

Title: Sub-second and multi-second dopamine dynamics underlie variability in human time perception

Authors: Renata Sadibolova^{1,2,3*}, Emily K. DiMarco^{4,5}, Angela Jiang⁵, Benjamin Maas^{5,6,7}, Stephen B. Tatter⁸, Adrian Laxton⁸, Kenneth T. Kishida^{4,5,6,7,8,*,†}, & Devin B. Terhune^{1,2,*,†}

Affiliations:

¹Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths, University of London; London SE14 6NW, UK.

²Department of Psychology, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London; London SE5 8AB, UK.

³School of Psychology, University of Roehampton; London SW15 4JD, UK.

⁴Neuroscience Graduate Program, Wake Forest School of Medicine; Winston-Salem, NC, 27157, USA.

⁵Department of Translational Neuroscience, Wake Forest School of Medicine; Winston-Salem, NC, 27157, USA.

⁶Virginia Tech – Wake Forest University School of Biomedical Engineering and Sciences, Wake Forest School of Medicine; Winston-Salem, NC, 27157, USA.

⁷Department of Biomedical Engineering, Wake Forest School of Medicine; Winston-Salem, NC, 27157, USA.

⁸Department of Neurosurgery, Wake Forest School of Medicine; Winston-Salem, NC, 27157, USA.

*Corresponding authors. Email: renata.sadibolova@roehampton.ac.uk, kkishida@wakehealth.edu, devin.terhune@kcl.ac.uk

†Co-senior authors.

Abstract: Timing behaviour and the perception of time are fundamental to cognitive and emotional processes in humans. In non-human model organisms, the neuromodulator dopamine has been associated with variations in timing behaviour, but the connection between variations in dopamine levels and the human experience of time has not been directly assessed. Here, we report how dopamine levels in human striatum, measured with sub-second temporal resolution during awake deep brain stimulation surgery, relate to participants' perceptual judgements of time intervals. Fast, phasic, dopaminergic signals were associated with underestimation of temporal intervals, whereas slower, tonic, decreases in dopamine were associated with poorer temporal precision. Our findings suggest a delicate and complex role for the dynamics and tone of dopaminergic signals in the conscious experience of time in humans.

One-Sentence Summary: Tonic and phasic dopamine fluctuations in striatum differentially relate to variations in human time perception.

1 The decisions we make, the memories we retain, and the way we perceive our surroundings
2 are all intrinsically tied to our experience of time (1–4). Therefore, investigations into human
3 cognition and consciousness require consideration of the mechanisms governing time
4 perception, particularly in a time frame on the order of milliseconds to seconds which is
5 integral to basic perceptual and cognitive processes (5–8).

6 The neurobiological mechanisms underlying the timing of these relatively short intervals
7 remain elusive. Past evidence implicates the striatum and striatal dopamine in time perception
8 (9–17), with higher dopamine levels associated with a tendency to perceive short intervals of
9 time as longer (18–22). This association was drawn largely on the basis of pharmacological
10 experiments and work in non-human animal models (9–13), owing to the inherent challenges
11 of collecting direct dopamine measurements in the living human brain during conscious
12 behaviour (23, 24). However, recent optogenetic work in rodents has introduced a new
13 perspective by demonstrating that rapid changes in dopamine signals (i.e., bursts in phasic
14 dopaminergic neuron activity) may induce temporal underestimation (25). This finding
15 challenges classic timing models that are based on relatively slow response pharmacological
16 effects (18–22, 26). Notably, the contrast between these lines of evidence isn't just in their
17 resulting interpretation, but also for the very different timescales by which the dopaminergic
18 system was observed to be exerting its influence.

19 Here we report the first human fast scan cyclic voltammetry (FSCV) (23, 24) study to directly
20 assess the role of sub-second striatal dopamine signals in human time perception. FSCV
21 during the implantation of deep brain stimulation electrodes for the treatment of Parkinson's
22 disease (PD) symptoms (27) enables the recording of both tonic and phasic striatal dopamine
23 with 100ms precision during concurrent behavioural assessments (23, 24, 28–33). Tonic
24 dopamine refers to the sustained signaling over the course of minutes whereas fast, phasic,
25 dopamine fluctuations occur rapidly within tens to hundreds of milliseconds (34). The present
26 study tests the hypothesis that interval timing is differentially related to dopaminergic activity
27 at varying timescales (34–36), as observed in non-timing cognitive functions (37).
28 Additionally, our approach allows for simultaneous and colocalized measurements of
29 serotonin (28, 30) to assess the neurochemical specificity of any observed effects.

30 Seventeen healthy controls from a separate study (38) and six patients undergoing deep brain
31 stimulation (DBS) surgery completed a visual temporal bisection task (39). All participants
32 first learned two anchor intervals (500ms and 1,100ms) before judging whether specific
33 intervals (of varying durations between 500ms and 1,100ms) were closer in duration to the
34 short or long anchor interval. This enabled an assessment of temporal accuracy and precision,
35 defined by the degree of systematic error in time judgements and the sensitivity to interval
36 differences, respectively. Concurrently, utilizing a safe and validated human-adapted FSCV
37 protocol (24, 28, 30–33), we recorded in-vivo electrochemical responses at 10 Hz temporal
38 resolution from patients' caudate (Fig. S1). To estimate dopamine and serotonin
39 concentrations, we trained elastic net penalised regression models using in-vitro calibration
40 data following prior work (24, 28, 30–33, also see Supplemental Information). Subsequently,
41 we quantified both short-lived transient (i.e., phasic) changes and slowly changing (i.e., tonic,
42 at ~4 min timescale) concentrations to investigate the association between these
43 neurochemical signals and changes in participants' temporal accuracy and precision across
44 trials.

45


46 **Elevated *phasic* dopamine concentrations are associated with temporal underestimation**

1 We tested the hypothesis that elevated striatal dopamine transients are associated with
2 increased temporal underestimation (25). A cluster analysis (40) revealed that short-interval
3 temporal judgements were associated with phasic increases in dopamine levels at 625ms to
4 670ms after stimulus onset (Fig. 1C), $p < .050$. Notably, this association was not observed
5 when comparing across objectively short and long stimulus durations and no effects were
6 found for serotonin (Fig 1A,B,D, Supplementary Materials). Additional analyses show that
7 the likelihood of short judgements is significantly increased during higher mean single-trial
8 dopamine concentrations, but not serotonin concentrations, in the 625ms to 670ms time
9 window after the stimulus onset (dopamine: $\beta = -.11$, $p = .048$, serotonin: $\beta = -.06$, $p = .28$).

10 To delve further into the relationship between phasic dopamine fluctuations and variations in
11 temporal accuracy and precision, we partitioned trials ($n_{(total)} = 300$) for each patient according
12 to the average dopamine level in the cluster window into low, medium, and high terciles.
13 Using generalized mixed-effects modelling (41), we compared the temporal psychometric
14 functions across these terciles (Fig. 1E-F), where left- and right-ward shifts signify under-
15 and over-estimation biases, respectively, and steeper functions signify superior precision.
16 Consistent with both the foregoing analyses and rodent data (25), our results point to a
17 significant underestimation bias concurrent with higher dopamine transients (Fig. 1E,G; $\beta =$
18 $-.15$, $p = .010$). This effect was not observed for serotonin (Fig. 1F,I; $\beta = -.01$, $p = .82$). Finally,
19 we complemented our analyses with Bayesian assessment of effect prevalence (Fig. S2)
20 which is uniquely suited for experiments with small sample sizes and large trial numbers such
21 as ours (42). The results suggest an 83% probability (with at least 43% at the lower
22 boundary) of detecting statistically significant classification of temporal judgments from
23 dopamine signals within 1,100ms from stimulus onset if our methods are replicated (the
24 lower boundary for prevalence estimate reduces to 33% under more stringent assessment).

25 Although the observed effects reached statistical significance at 625ms to 670ms from the
26 stimulus onset, our data show that dopamine timeseries for short and long judgments began
27 diverging earlier at around 500ms (short anchor duration) until approximately 800ms (mid-
28 interval of presented stimulus range) (Fig. 1C). This suggests that dopamine neurons may
29 anticipate the impending stimulus offset during this period, which would facilitate efficient
30 decision-making by favouring the selection of the short reference anchor and decreasing the
31 likelihood of classifying the response as 'long' when the offset falls within this timeframe.
32 Critically, this plausibly explains why dopamine responses in this time window differed
33 between short and long subjective responses but not following the objective short and long
34 stimulus intervals (Fig. 1A). In line with this interpretation, lower dopamine responses for
35 long judgements might partly reflect temporal discounting of the reward value (43). Notably,
36 in some population clock models, dopaminergic projections modify cortical population
37 dynamics through processes linked to reward prediction error (44), implying that a transient
38 increase in dopamine may lead to temporal underestimation by decelerating trajectories of
39 population dynamics (45, 46). Though, evidence from research in rodents suggests that
40 dopamine neurons exert control over temporal judgments independently of reward processing
41 (25), highlighting the timing specificity of the striatal dopaminergic system as an alternative
42 interpretation. More research is required to further distinguish between these competing
43 hypotheses.

44



1 **Fig. 1: Relationships between phasic caudal changes in dopamine and serotonin levels**
2 **and stimulus and response parameters.** (A-D): Normalized dopamine (A,C) and serotonin
3 (B,D) concentrations from stimulus onset as a function of (A-B) stimulus intervals and (C-D)
4 responses. Shaded areas reflect standard error (SE); x-axis markers on the zero y-axis
5 represent stimulus interval offsets, and the significant cluster*. (E-F) Psychometric functions
6 (PF) fitted to the proportion of 'long' responses across stimulus intervals as a function of
7 phasic dopamine (E) and serotonin (F) terciles (Low, Medium, and High). Markers represent
8 individual patient datapoints; dotted lines mark accurate performance with 50% long and
9 short responses (Point of subjective equality [PSE]=0.5) for the true stimulus mid-interval =
10 0.8 s. (G-J) Indices of the PFs fitted to individual patients' data. Subjective mid-intervals
11 (Bisection Points) and temporal precision (Weber's fractions) across dopamine (G-H) and
12 serotonin (I-J) terciles. Markers represent individual patient datapoints. Lines show for each
13 patient the difference in time perception performance as a function of Dopamine or Serotonin
14 tercile. Lower Bisection Point and Weber fraction values denote greater underestimation bias
15 and temporal precision, respectively.

16 * $p < .050$


17

18 **Elevated tonic dopamine concentrations underlie superior temporal precision**

19 Parkinson's Disease is marked by poorer temporal precision (47–50). Owing to the depletion
20 of dopamine neurons in this condition (51), it has been hypothesized that striatal dopamine
21 concentrations scale with temporal precision. This has been corroborated in pharmacological

1 research (17) but, to our knowledge, has not yet been shown directly with in vivo dopamine
2 measurement in humans. Consistent with this hypothesis, we observed diminished temporal
3 precision in patients (Just Noticeable Difference, $JND=.14$) compared to controls ($JND=.09$)
4 (Fig. 2A), $p=.017$, although the Bayesian evidence for this effect was ambiguous, $BF_{10}=1.03$.
5 Further, we found that patients' slowly changing tonic dopamine levels over the course of
6 completing the task, predicted variation in their temporal precision ($\beta=.50$, $p=.009$,
7 $BF_{10}=1.70$), such that elevated tonic dopamine levels were associated with improved
8 precision (Fig. 2D,F). This effect appeared to be specific to tonic dopamine, as we found
9 evidence supporting the corresponding null hypothesis for serotonin (Fig. 2G,I, $\beta=.26$, $p=.35$,
10 $BF_{10}=.09$). Furthermore, exploratory analyses on phasic dopamine and serotonin transients
11 did not suggest a link with temporal precision (Fig. 1E-J; dopamine: $\beta=.49$, $p=.39$, serotonin:
12 $\beta=.61$, $p=.13$).

13



1
 2 **Fig. 2: Relationships between tonic caudal changes in dopamine and serotonin levels**
 3 **and time perception performance.** (A, D, G) PFs were fitted to the proportion of 'Long'
 4 responses across stimulus intervals. The horizontal dotted line indicates the point of
 5 indifference, i.e., 50% of 'long' and 50% of 'short' responses. The vertical dotted lines
 6 denote the absence of a perceptual bias, such that relative leftward and rightward PF shifts
 7 represent the over- and under- estimation biases, respectively. PFs show the fit to (A) patient
 8 and control group data, (B) across patients' dopamine terciles, and (C) patients' serotonin
 9 terciles. (B-C,E-F,H-I) Indices of the PFs fitted to individual patients' and controls' data.
 10 Subjective mid-intervals (Bisection Points) and temporal precision (Weber's fractions) across
 11 groups (B-C), and patients' dopamine (E-F) and serotonin (H-I) terciles. Lines show for each
 12 patient the difference in time perception performance as a function of Dopamine or Serotonin

1 tercile. Lower Bisection Points (leftward PF shift) and Weber's fractions (steeper PF slopes)
2 denote increasing underestimation bias and temporal precision, respectively. Markers reflect
3 individual participant datapoints.

4

5 Future research investigating the interplay between across-trial interval learning and tonic
6 dopamine could shed further light on the mechanisms underlying our observed association
7 between tonic dopamine and temporal precision. For example, decreased temporal precision
8 may relate to observed lower motivational states being associated with reduced dopamine
9 levels (52). Our observations may also reflect the role of tonic dopamine in behaviour
10 reinforcement, where a hypoactive tonic firing rate, demonstrated to hinder the extinction of
11 previously reinforced behaviours (53) could contribute to the observed bias towards
12 responses from prior trials in our study. This bias could lead to increased response variability
13 across trials, subsequently diminishing temporal precision.

14 Our final set of analyses sought to discriminate between two contrasting hypotheses
15 regarding the role of *tonic* striatal dopamine in temporal accuracy. The first hypothesis,
16 grounded in pharmacological research (18–22), predicts a positive association between
17 dopamine and temporal accuracy whereas the second hypothesis predicts no association
18 because of the absence of clear evidence for atypical temporal accuracy in dopamine-depleted
19 PD (54). In alignment with the latter, our observations revealed comparable accuracy across
20 patients and controls (Fig. 2A,B), $p=.76$, with Bayesian evidence for the null hypothesis,
21 $BF_{10}=.09$. This observation was strengthened by the lack of correspondence between
22 temporal accuracy and variations observed in patients' tonic dopamine levels (comprising a
23 ~4 min period) over the course of experimental sessions (Fig. 2D,E; $p=.89$, $BF_{10}=.06$). This
24 was consistent across different analysis window lengths, underscoring that temporal accuracy
25 is not related to steady-state (i.e., slowly changing or tonic) striatal dopamine levels.
26 Similarly, no link was found between temporal accuracy and tonic serotonin fluctuations
27 (Fig. 2G,H; $p=.24$, $BF_{10}=.11$). These observations challenge internal clock models proposing
28 that higher dopamine levels produce a tendency to perceive time as lasting longer (20). The
29 pharmacological evidence used to support these models (18–22) plausibly reflects
30 mechanisms other than a putative internal clock with its speed of ticking purportedly
31 controlled by striatal dopamine levels. Perhaps most compellingly, our observations reveal
32 differential effects of phasic and tonic dopamine dynamics on temporal accuracy. This
33 suggests a far more intricate relationship between the striatal dopamine system and time
34 perception that warrants further exploration and refinement of existing theoretical
35 frameworks.

36 Collectively, our observations indicate that changes in tonic dopamine levels may specifically
37 underlie the precision of temporal judgments, whereas we did not observe compelling
38 evidence linking temporal precision to phasic dopamine nor to phasic or tonic serotonin.
39 Coupled with our finding showing that phasic dopamine increases were selectively associated
40 with a higher underestimation bias, these results cumulatively suggest differential roles for
41 tonic and phasic dopamine in human time perception.

42

43 **New insights into the role of dopamine in time perception**

44 The present results offer a nuanced perspective on how striatal dopamine fluctuations
45 underlie different features of human time perception. Grace (36) has proposed that dopamine
46 dynamics operate across multiple timescales, encompassing a fast phasic release in response
47 to stimuli and a slow tonic release, which sustains steady-state concentration levels and

1 modulates phasic firing. In line with this perspective, other studies have shown that striatal
2 tonic and phasic firing can yield diverse and even opposing effects on behaviour (37, 55).
3 Investigations into the role of striatal dopamine in time perception faces similar challenges
4 due to conflicting observations linking elevated dopamine with both temporal overestimation
5 (18–22) and underestimation (25, 56). Here we leveraged advances in neurochemical
6 measurement methods in human participants to show that heightened phasic bursts of striatal
7 dopamine are uniquely associated with temporal underestimation whereas higher tonic
8 dopamine concentrations correlated with superior temporal precision. Moreover, our results
9 highlight the neurochemical specificity of these effects as our analyses suggest that the
10 observed effects are specific to dopamine fluctuations and are not observed with
11 corresponding variations in serotonin levels, which have been linked to interval timing in
12 pharmacological studies (57–59).

13 Dopamine assumes a central role in brain function regulation and is implicated in a broad
14 spectrum of disorders, including Parkinson's disease (51). These roles, rooted in dopamine's
15 evolutionary antiquity, persist across species (60). Recent shifts in dopamine transmission
16 models have recognized the importance of spatiotemporal precision in certain dopamine
17 functions. A specialized architecture has been proposed, involving release-receptor
18 assemblies at micrometre scales, to account for the distinct functions associated with the tonic
19 concentrations and transient bursts of activity of dopaminergic neurons (34). This theoretical
20 framework emphasizes a more refined spatiotemporal resolution of dopamine signalling to
21 mediate diversity of functions within the striatal dopamine system. Ongoing research
22 investigating the principles of these theories may profoundly impact our understanding of
23 past evidence linking a wide range of phenomena to the function of the striatal dopamine
24 system, including time perception.

25 Studies employing FSCV in animal models have shed light on how dopaminergic
26 transmission and dopamine dynamics contribute to the neurochemical mechanisms of drug
27 addiction, PD, and schizophrenia (61). Nonetheless, until recently, such research had not
28 been feasible in the human brain, owing to various methodological hurdles (23, 24, 62). Our
29 results suggest new directions for research that harness recent methodological advances in the
30 measurement of neurochemical dynamics (33, 63) and their function in time perception and
31 related behaviour in humans. Advancing our understanding of the neurobiological
32 foundations of human time perception will refine existing theories (20, 44, 64, 65), impacting
33 healthy and dysfunctional timing and the knowledge concerning the timing in human
34 cognition more broadly. This includes implications for metacognition, reinforcement
35 learning, reward processing, and understanding neurological and psychiatric conditions like
36 schizophrenia, addiction disorders and impulse control that involve aberrant dopamine
37 functioning (66, 67). For example, recent research indicates that heterogeneity in PD
38 symptoms may be accounted for by differences in time perception, with implications for
39 understanding dopaminergic mechanisms in time perception and PD symptomatology (38).
40 These insights are crucial for developing nuanced treatment approaches and enhancing our
41 comprehension of the complex interplay between dopamine, time perception, and human
42 cognition. Consequently, human FSCV emerges as a valuable set of methods for
43 investigating the neurochemical underpinnings of human time perception and germane
44 cognitive functions.

45

46 **References**

- 47 1. H. Merchant, D. L. Harrington, W. H. Meck, Neural basis of the perception and
48 estimation of time. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **36**, 313–336 (2013).

- 1 2. M. Wittmann, The inner sense of time: how the brain creates a representation of
2 duration. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **14**, 217–223 (2013).
- 3 3. D. M. Eagleman, Human time perception and its illusions. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **18**,
4 131–136 (2008).
- 5 4. M. Wittmann, "How we experience the passage of time: the body, feelings, and the
6 self" in *Subjective time: The philosophy, psychology, and neuroscience of temporality*,
7 V. Arstila & D. Lloyd, Ed. (Boston Review, 2014), pp. 507–523.
- 8 5. W. J. Matthews, W. H. Meck, Temporal cognition: Connecting subjective time to
9 perception, attention, and memory. *Psychol. Bull.* **142**, 865–907 (2016).
- 10 6. S. Thönes, S. Arnau, E. Wascher, Cognitions about time affect perception, behavior,
11 and physiology – A review on effects of external clock-speed manipulations.
12 *Conscious. Cogn.* **63**, 99–109 (2018).
- 13 7. M.-H. Sohn, R. A. Carlson, Implicit temporal tuning of working memory strategy
14 during cognitive skill acquisition. *Am. J. Psychol.* **116**, 239 (2003).
- 15 8. H. Merchant, A. P. Georgopoulos, Neurophysiology of perceptual and motor aspects
16 of interception. *J. Neurophysiol.* **95**, 1–13 (2006).
- 17 9. G. C. Tunes, E. Fermino de Oliveira, E. U. Vieira, M. S. Caetano, A. M. Cravo, M.
18 Bussotti Reyes, Time encoding migrates from prefrontal cortex to dorsal striatum
19 during learning of a self-timed response duration task. *Elife.* **11**, 65495 (2022).
- 20 10. A. Toso, S. Reinartz, F. Pulecchi, M. E. Diamond, Time coding in rat dorsolateral
21 striatum. *Neuron.* **109**, 3663-3673.e6 (2021).
- 22 11. K. I. Bakhurin, V. Goudar, J. L. Shobe, L. D. Claar, D. V. Buonomano, S. C.
23 Masmanidis, Differential encoding of time by prefrontal and striatal network
24 dynamics. *J. Neurosci.* **37**, 854–870 (2017).
- 25 12. R. A. Bruce, M. A. Weber, R. A. Volkman, M. Oya, E. B. Emmons, Y. Kim, N. S.
26 Narayanan, Experience-related enhancements in striatal temporal encoding. *Eur. J.*
27 *Neurosci.* **54**, 5063–5074 (2021).
- 28 13. E. B. Emmons, B. J. De Corte, Y. Kim, K. L. Parker, M. S. Matell, N. S. Narayanan,
29 Rodent medial frontal control of temporal processing in the dorsomedial striatum. *J.*
30 *Neurosci.* **37**, 8718–8733 (2017).
- 31 14. N. Naghibi, N. Jahangiri, R. Khosrowabadi, C. R. Eickhoff, S. B. Eickhoff, J. T. Coull,
32 M. Tahmasian, Embodying time in the brain: A multi-dimensional neuroimaging meta-
33 analysis of 95 duration processing studies. *Neuropsychol. Rev.*, 1–22 (2023).
- 34 15. A. Nani, J. Manuello, D. Liloia, S. Duca, T. Costa, F. Cauda, The neural correlates of
35 time: A meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **31**, 1796–1826
36 (2019).
- 37 16. P. V. Agostino, R.-K. Cheng, Contributions of dopaminergic signaling to timing
38 accuracy and precision. *Curr. Opin. Behav. Sci.* **8**, 153–160 (2016).
- 39 17. J. T. Coull, R.-K. Cheng, W. H. Meck, Neuroanatomical and neurochemical substrates
40 of timing. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* **36**, 3–25 (2011).
- 41 18. M. S. Matell, M. Bateson, W. H. Meck, Single-trials analyses demonstrate that
42 increases in clock speed contribute to the methamphetamine-induced horizontal shifts
43 in peak-interval timing functions. *Psychopharmacology (Berl).* **188**, 201–212 (2006).

- 1 19. M. S. Matell, G. R. King, W. H. Meck, Differential modulation of clock speed by the
2 administration of intermittent versus continuous cocaine. *Behav. Neurosci.* **118**, 150–
3 156 (2004).
- 4 20. W. H. Meck, Neuropharmacology of timing and time perception. *Cogn. Brain Res.* **3**,
5 227–242 (1996).
- 6 21. T. H. Rammsayer, On dopaminergic modulation of temporal information processing.
7 *Biol. Psychol.* **36**, 209–222 (1993).
- 8 22. T. Rammsayer, Effects of pharmacologically induced dopamine-receptor stimulation
9 on human temporal information processing. *NeuroQuantology.* **7**, 103–113 (2009).
- 10 23. K. T. Kishida, S. G. Sandberg, T. Lohrenz, Y. G. Comair, I. Sáez, P. E. M. Phillips, P.
11 R. Montague, Sub-second dopamine detection in human striatum. *PLoS One.* **6**,
12 e23291 (2011).
- 13 24. K. T. Kishida, I. Saez, T. Lohrenz, M. R. Witcher, A. W. Laxton, S. B. Tatter, J. P.
14 White, T. L. Ellis, P. E. M. Phillips, P. R. Montague, Subsecond dopamine fluctuations
15 in human striatum encode superposed error signals about actual and counterfactual
16 reward. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **113**, 200–205 (2016).
- 17 25. S. Soares, B. V. Atallah, J. J. Paton, Midbrain dopamine neurons control judgment of
18 time. *Science (80-.).* **354**, 1273–1277 (2016).
- 19 26. R.-K. Cheng, J. Tipples, N. S. Narayanan, W. H. Meck, Clock speed as a window into
20 dopaminergic control of emotion and time perception. *Timing Time Percept.* **4**, 99–122
21 (2016).
- 22 27. A. Mansouri, S. Taslimi, J. H. Badhiwala, C. D. Witiw, F. Nassiri, V. J. J. Odekerken,
23 R. M. A. De Bie, S. K. Kalia, M. Hodaie, R. P. Munhoz, A. Fasano, A. M. Lozano,
24 Deep brain stimulation for Parkinson’s disease: meta-analysis of results of randomized
25 trials at varying lengths of follow-up. *J. Neurosurg.* **128**, 1199–1213 (2018).
- 26 28. D. Bang, K. T. Kishida, T. Lohrenz, J. P. White, A. W. Laxton, S. B. Tatter, S. M.
27 Fleming, P. R. Montague, Sub-second dopamine and serotonin signaling in human
28 striatum during perceptual decision-making. *Neuron.* **108**, 999-1010.e6 (2020).
- 29 29. T. Lohrenz, K. T. Kishida, P. R. Montague, BOLD and its connection to dopamine
30 release in human striatum: a cross-cohort comparison. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol.*
31 *Sci.* **371**, 20150352 (2016).
- 32 30. R. J. Moran, K. T. Kishida, T. Lohrenz, I. Saez, A. W. Laxton, M. R. Witcher, S. B.
33 Tatter, T. L. Ellis, P. E. Phillips, P. Dayan, P. R. Montague, The protective action
34 encoding of serotonin transients in the human brain. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* **43**,
35 1425–1435 (2018).
- 36 31. B. Liebenow, A. Jiang, E. DiMarco, T. Wilson, M. S. Siddiqui, I. ul Haq, A. W.
37 Laxton, S. B. Tatter, K. T. Kishida, Intracranial subsecond dopamine measurements
38 during a “sure bet or gamble” decision-making task in patients with alcohol use
39 disorder suggest diminished dopaminergic signals about relief. *Neurosurg. Focus.* **54**,
40 E3 (2023).
- 41 32. B. Liebenow, M. Williams, T. Wilson, I. ul Haq, M. S. Siddiqui, A. W. Laxton, S. B.
42 Tatter, K. T. Kishida, Intracranial approach for sub-second monitoring of
43 neurotransmitters during DBS electrode implantation does not increase infection rate.
44 *PLoS One.* **17**, e0271348 (2022).

- 1 33. L. P. Sands, A. Jiang, B. Liebenow, E. DiMarco, A. W. Laxton, S. B. Tatter, P. R.
2 Montague, K. T. Kishida, *bioRxiv*, in press, doi:10.1126/sciadv.adi4927.
- 3 34. C. Liu, P. Goel, P. S. Kaeser, Spatial and temporal scales of dopamine transmission.
4 *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **22**, 345–358 (2021).
- 5 35. N. Zhao, J. Song, S. Liu, Multi-timescale analysis of midbrain dopamine neuronal
6 firing activities. *J. Theor. Biol.* **556**, 111310 (2023).
- 7 36. A. A. Grace, The tonic/phasic model of dopamine system regulation and its
8 implications for understanding alcohol and psychostimulant craving. *Addiction.* **95**,
9 119–128 (2000).
- 10 37. E. A. Budygin, C. E. Bass, V. P. Grinevich, A. L. Deal, K. D. Bonin, J. L. Weiner,
11 Opposite consequences of tonic and phasic increases in accumbal dopamine on
12 alcohol-seeking behavior. *iScience.* **23**, 100877 (2020).
- 13 38. E. K. DiMarco, R. Sadibolova, A. Jiang, B. Liebenow, R. E. Jones, I. ul Haq, M. S.
14 Siddiqui, D. B. Terhune, K. T. Kishida, Time perception reflects individual differences
15 in motor and non-motor symptoms of Parkinson’s disease. *Parkinsonism Relat.*
16 *Disord.* **114**, 105800 (2023).
- 17 39. C. D. Kopec, C. D. Brody, Human performance on the temporal bisection task. *Brain*
18 *Cogn.* **74**, 262–272 (2010).
- 19 40. J. Frossard, O. Renaud, Permutation tests for regression, anova, and comparison of
20 signals: The permuco package. *J. Stat. Softw.* **99**, 1–32 (2021).
- 21 41. A. Moscatelli, M. Mezzetti, F. Lacquaniti, Modeling psychophysical data at the
22 population-level: The generalized linear mixed model. *J. Vis.* **12**, 26–26 (2012).
- 23 42. R. A. A. Ince, A. T. Paton, J. W. Kay, P. G. Schyns, Bayesian inference of population
24 prevalence. *Elife.* **10** (2021), doi:10.7554/eLife.62461.
- 25 43. B. Pasquereau, R. S. Turner, Dopamine neurons encode errors in predicting movement
26 trigger occurrence. *J. Neurophysiol.* **113**, 1110–1123 (2015).
- 27 44. J. J. Paton, D. V. Buonomano, The neural basis of timing: Distributed mechanisms for
28 diverse functions. *Neuron.* **98**, 687–705 (2018).
- 29 45. G. B. M. Mello, S. Soares, J. J. Paton, A scalable population code for time in the
30 striatum. *Curr. Biol.* **25**, 1113–1122 (2015).
- 31 46. T. Monteiro, F. S. Rodrigues, M. Pexirra, B. F. Cruz, A. I. Gonçalves, P. E. Rueda-
32 Orozco, J. J. Paton, Using temperature to analyze the neural basis of a time-based
33 decision. *Nat. Neurosci.* **26**, 1407–1416 (2023).
- 34 47. C. Malapani, B. Rakitin, R. Levy, W. H. Meck, B. Deweer, B. Dubois, J. Gibbon,
35 Coupled temporal memories in Parkinson’s disease: A dopamine-related dysfunction.
36 *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **10**, 316–331 (1998).
- 37 48. C. Malapani, B. Deweer, J. Gibbon, Separating Storage from Retrieval Dysfunction of
38 Temporal Memory in Parkinson’s Disease. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **14**, 311–322 (2002).
- 39 49. J. Zhang, C. Nombela, N. Wolpe, R. A. Barker, J. B. Rowe, Time on timing:
40 Dissociating premature responding from interval sensitivity in Parkinson’s disease.
41 *Mov. Disord.* **31**, 1163–1172 (2016).
- 42 50. H. Merchant, M. Luciana, C. Hooper, S. Majestic, P. Tuite, Interval timing and
43 Parkinson’s disease: heterogeneity in temporal performance. *Exp. Brain Res.* **184**,

- 1 233–248 (2007).
- 2 51. W. Poewe, K. Seppi, C. M. Tanner, G. M. Halliday, P. Brundin, J. Volkmann, A.-E.
3 Schrag, A. E. Lang, Parkinson disease. *Nat. Rev. Dis. Prim.* **3**, 17013 (2017).
- 4 52. S. Ikemoto, C. Yang, A. Tan, Basal ganglia circuit loops, dopamine and motivation: A
5 review and enquiry. *Behav. Brain Res.* **290**, 17–31 (2015).
- 6 53. T. Sagvolden, E. B. Johansen, H. Aase, V. A. Russell, A dynamic developmental
7 theory of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) predominantly
8 hyperactive/impulsive and combined subtypes. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **28**, 397–419 (2005).
- 9 54. Y. Terao, M. Honma, Y. Asahara, S. Tokushige, T. Furubayashi, T. Miyazaki, S.
10 Inomata-Terada, A. Uchibori, S. Miyagawa, Y. Ichikawa, A. Chiba, Y. Ugawa, M.
11 Suzuki, Time distortion in Parkinsonism. *Front. Neurosci.* **15**, 648814 (2021).
- 12 55. R. D. Badgaiyan, S. Sinha, M. Sajjad, D. S. Wack, Attenuated Tonic and Enhanced
13 Phasic Release of Dopamine in Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *PLoS One.*
14 **10**, e0137326 (2015).
- 15 56. C. D. Howard, H. Li, C. E. Geddes, X. Jin, Dynamic nigrostriatal dopamine biases
16 action selection. *Neuron.* **93**, 1436-1450.e8 (2017).
- 17 57. S. Yanakieva, N. Polychroni, N. Family, L. T. J. Williams, D. P. Luke, D. B. Terhune,
18 The Effects of Microdose LSD on Time Perception: A Randomised, Double-Blind,
19 Placebo-Controlled Trial. *Psychopharmacology (Berl.)* **236**, 1159–1170 (2019).
- 20 58. R. Sadibolova, C. Murray-Lawson, N. Family, L. T. J. Williams, D. P. Luke, D. B.
21 Terhune, LSD Microdosing Attenuates the Impact of Temporal Priors in Time
22 Perception. *bioRxiv* (2023), doi:10.1101/2023.04.14.536983.
- 23 59. M. Wittmann, O. Carter, F. Hasler, B. R. Cahn, U. Grimberg, P. Spring, D. Hell, H.
24 Flohr, F. X. Vollenweider, Effects of psilocybin on time perception and temporal
25 control of behaviour in humans. *J. Psychopharmacol.* **21**, 50–64 (2007).
- 26 60. S. Grillner, B. Robertson, The Basal Ganglia Over 500 Million Years. *Curr. Biol.* **26**
27 (2016), pp. R1088–R1100.
- 28 61. V. P. Grinevich, A. N. Zakirov, U. V. Berseneva, E. V. Gerasimova, R. R.
29 Gainetdinov, E. A. Budygin, Applying a Fast-scan cyclic voltammetry to explore
30 dopamine dynamics in animal models of neuropsychiatric disorders. *Cells.* **11**, 1533
31 (2022).
- 32 62. P. R. Montague, K. T. Kishida, Computational underpinnings of neuromodulation in
33 humans. *Cold Spring Harb. Symp. Quant. Biol.* **83**, 71–82 (2018).
- 34 63. D. Bang, Y. Luo, L. S. Barbosa, S. R. Batten, B. Hadj-Amar, T. Twomey, N. Melville,
35 J. P. White, A. Torres, X. Celaya, P. Ramaiah, S. M. McClure, G. A. Brewer, R. W.
36 Bina, T. Lohrenz, B. Casas, P. H. Chiu, M. Vannucci, K. T. Kishida, M. R. Witcher, P.
37 R. Montague, Noradrenaline tracks emotional modulation of attention in human
38 amygdala. *Curr. Biol.* **33**, 5003-5010.e6 (2023).
- 39 64. K. J. Friston, T. Shiner, T. FitzGerald, J. M. Galea, R. Adams, H. Brown, R. J. Dolan,
40 R. Moran, K. E. Stephan, S. Bestmann, Dopamine, affordance and active inference.
41 *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **8**, e1002327 (2012).
- 42 65. B. Yin, Z. Shi, Y. Wang, W. H. Meck, Oscillation/Coincidence-Detection Models of
43 Reward-Related Timing in Corticostriatal Circuits. *Timing Time Percept.*, 1–43
44 (2022).

- 1 66. S. Thoenes, D. Oberfeld, Meta-Analysis of Time Perception and Temporal Processing
2 in Schizophrenia: Differential Effects on Precision and Accuracy. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.*
3 **54**, 44–64 (2017).
- 4 67. C. Paasche, S. Weibel, M. Wittmann, L. Lalanne, Time perception and impulsivity: A
5 proposed relationship in addictive disorders. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **106**, 182–201
6 (2019).
- 7 68. D. H. Brainard, The psychophysics toolbox. *Spat. Vis.* **10**, 433–436 (1997).
- 8 69. M. W. Woolrich, S. Jbabdi, B. Patenaude, M. Chappell, S. Makni, T. Behrens, C.
9 Beckmann, M. Jenkinson, S. M. Smith, Bayesian analysis of neuroimaging data in
10 FSL. *Neuroimage*. **45**, S173–S186 (2009).
- 11 70. R Core Team, A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing (2021),
12 (available at <http://www.r-project.org/>).
- 13 71. J. Qian, T. Hastie, J. Friedman, R. Tibshirani, N. Simon, Glmnet for Matlab (2013),
14 (available at http://www.stanford.edu/~hastie/glmnet_matlab/).
- 15 72. H. Zou, T. Hastie, Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *J. R. Stat.*
16 *Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **67**, 301–320 (2005).
- 17 73. E. Maris, R. Oostenveld, Nonparametric statistical testing of EEG- and MEG-data. *J.*
18 *Neurosci. Methods*. **164**, 177–190 (2007).
- 19 74. J. Frossard, O. Renaud, The cluster depth tests: Toward point-wise strong control of
20 the family-wise error rate in massively univariate tests with application to M/EEG.
21 *Neuroimage*. **247**, 118824 (2022).
- 22 75. S. M. Smith, T. E. Nichols, Threshold-free cluster enhancement: Addressing problems
23 of smoothing, threshold dependence and localisation in cluster inference. *Neuroimage*.
24 **44**, 83–98 (2009).
- 25 76. S. Kherad-Pajouh, O. Renaud, An exact permutation method for testing any effect in
26 balanced and unbalanced fixed effect ANOVA. *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.* **54**, 1881–
27 1893 (2010).
- 28 77. M. R. Drew, S. Fairhurst, C. Malapani, J. C. Horvitz, P. D. Balsam, Effects of
29 dopamine antagonists on the timing of two intervals. *Pharmacol. Biochem. Behav.* **75**,
30 9–15 (2003).
- 31 78. T. Rammsayer, Neuropharmacological evidence for different timing mechanisms in
32 humans. *Q. J. Exp. Psychol. Sect. B Comp. Physiol. Psychol.* **52**, 273–286 (1999).
- 33 79. R. A. A. Ince, J. W. Kay, P. G. Schyns, Within-participant statistics for cognitive
34 science. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **26**, 626–630 (2022).
- 35 80. A. V. Maricq, R. M. Church, The differential effects of haloperidol and
36 methamphetamine on time estimation in the rat. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. **79**, 10–
37 15 (1983).
- 38 81. C. J. MacDonald, W. H. Meck, Differential effects of clozapine and haloperidol on
39 interval timing in the supraseconds range. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. **182**, 232–244
40 (2005).
- 41 82. R. Sadibolova, L. Monaldi, D. B. Terhune, A proxy measure of striatal dopamine
42 predicts individual differences in temporal precision. *Psychon. Bull. Rev.* **1**, 3 (2022).
- 43

1 **Acknowledgments:**

2 **Funding:**

3 Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council grant BB/R01583X/1
4 (DBT)

5 National Institutes of Health grant NIH-NIMH R01MH121099 (KTK)

6 National Institutes of Health grant NIH-NIDA R01DA048096 (KTK)

7 National Institutes of Health grant NIH-NIMH R01MH124115 (KTK)

8 National Institutes of Health grant NIH-NIDA P50DA006634 (KTK)

9 National Institutes of Health grant NIH 5KL2TR001420 (KTK)

10

11 **Author contributions:**

12 Conceptualization: RS, EDM, KTK, DBT

13 Methodology: RS, EDM, AJ, KTK, DBT

14 Investigation: EDM, AJ, SBT, AL, KTK

15 Visualization: RS, BM

16 Funding acquisition: KTK, DBT

17 Project administration: KTK, DBT

18 Supervision: KTK, DBT

19 Writing – original draft: RS

20 Writing – review & editing: RS, EDM, SBT, AL, KTK, DBT

21

22 **Competing interests:** Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

23

24 **Data and materials availability:** All data and code will be released with a 1-year
25 embargo from the publication date.

26

Supplementary Materials for

Sub-second and multi-second dopamine dynamics underlie variability in human time perception

Renata Sadibolova, Emily DiMarco, Angela Jiang, Benjamin Maas, Stephen B. Tatter, Adrian Laxton, Kenneth T. Kishida, & Devin B. Terhune

Corresponding authors: renata.sadibolova@roehampton.ac.uk, kkishida@wakehealth.edu, devin.terhune@kcl.ac.uk

Materials and Methods

The study comprised two sessions (1 to 10 days apart for the patients and the same day with a ten-minute break between sessions for controls), each including training and experimental phases. All participants achieved 65% accuracy in 20 consecutive training trials, with a single patient and a single control requiring, respectively, 48 and 30 trials in the first session and another patient requiring 21 trials in the second session. Control participants and patients not in the surgical setting (session 1) were seated at a desk approximately 70 cm from the monitor and completed four blocks of fifty experimental trials. During surgery (session 2), PD patients sat in a semi-upright position and viewed the monitor at a distance of approximately 100 cm. Patients were on their dopamine replacement medication in session 1 whereas their medication was withheld in session 2 at least 12 hours prior to their surgery (27). Our experimental protocol afforded up to 30 minutes for the experimental task with concurrent FSCV recording (24, 32), during which PD patients completed six blocks of 50 experimental trials.

Participants

Six patients with Parkinson's disease (PD) (2 females, 4 males) between the ages of 62 and 73 years ($M_{Age}=67.7$, $SD=4.5$) participated in this study during DBS surgery. For behavioural analyses only, we additionally included a sample of 17 healthy controls (7 females, 10 males, aged 50-66; $M_{Age}=57.5$, $SD=5.0$) from a prior study (38), with no psychiatric or neurological conditions. We excluded 3 patients with a psychiatric diagnosis. All participants provided informed written consent in accordance with approval by the IRB committee at Wake Forest University Health Sciences (IRB00017138 and IRB00044216).

Experimental task

Participants completed a visual temporal bisection task with stimulus presentation implemented with Psychtoolbox-3 (68) in MATLAB R2018b (MathWorks, Natick, USA). Each trial consisted of a jittered interstimulus interval (ISI1; blank black screen) drawn from a truncated Poisson distribution (400-600ms), a white circle ($\sim 2^\circ$ of visual field) that varied in duration (500, 650, 750, 850, 950, or 1100ms), a second interstimulus interval (ISI2; blank black screen; 900ms), and a two-alternative forced choice judgment prompt ("S"=short; "L"=long). The response prompt on screen (i.e., [S L] or [L S]) was randomized on every


1 trial to counterbalance handedness and visual presentation effects. Participants responded
2 with the left or right shoulder keys of a Logitech game controller (Logitech International
3 S.A.), corresponding to the respective response letter location on the monitor. In the 20-trial
4 training phase, participants learnt two anchor intervals (500 and 1100ms) comprising equal
5 proportions of each stimulus. Additional training trials automatically followed if accuracy
6 was below 65% until this target was reached in the lattermost 20 trials or until the maximum
7 training time of 7 minutes had passed. In the subsequent experimental phase, participants
8 were presented with white circles of varying intervals (500-1100ms) and judged whether they
9 were closer in duration to the trained short or long anchor intervals. All six experimental (50-
10 trial) blocks began with two reminders of each anchor stimulus (4 trials); the remaining 46
11 trials included 10 repetitions of the 4 middle stimuli and 3 repetitions of each anchor
12 stimulus.

13

14 Fast-Scan Cyclic Voltammetry (FSCV)

15 Fast scan cyclic voltammetry (FSCV) was performed using carbon fibre microelectrodes
16 surgically placed in the caudate (Fig. S1; 6 channels, 5 patients) or thalamus (Fig. S1; 1
17 channel, 1 patient, excluded to focus analyses on caudate region). Briefly, the FSCV
18 measurement protocol is the same as previously reported in humans: hold working electrode
19 at -0.6V for 90ms, ramp to +1.4 V and back to -0.6V at 400 V/s, and repeat, for an overall
20 electrochemical sampling rate of 10 Hz frequency reported (23, 24, 63, 28–33, 38, 62). The
21 resulting raw electrochemical current was measured at a sampling rate of 250kHz, thus
22 providing a raw 10ms voltammogram (2500 samples at 250KHz). These data were subjected
23 to analysis as described previously (24, 28) and below.

1



2 *Figure S1.* Electrode Coordinate Locations on MNI 152 Template, AC-PC aligned, and
3 WayPoint Navigator Software. For each participant, from left to right, electrode coordinates
4 are depicted on the MNI 152 1 mm template, AC-PC aligned participant brains, and
5 WayPoint Navigator Surgical Planning Software Suite. Normalization to the MNI 152
6 template was achieved through FSL(69). Each figure panel shows sagittal, coronal, and axial
7 planes for each participant from top to bottom. An exception is noted for Participant 3, for
8 whom MRI was contraindicated and unavailable. For Participant 5, two distinct recordings
9 were obtained from the same depth, one from a center channel, and another from a medial
10 channel with a 2 mm offset. Abbreviations: AC-PC = anterior commissure-posterior
11 commissure; S = superior; I = inferior; P = posterior; A = anterior; R = right; L = left; MRI =
12 magnetic resonance imaging.

1 Analyses

2

3 *Behavioural data analysis*

4 Trials with premature responses (during ISI2) were excluded ($M=1.50$, $SD=1.76$, range:
5 0-5). We first tested whether psychophysical markers of time perception differed between
6 controls and PD patients. Using the *MixedPsy* package (41) in R (70), we fitted a generalized
7 linear mixed-effects model (GLMM) to the proportion of long responses, including the group
8 and demeaned stimulus intervals and their interaction as fixed-effects parameters and
9 stimulus interval slopes and intercepts for participants as random effects. Temporal accuracy
10 (Point of Subjective Equality; PSE or Bisection Point; BP) and temporal precision (Just
11 Noticeable Difference; JND, or Weber's Fraction; WF) were derived, respectively, from the
12 intercepts and slopes of a cumulative normal distribution (probit) function (41). Leftward
13 (negative PSE) and rightward (positive PSE) shifts of this function reflect, respectively,
14 temporal over- and under- estimation biases whereas a steeper function (lower JND) reflects
15 greater temporal precision.

16

17 *Neurochemical concentrations*

18 We trained statistical models for optimal out-of-probe prediction of striatal DA and SE
19 concentrations following prior work (24, 28, 30) and applied these models to estimate
20 dopamine and serotonin concentrations from our human FSCV data. To this end, we
21 produced the calibration data with known concentration labels following an in-vitro FSCV
22 protocol described in detail elsewhere (24, 28, 30). Calibration data were collected using the
23 same protocol as that used in the human experiments. Calibration data consisted of 10ms
24 voltammograms recorded every 100ms (each voltammogram = 2500 samples at 250kHz),
25 thus yielding 10Hz overall temporal resolution of DA and SE signal time series. We first
26 sought to specify the set of parameters for optimal machine learning performance on naïve
27 probes not included in the training. This was achieved by down-sampling calibration
28 voltammograms by averaging the bins of every 30 samples for dopamine and 10 samples for
29 serotonin. Each down-sampled voltammogram was concatenated with its first and second
30 derivative with the resulting 249 (dopamine) and 747 (serotonin) samples submitted as
31 predictors to an elastic-net regularized linear regression model (71, 72). The outcome variable
32 was a multivariate Gaussian distribution consisting of known concentration labels for pH,
33 3,4-dihydroxyphenylacetic acid (DOPAC), L-ascorbic acid (LAA) and dopamine (DA) or
34 serotonin (SE). We trained separate models for DA and SE estimation using a 10-fold cross-
35 validation procedure whilst searching for minimal mean squared error (unexplained variance)
36 in a 2D penalty parameter space (penalty weight λ and a mixing term α , see Qian et al.,
37 2013). The λ values were determined by an inbuilt function (71) and the α range was 0 to 1
38 in steps of 0.25. Our approach allowed for the reliable and generalized estimation of DA and SE
39 concentrations against a background of varying pH activity as shown by model performance
40 on two naïve calibration probes withheld from model-training (Root Mean Squared Error:
41 dopamine = 0.632, serotonin = 0.113; Signal to Noise Ratio: dopamine = 3.99, serotonin =
42 18.91).

43

44 *Phasic signal change and time perception*

45 The final model estimates for patients' in-vivo DA and SE concentrations were up-
46 sampled by linear interpolation to 1000 Hz for the purposes of epoching. We extracted
47 epochs relative to stimulus onset or stimulus offset and z-scored the signal (± 3 sec relative to
48 stimulus onset) to subtract away fluctuations at slower timescales. Insofar as the z-score

1 normalization brings the epochs into a common frame of reference without affecting their
2 individual shapes, we compared the transient within-trial signal changes both within and
3 across participants.

4 Our next objective was to assess if patients' binary response patterns in the temporal
5 bisection task varied with transient changes in caudal DA and SE signals during and after
6 stimulus presentation. We analysed timeseries aligned to stimulus onset [0 to 1400ms] and
7 offset [-500 to 900ms]. We applied a cluster mass test procedure (73, 74) for detecting the
8 time window where neurochemical concentrations differed at the group level as a function of
9 the stimulus interval, response (short or long), and their interaction, including the by-
10 participant random error for the interaction term in the model. Clusters were identified with
11 the threshold-free cluster enhancement (*tfce*) method (75) and assessed for significance with
12 the *Rde_keradPajouh_renaud* (76) permutation method (10,000 iterations) in the *permuco*
13 package (40) in R (70).

14 In the subsequent analyses, we submitted mean single-trial concentrations in identified
15 cluster window(s) and stimulus interval (short vs. long) as fixed-effects predictors in a
16 GLMM with binary responses (short vs. long) as the outcome variable and patient probes as
17 the random intercept term. We additionally demarcated trials for individual probes into low,
18 medium, and high DA and SE terciles of the mean signal distribution in the cluster window(s)
19 and fitted GLMMs with signal tercile and stimulus predictors, proportion of long responses as
20 the outcome variable, including the uncorrelated random intercepts and by-stimulus slopes
21 for the probe. This allowed us to assess whether transient neurochemical fluctuations related
22 to psychophysical indices of temporal accuracy and precision (41).

23 Although appropriate for its improved statistical power in dealing with multiple
24 comparison tests (40, 73), the cluster permutation analysis disregards random effects
25 associated with participants and their interactions with fixed effects. Whereas the GLMM
26 remedies some of those issues, we complemented these analyses with Bayesian assessments
27 of the effect prevalence, which shifts the focus from population mean estimates to individuals
28 and is particularly well-suited for experiments with small sample sizes and large trial
29 numbers (42). For each PD patient, we trained 10-fold cross-validated logistic regression
30 models in a sliding window across the signal time series (200ms width, steps of 20ms) with
31 neurochemical concentrations as predictors and binary responses as the outcome. To ensure
32 that the models were unbiased, the predictors were normalized, and the training data were
33 balanced by subsampling trials from the response class with more trials, so that the number of
34 trials was matched to the class with fewer trials. The minimal size of a training dataset in this
35 study was N=212 trials. Area under the curve (AUC) was computed to assess classification
36 performance with values of 0.50 and 1.00 representing chance and perfect classification,
37 respectively. We applied one-tailed one-sample t-tests to compare AUC values (10 folds)
38 against 50% chance performance at each timepoint for each participant. The alpha level was
39 lowered to 0.01 to correct for multiple comparisons (46 time points); however, given that this
40 is the first human study investigating in-vivo human sub-second neurochemical fluctuations
41 relating to time perception, we additionally include the results without the multiple
42 comparison correction (28). The Bayesian prevalence analysis provides the population
43 prevalence estimate (maximum a posteriori [MAP]) together with its associated uncertainty
44 intervals (highest posterior density intervals [HPDI] or lower bound posterior quantiles).
45 Expanding upon the traditional prevalence analysis, we also followed Ince et al.'s (42)
46 approach to obtain prevalence estimates for different effect sizes.

47

48 *Tonic signal change and time perception*

1 Our previous analyses were complemented with further mixed-effects modelling to assess
2 the role of tonic DA concentrations in time perception. To facilitate comparison across all
3 patient probes, we z-scored the concentrations observed for ongoing stimuli using the mean
4 and standard deviation of these concentrations across all trials. We subsequently computed
5 baseline-corrected mean concentrations for individual trials and probes. These were then
6 averaged and the proportions of “long” responses for each stimulus interval were computed
7 for each window of 100 trials moving forward in ~60-second (~25-trial) increments. The
8 robustness of this analysis was further assessed across different window lengths: 50, 75, 125
9 and 150 trials (Supplemental materials). A GLMM (probit link) was then fitted to the
10 proportion of long responses, including tonic DA concentrations and demeaned stimulus
11 intervals and their interaction as fixed-effects parameters and by-stimulus slopes and
12 intercepts for patient probes as random effects. As described above, this method yielded
13 psychometric functions with separate beta coefficients reflecting temporal accuracy and
14 precision (41). The windows were additionally partitioned according to the average DA
15 concentrations into low, medium, and high DA terciles, thereby enhancing our ability to
16 visualize the results. Finally, all analyses were repeated with SE concentrations to assess the
17 neurochemical specificity of our findings. The Bayesian prevalence estimate was not
18 computed for this analysis due to the small number of trial-windows.
19

20 **Supplementary Text**

21

22 Time perception in PD

23 We assessed two contrasting hypotheses for the role of tonic striatal DA in temporal
24 accuracy. The first, grounded in prior pharmacological studies (20, 77, 78), predicted a
25 positive relationship, and the second, given the absence of clear evidence in dopamine-
26 depleted PD (54), predicted no association. We observed a trend for a leftward shift of a
27 psychometric function denoting an overestimation trend (Fig. 2A) in both PD patients,
28 $PSE_{PD} = -.03$ s, $SE = .03$, [95% CI: -.08, .02], and controls, $PSE_{CTRL} = -.04$ s, $SE = .03$, 95% CI [-
29 .08, .01], which, in line with the second hypothesis, was similar across the groups, $\beta = .10$,
30 $SE = .33$, 95% CI [-.58, .79]), $z = .31$, $p = .76$, with Bayesian evidence for the null hypothesis,
31 $BF_{10} = .09$.

32 We additionally hypothesised that lower tonic DA levels will correspond with poorer
33 precision (49, 50). As expected, temporal precision was poorer in PD patients, $JND_{PD} = .14$,
34 $SE = .02$, 95% CI [.08, .19], as indicated by higher values (i.e., flatter slopes; Fig. 2A), than in
35 controls, $JND_{CTRL} = .09$, $SE = .01$, 95% CI [.08, .10], $\beta = 2.44$, $SE = 1.03$, 95% CI [.33, 4.56]),
36 $z = 2.37$, $p = .02$, $BF_{10} = 1.03$. These results underscore diminished temporal precision in PD
37 patients, corroborating previous findings amid some contrasting evidence (49, 50).

38

39 Caudal dopamine and serotonin transients and time perception


40 We next tested the prediction that the elevated striatal DA transients are linked to
41 temporal underestimation, as suggested by animal research (25). Toward this end, we
42 investigated how patients’ neurochemical signals tracked variations in their temporal
43 responses. Lower caudal DA after stimulus onset [625 to 670 ms] was associated with
44 increased tendency to judge stimulus intervals as long, cluster $p_{TFCE} < 0.05$ (Fig. 1C). This
45 effect was dopamine-specific with no clusters found in SE time series (Fig. 1D). Importantly,
46 the cluster analyses did not yield any statistically significant differences in DA or SE

1 concentrations as a function of actual stimulus interval (modelled as both a binary variable
2 [Fig. 1A,B] and with six stimulus levels). Finally, no clusters were identified in signal
3 timeseries aligned to stimulus offset. Cumulatively, these results suggest that short responses
4 are associated with larger bursts of DA activity during stimulus processing.

5 A complementary GLMM analysis corroborated that lower phasic DA at 625 – 670ms
6 from stimulus onset was associated with increased long responses, $\beta = -.11$ (95% CI [-.22, -
7 .001]), $SE = .06$, $t = -1.97$, $p = .048$, whereas SE was not a significant predictor of temporal
8 estimates in this time window, $\beta = -.06$ (95% CI [-.16, .05]), $SE = .05$, $t = -1.07$, $p = .28$. This
9 effect is further reflected in our analysis of a psychophysical measure of temporal accuracy
10 (PSE): lower DA was associated with a greater overestimation bias, $\beta = -.15$ (95% CI [-.27, -
11 .04]), $SE = .06$, $z = -2.58$, $p = .01$ whereas this effect was not significant for serotonin, $\beta = -.01$
12 (95% CI [-.13, .10]), $SE = .06$, $z = -.22$, $p = .82$. By contrast, temporal precision (JND) did not
13 differ across phasic DA terciles, $\beta = .34$ (95% CI [-.43, 1.13]), $SE = .40$, $z = .86$, $p = .39$, or SE
14 terciles, $\beta = .61$ (95% CI [-.18, 1.42]), $SE = .41$, $z = 1.51$, $p = .13$ (Fig. 1E-J). These results
15 complement the previous analysis and demonstrate that intra-individual variability in timing
16 accuracy is related to transient caudal DA fluctuations, with evidence for neurochemical
17 specificity.

18 To gain a deeper insight into these effects, we used a Bayesian approach to estimate
19 population prevalence. This approach offers several benefits compared to traditional
20 population mean hypothesis testing, including the capability to infer population-level
21 estimates and their precision in studies with small participant numbers and to derive an
22 estimate irrespective of the specific window where classification may peak in different
23 participants (42). The AUC for classification of short and long responses from DA
24 concentrations within individual participants varied from .50 to .59 (59% classification
25 accuracy), reflecting heterogeneity across patients (Fig. S2 top-left). For example, whereas
26 patient 20's AUC ranged from .50 to .53, reflecting poor classification, patient 19 displayed
27 the highest AUC values (.55 < AUC < .60) around anchor stimulus interval offsets (500 and
28 1100 ms). The Bayesian estimate of population prevalence based on classification
29 performance peaked at 47.38% at 620ms, which corresponds with our earlier results (Fig. 1).
30 The Bayesian maximum a posteriori (MAP) (79) estimate of the effect prevalence was
31 82.50% (96% highest posterior density interval [HPDI]: [42.50, 98.80]) with uncorrected
32 within-subject threshold $\alpha = .05$ (Fig. S2 top-right). This suggests that there is at least a
33 42.50% chance of observing statistically significant classification of temporal judgments
34 from DA signals within 1100ms from stimulus onset in a new sample if our methods are
35 replicated (the prevalence estimate reduces to 32.70% with a more stringent threshold $\alpha = .01$;
36 Fig. S2 bottom-right).

37



1
 2 **Figure S2.** Bayesian population prevalence for classification of short and long responses from
 3 dopamine timeseries. (**Top-left**): Heatmap of AUC values for each patient probe (rows) and
 4 time window (200ms width, centred on x-axis labels). The blue solid line in **bottom-left**
 5 panel tracks the group-level t-test values, and the dotted blue line denote the threshold at
 6 $\alpha=0.01$. The posterior distribution of population prevalence is shown for an effect in the
 7 analysed time series (cumulative density function in **right panels**) and at each timepoint
 8 (dashed black line in **bottom-left panel**). (**Right panels**) The grey horizontal line represents
 9 96% highest posterior density intervals (HPDI), and the short rectangle shows the 50% HPDI.

10

11

12 Tonic caudal dopamine and serotonin concentrations and time perception

13 Our next set of analyses evaluated the association between within-subject variations in
 14 interval timing and *tonic* caudal DA levels. We contrasted the competing predictions: one
 15 suggesting that tonic DA is unrelated to temporal accuracy, given inconclusive evidence for
 16 atypical temporal bias in PD (54), and the other proposing a positive correlation, supported
 17 by pharmacological evidence (22, 80–82). Consistent with the first hypothesis and our
 18 behavioural observations, tonic DA was not associated with temporal bias, $\beta=-.004$ (95% CI
 19 $[-.06, .05]$), $SE=.03$, $z=-.14$, $p=.89$, $BF_{10} = .06$, underscoring that temporal accuracy is not
 20 related to steady-state (tonic) caudal DA levels (Fig. 2D,E). This finding stands in stark
 21 contrast to the compelling link observed for phasic DA levels. Furthermore, we also observed
 22 no association between tonic SE and temporal bias, $\beta=-.04$ (95% CI $[-.12, .03]$), $SE=.04$, $z=-$
 23 1.17 , $p=.24$, $BF_{10} = .11$ (Fig. 2G,H).

24 We additionally predicted that lower tonic DA levels, prevalent in PD, will correspond
 25 with poorer precision (49, 50). Our behavioural data analysis supported this hypothesis,
 26 revealing poorer precision for patients than controls. Crucially, in our patient sample,
 27 temporal precision showed a positive association with their tonic DA concentrations (as
 28 shown by steeper slopes for high DA terciles in Fig. 2D), $\beta=.50$ (95% CI $[.13, .87]$), $SE=.19$,

1 $z=2.61, p=.01, BF_{10} = 1.70$, although the Bayesian evidence was not conclusive. We did not
2 find a similar association with serotonin levels (Fig 2G), $\beta=.26$ (95% CI [-.28, .80]), $SE=.27$,
3 $z=.94, p=.35, BF_{10} = .09$. These findings support the hypothesis that fluctuations in tonic DA,
4 but not SE, are linked to temporal precision. As observed earlier for temporal accuracy, the
5 results for temporal precision further emphasize the contrast in the impact of tonic vs. phasic
6 dopamine concentrations on interval perception, highlighting potentially differential effects
7 of distinct temporal dynamics of DA activity.

