Title

Mind the gap: temporal discrimination and dystonia

Authors

Anna Sadnicka MD PhD[1], Corinna Daum MD[1], Carla Cordivari MD[1], Kailash P Bhatia FRCP[1], John C Rothwell PhD[1], Sanjay Manohar MD PhD[2], Mark J Edwards MD PhD[3]

Institutions addresses

1. Sobell Department for Motor Neuroscience and Movement Disorders, Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, UK
2. Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, John Radcliffe Hospital, University of Oxford, UK
3. Institute of Cardiovascular and Cell Sciences, St George's University, Cranmer Terrance, London, UK

Corresponding author

Anna Sadnicka

Telephone: (+44) 2034488605

Fax: (+44) 2084290501

Email Address: a.sadnicka@ucl.ac.uk

Word count

2888

Running title

Assessing decision-making and temporal processing in cervical dystonia

Key words

temporal discrimination threshold, psychophysics, cervical dystonia, millisecond timing, drift diffusion model

Abstract

Background: One of the most widely studied perceptual measures of sensory dysfunction in dystonia is the temporal discrimination threshold (the shortest interval at which subjects can perceive that there are two stimuli rather than one, TDT). In this study we present two paradigms designed to better quantify temporal processing and used a decision-making model to assess the influence of decision strategy over responses for the first time.

Methods: 22 patients and 22 age-matched control were examined with two tasks (i) temporal resolution (a randomised, automated version of existing TDT paradigms) and (ii) interval discrimination (rating the length of two consecutive intervals).

Results: In the temporal resolution task patients had delayed (p=0.021) and more variable (p=0.013) response times but equivalent discrimination thresholds. Modelling these effects suggested this was due to an increased perceptual decision boundary in dystonia with patients requiring greater evidence before committing to decisions (p=0.020). Patient performance on the interval discrimination task was normal.

Conclusions: Previously observed abnormal in TDT may not solely reflect abnormalities in temporal processing as decision-making is abnormal is dystonia. Our work did not support the presence of a selective sensory deficit of temporal resolution or interval discrimination. Decision modelling promises to be powerful analytical tool by which to better define psychophysical abnormalities in movement disorders research yielding corresponding insight into relevant pathophysiology.

Introduction

Dystonia is a movement disorder characterised by abnormal postures due to involuntary muscle contractions. Individuals frequently use alleviating manoeuvres (sensory tricks) to reduce the severity of abnormal muscle activity (1) and the importance of such sensory influences has received much attention experimentally with a range of abnormalities in the sensory domain documented (2-4). One of the most widely studied perceptual measures is the temporal discrimination threshold (TDT) which has been defined as the shortest interval at which subjects can perceive that there are two stimuli rather than one (5). Elevated thresholds are present across subtypes of isolated dystonia (6). Furthermore the finding that TDTs are abnormal in first degree relatives of those with dystonia has led the suggestion that the TDT represents an endophenotype. Correspondingly there has been much speculation on how mechanisms underpinning abnormal thresholds may inform on the pathogenesis of dystonia (6-9).

Interestingly current paradigms used to test TDT not only assesses temporal discrimination but also extraneous sensory and decision making parameters. For example some studies test more than one sensory modality (visual, somatosensory) and deliver stimuli to two sites which requires spatial integration (e.g. index and middle fingers). Whatsmore the design of standard staircase methodology in which the separation between two stimuli is slowly increased or decreased in a predictable manner allows the obtained thresholds to be readily biased by decision strategy unrelated to temporal discrimination ability. Elevated TDTs have been documented across a range of hypokinetic and hyperkinetic movement disorders, cerebellar disease and functional (psychogenic) symptoms (6, 10-14). Disease-specific abnormalities may be concealed within the currently used TDT metric and better quantification of the precise deficit could offer better insight into the pathophysiological mechanisms involved in these distinct diseases.

In the present study we applied more rigorous psychophysical methodology and tested two tasks which assessed different aspects of temporal processing in the millisecond range. A randomised and automatic version of the TDT, *temporal resolution,* had basic elements common to currently used TDT methods and removed potentially confounding elements which are not integral to the definition of resolution/acuity (the ability to detect that two stimuli are present rather than one). A second task, *interval discrimination,* examined the ability of subjects to compare the lengths of two consecutive intervals in the millisecond range. This task was designed to test a different aspect of

time perception: temporal discrimination, i.e. the ability to discern differences in the lengths of two intervals. To each of these tasks we applied an established mathematical model of decision-making that can disentangle the quality of sensory evidence entering the decision from decision strategy and non-decision processes such as stimulus encoding and response execution. Each of these could potentially be abnormal in dystonia.

Methods

Twenty-two healthy subjects (mean age 56.2 years (± 11.0), 17 females) and 22 subjects with cervical dystonia (mean age 58.2 years (± 11.1), 17 females) were tested. All dystonic subjects had clinically apparent postural abnormality (rather than tremor dominant) and were receiving treatment with botulinum toxin injections (tested a minimum of 3 months after their last treatment). A full history and examination excluded subjects that had any evidence of significant cognitive disease, other major health problems or sensory problems in the limbs. Reasoning and intelligence was estimated by the non-verbal Ravens Matrix score (maximum/high performance score 12) (15). The Toronto Western Spasmodic Torticollis Rating Score (TWSTRS, maximum/worst score 85) and disease duration was documented for all patients. Written informed consent was obtained and the study was approved by the local Ethics Committee.

Both tasks were performed seated and button presses were made using the index finger of their right hand. An answer was required for every trial even if uncertain of the answer and subjects were prompted to guess if they paused longer than 5 seconds (forced choice). Subjects were trained in each task (20 trials, data not analysed) prior to the start of each task. The total length of time of the experiment with both tasks was approximately 30 minutes. Experiments were coded in Matlab using the Cogent toolbox.

Temporal Resolution Task

300 consecutive trials were presented in which subjects pressed a button with their right index finger to indicate whether they felt one or two stimuli (figure 1A). Unknown to participants, the proportion of single-stimulus trials was 30% and of double stimuli trials was 70%. The double stimuli trials had an entirely randomised interval range from 1 to 200ms which could be any decimal within that range (generated using the random function in matlab (interval=rand*0.199+0.001)). The order of single and double trials was also randomised within the 300 trials. The index finger of

their left hand was stimulated using a ring electrode connected in parallel with two Digitimer electrical stimulators (supplementary material for further detail).

Interval Discrimination Task

After a short break, subjects were presented with 300 consecutive trials in which they were asked to respond with a button press whether the first or second interval was longer (figure 1B). One interval was selected from three fixed values (50ms, 100ms and 200ms). The other interval varied within the range from 1ms up to twice the fixed value (100ms, 200ms and 400ms respectively) were randomised to any value within this range. All stimuli were 2 x 200µs square wave pulses delivered to the left index finger using a single Digitimer stimulator.

Psychometric analysis

Data were binned into 15 interval ranges spread evenly over the range of possible intervals and a psychometric function was fitted to response behaviour for each individual (equations described in supplementary material). For the temporal resolution task, the fitted curve describes how the tendency or probability to respond "two pulses" rather than "one pulse" increases with larger millisecond gaps between the two pulses (figure 2A for examples in two patients). The floor of the function was defined by the false positive rate. The temporal resolution threshold (T_{50}) was defined as the interval at which subjects responded "2 pulses" in half of trials (probability of answering "2 pulses" is 0.5). Modelled thresholds are also given for temporal resolution at T_{75} and T_{98} in order to facilitate comparison to previous studies (probability of answering "2 stimuli" 0.75 and 0.98 respectively). The slope of the function at T_{50} was calculated as a measure of the range of time intervals over which decisions were uncertain. A similar psychometric analysis has recently been applied to the ascending staircase paradigm and the point of subjective equivalence corresponds to the T_{50} threshold (16).

For the interval discrimination task, a separate psychometric curve was fitted to the data for each of the three fixed intervals (50,100ms, 200ms), each containing a third of the trials. The *interval discrimination threshold* (I_{50}) indicated the variable interval at which the response probability for either answer was equal (the point of subjective equivalence) and the slope was calculated at this point (a steep slope reflecting high resolution for the discrimination of interval length).   In the absence of bias, I_{50} would be identical to the fixed interval. To analyse all trials we used a contrast index (the difference between intervals divided by their total length, see supplementary material)

which accounts for the fact that a just-noticeable difference is longer for longer intervals (Weber's law (17)).

Drift diffusion model

Data from both tasks were fitted to the drift diffusion model which treats decision time as a period for weighing up information. Mathematically, the distribution of reaction times and errors provides an estimate of the rate of information accumulation (drift rate), a decision boundary and non-decision time (18). The basic assumption is that in order to make a speeded choice between two options, evidence is accumulated sequentially over time during the decision period (figure 2B). As soon as sufficient evidence toward one option or the other has gathered, the process stops and a response is initiated. The accumulation process is governed by two distinct forces, the tendency to drift toward either decision boundary (drift rate) and a stochastic component (diffusion, i.e. random noise). The distance between the two boundaries (decision boundary) reflects the amount of evidence required before a decision is made. The non-decision time is the sum of all other processes involved such as the sensory encoding of stimuli and the time required for the motor execution of response. Simultaneously fitting both choices and response times to the drift-diffusion model allowed us to quantitatively dissociate how individuals accumulate sensory information, from the critical amount of information they need before initiating a choice. Our method specifically accounted for the different levels of difficulty as interval length was varied, in which different strengths of evidence were provided (analysis detailed in supplementary material).

Statistical analysis

To compare distributions between groups, independent t-tests were calculated when the data were normally distributed and the two-tailed Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test for independent samples was used otherwise. The mean (± the standard deviation) is given for descriptive statistics in the text. Repeated measures analysis of variance across condition was used to compare the drift rate between groups and the interaction of condition by group. Pearson's correlation was used to estimate covariance of two variables. Data analysis and statistics were performed using Matlab and SPSS.

Results

There was no significant difference in age (t(42) = -0.598, *p=.838*) or sex (17 females in both groups) which is important due to the known influence of both demographics on TDT values (19, 20). The mean TWSTRS score in the patient group was 35.9 (± 11.9) and mean disease duration was 16.3 (± 3.4) years. The mean Ravens index in controls was 9.3 (±2.42) and cervical dystonia was 7.86 (±2.93) with no significant difference between the two groups (t(42)=1.83, *p*=0.07).

Temporal Resolution

We had expected subjects with cervical dystonia to demonstrate impaired performance in this task, however we found that performance across groups was remarkably similar (figure 3A, individuals data shown in supp. Figure 1). Temporal resolution thresholds (T_{50}, T_{75} and T_{98}) were comparable across groups and there was no significant difference in the slope gradient between controls and cervical dystonia. Therefore despite precise quantification of both isolated thresholds and slope metrics, we found no direct evidence that temporal resolution, the ability to detect two stimuli, based on accuracy data alone was impaired in cervical dystonia. In addition, summary metrics such as the *hit rate* (proportion of two-stimuli trials correctly identified) and *false positive rate* (the proportion of one stimulus trials with incorrectly identified as two-stimuli trials) were comparable between groups (figure 3A). Intelligence (estimated by the Raven's matrix) strongly correlated with the slope (but not threshold) of psychometric function in both groups independently but also when the data were combined (R2=0.185, p=-.004. Thus a high intelligence score was associated with a high slope value or a small range of intervals over which there was decision uncertainty.

Subjects with cervical dystonia were however significantly slower and more variable in their response times (group mean of median reaction time in dystonia 1.07s vs 0.958s in controls, W_m=396, *p=.021*, z=-2.31); and group mean of standard deviation in dystonia 0.133s vs 0.234s in controls, W_m=389, *p=.013*, z=-2.47) (figure 3B). This suggested that despite comparable accuracy data there was a systematic alteration in the timing of responses in dystonic subjects with the longest reaction times seen for the more difficult decisions (figure 3C).

In order to obtain more insight into this observation we used the drift diffusion model which synergistically evaluates accuracy *and* reaction time data in order to quantify separate decision-making components. Given reports that motor function of the limb can be altered in cervical dystonia (21) it was important to show that *non-decision time* was equivalent between groups

(median in patients 0.880s vs 0.782s in controls, *ns*) (figure 4A). This value is an estimate of the minimum reaction time that would be present even if perceptual discrimination were instantaneous. It is therefore unlikely that increased reaction times observed in dystonia patients were an artefact due to increased time needed to execute the motor response required for the button press. As expected, *drift rate* significantly varied across interval bins (df=3.23, F=12.7, *p=.001),* with lowest drift rates for difficult decisions, close to the perceptual limit. However there was no difference in the drift rates between patient and controls (df=3.23, F=1.60, *p=.191*), indicating that the quality of the information on which decisions were based was not significantly different between groups (figure 4B). In contrast, patients had an elevated *decision boundary* (median in cervical dystonia 0.560 vs 0.293 in controls, W_m=348, *p=.020*, z=2.33) (figure 4C). This suggested that dystonic patients had set a different decision criterion, requiring greater evidence before committing to a decision.

Interval Discrimination

The second task evaluated the ability to discriminate the length of intervals between successive pairs of stimuli. Subjects reported that this task was more difficult than the temporal resolution task, with one control and two dystonic subjects being unable to complete the task (n=41). The psychometric function was fitted for each of the fixed intervals (50ms, 100ms or 200ms, supp. figure 2A). No clear group difference in response accuracy was observed, with comparable I_{50} and slope metrics at each fixed interval (supp. figure 2B). Response behaviour using contrast index to combine trials was thus similar across groups (supp. figure 3A). Compared to controls, subjects with cervical dystonia showed a trend to longer responding for the task but this was not significantly different between groups in terms of mean of median (dystonia 2.42s vs 2.31s in controls, W_m=492, *p=.061*, z=1.87) or variability (mean of standard deviation in dystonia 0.399s vs 0.469s in controls, W_m=484, *p=.097*, z=1.65) (supp. figure 3B). Similar to the temporal resolution threshold, it was decisions around the perceptual threshold (more difficult decisions with lower accuracy) which had the most pronounced increase in reaction time in dystonia (supp. figure 3C).

Modelling data from the interval discrimination task using the drift diffusion model again found no difference in the non-decision time between groups ($W_{m=}$.366, *p=.672,* z=0.424). Diffusion rates were lower than in the temporal resolution task, in keeping with this task being more difficult due to decreased quality of sensory information available. As expected, drift rate approximated zero when there was no contrast between the two intervals and increased with contrast magnitude (supp. Figure 3D, df=2.78,F=13.3, p<0.001) and there were no group differences (interaction of group and

drift rate df=2.78, F=1.05, p=.397) suggesting that the quality of sensory information available for the task was equal in both groups. In this task, the decision boundary was not significantly different (dystonia a=0.637 vs a=0.535 in controls, W_m=316, *p=.313* z = -1.01).

Relationship between tasks

Across individuals the slope in the temporal resolution task correlated strongly with the slopes in the interval discrimination task, as such both tasks appear to sensitively test a common aspect of sensory processing ability (supp. figure 4).

Discussion

We present two tasks designed to better quantify temporal processing in dystonia. The first task was similar to existing temporal discrimination threshold paradigms but the order of stimuli presentation was randomised rather than incremental. This simple paradigm shift revealed no significant difference between patients and controls in their accuracy in discriminating single from double stimuli. However due to the observation that patients showed longer and more variable reaction times we combined reaction time and accuracy data into a decision-making model. This demonstrated that patients approached decision making differently to controls with a higher criterion for information (decision boundary). A further task investigated the ability to distinguish intervals presented in pairs, found patients to be no worse at interval discrimination. Our data show that altered decision-making is likely to influence thresholds values and questions the assumption that abnormal TDT thresholds in dystonia are solely due to impaired temporal discrimination.

Superficially, documenting TDT is a simple procedure. It can be defined as the shortest interval at which subjects can perceive that there is a gap between two stimuli. Each trial represents a choice between two options in which the participant must communicate whether they perceived one or two stimuli. During an experiment the interval between two stimuli is varied and the threshold at which they detect this gap is noted. Ascending and descending staircase designs, in which the interval between stimuli is systematically increased or decreased, have shown similar results in many studies in the literature.

However in the psychophysical literature it is well known that such predictable threshold paradigms are vulnerable to the influence of multiple decision-making parameters (17). These can be collectively referred to as the participant's *decision criterion* and are determined by factors such as instruction, payoffs and reward contingencies (22). Furthermore in some previous studies (fuelled by a genuine desire for greater sensitivity and specificity) complicating and confounding components have been incorporated into TDT. For example some tasks introduce an obvious spatial element (two stimuli delivered at distinct locations), test both the somatosensory and visual modality, use single stimulus trials that may not be true catch trials (recognisable by being of weaker intensity) and have up to four possible response options which recruits more complex decision making (6, 7, 23).

For these reasons our first task, temporal resolution, was a randomised and automated version of commonly used TDT protocols which aimed to minimse both the effects of bias and potentially confounding elements. The second task required comparison of two consecutive interval lengths, a further test of temporal discrimination inspired by our current nomenclature of the psychophysical deficit in dystonia 'temporal discrimination threshold'. In addition for the first time we recorded both accuracy and reaction time since modelling these data in synergy allows assessment of these previously unexplored components of the decision-making process.

Interestingly, we could not provide clear evidence for the existence of deficits in temporal discrimination in cervical dystonia in either task. In the *temporal resolution task* patients were equally able as controls to classify one- vs. two-stimulus trials. Furthermore the ability to compare the length of two consecutive intervals, *interval discrimination*, was comparable between groups. Patients were however slower in their responses and demonstrated greater intra-subject variability in response time in the temporal resolution task. Such an increase in response time could reflect either slower sensory processing, or a higher threshold for initiating a response. We therefore modelled the data using the drift diffusion model which evaluates response *and* response time in order to quantify separate decision-making components. The model confirmed our psychometric results with equivalent drift rates between groups (no difference in the quality of sensory information upon which decisions were based). In the temporal resolution task the decision boundary (the level of evidence required before a decision is made), even when the paradigm was randomised, was the key difference between groups. As such, in a task with the same components as commonly used TDT tasks, dystonic subjects set a more conservative decision-making strategy (despite the forced choice and randomised design).

We did not set out to directly compare previous methodologies for assessing TDT in dystonia and the methods used here in the same patients. However, an increase in decision boundary could contribute to elevated thresholds obtained using an ascending staircase design (a popular method used in some but not all previous TDT publications in dystonia). An increased decision boundary translates into a bias for subjects to wait before a greater amount of sensory evidence is available before reporting a change in stimuli. Doubt about whether two stimuli were presented on trial n will tend to favour postponing the decision to trial $n+1$. These effects are seen irrespective of the quality of sensory signal. Thus our result does not query the reliability of previous studies in which a large body of evidence points to differences in performance in psychophysical tests in dystonia. Our results do however offer an alternative interpretation of the TDT as a consistent bias in the form of increased boundary separation and altered decision making in dystonia could partially explain some previous results.

Interestingly, our results may also offer a tentative link to work which has started to identify subtle cognitive and behavioural problems in association with dystonia. Previously unidentified deficits in the executive, attentional or visuospatial domains (24) and anxiety and depression have been documented in over 50% of patients in some studies (25). It has not yet been fully elucidated which of these are primary features of dystonia and which may be a consequence of the motor impairment (24). However any such change can potentially influence performance on psychophysical tasks. For example, it is well documented that anxiety leads to an increase in the decision boundary in a similar manner to the change we observed in cervical dystonia (26). Our work therefore identifies the need to evaluating psychophysical performance within models which also evaluate psychological co-morbidities and cognition in parallel.

It is important to consider differences between our paradigm and traditional methods. For example we delivered stimuli at a single site; it is possible that the spatial integration required to define two stimuli trials delivered at different sites (seen in some but not all paradigms) is the core problem in cervical dystonia (any spatial computation is inherently more complex in cervical dystonia due to abnormal head and neck position). Another important difference is that we randomised the order of stimulus presentation. An alternative hypothesis is that threshold abnormalities observed with ordered staircase paradigms are actually testing the ability of subjects to detect a *change* in stimuli rather than temporal discrimination. In line with this argument we have recently shown that mismatch negativity, an EEG event calculated by subtracting the potential produced by a standard repeated stimulus from that produced by a rare 'oddball' stimulus, correlated with TDT obtained by staircase methodology in cervical dystonia. Higher thresholds on the TDT were associated with

smaller mismatch negativity thresholds, both suggesting that the saliency of change was reduced (27).

The fact that such a simple paradigm change can reveal so many unanswered questions emphasises the complexity of understanding the significance of sensory deficits in dystonia. Abnormalities in the detection of stimuli relating to timing, spatial representations, pain, thermal qualities, kinaesthesia have all been documented (3). This hints that there may be a common mechanism central to how subjects with dystonia perceive and report sensory phenomena at the root of all of these deficits however the nature of this mechanism remains poorly defined. In this specific task we have shown a change in a core decision-making parameter but it remains to be established whether a more fundamental component of sensory processing is at the root of other sensory deficits. As the neural correlates to psychophysical phenomena are increasingly understood the onus is on researchers to better define the precise psychophysical deficits in dystonia so that the true neurobiological significance can be better appreciated (28, 29).

We have attempted to test as purely as possible perceptual sensitivity for millisecond timing mechanisms and assess the contribution of decision-making components. However the detailed characterisation of psychophysical performance requires careful interpretation, and our results need validation with further studies in this patient group and their relatives (to examine endophenotype phenomena). For example, there was a trend for drift rate to be reduced in the temporal resolution task at longer interval bins and as such our study may have been underpowered to detect subtler abnormalities in sensory processing which could co-exist together with the shift in the decision threshold that we observed.

It is relatively recently that the sensory aspects of movement disorders have been championed and their importance in pathogenesis debated. Abnormalities in various domains of sensory processing have been documented in almost all movement disorders yet we are still far from defining how such abnormalities interact to cause the distinct movement disorders. We hope that the application of novel methods and analysis, such as those detailed in this study, will provide better tools to identify disease specific abnormalities in the sensory domain with ensuing insight into the pathophysiology of dystonia and other movement disorders.

Legends

Figure 1. A Temporal Resolution 300 trials in which subjects respond with a button press whether they felt one or two stimuli. Either one pulse or two pulses (with an inter-stimulus range from 1 to 200ms) were presented at each trial. **B Interval Discrimination** 300 trials in which subjects respond with a button press to indicate whether the first or second interval was longer. One interval was selected from three fixed values (50ms, 100ms and 200ms) and the other interval varied within the range from 1ms to twice the fixed value (100ms, 200ms and 400ms respectively).

Figure 2 A Example of psychometric analysis. Each graph plots actual data and a fitted curve from two patients performing the temporal resolution task. Data were binned into 15 interval ranges and the proportion of trials to which subjects answered "two stimuli" are marked by crosses. Response behaviour was modelled using the psychometric function (solid line). The temporal resolution threshold (T_{50}) was defined as the interval at which subjects answer "2 pulses" in half of trials. The slope of the function at T_{50} is a measure of the range of intervals of decision uncertainty. Threshold values and slope metrics are complementary when evaluating discrimination performance. For example, it can be seen that subject 1 had a relatively high false positive rate (floor accentuated by shaded region), T_{50} is ~95ms and the slope is relatively shallow. Subject 2 by comparison had a low false positive rate, their threshold (T_{50}) was greater and the slope is steeper reflecting more consistent responses (with a high slope value (slope = $\Delta y/\Delta x$)). **B Drift diffusion model.** The model simultaneously analyses reaction time and accuracy data. In order to make a speeded choice between two options, evidence accumulates over the decision period. When sufficient evidence for one of the two options has gathered, a decision is made and a response initiated. Two distinct components drive the accumulator: a tendency to drift toward the correct choice (drift rate) and a random component (diffusion). An example graphical representation of the drift diffusion process is shown by the curved line and indicates the amount of evidence for the 'upper' response as it evolves over time. At about 800ms the upper boundary is crossed and the process ends.

Figure 3 Temporal Resolution A Psychometric analysis. Line plot of the probability of answer "two pulses" (y-axis) and log(inter-stimulus interval) (x-axis). Mean control (blue, dotted line) and dystonia (red, solid line) with shaded standard error. There was little difference in response behaviour across the range of intervals tested. Group metrics: Hit rate (HR, the percentage of two-stimuli trials in which subjects *correctly* identified an interval) and false positive rate (FP, the percentage of trials where only one stimulus was delivered in which subjects *incorrectly* identified an

interval) were calculated. Modelled thresholds are given for temporal resolution at T_{50}, T_{75} and T_{98} in order to facilitate comparison to previous studies. The slope at T_{50} has the units: probability of response/ms. p value from the Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test for independent samples given on the lower row of the table for each variable. Subjects with dystonia had a trend for increased thresholds compared to controls at both the T_{75} and T_{98} level, but neither were significantly different. B Reaction time histograms of all trials (200bins) revealed systematic differences in the distribution of reaction times. Both mean median reaction time and mean standard deviation of variance were elevated in the dystonic group. **C**. Plotting accuracy against reaction time (10 bins) revealed a systematic difference in the manner in which dystonic subjects responded.

Figure 4 Drift Diffusion Model A Non-decision time was no different between groups (bar plot, error bars display standard error). **B** Drift rate, a marker of the quality of sensory information, significantly varied across interval bins. As 30% of trials comprised the 0ms bin there are six conditions in the model output (bin centres 0ms, 13ms, 44ms, 85ms, 122ms, 158ms). Difficult decisions, close to the perceptual limit, had low drift rate (bins 2 and 3), whereas drift rates further from this point had higher drift rates. The lack of significant difference between groups suggests that there is no significant difference in the quality of sensory information reaching the decision process in cervical dystonia. **C** Decision threshold was increased in cervical dystonia suggesting that patients required greater evidence before a decision was made.

Supplementary material

Supplementary Figure 1 Temporal resolution task: psychometric analysis A Individual data Each graph plots actual data and model from an individual subject (n = 44) performing the temporal resolution task. Data were binned into 15 interval ranges (log(interval(ms)), x-axis) and the proportion of trials to which subjects answered "two stimuli" (y-axis) are marked by crosses. Response behaviour was modelled using the psychometric function (solid line). Controls are shown in blue, subjects with cervical dystonia in red. **B Group metrics** Hit rate (HR, the percentage of two-stimuli trials in which subjects *correctly* identified an interval) and false positive rate (FP, the percentage of trials where only one stimulus was delivered in which subjects *incorrectly* identified an interval) were calculated. Modelled thresholds are given for temporal resolution at T_{50}, T_{75} and T_{98} in order to facilitate comparison to previous studies. The slope at T_{50} has the units: probability of response/ms. p value from the Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test for independent samples given on the lower

row of the table for each variable. Subjects with dystonia had a trend for increased thresholds compared to controls at both the T_{75} and T_{98} level, but neither were significantly different.

Supplementary Figure 2 Interval discrimination task: data subdivided by the length of the fixed interval (50ms, 100ms, or 200ms). Each dataset contained approximately 100 trials. Mean accuracy increased as the length of the fixed interval increased (66.5%, 72.9%, 75.4%) reflecting greatest difficulty when the fixed interval was 50ms. Four individuals had no discriminatory ability for when the fixed interval was 50ms (two control, two dystonic) and one control had no discriminatory ability when the fixed interval was 100ms. Data for these subjects were excluded from subsequent analysis. Data from all 41 subjects when the fixed interval was 200ms are shown' y-axis plots probability of response "second interval longer" versus the x-axis, the length of second interval. Crosses are patient data and the solid line is the modelled psychometric function. Group means are shown to the right of the individual data plots. **B** Boxplots showing no significant difference in I_{50} or slope for any of the three fixed interval values respectively (p>0.05 for all rank sum comparisons).

Supplementary Figure 3 Interval discrimination task A Psychometric analysis Contrast index (equation 4) was used to plot all data. Performance behaviour was similar across the two groups. A negative contrast indicates that the 1st interval was longer than the 2nd interval. As expected response rate approximates 50% when the contrast is zero (no difference between intervals, subjects guessing) **B** Reaction Time As in the temporal resolution task the reaction time was elevated in the dystonic group but the effect was not significant and variance was comparable. C Accuracy vs reaction time with data divided into 10 bins. D. Drift Diffusion Model The non-decision time was no different between groups. The drift rate varied significantly with contrast with lowest quality of input sensory information when the difference between intervals was minimal. Bin centres of contrast were -0.288, -0.196, -0.098, 0.037, 0.239, 0.493, 0.813. Drift rate was not significantly different between groups. The decision boundary in the dystonic group was not significantly increased. These results support the hypothesis that another form of timing estimation in the millisecond range is intact in dystonia.

Supplementary Figure 4 Sensitivity of tasks The standard deviation (sigma) of the psychometric function significantly correlated across tasks. A small value signifies high resolution such that there was only a small range of intervals or contrast of interval through which there was response uncertainty.

References

1.   Patel N, Hanfelt J, Marsh L, Jankovic J, members of the Dystonia C. Alleviating manoeuvres (sensory tricks) in cervical dystonia. Journal of neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry. 2014 Aug;85(8):882-4.

2.   Stamelou M, Edwards MJ, Hallett M, Bhatia KP. The non-motor syndrome of primary dystonia: clinical and pathophysiological implications. Brain. 2012 Jun;135(Pt 6):1668-81.

3.   Patel N, Jankovic J, Hallett M. Sensory aspects of movement disorders. Lancet Neurol. 2014 Jan;13(1):100-12.

4.   Conte A, Berardelli I, Ferrazzano G, Pasquini M, Berardelli A, Fabbrini G. Non-motor symptoms in patients with adult-onset focal dystonia: Sensory and psychiatric disturbances. Parkinsonism Relat Disord. 2016 Jan;22 Suppl 1:S111-4.

5.   Kimmich O, Molloy A, Whelan R, Williams L, Bradley D, Balsters J, et al. Temporal discrimination, a cervical dystonia endophenotype: penetrance and functional correlates. Mov Disord. 2014 May;29(6):804-11.

6.   Bradley D, Whelan R, Kimmich O, O'Riordan S, Mulrooney N, Brady P, et al. Temporal discrimination thresholds in adult-onset primary torsion dystonia: an analysis by task type and by dystonia phenotype. J Neurol. 2012 Jan;259(1):77-82.

7.   Fiorio M, Gambarin M, Valente EM, Liberini P, Loi M, Cossu G, et al. Defective temporal processing of sensory stimuli in DYT1 mutation carriers: a new endophenotype of dystonia? Brain. 2007 Jan;130(Pt 1):134-42.

8.   Kimmich O, Bradley D, Whelan R, Mulrooney N, Reilly RB, Hutchinson S, et al. Sporadic adult onset primary torsion dystonia is a genetic disorder by the temporal discrimination test. Brain. 2011 Sep;134(Pt 9):2656-63.

9.   Miyazaki M, Kadota H, Matsuzaki KS, Takeuchi S, Sekiguchi H, Aoyama T, et al. Dissociating the neural correlates of tactile temporal order and simultaneity judgements. Sci Rep. 2016;6:23323.

10.   Fiorio M, Valente EM, Gambarin M, Bentivoglio AR, Ialongo T, Albanese A, et al. Subclinical sensory abnormalities in unaffected PINK1 heterozygotes. J Neurol. 2008 Sep;255(9):1372-7.

11.   Lyoo CH, Lee SY, Song TJ, Lee MS. Abnormal temporal discrimination threshold in patients with multiple system atrophy. Mov Disord. 2007 Mar 15;22(4):556-9.

12.   Morgante F, Tinazzi M, Squintani G, Martino D, Defazio G, Romito L, et al. Abnormal tactile temporal discrimination in psychogenic dystonia. Neurology. 2011 Sep 20;77(12):1191-7.

13.   Rocchi L, Conte A, Nardella A, Li Voti P, Di Biasio F, Leodori G, et al. Somatosensory temporal discrimination threshold may help to differentiate patients with multiple system atrophy from patients with Parkinson's disease. European journal of neurology : the official journal of the European Federation of Neurological Societies. 2013 Apr;20(4):714-9.

14.   Conte A, Ferrazzano G, Manzo N, Leodori G, Fabbrini G, Fasano A, et al. Somatosensory temporal discrimination in essential tremor and isolated head and voice tremors. Mov Disord. 2015 May;30(6):822-7.

15.   Raven J, Raven JC, Court JH. Manual for Raven's Progressive Matrices and Vocabulary Scales. San Antonio: Harcourt Assessment; 2004.

16.   Butler JS, Molloy A, Williams L, Kimmich O, Quinlivan B, O'Riordan S, et al. Non-parametric bootstrapping method for measuring the temporal discrimination threshold for movement disorders. J Neural Eng. 2015 Aug;12(4):046026.

17.   Gescheider GA. Psychophysics: The Fundamentals: Psychology Press; 1997.

18.   Vandekerckhove J, Tuerlinckx F. Diffusion model analysis with MATLAB: a DMAT primer. Behavior research methods. 2008 Feb;40(1):61-72.

19.   Butler JS, Beiser IM, Williams L, McGovern E, Molloy F, Lynch T, et al. Age-Related Sexual Dimorphism in Temporal Discrimination and in Adult-Onset Dystonia Suggests GABAergic Mechanisms. Front Neurol. 2015;6:258.

20.   Williams LJ, Butler JS, Molloy A, McGovern E, Beiser I, Kimmich O, et al. Young Women do it Better: Sexual Dimorphism in Temporal Discrimination. Front Neurol. 2015;6:160.

21.   Marinelli L, Pelosin E, Trompetto C, Avanzino L, Ghilardi MF, Abbruzzese G, et al. In idiopathic cervical dystonia movement direction is inaccurate when reaching in unusual workspaces. Parkinsonism & related disorders. 2011 Jul;17(6):470-2.

22.   Ratcliff R, Childers R. Individual Differences and Fitting Methods for the Two-Choice Diffusion Model of Decision Making. Decision (Wash). 2015;2015.

23.   Bradley D, Whelan R, Walsh R, O'Dwyer J, Reilly R, Hutchinson S, et al. Comparing endophenotypes in adult-onset primary torsion dystonia. Mov Disord. 2010 Jan 15;25(1):84-90.

24.   Kuyper DJ, Parra V, Aerts S, Okun MS, Kluger BM. Nonmotor manifestations of dystonia: a systematic review. Mov Disord. 2011 Jun;26(7):1206-17.

25.   Berardelli I, Ferrazzano G, Pasquini M, Biondi M, Berardelli A, Fabbrini G. Clinical course of psychiatric disorders in patients with cervical dystonia. Psychiatry research. 2015 Sep 30;229(1-2):583-5.

26.   Ratcliff R, McKoon G. The diffusion decision model: theory and data for two-choice decision tasks. Neural Comput. 2008 Apr;20(4):873-922.

27.   Chen J-C, Feng R, Sadnicka A, Hoffland BS, Warrenburg BP, Schuur F, et al. Somatosensory mismatch negativity is abnormal in cervical dystonia and correlates with temporal discrimination. under review.

28.   Antelmi E, Erro R, Rocchi L, Liguori R, Tinazzi M, Di Stasio F, et al. Neurophysiological correlates of abnormal somatosensory temporal discrimination in dystonia. Mov Disord. 2017 Jan;32(1):141-8.

29.   Samaha J, Postle BR. The Speed of Alpha-Band Oscillations Predicts the Temporal Resolution of Visual Perception. Curr Biol. 2015 Nov 16;25(22):2985-90.