis of the inducer RT data  
494 showed strong evidence for the ability of both PD and HC participant to use proactive control. Both  
495 groups displayed reduced RTs on incongruent trials, in high conflict temporal context (MI), compared to  
496 low-conflict temporal context (MI). However, in the assessment of the unbiased diagnostic items we  
497 observed strong evidence that only the HC-, but not the participants with PD, were able to regulate  
498 proactive control. This qualitative difference between both groups in the diagnostic data demonstrates  
499 that participants with PD are impaired in the ability to learn context-control associations necessary for  
500 proactive control.

501 Our findings on the inducer items are in line with Ruitenberg et al. (19) who observed significant  
502 conflict adaptation effects in participants with PD both ON- and OFF- their dopaminergic medication  
503 performing a Stroop task. Our diagnostic manipulation extends results by Ruitenberg et al. (19) showing  
504 that this adaptation effect does not transfer to general context dependent adaptation, but is restricted  
505 to the items which induce it. However, our results are in contrast to Bonnin et al. (6) reporting evidence  
506 for proactive, global control adaptations in healthy control participants, but not participants with PD  
507 (DOPA-ON). The insignificant interaction effect in participants with PD was interpreted as evidence for  
508 the null hypothesis of impaired conflict modulation. However, Bonnin et al. (6) never directly compared  
509 proactive control in participants with PD to HC participants. Similar to Bonnin et al. (6) our post-hoc  
510 analysis did not show an association with UPDRS scores. Thus, the impaired ability to extend control to a  
511 broader context, may not be associated with disease progression and could present a general deficit, or  
512 one that is present early on.



513 Behavioral results in conjunction with the absence of electrophysiological evidence suggest that  
514 participants with PD may also show impairments in reactive control adaptation. Both participants with  
515 PD, and HC participants displayed strong evidence for an interaction effect, indicative of reactive control  
516 in the analysis of the inducer items. However, inspection of the congruent and incongruent trials by  
517 conflict context revealed that only HC participants were effectively able to reduce RT conflict cost on  
518 incongruent trials in items associated with high conflict. The interaction effect in participants with PD on  
519 the other hand was largely explained by facilitation effects on congruent items in low conflict context  
520 items. The subsequent analysis of the diagnostic items showed no evidence for reactive control  
521 adaptations in both groups. This could be due to a failure of our item manipulation which will be  
522 discussed subsequently. However, since in the group with PD a reduction in conflict cost in the high  
523 conflict items was absent in the inducer items, a carry-over effect to the diagnostic items is unlikely. This  
524 could indicate that participants with PD are able to shift attention toward specific features to a degree  
525 but may still be unable to exert reactive control to resolve conflict.

526 The reactive control effect in the inducer items observed in the participants with PD parallels  
527 results by Ruitenberg et al. (20) who found no impairment in reactive control irrespective of participants  
528 being tested ON or OFF their dopaminergic medication. However, based on our analysis we would not  
529 exclude the possibility of impaired reactive conflict control adaptation in patients with PD, as the effect  
530 was explained by improved facilitation in participants with PD, in contrast to reduced interference in HC  
531 participants. Ruitenberg et al. (20) reported the difference in Stroop effects irrespective of the nature  
532 of the cost effect (incongruent/congruent items). It would be interesting to learn to what degree the  
533 effects in their task depend on improved conflict processing. Future research is needed, to replicate  
534 ISPCE manipulation effects in PD in different tasks.

### 535 Interpretation of Electrophysiological Adaptive Control Effects

536 We found midline-frontal theta modulation to be associated with successful conflict adaptation  
537 regardless of the type of control adaptation (both proactive and reactive) in the HC group. We observed  
538 a reduction in midline-frontal theta for proactive control adaptation in both the PD and HC group. This is  
539 in line with previous studies of proactive control on the CSE (Pastötter et al.(29) and the LWPCE (Chinn et  
540 al. (28) that also report reduced conflict theta during conflict processing. However, the group with PD  
541 showed evidence of modulation of midline-frontal theta despite their inability to form general context-  
542 control associations. Therefore, the presence of conflict theta modulations during conflict processing  
543 alone may not suffice to establish intact proactive control adaptation.

544 We observed a similar modulation of conflict midline-frontal theta in the reactive control  
545 adaptation proportion of the task for HC participants. We did not find evidence of conflict theta  
546 modulation in participants with PD. In conjunction with their comparatively weaker ability to improve on  
547 conflict trials, this suggests that reduced conflict theta in high conflict trials may be a necessary condition  
548 for effective reactive control. Our results show the opposite pattern of theta modulation described by  
549 Jiang et al. (30). However, the theta cluster Jiang et al. (30) identified was located over midline-posterior  
550 electrodes, not midline-frontal electrodes. Moreover, the study was performed in young and healthy  
551 participants. Thus, it is conceivable that aging effects may also affect the patterns of control related  
552 theta identified in both studies.

553 In conjunction the results of both experimental manipulations suggest that successful adjustment  
554 of control to context, irrespective of reactive or proactive, is associated with a reduction in midline-  
555 frontal theta in response to conflicting stimuli. This reduction in theta could reflect more efficient use of  
556 conflict resolution resources in control adaptation. When the context indicates a high probability of  
557 conflict, less control resources are required to resolve encountered conflict. Vice-versa when conflict  
558 expectation is low more control resources are required to resolve encountered conflict.

### 559 Explanations for Deficits Observed in Parkinson's Disease

560 Two possible interpretations of the deficit observed in Parkinson's disease come to mind. The first  
561 is the dopamine-overdose hypothesis (51–53). PD is associated with a loss in midbrain dopamine cells.  
562 Due to differential neurodegenerative progression in dorsal striatal circuits and ventral striatal circuits  
563 (54), dopamine replacement therapy such as Levodopa (L-Dopa) can have divergent effects on cognition.  
564 Cognitive functioning reliant on impaired dorsal striatal circuits may profit from dopaminergic  
565 medications, whereas functions relying on relatively intact ventral striatal circuitry may display impaired  
566 functioning. For example, L-Dopa associated increased tonic and phasic dopamine leads to over-activity  
567 of the direct pathway and suppression of indirect pathway, due to differential binding to D1(direct) and  
568 D2(indirect) receptors and modifies reinforcement learning behavior. Medicated participants are more  
569 inclined to seek rewards, instead of learning from failures i.e., avoiding punishment (55). Similarly, it has  
570 been proposed that brain regions associated with conflict monitoring rely more on the spared ventral  
571 striatal circuits (56). If proactive control adaptation depends on the ventral striatal circuitry it would be  
572 reasonable to expect impaired performance in medicated participants with PD as tested here. To confirm  
573 this prediction, future research should assess if performance in unmedicated patients with PD is not  
574 impaired in a diagnostic test set.



575 Another interpretation could be that participants can learn simple stimulus-driven associations but  
576 are unable to perform sustained top-down control, informed by learned priors, independent of  
577 dopaminergic medication. This is in line with work by Perugini et al. (57), who observed that participants  
578 with PD were unable to incorporate prior information during perceptual decision-making, when  
579 performing a glass pattern task (similar to the random-dot motion task). Participants learned that a  
580 particular response (left or right) was more likely within a given temporal context or item feature and  
581 were presented with visual evidence where the degree of visual stochastic noise could introduce  
582 conflicting interpretations. Having learned the prior probability of a response option in both task  
583 versions, participants with PD were unable to use this information under conditions with high  
584 uncertainty, where it would be most relevant. They continued to respond stimulus-driven even under  
585 conditions where physical evidence was minimally informative and maximally uncertain. The authors  
586 suggest that this reflects the inability of patients with PD to incorporate prior information in their  
587 decision-making. However, this could also be interpreted as a failure to engage in control adaptation and  
588 continued reliance on uninformed stimulus-driven responding. The failure to use prior information is  
589 believed to reflect basal ganglia impairment (58,59), as it was observed irrespective of dopaminergic  
590 status (ON/OFF) (58). Moreover, participants with dopamine unresponsive focal dystonia, a disorder  
591 with impaired basal ganglia function but unaffected frontal dopamine circuits (58), exhibited similar  
592 impairments as participants with PD. The “monochromatic” task (temporal context predicts response)  
593 used (57) shares features of proactive control adaptation, whereas the “dichromatic” task (item feature  
594 color predicts response) resembles reactive control adaptations. The tasks differ that in the Perugini et  
595 al. studies (57,58) participants could predict a concrete response within a given temporal window or  
596 feature, whereas in our task they were able to predict conflict. Nonetheless, it is striking how in both,  
597 conflict adaptation and informed perceptual decision-making, participants with PD appear to struggle to  
598 translate learned probabilistic stimulus information into concrete behavioral adaptations.

### 599 **Strength and Limitations**

600 To our knowledge, the present study is the first to evaluate both proactive control and reactive  
601 control in PD while controlling for S-R learning. We improved on previous work by having a relatively  
602 large sample size (30 participants per group), using state of the art statistical models to assess effects on  
603 reaction time distributions, and analyzing EEG frequency correlates of adaptive control in PD.  
604 Nonetheless, results need to be viewed in light of some limitations. Our conclusions with regard to  
605 reactive control are limited as our diagnostic manipulation was unsuccessful. The feature of the items  
606 that we manipulated may have been too abstract. In the future we suggest the manipulation of a more

607 salient feature. Nonetheless, it is unlikely that results in an unbiased diagnostic item set would show  
608 improved performance on conflict trials in the participants with PD. Moreover, a failure to identify an  
609 ISPCE in the diagnostic or transfer items is not uncommon. For example, Bejjani et al. (60) were unable to  
610 find an ISPCE in the diagnostic items. Further, our conclusions of the EEG analysis are limited due to our  
611 choice of a short fixation interval. This was done in order to maximize the amount of trials/power to  
612 detect an effect. Using the whole trial duration as a baseline allowed us to identify differences in  
613 transient modulations of midline-frontal theta, but not sustained changes. Lastly, while our study  
614 provides evidence of the state of adaptive control in participants with PD on their dopaminergic  
615 medication, it is yet to be conclusively determined to what degree adaptive control abilities are impacted  
616 by disease and medication (20,56).

## 617 Conclusion

618 We demonstrated distinct impairments of proactive- reactive control in participants with PD,  
619 when tested on their usual medication. Participants with PD appear to be capable to adjust cognitive  
620 control to items directly associated with specific cognitive control demands, but are incapable to form  
621 general proactive context-control associations. These adaptations cannot clearly be reinterpreted in  
622 terms of intact reactive control or caused by S-R learning. Participants with PD, in contrast to HC  
623 participants, failed to regulate cognitive control in the reactive control task in items with specific  
624 cognitive control demands. A distinguishing feature may have been the salience in conflict signaling the  
625 need of control adaptation. Moreover, results of our elderly control sample highlight that successful  
626 reactive and proactive control adaptations, may be accompanied by reduced conflict related midline-  
627 frontal theta activity - a common correlate for cognitive control. Unfortunately, the trial number of our  
628 EEG data was not large enough to isolate and compare signatures of control adaptations in diagnostic  
629 and inducer items separately. In future studies, it would be interesting to identify to what degree  
630 midline-frontal theta generalizes to unbiased context-control associations and how it is impacted by age.  
631 More studies are required to further dissociate to what degree adaptive control deficits can be explained  
632 in terms of PD and medication.

## 633 Acknowledgments

634 We would like to thank Veronika Weyer-Elberich for her consultation and helpful suggestions for  
635 the statistical analysis and Wolf Pink for his support during the data acquisition. Moreover, we would like  
636 to thank Martina Bantel for her helpful feedback during the conception of the task used in this study.

637 **Author Contributions**

638 Conceptualization: J. Kricheldorf, K. Witt, J. Ficke

639 Methodology: J. Kricheldorf, K. Witt, J. Ficke, S. Debener

640 Software: J. Kricheldorf

641 Validation: J. Kricheldorf

642 Formal Analysis: J. Kricheldorf

643 Investigation: J. Ficke, J. Kricheldorf

644 Resources: K. Witt

645 Data Curation: J. Ficke, J. Kricheldorf

646 Writing – Original Draft: J. Kricheldorf, K. Witt

647 Writing – Review and Editing: J. Kricheldorf, K. Witt, J. Ficke, S. Debener

648 Visualization: J. Kricheldorf

649 Supervision: K. Witt

650 Project Administration: J. Kricheldorf, K. Witt

651 Funding Acquisition: K. Witt

652 **Funding**

653 This study did not receive any funding.

654 **Data Availability Statement**

655 Due to privacy concerns the data cannot be made publicly available. The experiment, and code  
656 used for the analysis and experiment can be found at: <https://osf.io/bsn8v/>

657 **Conflict of Interest Statement**

658 The authors declare no conflict of interest associated with the present study. Outside the present  
659 study we report that K. W. receives research support for the German Research Foundation (DFG GK  
660 2783) and from STADAPHARM. He serves as a consultant for BIAL and receives speaker's honoraria from  
661 BIAL, STADAPHARM and Boston Scientific.

662           **References**

- 663           1. Lawson RA, Yarnall AJ, Duncan GW, Breen DP, Khoo TK, Williams-Gray CH, et al. Cognitive decline  
664           and quality of life in incident Parkinson's disease: the role of attention. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord.*  
665           2016;27:47–53.
- 666           2. Gauggel S, Rieger M, Feghoff T. Inhibition of ongoing responses in patients with Parkinson's disease.  
667           *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry.* 2004;75(4):539–44.
- 668           3. Manza P, Amandola M, Tatineni V, Li C shan R, Leung HC. Response inhibition in Parkinson's disease:  
669           a meta-analysis of dopaminergic medication and disease duration effects. *Npj Park Dis.* 2017;3(1):1–  
670           10.
- 671           4. Frank MJ, Seeberger LC, O'reilly RC. By carrot or by stick: cognitive reinforcement learning in  
672           parkinsonism. *Science.* 2004;306(5703):1940–3.
- 673           5. Cools R, Barker RA, Sahakian BJ, Robbins TW. L-Dopa medication remediates cognitive inflexibility,  
674           but increases impulsivity in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychologia.* 2003;41(11):1431–  
675           41.
- 676           6. Bonnin CA, Houeto JL, Gil R, Bouquet CA. Adjustments of conflict monitoring in Parkinson's disease.  
677           *Neuropsychology.* 2010;24(4):542.
- 678           7. Marien H, Aarts H, Custers R. Adaptive control of human action: the role of outcome representations  
679           and reward signals. *Front Psychol.* 2013;4:602.
- 680           8. Braver TS, Gray JR, Burgess GC. Explaining the many varieties of working memory variation: Dual  
681           mechanisms of cognitive control. *Var Work Mem.* 2007;75:106.
- 682           9. Braver TS. The variable nature of cognitive control: a dual mechanisms framework. *Trends Cogn Sci.*  
683           2012;16(2):106–13.
- 684           10. Stroop JR. Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. *J Exp Psychol.* 1935;18(6):643.
- 685           11. Braem S, Bugg JM, Schmidt JR, Crump MJ, Weissman DH, Notebaert W, et al. Measuring adaptive  
686           control in conflict tasks. *Trends Cogn Sci.* 2019;
- 687           12. Chiu YC, Egnér T. Cortical and subcortical contributions to context-control learning. *Neurosci*  
688           *Biobehav Rev.* 2019;99:33–41.
- 689           13. Schmidt JR. Evidence against conflict monitoring and adaptation: An updated review. *Psychon Bull*  
690           *Rev.* 2019;26(3):753–71.
- 691           14. Egnér T. Congruency sequence effects and cognitive control. *Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci.*  
692           2007;7(4):380–90.
- 693           15. Rodriguez-Raecke R, Schrader C, Tacik P, Dressler D, Lanfermann H, Wittfoth M. Conflict adaptation  
694           and related neuronal processing in Parkinson's disease. *Brain Imaging Behav.* 2022;16(1):455–63.

- 695 16. Fielding J, Georgiou-Karistianis N, Bradshaw J, Millist L, White O. No sequence dependent  
696 modulation of the Simon effect in Parkinson's disease. *Cogn Brain Res.* 2005;25(1):251–60.
- 697 17. Rustamov N, Rodriguez-Raecke R, Timm L, Agrawal D, Dressler D, Schrader C, et al. Absence of  
698 congruency sequence effects reveals neurocognitive inflexibility in Parkinson's disease.  
699 *Neuropsychologia.* 2013;51(14):2976–87.
- 700 18. Duthoo W, Braem S, Houtman F, Schoupe N, Santens P, Notebaert W. Dopaminergic medication  
701 counteracts conflict adaptation in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychology.*  
702 2013;27(5):556.
- 703 19. Ruitenberg MF, Abrahamse EL, Santens P, Notebaert W. The effect of dopaminergic medication on  
704 conflict adaptation in Parkinson's disease. *J Neuropsychol.* 2019;13(1):121–35.
- 705 20. Ruitenberg MF, Abrahamse EL, Santens P, Notebaert W. Testing the dopamine overdose hypothesis  
706 in action control: A study in people with Parkinson's disease. *J Neuropsychol.* 2022;
- 707 21. Gratton G, Cooper P, Fabiani M, Carter CS, Karayanidis F. Dynamics of cognitive control: Theoretical  
708 bases, paradigms, and a view for the future. *Psychophysiology.* 2018;55(3):e13016.
- 709 22. Cavanagh JF, Frank MJ. Frontal theta as a mechanism for cognitive control. *Trends Cogn Sci.*  
710 2014;18(8):414–21.
- 711 23. Cohen MX, Donner TH. Midfrontal conflict-related theta-band power reflects neural oscillations that  
712 predict behavior. *J Neurophysiol.* 2013;110(12):2752–63.
- 713 24. Chen KH, Okerstrom KL, Kingyon JR, Anderson SW, Cavanagh JF, Narayanan NS. Startle habituation  
714 and midfrontal theta activity in Parkinson disease. *J Cogn Neurosci.* 2016;28(12):1923–32.
- 715 25. Parker KL, Chen KH, Kingyon JR, Cavanagh JF, Narayanan NS. Medial frontal 4-Hz activity in humans  
716 and rodents is attenuated in PD patients and in rodents with cortical dopamine depletion. *J*  
717 *Neurophysiol.* 2015;114(2):1310–20.
- 718 26. Singh A, Richardson SP, Narayanan N, Cavanagh JF. Mid-frontal theta activity is diminished during  
719 cognitive control in Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychologia.* 2018;117:113–22.
- 720 27. De Loof E, Vassena E, Janssens C, De Taeye L, Meurs A, Van Roost D, et al. Preparing for hard times:  
721 scalp and intracranial physiological signatures of proactive cognitive control. *Psychophysiology.*  
722 2019;56(10):e13417.
- 723 28. Chinn LK, Pauker CS, Golob EJ. Cognitive control and midline theta adjust across multiple timescales.  
724 *Neuropsychologia.* 2018;111:216–28.
- 725 29. Pastötter B, Dreisbach G, Bäuml KHT. Dynamic adjustments of cognitive control: oscillatory  
726 correlates of the conflict adaptation effect. *J Cogn Neurosci.* 2013;25(12):2167–78.
- 727 30. Jiang J, Bramão I, Khazenon A, Wang SF, Johansson M, Wagner AD. Temporal dynamics of memory-  
728 guided cognitive control and generalization of control via overlapping associative memories. *J*  
729 *Neurosci.* 2020;40(11):2343–56.

- 730 31. Henik A, Tzelgov J. Is three greater than five: The relation between physical and semantic size in  
731 comparison tasks. *Mem Cognit.* 1982;10(4):389–95.
- 732 32. World Medical Association WM. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical principles  
733 for medical research involving human subjects. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2001;79(4):373.
- 734 33. Postuma RB, Berg D, Stern M, Poewe W, Olanow CW, Oertel W, et al. MDS clinical diagnostic criteria  
735 for Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord.* 2015;30(12):1591–601.
- 736 34. Mathôt S, Schreij D, Theeuwes J. OpenSesame: An open-source, graphical experiment builder for the  
737 social sciences. *Behav Res Methods.* 2012;44(2):314–24.
- 738 35. Dadon G, Henik A. Adjustment of control in the numerical Stroop task. *Mem Cognit.* 2017  
739 Aug;45(6):891–902.
- 740 36. van Casteren M, Davis MH. Mix, a program for pseudorandomization. *Behav Res Methods.*  
741 2006;38(4):584–9.
- 742 37. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2013;
- 743 38. Wickham H. Package 'ggplot2': elegant graphics for data analysis. Springer-Verl N Y Doi.  
744 2016;10:978–0.
- 745 39. Kay M. ggdist: Visualizations of distributions and uncertainty. R Package Version 320 [Internet].  
746 2022; Available from: <https://mjskay.github.io/ggdist/>
- 747 40. Bürkner PC. brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *J Stat Softw.* 2017;80:1–  
748 28.
- 749 41. Gronau QF, Sarafoglou A, Matzke D, Ly A, Boehm U, Marsman M, et al. A tutorial on bridge sampling.  
750 *J Math Psychol.* 2017;81:80–97.
- 751 42. Jeffreys H. The theory of probability [Internet]. third. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 1961  
752 [cited 2022 Oct 24]. Available from:  
753 [https://scholar.google.com/scholar\\_lookup?title=Theory%20of%20probability&publication\\_year=1961&author=H.%20Jeffreys](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_lookup?title=Theory%20of%20probability&publication_year=1961&author=H.%20Jeffreys)  
754
- 755 43. Brainproducts. Brain Products GmbH / Products & Applications / actiCHamp Plus [Internet]. 2020  
756 [cited 2021 Feb 22]. Available from: <https://www.brainproducts.com/productdetails.php?id=74>
- 757 44. Delorme A, Makeig S. EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG dynamics  
758 including independent component analysis. *J Neurosci Methods.* 2004;134(1):9–21.
- 759 45. Kothe CAE, Jung TP. Artifact removal techniques with signal reconstruction. Google Patents; 2016.
- 760 46. Kayser J, Tenke CE. Issues and considerations for using the scalp surface Laplacian in EEG/ERP  
761 research: A tutorial review. *Int J Psychophysiol.* 2015;97(3):189–209.
- 762 47. Grandchamp R, Delorme A. Single-trial normalization for event-related spectral decomposition  
763 reduces sensitivity to noisy trials. *Front Psychol.* 2011;2:236.

- 764 48. Pernet CR, Chauveau N, Gaspar C, Rousselet GA. LIMO EEG: a toolbox for hierarchical Linear  
765 MOdeling of ElectroEncephaloGraphic data. *Comput Intell Neurosci*. 2011;2011.
- 766 49. Maris E, Oostenveld R. Nonparametric statistical testing of EEG-and MEG-data. *J Neurosci Methods*.  
767 2007;164(1):177–90.
- 768 50. Oostenveld R, Fries P, Maris E, Schoffelen JM. FieldTrip: open source software for advanced analysis  
769 of MEG, EEG, and invasive electrophysiological data. *Comput Intell Neurosci*. 2011;2011.
- 770 51. Gotham AM, Brown RG, Marsden CD. 'Frontal' cognitive function in patients with Parkinson's disease  
771 'on'and 'off'levodopa. *Brain*. 1988;111(2):299–321.
- 772 52. Swinson R, Rogers RD, Sahakian BJ, Summers BA, Polkey CE, Robbins TW. Probabilistic learning and  
773 reversal deficits in patients with Parkinson's disease or frontal or temporal lobe lesions: possible  
774 adverse effects of dopaminergic medication. *Neuropsychologia*. 2000;38(5):596–612.
- 775 53. Cools R, Barker RA, Sahakian BJ, Robbins TW. Enhanced or impaired cognitive function in Parkinson's  
776 disease as a function of dopaminergic medication and task demands. *Cereb Cortex*.  
777 2001;11(12):1136–43.
- 778 54. Hornykiewicz O. Biochemical aspects of Parkinson's disease. *Neurology*. 1998;51(2 Suppl 2):S2–9.
- 779 55. Wiecki TV, Frank MJ. Neurocomputational models of motor and cognitive deficits in Parkinson's  
780 disease. *Prog Brain Res*. 2010;183:275–97.
- 781 56. Ruitenberg MF, van Wouwe NC, Wylie SA, Abrahamse EL. The role of dopamine in action control:  
782 insights from medication effects in Parkinson's disease. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2021;
- 783 57. Perugini A, Ditterich J, Basso MA. Patients with Parkinson's disease show impaired use of priors in  
784 conditions of sensory uncertainty. *Curr Biol*. 2016;26(14):1902–10.
- 785 58. Perugini A, Basso MA. Perceptual decisions based on previously learned information are  
786 independent of dopaminergic tone. *J Neurophysiol*. 2017;119(3):849–61.
- 787 59. Perugini A, Ditterich J, Shaikh AG, Knowlton BJ, Basso MA. Paradoxical Decision-Making: A  
788 Framework for Understanding Cognition in Parkinson's Disease. *Trends Neurosci*. 2018  
789 Aug;41(8):512–25.
- 790 60. Bejjani C, Tan S, Egnér T. Performance feedback promotes proactive but not reactive adaptation of  
791 conflict-control. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform*. 2020;46(4):369.

792