
IMPLICIT VERSUS EXPLICIT TIMING

—

SEPARATE OR SHARED MECHANISMS?

Sophie K Herbst

Cognitive Neuroimaging Unit, INSERM, CEA, CNRS,
Université Paris-Saclay, NeuroSpin center,
Bât 145, Gif s/ Yvette 91190, France

Jonas Obleser

Department of Psychology, University of Lübeck, 23562 Lübeck, Germany
Center of Brain, Behavior, and Metabolism, University of Lübeck, 23562 Lübeck, Germany

Virginie van Wassenhove

Cognitive Neuroimaging Unit, INSERM, CEA, CNRS,
Université Paris-Saclay, NeuroSpin center,
Bât 145, Gif s/ Yvette 91190, France

March 21, 2022

Short title: Implicit versus explicit timing

Corresponding author: Sophie K. Herbst, sophie.herbst@cea.fr

Conflict of interest statement: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the members of the Cognition and Brain Dynamics Team and Jens Kreitewolf for helpful comments on the implementation of the study, and the members of UNIACT at NeuroSpin for help with participant recruitment and preparation, as well as Leila Azizi and Pooja Prabhu for help during the recordings. The study was funded by a DFG Grant HE 7520-1/1 to SKH, and ANR-16-CE37-0004-04 AutoTime to VvW.

ABSTRACT

Time implicitly shapes cognition, but time is also explicitly represented, for instance in the form of durations. Parsimoniously, the brain could use the same mechanisms for implicit and explicit timing. Yet, the evidence has been equivocal, revealing both joint versus separate signatures of timing. Here, we directly compared implicit and explicit timing using magnetoencephalography, whose temporal resolution allows investigating the different stages of the timing processes. Implicit temporal predictability was induced in an auditory paradigm by a manipulation of the foreperiod. Participants received two consecutive task instructions: discriminate pitch (indirect measure of implicit timing) or duration (direct measure of explicit timing). The results show that the human brain efficiently extracts implicit temporal statistics of sensory environments, to enhance the behavioral and neural responses to auditory stimuli, but that those temporal predictions did not improve explicit timing. In both tasks, attentional orienting in time during predictive foreperiods was indexed by an increase in alpha power over visual and parietal areas. Furthermore, pre-target induced beta power in sensorimotor and parietal areas increased during implicit compared to explicit timing, in line with the suggested role for beta oscillations in temporal prediction. Interestingly, no distinct neural dynamics emerged when participants explicitly paid attention to time, compared to implicit timing. Our work thus indicates that implicit timing shapes the behavioral and sensory response in an automatic way, and is reflected in oscillatory neural dynamics, while the translation of implicit temporal statistics to explicit durations remains somewhat inconclusive, possibly due to the more abstract nature of this task.

Keywords:

implicit timing, explicit timing, temporal prediction, magnetoencephalography, oscillations

1 Introduction

2 Implicit and explicit timing orchestrate perception and action, allowing us to interact with dynamic environments
3 (Coull et al., 2011, 2013; Coull and Nobre, 2008; Michon, 1990). Dynamic sensory environments have a temporal
4 structure, defined for example by delays between events, order, or synchrony. Such temporal features can be learned to
5 form temporal predictions about future events, a mainly implicit or unconscious cognitive process. At the same time,
6 temporal features can be perceived explicitly and consciously, for example time dragging when waiting for the bus.

7 In accordance with the literature, we adhere to the following working definitions: *Implicit timing* is defined as
8 the extraction of temporal contingencies between perceived events, resulting in facilitation of behaviour (indirect
9 measurement). *Explicit timing* is defined as the deliberate engagement in timing, resulting in overt temporal estimates
10 (direct measurement).

11 It is currently an open question whether the brain uses the same mechanisms for the online coding of elapsed time for
12 implicit and explicit timing, approached mainly as separate processes in previous studies. Behavioural studies provided
13 some evidence for shared mechanisms: both implicit and explicit timing are subject to scalar variability (Piras and
14 Coull, 2011; but see Ameqrane et al., 2014), and behavioural measures of implicit and explicit timing partially correlate
15 over participants (Coull et al., 2013, but only for long intervals). However, several recent studies show dissociable
16 patterns of responses in implicit versus explicit timing tasks (Droit-Volet and Coull, 2016; Droit-Volet et al., 2019; Los
17 and Horoufchin, 2011; Mioni et al., 2018). In sum, these results suggest that timing mechanisms are at least partially
18 task-specific, but it is currently unclear which cognitive and neural processes are responsible for the divergence.

19 Considering the anatomical networks underlying implicit and explicit timing, an influential set of studies directly
20 compared both tasks using fMRI (Coull et al., 2013; Coull and Nobre, 2008), and found a common substrate in
21 pre-motor areas, but distinct contributions to implicit timing from the left inferior parietal cortex and the cerebellum,
22 versus, for explicit timing, from the right frontal and parietal areas, and the basal ganglia. The anatomical sources
23 identified by studies performed separately on implicit timing (using fMRI or EEG/MEG; Herbst et al., 2018; Martin
24 et al., 2006; Mento et al., 2013; Praamstra et al., 2006) partially converge with those well known for explicit timing,
25 namely pre-motor and motor areas (Wiener et al., 2010). However, implicit timing also engages brain networks more
26 generally associated with attention and predictive processing in frontal and parietal cortices (Coull and Nobre, 2008;
27 Meindertsma et al., 2018; Visalli et al., 2019), as well as the cerebellum (Breska and Ivry, 2018).

28 A large number of EEG and MEG studies have investigated the neural dynamics of implicit and explicit timing,
29 implicating all canonical frequency bands (see review by Wiener and Kanai, 2016). The strongest overlap between
30 studies on implicit and explicit timing occurs in the modulation of intermediate to high frequent oscillatory power
31 (alpha/ 8–12 Hz, beta/ 15–30 Hz, gamma/ 30–100 Hz), described in both, implicit (Cravo et al., 2011; Meindertsma
32 et al., 2018; Todorovic et al., 2015), and explicit (Kononowicz and Rijn, 2015; Kononowicz et al., 2018; Kulashekhar
33 et al., 2016; Spitzer et al., 2014; Wiener et al., 2018) timing situations. In particular, beta power fluctuations have been
34 observed over a range of different paradigms, but their distinct role for unique aspects of temporal cognition remains to
35 be established.

36 Here, we set out to directly compare implicit and explicit timing using magnetoencephalography (MEG), based on the
37 same sensory inputs. Participants were asked to perform either a pitch discrimination task or a duration discrimination
38 task during an auditory foreperiod paradigm (Niemi and Näätänen, 1981; adapted from Herbst and Obleser, 2019). To
39 induce implicit timing, we manipulated the foreperiod over blocks, such that it was either predictive (same foreperiod
40 throughout the block) or non-predictive (variable foreperiod throughout the block). Combining the manipulation of
41 predictability with the two tasks resulted in a balanced 2×2 factorial design (see Fig.1A, B), with the factors **task**
42 (pitch versus duration discrimination) and **predictability** (predictive versus non-predictive), to address how the same
43 temporal statistics inform implicit predictions versus explicit temporal decision making.

44 Importantly, this design allowed us to compare implicit and explicit timing during the foreperiod: in the pitch
45 discrimination task, participants could anticipate the onset of the target, hence implicitly time the foreperiod. In the
46 explicit timing task, participants could also anticipate the target based on the same temporal statistics, but, additionally,
47 had to explicitly encode the duration of the foreperiod. Our results show that participants systematically formed
48 temporal predictions from the temporal statistics of the inputs, resulting in enhanced behavioral and neural processing
49 of the auditory stimuli. Orienting attention in time was reflected by an anticipatory increase of alpha power over
50 parietal and visual areas in the temporally predictive conditions in both tasks. Beta power was increased during implicit
51 compared to explicit timing during the foreperiod, in line with the previously proposed role of beta oscillations for
52 temporal prediction.

53 **Methods**

54 **Participants**

55 Twenty-four right-handed volunteers (mean age: 24.4, SD: 4.4 years, 11 females) with no self-reported hearing loss or
56 neurological disorder participated in the experiment. The sample size was planned based on a previous EEG study using
57 a very similar foreperiod paradigm (N = 24, Herbst and Obleser, 2019). Each participant gave written informed consent
58 prior to the experiment in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and the Ethics Committee on Human Research at
59 Neurospin (Gif-sur-Yvette). The data of one participant was completely removed, due to technical problems resulting
60 in missing blocks. The MEG data of four participants was excluded from the MEG analysis due to technical problems
61 with the head positioning system during MEG-acquisition. The behavioral data of these four participants were kept in
62 the analysis.

63 **Software and Toolboxes**

64 The experimental protocol was implemented in the *Psychophysics Toolbox* (Version 3.0.13 Brainard, 1997; Pelli, 1997)
65 for Matlab (R2017a), run on a laptop under Windows 7. Behavioral analyses were carried out in *Matlab* (version
66 R2019b), using the *Psignifit toolbox* (Version 4, Schütt et al., 2016), as well as in *R* (Team, 2016), using the and the
67 *lme4* package (Bates et al., 2015). MEG analyses were carried out in *MNE python* (Versions 20.0 – 23.0 Gramfort et al.,
68 2013, 2014), in combination with *Freesurfer* for MRI surface reconstruction (Dale et al., 1999).

69 **Data Availability**

70 Data will be shared upon request.

71 **Procedure**

72 Participants were recruited at NeuroSpin (Gif sur Yvette, France), for an experimental session of about 4 h, which
73 included an MRI safety screening, the preparation for EEG and MEG recording, 1.5 h of simultaneous M/EEG recording,
74 debriefing, and a subsequent anatomical MRI exam. The M/EEG recording started with short tests to adjust the auditory
75 stimuli (described in more details below). During the M/EEG recording, participants were presented with an auditory
76 foreperiod paradigm (adapted from Herbst and Obleser, 2019), and were asked to perform a pitch discrimination task in
77 half of the session, and a duration discrimination task in the other half. Each participant performed 12 blocks of both
78 tasks in succession with the task order being counterbalanced across participants. Between the two tasks, participants
79 took a short break, but remained seated in the MEG chair. After the full MEG recording, participants received a
80 post-experimental questionnaire, were debriefed, and underwent an anatomical MRI exam, which lasted about 20
81 minutes.

82 **Stimuli**

83 Auditory stimuli were delivered via in-ear headphones (EatyMotic). Lowpass (5 kHz) filtered white noise was presented
84 constantly throughout each block, at 50 dB above the individual sensation level, which was determined for the noise
85 alone at the beginning of the experiment using the method of limits. Pure tones of varying frequencies (duration 50 ms
86 with a 10 ms on- and offset ramp) were presented with a tone-to-noise ratio fixed at -18 dB relative to the individual
87 noise level.

88 The first tone, to which we will refer as the *cue* had a fixed frequency of 700 Hz. The second tone, the *target*, was varied
89 in individually predetermined steps, logarithmically transformed and multiplied with the cue tone's frequency, to obtain
90 a log-spaced frequency scale around the cue. The frequency steps were predetermined during an initial training phase:
91 each participant was first presented with one short block (18 trials) of the pitch discrimination task, with feedback after
92 each trial, to familiarize themselves with the task. In a second training block, performance was computed over all
93 trials (30), and the training was terminated if the participant reached between 55 – 75% accuracy. If performance was
94 below 55% (too close to chance level) or above 75% (suggesting a possible ceiling effect), the frequency-steps were
95 increased or decreased, respectively, and the participant performed another block of the training. This way, participants
96 underwent minimally two blocks (2.67 blocks on average), and the maximal number of training blocks needed was five
97 (one participant). The frequency-steps were kept as determined by this procedure throughout the whole experiment for
98 both tasks. The foreperiods used in the duration discrimination task were not adjusted individually, because varying
99 intervals would have been difficult to use in the group analyses of the EEG data.




Figure 1: **Experimental design: A. Foreperiod paradigm:** tone pairs (cue and target) were presented, embedded in white noise. Unbeknownst to participants, temporal predictability was manipulated block-wise, by either varying the foreperiod within a block (non-predictive condition, light grey, upper panel), or using a fixed foreperiod throughout a block (predictive condition, dark grey, lower panel). Overall, the same foreperiods were used in both conditions. **B. Design:** in a 2 x 2 design, the predictability manipulation was crossed with two tasks: participants were either asked to judge whether the pitch of the target tone was higher or lower than the one of the cue (pitch discrimination task), or whether the foreperiod interval was short or long (duration discrimination task), in comparison to all previously presented intervals.

100 To induce implicit timing, the interval between cue and target tones, *the foreperiod*, was varied in six linear steps
 101 from 0.5 s to 3.0 s (see also Fig. 1A). Per experimental block (30 trials), foreperiods were either variable (*temporally*
 102 *non-predictive*), that is each foreperiod interval occurred five times per block in random order, or fixed (*temporally*
 103 *predictive*), that is during one block only one foreperiod interval occurred. In the predictive condition, the fixed
 104 foreperiods were varied between blocks, such that one block was presented per task and foreperiod interval. Blocks
 105 with fixed and variable foreperiods were presented randomly interleaved. During the training blocks, only variable
 106 foreperiod blocks were presented.

107 After the target tone, participants had to withhold their response for a delay, varying between 0.5 – 2.5 s (exponential
 108 distribution, truncated at 2.5 s), until a black question mark was presented on the screen as response prompt. The
 109 question mark disappeared when a response was given, or after 2 s, followed by a variable inter-trial interval between
 110 3 – 4.5 s (exponential distribution, truncated at 4.5 s). To respond, participants pressed one out of two coloured buttons
 111 on a Fiber Optic Response Pad (FORP, Science Plus Group, DE), using the index or middle finger of their right hand.

112 Tasks

113 Each participant performed both tasks, pitch discrimination and duration discrimination, based on the exact same
 114 auditory stimuli. In the pitch discrimination task, participants were instructed to indicate whether the target tone was
 115 lower or higher in pitch than the cue tone. In the duration discrimination task, participants had to indicate whether the
 116 interval between the cue and target tone was short or long, in comparison to all the intervals presented in the study. They
 117 were instructed not to count seconds (Rattat and Droit-Volet, 2012). We did not present a standard interval on each task
 118 to keep the stimulation equal to the pitch discrimination task. To make sure that participants were sufficiently exposed
 119 to all possible time intervals before starting the main task, we presented variable foreperiod blocks during training (2
 120 – 5 blocks per participant). In the predictive blocks of the duration discrimination task, participants were effectively
 121 asked to judge the duration of the same foreperiod interval on every trial. However, no feedback was given per trial, so
 122 duration judgements remained subjective. We verified in the behavioral analyses that participants did engage in explicit
 123 timing, both in the predictive and non-predictive conditions.

124 In addition to the training at the beginning of the experimental session, participants performed one short block of
 125 training at the start of each task (pitch or duration discrimination, 18 trials). Feedback was provided after each response,
 126 by the color of the fixation cross (correct answer: green, wrong answer: red), or by the phrase 'pas de réponse' (no
 127 response) if the participant did not respond. During the experimental blocks, participants did not receive trial-wise
 128 feedback, but were informed after each block about their average performance. The no-response feedback was shown
 129 after each missed trial.

130 Per task, participants performed 12 blocks of 30 trials. Six blocks had random foreperiods (six foreperiods appearing
131 randomly, five times each), and six blocks had fixed foreperiods (one out of the six foreperiods presented constantly
132 throughout the block), resulting in 720 trials overall (excluding tone frequency adjustment and training blocks).

133 **Post-experimental questionnaire**

134 After the M/EEG recording, participants were asked a set of questions (see Appendix), to rate the subjective difficulty
135 of the tasks, and check whether they had noticed the manipulation of predictability. To achieve the latter, we first asked
136 participants whether they realized that the time intervals between cues and targets varied, and second, whether they
137 could describe the variability. Finally, the experimenter explained the predictability manipulation, and asked whether
138 the participant had noticed it.

139 **M/EEG recordings**

140 Prior to the arrival of the participant, an empty room recording was performed for 1 minute to assess the noise level of
141 the MEG sensors.

142 Before the M/EEG recording, participants were equipped with an EEG cap (64 Ag-AgCl electrodes, EasyCap, Germany).
143 The impedances of the electrodes were adjusted below 15 k Ω . External electrodes were positioned to record the electro-
144 oculograms (EOG, horizontal and vertical eye movements) and electro-cardiograms (ECG). The positions of the EEG
145 electrodes, four head-position coils, and three fiducial points (nasion, left and right pre-auricular areas) were digitized
146 using a 3D digitizer (Polhemus, US/Canada) for subsequent co-registration with the individual's anatomical MRI.

147 The combined M/EEG recordings took place in a magnetically shielded chamber, where the participant was seated
148 in an arm-chair under the MEG helmet. The electromagnetic brain activity was recorded using a whole-head Elekta
149 Neuromag Vector View 306 MEG system (Neuromag Elekta LTD, Helsinki) with 102 triple-sensors elements (two
150 orthogonal planar gradiometers, and one magnetometer per sensor location) and concurrent recording of electric brain
151 activity (EEG).

152 Participants were instructed to fixate their gaze on a screen positioned in front of them, at about one meter distance. The
153 chamber was dimly lit. Their head position was measured before each recording run (8 in total) using four head-position
154 coils. M/EEG recordings were sampled online at 1 kHz, and low-pass filtered at 330 Hz, but no online high-pass filter
155 was used.

156 **Anatomical MRI recordings**

157 Anatomical Magnetic Resonance Imaging (aMRI) was used to provide high-resolution structural images of each
158 individual's brain. The anatomical MRI was recorded directly after the MEG recording using a Siemens 3 T Magnetom
159 Prisma Fit MRI scanner. Parameters of the sequence were: slice thickness: 1 mm, repetition time TR = 2300 ms, echo
160 time TE = 2.98 ms, and flip angle 9 degrees.

161 **Analyses**

162 **Behavioural data**

163 We analysed accuracy as the proportion of correct responses, and response times from the onset of the response
164 prompt to the registered button press (Figure 2A, B). We compared the average accuracy and response times per
165 participant between tasks and predictive versus non-predictive conditions, using paired t-tests. For the response times,
166 we additionally computed a repeated measures ANOVA with the factors foreperiod and predictability. Response times
167 were log-transformed before being entered into the statistical tests.

168 To verify whether participants had engaged in explicit timing, especially also in the predictive blocks when the same
169 interval was presented on each trial, we analysed the variability of participants' duration discrimination responses over
170 trials per condition (predictive, non-predictive) and foreperiod (Figure 2C). To this end, we first computed a moving
171 average of 5 trials of the responses coded as -1 for 'short' and 1 for 'long' over the trials per block. Note that the trials
172 combined to one 'block' (same foreperiod, same condition) were presented consecutively in the predictive conditions,
173 but taken from different experimental blocks in the non-predictive condition. We then computed participants' standard
174 deviation per block as a measure of response variability, and assessed linear fits over trials to capture a shift in the
175 reference throughout a block.

176 To obtain a more refined measure of pitch and duration discrimination sensitivity, a cumulative normal function was
177 fitted to the responses using the *Psignifit toolbox* for Matlab (Version 4, Schütt et al., 2016). We used Psignifit's default

178 priors for the threshold, slope, guess, and lapse-rates, based on the given stimulus range (Schütt et al., 2016, p.109).
179 To obtain the same stimulus levels for all participants for fitting the psychometric functions, the individually adjusted
180 pitch steps were normed to six linearly spaced steps from -1 to 1 , with -1 and 1 reflecting each participant's lowest/
181 highest tones, and 0 being the pitch of the standard tone. For the duration discrimination task, foreperiods were also
182 normed between -1 and 1 . We fitted psychometric functions to each individual's data separately per condition and
183 compared the resulting parameters between conditions (threshold, slope, guess- and lapse rates) using two-sided t-tests.
184 Additionally, we calculated Bayes Factors for all statistical tests, using the *Bayes Factors* package for Matlab (Rouder
185 et al., 2009). All behavioral results are depicted in Figure 2D – E.

186 M/EEG preprocessing

187 M/EEG data were analysed using MNE python, following a standardized pre-processing pipeline¹. Due to substantial
188 artefacts, we chose to disregard the EEG data. The following description refers only to the MEG data. As a first step,
189 noisy or flat sensors were identified visually and marked (5.1 on average). The raw MEG data were then pre-processed
190 with Maxfilter implemented in MNE python (using spatiotemporal signal source separation, duration: 30 s, tSSS; Taulu
191 and Simola, 2006), which also interpolates the bad sensors. Head coordinates were read from the 5th of the eight
192 recording runs, and all other runs were spatially aligned to these coordinates.

193 The continuous data were low-pass filtered at 120 Hz using a finite impulse response filter (with a hamming window
194 and a transition band-width of 30 Hz), run forward and backward. Data were downsampled to 256 Hz, epoched with
195 respect to the cue tones ($-3 - 7$ s), and linearly detrended over the full 10 s time window.

196 A custom-build rejection procedure was applied to remove noisy epochs, rejecting epochs that exceeded each partici-
197 pant's average global field power (standard deviation over either magneto- or gradiometers) by more than three standard
198 deviations. Independent component analysis (ICA) was performed on the remaining epochs, with an additional 1 Hz
199 high-pass filter applied only for that purpose. For the detection of artefacts related to the electroocculo- (EOG) and
200 electrocardiogram (ECG), we used an inbuilt routine in MNE python, which finds a participant's typical EOG and ECG
201 activity, and returns the ICA components that correlate with these typical events. Thresholds for returning the ICA
202 components were set to: 0.75 for the ECG (Dammers et al., 2008, cross-trial phase statistics), and 3.0 for the EOG
203 (z-score). In addition, ICA components were screened manually and removed if they could be identified as noise (27.57
204 manually identified components on average).

205 To remove remaining artefacts, a fixed threshold rejection procedure was applied, removing epochs with amplitudes
206 exceeding 6000fT (magnetometers) and 4000fT/cm (gradiometers). On average, 696.84 epochs (out of 720, SD =
207 13.79, range = 654 – 710 epochs) were retained per participant. For the analyses of the time window around the target
208 stimulus, we re-aligned epochs to the target-tones ($-3.5 - 3$ s). We also produced a specific version of the target-locked
209 epochs with the aim to look for a slow ramping activity during the foreperiod. These epochs were low-pass filtered at
210 7 Hz (a-causal FIR filter, hamming window, applied forward and backward, transition bandwidth 2 Hz) and baseline
211 corrected to $-0.5 - 0$ s from cue onset.

212 In the following, we report only the analyses of the 102 magnetometers, to reduce the dimensionality of the data and
213 simplify the interpretation of the results and topographies.

214 Evoked fields

215 To assess whether task and temporal predictability affect the processing of cue and target stimuli, we analysed the
216 evoked fields in response to the presentation of the tones. Statistical results are depicted in Figure 3 (with an additional
217 7 Hz low-pass filter applied only for display purposes) and reported in Table 1. The statistical analysis was implemented
218 on two levels. First, we computed a linear regression on the single trial data per participant. Then, we submitted the
219 individual regression weights to spatio-temporal cluster-based permutation tests to test for significance at the group
220 level.

221 For the first-level regression, three factors were used: foreperiod, predictability, and task. We also tested for all two-way
222 interactions, as well as the three-way interaction between foreperiod, predictability, and task. All predictors were zeroed.
223 We computed the regression per time-point in the peri-stimulus time window (cue: 0.00 – 0.50 s, target: $-0.50 - 1.00$ s)
224 and sensor. For the analysis of slow ramping activity, we removed the shortest foreperiod (0.5 s), and performed the
225 statistical analyses on the interval from $-1.0 - 0.0$ s, time-locked to target onset.

226 On the group level, we computed t-tests, testing for each factor the regression weights obtained on the individual level
227 against 0, with spatio-temporal cluster-based permutations for multiple comparison correction (Maris and Oostenveld,
228 2007). The threshold for inclusion in the cluster-test was $p < 0.05$ and the final acceptance threshold $p < 0.05$. Statistical

¹https://github.com/brainthemind/CogBrainDyn_MEG_Pipeline

229 results are displayed in Table 1, and Figures 3 and 4. We did not consider the factor foreperiod as a factor of interest, as
230 main effects thereof trivially reflect the differences in stimulus timing. Below, will only discuss foreperiod effects in
231 interaction with the factors predictability or task.

232 **Time-frequency analyses**

233 First, we assessed general differences between the power spectra of the experimental conditions (presented in blocks),
234 by computing Welch's power spectral density (PSD) over the 10 s long epochs, time-locked to cue onset, for frequencies
235 from 0 – 40 Hz, with a frequency resolution of 0.1 Hz. PSD was computed on single epochs and then averaged per
236 experimental condition (not shown as no differences were found). To test for differences in power spectra between the
237 pitch and duration discrimination tasks, we computed paired t-tests per frequency and sensor on the difference between
238 the two tasks. Cluster permutation tests were used to correct for multiple comparisons. These spectral analyses revealed
239 no long-lasting differences in power between conditions.

240 Second, we assessed modulations of power during the foreperiod, focussing on the pre-target time window. To be able to
241 include also the shortest foreperiods in this analysis, for which we found the strongest effects of temporal predictability
242 in the behavioral data and evoked fields, we computed induced power by subtracting per condition (task, predictability,
243 and foreperiod) the trial-average time domain response from each trial's data. To avoid edge effects, we appended
244 the left side of the epochs (–3.5 – 0.0 s with their flipped version: 0.0 – –3.5 s). Then we computed time-frequency
245 transformations, using multitapers (bandwidth = 2.0) on 40 linearly spaced frequencies from 0.5 – 40.0 Hz in steps of
246 1 Hz, with varying cycles per frequency (2 – 10, linearly spaced). Power estimates were baseline corrected by manually
247 z-scoring each epoch with respect to its pre-cue baseline (–0.5 – –0.2 s before cue onset). The manual correction was
248 necessary due to the varying foreperiods.

249 As for the time-domain activity, statistics were computed on two levels. Per participant, we computed, per time-
250 frequency point and sensor, a linear regression predicting per-trial power, with the factors foreperiod, predictability, and
251 task, as well as their possible interactions. A three-dimensional cluster test per regressor over frequency, time points,
252 and sensors was computed in FieldTrip (Matlab 2020a), using similar parameters as for the time domain data. Testing
253 was restricted to the pre-target time window (–0.5 – 0.0 s). Statistical results are displayed in Table 2, and Figure 5.

254 **Source Reconstruction**

255 Individual head models were computed using the anatomical T1-weighted images recorded for each participant. The
256 volumetric segmentation of participants' anatomical MRI and the cortical surface reconstruction was performed with
257 the FreeSurfer software (Fischl, 2012). Single layer individual head models were computed using the boundary-element
258 method (BEM), using each participant's anatomical MRI. The coregistration of the MEG data with the individual's
259 structural MRI was carried out by manually realigning the digitized fiducial points with MRI slices (using MNE
260 python's command line tools). Second, an iterative refinement procedure was used to realign all digitized points with
261 the individuals' scalp.

262 The noise covariance matrices were estimated using the empty room recordings for each participant, after applying
263 the same low-pass filter as to the task data. Source reconstruction illustrating oscillatory power effects used noise
264 covariance matrices bandpass-filtered to the frequency band for which a significant cluster was found.

265 We computed individual forward solutions (surface models; spacing = ico 5), resulting in 10,242 voxels per hemisphere.
266 We then projected per participant the first-level regression weights from the sensor space analyses described above
267 onto the surface, using dynamical Statistical Parametric Mapping (dSPM, Dale et al., 2000), with partially fixed
268 dipole orientation (0.2), and depth weighting of 0.8. Individual surface activation maps were aligned to FreeSurfer's
269 'fsaverage' template brain, and averaged over all participants.

270 Results

271 Behavioural responses

272 Temporal predictability improves the discrimination of pitch, but not of duration

273 Participants' pitch discrimination accuracy was enhanced in the temporally predictive condition compared to the
274 non-predictive condition (non-predictive: 0.71 (SD = 0.11), predictive: 0.73 (SD = 0.13), $T(22) = -2.88$, $p < 0.01$, Bayes
275 Factor (BF) = 7.13). Duration discrimination accuracy did not differ significantly between predictive and non-predictive
276 conditions (0.78 (SD = 0.09) vs. 0.77 (SD = 0.12), $T(22) = -0.66$, $p = 0.51$, BF = 0.35), see also Figure 2A. We observed
277 a significant difference in accuracy between the pitch and duration judgement tasks, albeit with an inconclusive Bayes
278 Factor (pitch: 0.72 (SD = 0.12) duration: 0.78 (SD = 0.09), $T(22) = -2.18$, $p = 0.04$, BF = 1.91).

279 Temporal predictability speeds up response times

280 Response times were faster in the temporally predictive condition in both tasks (pitch discrimination: 0.56 (SD = 0.12)
281 vs. 0.52 s (SD = 0.11), $T(22) = 4.80$, $p < 0.001$, Bayes Factor (BF) = 941.67; duration discrimination: 0.54 (SD = 0.11)
282 vs. 0.51 s (SD = 0.09), $T(22) = 3.60$, $p < 0.01$, Bayes Factor (BF) = 37.01 ; see Figure 2B). We also found a significant
283 interaction between temporal predictability and foreperiod in both tasks (pitch: $F(5,22) = 4.71$, $p < 0.001$; duration:
284 $F(5,22) = 2.34$, $p = 0.046$), indicating that the difference in response times due to temporal predictability occurred
285 predominantly at the short foreperiods. Post-hoc tests showed that in the pitch-discrimination task, the difference was
286 significant at foreperiods 0.5 and 1 s ($p < 0.001$, $p < 0.01$; all other $p > 0.25$), and in the duration discrimination task at
287 foreperiods 0.5, 1, and 1.5 s ($p = 0.02$, $p < 0.001$, $p < 0.001$, all other $p > 0.35$).

288 Explicit timing behavior

289 To verify that participants had engaged in explicit timing, even in the predictive blocks when the same interval was
290 presented on each trial, we assessed duration discrimination responses over trials (Figure 2C). As expected, the average
291 response ('short' = -1, 'long' = 1) gradually increased with foreperiod, in the non-predictive and predictive blocks
292 (Figure 2C, top), indicating that duration judgements reflected the presented durations. Also, individual responses
293 (depicted by the thin lines in the top panel) showed similar variability in predictive and non-predictive blocks, ruling
294 out the alternative assumption that participants repetitively pressed the same button in the predictive blocks, without
295 timing each interval. Similarly, the standard deviations (computed per participant over trials) was highest in for the
296 intermediate foreperiods. Paired t-tests between the standard deviations of the non-predictive and predictive conditions
297 per foreperiod revealed (marginally) larger standard deviations for the non-predictive blocks, for the foreperiods 0.5,
298 1.0, and 1.5 s (0.5 s: $T(22) = 2.4$, $p = 0.02$; 1.0 s: $T(22) = 1.8$, $p = 0.09$; 1.5 s: $T(22) = 2.8$, $p = 0.01$; all other $p > 0.16$).
299 This result indicates that participants might have benefited from the predictability when judging the duration of the
300 shorter foreperiods.

301 Additionally, we tested the responses in the explicit timing task for linear trends over trials, which would be indicative
302 of a shift in the internal reference throughout the block (fits shown in Figure 2C, bottom right). T-tests against 0
303 revealed no significant linear fits in the non-predictive condition (all $p > 0.2$), and a significant negative slope in for the
304 2 s-foreperiods in the predictive condition ($T(22) = -2.7$, $p = 0.01$, as well as a marginal effect for the 2.5 s foreperiod
305 $T(22) = -2.1$, $p = 0.06$; all other $p > 0.14$). These findings indicate that a reference shift might have occurred in the
306 predictive blocks with ambiguous durations, providing further evidence that participants did engage in explicit timing
307 throughout these blocks.

308 Temporal predictability improves pitch discrimination sensitivity

309 In line with our main hypothesis, we addressed whether behavioral sensitivity, indexed by the slope of the psychometric
310 functions (shown in Figure 2D) did improve with temporal predictability. The slopes of the psychometric functions
311 were significantly steeper in the pitch discrimination task for the temporally predictive condition as compared to the
312 non-predictive one ($T(22) = -2.90$, $p < 0.01$, BF = 7.49). This was not observed in the duration discrimination task
313 ($T(22) = 0.05$, $p = 0.96$, BF = 0.30), see Figure 2E. We observed no effects on the thresholds of the psychometric
314 functions.

315 The slope and accuracy effects were significant in the group of 19 participants for whom we analysed the MEG data
316 (accuracy: $p = 0.01$, BF = 5.96; slope: $p = 0.02$, BF = 3.75).

317 In sum, temporal predictability improved the performance in the pitch discrimination task, as indexed by accuracy
318 and behavioral sensitivity (slope), but did not affect performance in the duration discrimination task. The absence of a
319 performance increase in the duration discrimination task appeared surprising at a first glance – we had expected to see a




Figure 2: Behavioral results: **A. Accuracy:** temporal predictability increased pitch discrimination accuracy (red scatter plot), but not duration discrimination accuracy (blue scatter plot). The cross depicts the mean and 95% confidence intervals in the directions of both variables. **B. Response times:** response times were faster in the predictive condition in both tasks. Furthermore, we found an interaction between foreperiod and predictability in both tasks: response times of the predictive and non-predictive conditions diverged predominantly at the short foreperiods. Error bars depict the standard error of the mean. **C. Explicit timing behavior:** Top: responses (coded as 'short' = -1, 'long' = 1, moving average over 5 trials) per condition and foreperiod. Thick lines are the participant average, thin lines depict single participants' responses. Bottom left: Participants' standard deviations of responses over trials, per condition and foreperiod. The black horizontal lines depict the average. Bottom right: Linear fits over responses throughout a block. A significant negative slope was found for the 2 s foreperiods in the predictive blocks). **D. Psychometric curves:** pitch discrimination task: the proportion of responding 'high' is fitted as a function of the pitch difference between cue and target tone; duration discrimination: the proportion of responding 'long' is fitted as a function of the foreperiod duration. The thin lines show the curves of single participants, and the thick line the average thereof. **E. Thresholds and slopes of the psychometric function:** thresholds (upper row) were not affected by the predictability manipulation. In the pitch discrimination task only, the slopes (lower row) were steeper in the temporally predictive condition. No slope difference was found in the duration discrimination task. The cross depicts the mean and 95% confidence intervals in the directions of both variables.

320 facilitation of explicit timing due to the repetition of foreperiods over blocks. It is important to mention here that no
321 feedback was given, meaning that participants could not correct their temporal judgements with respect to an objective
322 duration. Furthermore, no objective reference interval was presented per trial, with the intention to keep the stimulation
323 in the pitch and duration discrimination tasks the same. Hence, participants relied on their subjective estimates of
324 duration. Furthermore, we think that the absence of performance differences between the non-predictive and predictive
325 blocks in explicit timing confirms that temporal predictability was processed mainly implicitly and therefore did not
326 affect explicit duration discrimination.

327 **No correlations between implicit and explicit timing performance**

328 We found no significant correlations between the measures of implicit and explicit timing. Correlating the ratio between
329 predictive and non-predictive conditions for slope, accuracy, and response time in the pitch discrimination task with the
330 respective ratios in the duration discrimination task yielded no significant outcomes (slopes: $r = -0.32$, $p = 0.13$, $BF =$
331 0.50 ; RT: $r = 0.35$, $p = 0.10$, $BF = 0.52$; accuracy: $r = 0.04$, $p = 0.87$, $BF = 0.52$).

332 **Post-experimental questionnaire**

333 Participants reported no significant differences in the difficulty of the pitch and the duration discrimination tasks, as
334 assessed in the post-experimental questionnaire (mean 5.50 vs. 4.43 on a scale of 1 – 10; SD: 2.16 vs. 2.12; $T(19) = 1.7$,
335 $p = 0.10$, $BF = 0.97$). Three participants did not, or only partially respond to the questionnaire.

336 All participants noticed that the time intervals varied, but only one spontaneously described that there were identical
337 series of foreperiods. After being told that the intervals were fixed during some blocks, thirteen participants confirmed
338 they had noticed this, seven of which only noticed it in the duration discrimination task, but not in the pitch discrimination
339 task. Six participants claimed that fixed foreperiods had helped them in the pitch discrimination task, and two explicitly
340 stated that it helped most at the shortest foreperiods. Thirteen participants reported that fixed durations helped them
341 in the duration discrimination task. In sum, participants were not able to spontaneously describe the foreperiod
342 manipulation, which shows that they were not fully aware of the temporal predictability. However, the fact that a
343 substantial number of participants confirmed noticing the fixed foreperiod blocks after it was described to them indicates
344 that they may have gained partial awareness of the predictability manipulation.

345 **Modulations of auditory activity by temporal predictability and task**

346 **Cue-evoked activity reflects temporal predictions**

347 At latencies following the cue, we observed an interaction between predictability and foreperiod: the auditory response
348 to temporally predictive cues was stronger than to non-predictive cues, and this effect was strongest at the shortest
349 foreperiods (0.35 – 0.50 s, $p = 0.02$, Figure 3A, Table 1). Post-hoc tests revealed that the interaction was significant for
350 the shortest foreperiod (0.5 s, $T(18) = -4.27$, $p < 0.001$, $BF = 72.56$, all other $p > 0.24$). For the 2 s foreperiod, the
351 effect was inverted ($T(18) = -2.75$, $p < 0.013$, $BF = 4.16$, no correction for multiple comparisons).

352 Since the relatively late latency of the effect could indicate that temporal predictions conveyed by the cue were processed
353 consciously (Sergent et al., 2005), we performed a post-hoc split of participants in two groups with respect to whether
354 they had claimed to recognize the foreperiod manipulation or not (Figure 3A, inset bottom right). Although the small
355 number of participants did not allow for a robust statistical comparison, the effect appeared to be larger in the group of
356 participants who noticed the predictability manipulation (in green, larger average absolute regression weight; confidence
357 interval does not include 0).

358 **Target-evoked activity is affected by temporal predictability and task**

359 In the target time window, we observed an interaction between foreperiod and predictability in three bilateral significant
360 clusters ranging from -0.40 to 0.46 s post-target onset ($p = 0.03$, Table 1 and Figure 3B). The effects of foreperiod and
361 of predictability started before target onset, thus likely overlapping with the cue-evoked differences.

362 The interaction between foreperiod and predictability consisted in larger evoked activity following predictive foreperiods
363 as compared to non-predictive ones: the shorter the foreperiod, the more marked this difference was, appearing
364 particularly salient on the topographic maps (Table 1, Figure 3B). Post-hoc tests revealed that the interaction was driven
365 by the shortest foreperiod (0.5 s, $T(18) = -4.79$, $p < 0.001$, $BF = 200.36$, all other $p > 0.12$). Again, we observed a
366 reversed effect (non-predictive $>$ predictive) at the 3 s foreperiod ($T(18) = -2.84$, $p = 0.01$, $BF = 4.85$).

367 The source localization of this effect showed, as for the cue-evoked effect, the implication of early auditory areas. The
368 interaction between foreperiod and predictability aligns well with the similar interaction found in the response times.

369 Altogether, these observations suggest that temporal predictability was extracted regardless of the task, and had the
 370 strongest effect on the processing of early target tones.

371 Furthermore, following the target we observed a late main effect of task (two clusters, 0.47 – 1.00 s, $p = 0.04$, Figure
 372 3C), which resulted in a more sustained response in auditory areas for the pitch discrimination task as compared to the
 373 duration discrimination task.




Figure 3: **Evoked fields and source estimates: A. Cue-evoked activity** differed at latencies following temporally predictive vs. non-predictive cues in a post-cue time window of 0.35 – 0.50 s, regardless of the task. The effect was stronger for shorter foreperiods. The sensor-space topographies show the evoked activity, extracted at the clusters that formed the significant cluster (marked by black circles). Source localizations show the average regression weights obtained for the interaction effect in the significant time window, with a typical auditory profile. A post-hoc split between participants who did not recognize the foreperiod manipulation during debriefing (in yellow and those who did, in green) suggests that the cue-evoked difference in temporal predictability is larger in the second group. **B. Target-evoked activity** showed an interaction between foreperiod and predictability, with the strongest difference between predicted and non-predicted targets after short foreperiods, localized mainly to auditory areas. **C. Late target-evoked activity** differed between the pitch and duration discrimination tasks, showing stronger activity in auditory areas for pitch discrimination. The color code for the source activity reflects a relative scale, between the 95th (red) and 100th percentile (yellow).

374 In an additional analysis devised to assess slow ramping activity prior to target onset, we observed an interaction
 375 between foreperiod and predictability ($-0.78 - 0.0$ s, $p = 0.02$, Table 1, see Figure 4): during the foreperiod, there was
 376 a sustained negative deflection, which was stronger in the predictive compared to non-predictive conditions at short
 377 foreperiods, and less negative at the longer foreperiods. The shape of this activity resembles the contingent negative
 378 variation (CNV/ CMV), but the generators were in auditory areas.

379 Modulation of induced alpha and beta power during the foreperiod

380 In the time-frequency analyses, we focused on the pre-target time window, to assess the effects of temporal predictability
 381 and of task, when participants were either *implicitly timing* in anticipation of the upcoming target in the pitch task, or
 382 *explicitly timing* in anticipation of the tone marking the end of time interval in the duration task. As both, behavioral
 383 data (RT) and evoked fields showed the strongest benefit of temporal predictability for short foreperiods, we used all
 384 foreperiods in this analysis and focused on induced power, to avoid confounding cue-evoked effects with pre-target
 385 modulations. Statistical results are reported in Table 2.

386 Temporal predictability was found to modulate pre-target alpha power (7.6 – 10.6 Hz, $-0.50 - 0.00$ s pre-target, $p = 0.03$;
 387 see Figure 5B), with higher alpha power in temporally predictive conditions over the parietal and visual cortices. The
 388 parietal regions also showed an interaction between task and predictability, in a broader frequency range (3.5 – 13.7 Hz,
 389 $-0.50 - 0.00$ s pre-target, $p < 0.01$; Figure 5D, upper row). Post-hoc paired t-tests on the average amplitudes extracted
 390 from the significant cluster (time points, sensors) showed that the interaction resulted from a reversal of the direction of
 391 the predictability effect in the pitch discrimination task ($T(18) = 2.87$, $p = 0.01$, $BF = 5.12$) compared to the duration
 392 discrimination task ($T(18) = -4.41$, $p < 0.001$, $BF = 96.35$). The task difference was significant in the non-predictive
 393 blocks (pitch versus duration: $T(18) = 3.26$, $p < 0.01$, $BF = 10.51$), but not in the predictive blocks ($T(18) = -1.59$, $p =$
 394 0.13 , $BF = 0.69$).

395 A main effect of task was observed in the beta frequency range (14.7 – 22.8 Hz, $-0.32 - 0.00$ s pre-target, $p = 0.04$,
 396 see Figure 5C), indicating that the pitch task elicited higher beta power during the foreperiod than the duration task.
 397 The statistical significance occurred over the right central sensors, and source reconstruction of the regression weights
 398 revealed sources mainly in central (motor) areas, including the left SMA, and parietal areas, bilaterally.





Figure 4: **Slow deflections during the foreperiod: A. Pre-target slow ramping activity.** Prior to target onset, a slow negative potential was observed, which reflects an interaction between foreperiod and predictability: at short foreperiods, activity was more negative for predictive versus non-predictive conditions, while at long foreperiods the relation flipped. **B. Interaction: Foreperiod × predictability:** The thin lines show single participants' activity (z-scored), extracted from the significant sensors and time points in the group statistics. The thick lines depict the group average. The color code for the source activity reflects a relative scale, between the 95th (red) and 100th percentile (yellow).

399 As we had observed a significant task difference in behavioral accuracy, we assessed whether the main effect of task in
400 the beta band was driven by task difficulty. The correlation between between the task difference in accuracy and the
401 task difference in beta power was marginally significant ($\rho = 0.43$, $p = 0.06$), but driven by four participants who had a
402 large difference in task difficulty, and no or a positive difference in beta power (compared to the negative difference
403 observed in the main effect). After removing those four participants the correlation was not significant ($\rho = -0.26$, $p =$
404 0.33). This confirms that the task difference in the beta band was not driven by differences in task demands.


405 A second interaction occurred in the upper beta band (24.8 – 33.9 Hz, -0.43 – -0.12 s pre-target, $p < 0.01$; Figure 5D,
406 bottom row). Post-hoc tests showed that the predictive and non-predictive conditions differed significantly only in the
407 duration task (pitch: $T(18) = 0.64$, $p = 0.53$, $BF = 0.29$; duration: $T(18) = -4.89$, $p < 0.01$, $BF = 239.88$). The task
408 difference was significant but reversed in direction in the non-predictive blocks (pitch versus duration: $T(18) = 3.81$, p
409 < 0.01 , $BF = 29.76$), as well as in the predictive blocks ($T(18) = -2.69$, $p = 0.02$, $BF = 3.70$). The sources were more
410 wide-spread over central and frontal areas, and the frequency band did not overlap with the main effect of task.

411 None of the above effects showed a significant interaction with the foreperiod (predictability \times foreperiod: $p = 0.15$
412 (22.8 – 27.8 Hz); task \times foreperiod: $p = 0.10$ (23.8 – 27.8 Hz); 3-way interaction: $p = 0.06$ (3.5 – 8.6 Hz)). Exploratory
413 analyses were carried out to test for differences in inter-trial phase coherence between conditions, as well as differences
414 in phase-amplitude coupling strength, but yielded no consistent results.


A. Time-frequency matrix per condition



B. PREDICTABILITY effect: 7.6 – 10.6 Hz



C. TASK effect: 14.7 – 22.8 Hz



D. Interactions: predictability x task




Figure 5: Caption on next page.

Figure 5: (Continued from previous page.) **A. Power per time point and frequency** for all four conditions (baseline corrected), extracted at the joint group of sensors depicted in B and C. **B. Main effect of predictability:** Temporal predictability was indexed by a stronger increase in alpha power prior to target onset, with sources in parietal areas, reaching into visual cortices. The top left panel shows the time-frequency matrix of the difference between the predictive and non-predictive conditions. The topographies show the distribution of alpha power across sensors per condition, with stronger alpha power in the predictive conditions of both tasks. The middle panel shows the alpha power time courses for all four conditions, time-locked to target onset (the gray shade marks the statistically significant time window), averaged over all sensors included in the significant cluster. Source plots show average regression weights for the task effect in the alpha band, localized to parietal and visual areas. **C. Main effect of task:** Induced power in the beta range showed a task difference, namely it was higher in the pre-target time window for the pitch discrimination compared to the duration discrimination task. The top panel shows the time-frequency matrix of the contrast between duration discrimination and pitch discrimination. The topographies show the distribution of beta power across sensors per condition, with stronger beta activity over right central sensors in the pitch discrimination task. The middle panel shows the beta power time course for all four conditions, time-locked to target onset (the gray shade marks the statistically significant time window), averaged over all sensors included in the significant cluster. Source plots show average regression weights for the task effect in the beta band, localized to motor and parietal areas. **D. Interactions between predictability and task:** Top row: interaction between predictability and task in the theta/alpha range with higher power for the conditions pitch non-predictive, and duration predictive. The interaction was found over parietal areas, comparable to those shown for the predictability effect in panel B. Bottom row: interaction between predictability and task in the higher beta range, with the lowest power in the non-predictive blocks of the pitch discrimination task, over central and frontal sensors. The color code for the source activity reflects relative activity between the 95th (red) and 100th percentile (yellow).

415

416 Discussion

417 In this study, we asked whether implicit temporal prediction and explicit duration judgement rely on shared versus
418 separate timing mechanisms. We induced implicit timing in an auditory foreperiod paradigm by manipulating the
419 foreperiod to be either temporally predictive (constant) or not (variable). Participants received two consecutive task
420 instructions: pitch discrimination (indirect measure of implicit timing) and duration discrimination (direct measure of
421 explicit timing), while their brain activity was recorded with magnetoencephalography (MEG). Participants were not
422 informed about this manipulation, and post-experimental debriefing showed that they were not explicitly aware of it.
423 To engage participants in explicit timing, we asked them to perform a duration discrimination task on the foreperiod
424 intervals.

425 The results show that participants systematically formed temporal predictions in both tasks, speeding up response times
426 and enhancing the auditory evoked response. However, behaviourally, only pitch discrimination performance benefited
427 from the temporal predictability. Attentional orienting in time during predictive foreperiods was indexed by an increase
428 in alpha power over parietal and visual areas. Pre-target induced beta power in sensorimotor and parietal areas was
429 increased during pitch discrimination compared to duration discrimination, suggesting that beta power here reflects
430 implicit timing. Interestingly, we observed no distinct neural signatures when participants were asked to provide explicit
431 duration judgements (duration discrimination), compared to implicit timing alone (pitch discrimination).

432 Temporal predictions are formed irrespective of the task, but only affect pitch discrimination performance

433 The behavioral findings (Figure 2) clearly show that our manipulation of the foreperiod induced implicit timing. Slower
434 response times at short foreperiods are commonly reported in variable foreperiod designs (Cravo et al., 2011; Niemi
435 and Näätänen, 1981; Nobre and van Ede, 2018), indicating that participants automatically extract the temporal statistics
436 of the inputs (here: the range of foreperiods; Droit-Volet and Coull, 2016; Martin et al., 2017). A novel finding we
437 report here is that when combining variable and fixed foreperiods, the temporal predictability allowed to overcome the
438 slowing of responses at short foreperiods.

439 While response times reflected the extraction of temporal predictability irrespective of the task, pitch discrimination
440 sensitivity increased after temporally predictive foreperiods, replicating a previously published finding (Herbst and
441 Obleser, 2019). Duration discrimination performance did however not benefit from temporal predictability. Interestingly,
442 the response time effects, and MEG results show that temporal predictability was extracted, also in the duration
443 judgement blocks, but apparently the implicit knowledge of temporal statistics did not improve the explicit duration
444 judgements. This finding points to a difference between implicit temporal predictions that serve to orient attention in
445 time, and explicitly encoded durations.

446 Importantly, the duration judgements showed that participants did engage in explicit timing, even when the same
447 foreperiod interval was presented repeatedly in the predictive blocks. Duration judgements showed comparable patterns
448 of mean and variability in the non-predictive and predictive blocks (Figure 2C). Furthermore, we observed a linear
449 trend in the responses in the predictive block with 2 s foreperiods indicating that participants were more likely to judge
450 the interval as 'long' in the beginning, and as 'short' in the end of a block. This shift suggests an adjustment of the
451 internal reference used for the comparison, an established effect in explicit timing (Dyjas et al., 2012). Here, during
452 predictive blocks, the moving average of previously presented durations might shift in the direction of the foreperiod
453 used on that block, hence increase in the case of the 2 s or 2.5 s durations. Thus, the comparison foreperiod would
454 appear shorter, especially towards the end of the block. This effect is more likely to affect the ambiguous intervals, than
455 the ones for which the discrimination is clear. Taken together, the observed patterns of variability and the drift for the
456 intermediate intervals support the assumption that participants encoded and judged the foreperiod interval on each trial
457 even in the predictive blocks.

458 Notably, we observed no correlations between implicit and explicit timing performance, in line with a majority of
459 previous studies that reported dissociable behavioral patterns when comparing implicit and explicit timing across
460 individuals (Droit-Volet and Coull 2016; Droit-Volet et al. 2019; Los and Horoufchin 2011; Mioni et al. 2018; but see
461 Coull et al. 2013, long intervals). In line with the absence of an improvement of explicit timing by predictability, this
462 finding suggests that the implicit temporal predictions are not directly translated to duration estimates.

463 Overall, the behavioral results show that the human brain is tuned to efficiently extract implicit temporal statistics of
464 sensory environments, which here, were present in both tasks due to the balanced design. Yet, the behavioral results
465 indicate that temporal predictability is only used implicitly, to benefit sensory processing and reduce response times,
466 but does not affect the explicit duration judgements.

467 Implicit timing enhances the auditory response to predictive and predicted stimuli

468 The enhanced auditory response to predictive cues and predicted targets (Figure 3) confirms that temporal predictability
469 anticipates and enhances the auditory representation of sound (Jaramillo and Zador, 2011; Miniussi et al., 1999),
470 regardless of whether the sound's properties are directly task relevant (as in the pitch discrimination task), or whether
471 the sound only serves as a temporal marker (as in the duration discrimination task). Furthermore, the predictability

472 effect occurred in interaction with the foreperiod (driven by the shortest foreperiod), which confirms that temporal
473 predictions are conditionally updated over time (Giersch et al., 2016; Herbst et al., 2018; Nobre et al., 2007), and
474 therefore more useful to anticipate early target onsets. In light of the recent debates on the effects of attention versus
475 prediction (de Lange et al., 2018; Heilbron and Chait, 2018; Press et al., 2020; Todorovic et al., 2015), our results align
476 with an attentional enhancement of auditory processing: here temporal predictions allowed to orient attention in time,
477 to the most likely moment of target occurrence.

478 We also observed anticipatory auditory activity to be modulated by temporal predictability in interaction with the
479 foreperiod (Figure 4). Such anticipatory auditory activity was previously reported during explicit timing of auditory
480 stimuli (Bendixen et al., 2005; Picton et al., 1978; van Wassenhove and Lecoutre, 2015), and when auditory stimuli
481 contain implicit temporal regularities (Sohoglu and Chait, 2016), and is in line with sensory timing models (Buetti,
482 2011; Eagleman and Pariyadath, 2009), which hold that the neural populations that process the sensory stimuli also
483 contribute to representing its temporal features.

484 **Induced alpha and beta power carry distinct signatures of attentional orienting and implicit timing**

485 **Alpha power as a signature of attentional orienting:** Distinct signatures of orienting attention in time were observed
486 in parietal/ visual alpha power increasing prior to the predicted compared to the non-predicted targets in both tasks
487 (Figure 5B). The modulation of alpha power prior to temporally predicted stimuli is a classical finding, usually surfacing
488 as a decrease when the stimuli are visual (Ede et al., 2016; Rohenkohl and Nobre, 2011; Solís-Vivanco et al., 2018; van
489 Diepen et al., 2015). In the auditory domain, attentional modulations of alpha power often show the reversed direction,
490 namely an increase in alpha over visual/parietal areas (Schneider et al., 2021; Strauß et al., 2014), interpreted as a
491 suppression of task-irrelevant (e.g. visual) processes (Jensen and Mazaheri, 2010; Klimesch et al., 2007). The stronger
492 increase in alpha power during predictive foreperiods aligns nicely with those earlier findings, and replicates a previous
493 finding of increased alpha power prior to temporally predictable auditory stimuli (Herbst and Obleser, 2017). The
494 parietal sources of the alpha power effects are in line with a previously reported involvement of these areas in temporal
495 prediction (Coull and Nobre, 2008; Meindertsma et al., 2018; Visalli et al., 2019).

496 We also observed an interaction between predictability and task in at least partially overlapping anatomical regions
497 compared to the main effect of predictability, but in a broader frequency band, from low theta to high alpha (Figure
498 5D), likely reflecting an on-top modulation of the predictability effect by task. The parietal sources of the interaction
499 (compared to the parieto-visual effect of predictability) suggests the involvement of the dorsal attentional orienting
500 network (Corbetta and Shulman, 2002; Petersen and Posner, 2012), also supported by the broader frequency range
501 found to be modulated (Cavanagh and Frank, 2014; Fox et al., 2006; Haegens et al., 2011; Palva and Palva, 2011;
502 Sadaghiani et al., 2010). We speculate that this gradual decrease in alpha power over conditions indicates differential
503 allocation of attentional resources to elapsed time throughout the foreperiod.

504 **Beta power as a signature of implicit timing:** When comparing the two timing tasks, we did observe a difference
505 in pre-target induced beta power over sensorimotor and parietal areas, including the SMA (Figure 5C): beta power was
506 increased during pitch discrimination compared to duration discrimination. Lower power in the explicit timing task
507 might appear counter intuitive at first, as previous studies found beta-power to increase when comparing an explicit
508 timing task to non-timing task (Kulashekhar et al., 2016; Spitzer et al., 2014). However, these studies did not modulate
509 implicit timing, and they used visual and tactile comparison tasks. The study by Kulashekhar et al. reports a relative
510 suppression of beta power compared to baseline, both in the visual and the timing task, but the suppression is stronger in
511 the non-timing task, resulting in a positive difference. Furthermore, in explicit non-rhythmic motor timing, a transient
512 increase in beta power after the self-initiated onset button press has been found to reflect the duration the participant will
513 produce (Kononowicz and Rijn, 2015; Kononowicz et al., 2018), thought to index the inhibition of a state-dependent
514 timing network. In our results, the modulation of beta power occurred throughout the foreperiod, with no distinct
515 temporal profile, suggesting that, without a clear motor component in the explicit timing task, implicit timing engages
516 oscillatory dynamics in the beta range more so than explicit timing.

517 Increased beta power during implicit timing was previously reported during rhythmic temporal prediction (Fujioka
518 et al., 2012; Morillon and Baillet, 2017), and predictive foreperiods (Meindertsma et al., 2018), and aligns more
519 generally with the involvement of beta oscillations in top-down predictions (Arnal, 2012; Bastos et al., 2015; Engel
520 and Fries, 2010; Spitzer and Haegens, 2017). In our case, beta power was increased in both conditions of the pitch
521 discrimination task, where temporal predictions appeared beneficial for task performance. In line with the behavioral
522 findings, this confirms that in the variable foreperiod conditions, participants conditionally updated their tempo-
523 ral predictions with elapsed time (Buetti et al., 2010; Giersch et al., 2016; Herbst et al., 2018; Janssen and Shadlen, 2005).

524

525 **Shared or separate timing mechanisms?**

526 Taken together, our results suggest that the brain flexibly uses overlapping time coding mechanisms in implicit and
527 explicit timing situations, depending on the temporal statistics of the inputs and the task requirements (see also van Ede
528 et al., 2020), rather than deploying specialized modules for either timing task.

529 A noteworthy outcome of this study is the absence of distinct brain dynamics emerging during the to-be-timed interval
530 when attention is directed *to* time during explicit timing (duration discrimination), compared to implicit timing (pitch
531 discrimination), in other words, the absence of a positive task difference. This divergence from the previous fMRI work
532 (Coull et al., 2013) is likely due to the different neural dynamics targeted by fMRI versus MEG, and the focus on a
533 fine-grained temporal resolution in our study. Tentatively, the absence of distinct neural dynamics during explicit timing
534 in this study could indicate that elapsed time is encoded by a common mechanism during implicit and explicit timing,
535 and subjected to separate read-out mechanisms per task. Such task-independent encoding of time has been found
536 in several brain areas, for instance a recent report showed precise encoding of elapsed time in rats' dorsal striatum,
537 which was, however, unrelated to subjective duration perception (Toso et al., 2021). This suggests that downstream
538 readers are needed to transform the signals which encode elapsed time to task-relevant information (Buzsáki, 2010; van
539 Wassenhove, 2009). Possibly, for the implicit timing task, the relevant readout consists in a prediction error (Meirhaeghe
540 et al., 2021), while for the purpose of explicit timing a duration is required (Kononowicz et al., 2018; van Wassenhove,
541 2009). Different read-out mechanisms would also allow to account for the observed differences in behavior between the
542 two timing tasks. One reason for not observing any neural signatures related to the readout in this study might be that
543 this process is not necessarily locked to a specific time point (target onset).

544 **Comparing implicit and explicit timing: limitations**

545 Comparing an implicit cognitive process, such as implicit timing, with an explicit one is a challenging endeavour, as
546 it requires another sensory task during which the implicit process takes place (here: the pitch discrimination task).
547 While we are aware that the choice of that sensory task might have affected the results, several measures were taken
548 to ensure the comparability between conditions: notably, we used empty intervals delimited by two sensory events to
549 keep the stimulation exactly the same in both tasks and avoid any sensory processing during these intervals on which
550 we focussed our comparisons of neural dynamics. It should also be noted that performance was significantly better in
551 the duration discrimination task compared to the pitch discrimination task. However, this difference did not correlate
552 significantly with the observed difference between tasks in beta power.

553 To achieve a balanced design, the study had a 2×2 manipulation, with the factors predictability and task. The main
554 effects found for both factors suggest an implementation by separate neural dynamics (alpha, and beta oscillations), but
555 the interactions also show differences between the individual conditions. Necessarily, our design contains a sub-selection
556 of timing tasks, and future studies should vary tasks and sensory modalities to test the generality of those results.

557 Notably, the non-predictive condition in the pitch discrimination task was intended to reflect a temporally neutral
558 condition (Coull et al., 2013), with no incentives to engage in timing (Figure 1B). However our results clearly show
559 that the brain constantly extracts temporal statistics from sensory environments (Jazayeri and Shadlen, 2010; Nobre
560 et al., 2007): the interaction effect between predictability and foreperiod indicate that the temporal predictability
561 mainly benefited sensory processing and motor preparation at the short foreperiods, and that participants updated their
562 predictions with elapsed time, even in the non-predictive blocks.

563 **Conclusions**

564 In this study, temporal predictions systematically enhanced auditory processing, but did not translate to explicit duration
565 judgements. In line with previous studies, alpha power indexed the orienting of attention to temporally predicted events.
566 Increased beta power surfaced as a signature of implicit timing in the pitch discrimination task to which temporal
567 predictions were also relevant for performance. However, we did not observe distinct neural dynamics during the
568 foreperiod when attention explicitly directed to time. Our work thus indicates that implicit timing shapes the behavioral
569 and sensory response in an automatic way, and is reflected in oscillatory neural dynamics, while the translation of
570 implicit temporal statistics to explicit durations remains inconclusive, possibly due to the more abstract nature of the task.

571

572

event	factor	time window	cluster p-value
cue	foreperiod × predictability	0.35 – 0.5 s	0.02
target	foreperiod	-0.23 – 0.39 s	0.041
		-0.36 – 0.45 s	<0.01
	foreperiod × predictability	-0.39 – -0.11 s	0.02
		-0.10 – 0.30 s	<0.01
		-0.32 – 0.46 s	<0.01
	task	0.47 – 1.00 s	0.04
		0.56 – 1.00 s	0.03
pre-target	foreperiod	-0.85 – 0.0 s	0.01
	foreperiod × predictability	-0.78 – 0.0 s	0.02

Table 1: **Statistical results, event related fields:** Significant results from the group-level cluster permutation tests, computed for cue- and target evoked activity (magnetometers). Time window in which the respective contrast was significant and corresponding cluster p-value.

event	factor	time window	frequencies	cluster p-value
target	foreperiod	-0.5 – 0.00 s	0.5 – 18.7 Hz	<0.01
target	task	-0.32 – 0.00 s	14.7 – 22.8 Hz	0.04
		predictability	-0.50 – 0.00 s	7.6 – 10.6 Hz
	task × predictability	-0.50 – 0.00 s	3.5 – 13.7 Hz	<0.01
		task × predictability	-0.43 – 0.12 s	24.8 – 33.9 Hz

Table 2: **Statistical results, induced power:** Significant results from the group-level cluster permutation tests, computed in the foreperiod window (pre-target). Time window in which the respective contrast was significant, frequencies, and corresponding cluster p-value.

573 Appendix

574 Debriefing questionnaire

575 How tiring did you find the experiment on a scale from = not tiring at all, to 10 = very tiring?

576 Which aspects were tiring?

577 How difficult was it for you to separate the tones from the background noise on a scale from 1 = not difficult at
578 all, to 10 = very difficult?

579 How difficult was it for you to judge the pitch on a scale from 1 = not difficult at all, to 10 = very difficult?

580 How difficult was it for you to judge the duration on a scale from 1 = not difficult at all, to 10 = very difficult?

581 Did you realize that the time interval between the two tones was variable? If yes, can you describe the
582 variability?

583 In fact, there were blocks where the interval was always the same, and others where it varied. Did you notice
584 that? Did you think this helped you with performing the tasks (answer separately for pitch and duration)?

585 Do you have other remarks about the experiment?

586 Do you play a musical instrument? If yes, which, and for how many years?

587 References

- 588 Ameqrane, I., Pouget, P., Wattiez, N., Carpenter, R., and Missal, M. (2014). Implicit and Explicit Timing in Oculomotor
589 Control. *PLoS ONE*, 9(4):e93958.
- 590 Arnal, L. H. (2012). Predicting "When" Using the Motor System's Beta-Band Oscillations. *Frontiers in Human*
591 *Neuroscience*, 6.
- 592 Bastos, A. M., Vezoli, J., Bosman, C. A., Schoffelen, J.-M., Oostenveld, R., Dowdall, J. R., De Weerd, P., Kennedy, H.,
593 and Fries, P. (2015). Visual Areas Exert Feedforward and Feedback Influences through Distinct Frequency Channels.
594 *Neuron*, 85(2):390–401.
- 595 Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *Journal of*
596 *Statistical Software*, 67(1):1–48.
- 597 Bendixen, A., Grimm, S., and Schröger, E. (2005). Human auditory event-related potentials predict duration judgments.
598 *Neuroscience letters*, 383(3):284–288. Publisher: Elsevier.
- 599 Brainard, D. H. (1997). The Psychophysics Toolbox. *Spatial Vision*, 10(4):433–436.
- 600 Breska, A. and Ivry, R. B. (2018). Double dissociation of single-interval and rhythmic temporal prediction in cerebellar
601 degeneration and Parkinson's disease. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(48):12283–12288.
602 Publisher: National Acad Sciences.
- 603 Buetti, D. (2011). The Sensory Representation of Time. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, 5.
- 604 Buetti, D., Bahrami, B., Walsh, V., and Rees, G. (2010). Encoding of Temporal Probabilities in the Human Brain. *The*
605 *Journal of Neuroscience*, 30(12):4343–4352.
- 606 Buzsáki, G. (2010). Neural syntax: cell assemblies, synapsembles, and readers. *Neuron*, 68(3):362–385.
- 607 Cavanagh, J. F. and Frank, M. J. (2014). Frontal theta as a mechanism for cognitive control. *Trends in cognitive*
608 *sciences*, 18(8):414–421.
- 609 Corbetta, M. and Shulman, G. L. (2002). Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven attention in the brain. *Nature*
610 *Reviews Neuroscience*, 3(3):201–215. Number: 3 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- 611 Coull, J. T., Cheng, R.-K., and Meck, W. H. (2011). Neuroanatomical and neurochemical substrates of timing.
612 *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 36(1):3–25.
- 613 Coull, J. T., Davranche, K., Nazarian, B., and Vidal, F. (2013). Functional anatomy of timing differs for production
614 versus prediction of time intervals. *Neuropsychologia*, 51(2):309–319.
- 615 Coull, J. T. and Nobre, A. C. (2008). Dissociating explicit timing from temporal expectation with fMRI. *Current*
616 *Opinion in Neurobiology*, 18(2):137–144.
- 617 Cravo, A. M., Rohenkohl, G., Wyart, V., and Nobre, A. C. (2011). Endogenous modulation of low frequency oscillations
618 by temporal expectations. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 106(6):2964–2972.
- 619 Dale, A. M., Fischl, B., and Sereno, M. I. (1999). Cortical surface-based analysis I. Segmentation and surface
620 reconstruction. *Neuroimage*, 9(2):179–194.
- 621 Dale, A. M., Liu, A. K., Fischl, B. R., Buckner, R. L., Belliveau, J. W., Lewine, J. D., and Halgren, E. (2000). Dynamic
622 statistical parametric mapping: combining fMRI and MEG for high-resolution imaging of cortical activity. *Neuron*,
623 26(1):55–67.
- 624 Dammers, J., Schiek, M., Boers, F., Silex, C., Zvyagintsev, M., Pietrzyk, U., and Mathiak, K. (2008). Integration of
625 amplitude and phase statistics for complete artifact removal in independent components of neuromagnetic recordings.
626 *IEEE transactions on biomedical engineering*, 55(10):2353–2362. Publisher: IEEE.
- 627 de Lange, F. P., Heilbron, M., and Kok, P. (2018). How Do Expectations Shape Perception? *Trends in Cognitive*
628 *Sciences*, 22(9):764–779.
- 629 Droit-Volet, S. and Coull, J. T. (2016). Distinct developmental trajectories for explicit and implicit timing. *Journal of*
630 *Experimental Child Psychology*, 150:141–154.
- 631 Droit-Volet, S., Lorandi, F., and Coull, J. T. (2019). Explicit and implicit timing in aging. *Acta Psychologica*,
632 193:180–189.
- 633 Dyjas, O., Bausenhardt, K. M., and Ulrich, R. (2012). Trial-by-trial updating of an internal reference in discrimination
634 tasks: Evidence from effects of stimulus order and trial sequence. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 74(8):1819–
635 1841. Publisher: Springer.
- 636 Eagleman, D. M. and Pariyadath, V. (2009). Is subjective duration a signature of coding efficiency? *Philosophical*
637 *Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 364(1525):1841.

- 638 Ede, F. v., Niklaus, M., and Nobre, A. C. (2016). Temporal expectations guide dynamic prioritization in visual working
639 memory through attenuated alpha oscillations. *Journal of Neuroscience*, pages 2272–16.
- 640 Engel, A. K. and Fries, P. (2010). Beta-band oscillations—signalling the status quo? *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*,
641 20(2):156–165.
- 642 Fischl, B. (2012). FreeSurfer. *NeuroImage*, 62(2):774–781.
- 643 Fox, M. D., Corbetta, M., Snyder, A. Z., Vincent, J. L., and Raichle, M. E. (2006). Spontaneous neuronal activity
644 distinguishes human dorsal and ventral attention systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
645 103(26):10046–10051. Publisher: National Acad Sciences.
- 646 Fujioka, T., Trainor, L. J., Large, E. W., and Ross, B. (2012). Internalized Timing of Isochronous Sounds Is Represented
647 in Neuromagnetic Beta Oscillations. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(5):1791–1802.
- 648 Giersch, A., Lalanne, L., and Isope, P. (2016). Implicit Timing as the Missing Link between Neurobiological and Self
649 Disorders in Schizophrenia? *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 10.
- 650 Gramfort, A., Luessi, M., Larson, E., Engemann, D. A., Strohmeier, D., Brodbeck, C., Goj, R., Jas, M., Brooks,
651 T., Parkkonen, L., and Hämäläinen, M. (2013). MEG and EEG data analysis with MNE-Python. *Frontiers in*
652 *Neuroscience*, 7.
- 653 Gramfort, A., Luessi, M., Larson, E., Engemann, D. A., Strohmeier, D., Brodbeck, C., Parkkonen, L., and Hämäläinen,
654 M. S. (2014). MNE software for processing MEG and EEG data. *NeuroImage*, 86:446–460.
- 655 Haegens, S., Händel, B. F., and Jensen, O. (2011). Top-Down Controlled Alpha Band Activity in Somatosensory Areas
656 Determines Behavioral Performance in a Discrimination Task. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 31(14):5197–5204.
- 657 Heilbron, M. and Chait, M. (2018). Great Expectations: Is there Evidence for Predictive Coding in Auditory Cortex?
658 *Neuroscience*, 389:54–73.
- 659 Herbst, S. K., Fiedler, L., and Obleser, J. (2018). Tracking Temporal Hazard in the Human Electroencephalogram
660 Using a Forward Encoding Model. *eneuro*, 5(2):ENEURO.0017–18.2018.
- 661 Herbst, S. K. and Obleser, J. (2017). Implicit variations of temporal predictability: Shaping the neural oscillatory and
662 behavioural response. *Neuropsychologia*, 101:141–152. Publisher: Elsevier.
- 663 Herbst, S. K. and Obleser, J. (2019). Implicit temporal predictability enhances pitch discrimination sensitivity and
664 biases the phase of delta oscillations in auditory cortex. *NeuroImage*, 203:116198.
- 665 Janssen, P. and Shadlen, M. N. (2005). A representation of the hazard rate of elapsed time in macaque area LIP. *Nature*
666 *Neuroscience*, 8(2):234–241.
- 667 Jaramillo, S. and Zador, A. M. (2011). The auditory cortex mediates the perceptual effects of acoustic temporal
668 expectation. *Nature Neuroscience*, 14(2):246–251.
- 669 Jazayeri, M. and Shadlen, M. N. (2010). Temporal context calibrates interval timing. *Nature Neuroscience*, 13(8):1020–
670 1026.
- 671 Jensen, O. and Mazaheri, A. (2010). Shaping functional architecture by oscillatory alpha activity: gating by inhibition.
672 *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 4:186.
- 673 Klimesch, W., Sauseng, P., and Hanslmayr, S. (2007). EEG alpha oscillations: the inhibition-timing hypothesis. *Brain*
674 *Research Reviews*, 53(1):63–88.
- 675 Kononowicz, T. W. and Rijn, H. v. (2015). Single trial beta oscillations index time estimation. *Neuropsychologia*,
676 75:381–389.
- 677 Kononowicz, T. W., Roger, C., and van Wassenhove, V. (2018). Temporal Metacognition as the Decoding of Self-
678 Generated Brain Dynamics. *Cerebral Cortex (New York, N.Y.: 1991)*.
- 679 Kulashekhar, S., Pekkola, J., Palva, J. M., and Palva, S. (2016). The role of cortical beta oscillations in time estimation.
680 *Human brain mapping*, 37(9):3262–3281.
- 681 Los, S. A. and Horoufchin, H. (2011). Dissociative patterns of foreperiod effects in temporal discrimination and reaction
682 time tasks. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 64(5):1009–1020.
- 683 Maris, E. and Oostenveld, R. (2007). Nonparametric statistical testing of EEG-and MEG-data. *Journal of neuroscience*
684 *methods*, 164(1):177–190.
- 685 Martin, B., Franck, N., Cermolacce, M., Falco, A., Benair, A., Etienne, E., Weibel, S., Coull, J. T., and Giersch, A.
686 (2017). Fragile temporal prediction in patients with schizophrenia is related to minimal self disorders. *Scientific*
687 *Reports*, 7(1):8278.

- 688 Martin, T., Houck, J. M., Bish, J. P., Kičić, D., Woodruff, C. C., Moses, S. N., Lee, D. C., and Tesche, C. D. (2006).
689 MEG reveals different contributions of somatomotor cortex and cerebellum to simple reaction time after temporally
690 structured cues. *Human Brain Mapping*, 27(7):552–561.
- 691 Meindertsma, T., Kloosterman, N. A., Engel, A. K., Wagenmakers, E. J., and Donner, T. H. (2018). Surprise About
692 Sensory Event Timing Drives Cortical Transients in the Beta Frequency Band. *Journal of Neuroscience*, pages
693 0307–18.
- 694 Meirhaeghe, N., Sohn, H., and Jazayeri, M. (2021). A precise and adaptive neural mechanism for predictive temporal
695 processing in the frontal cortex. *Neuron*, 109(18):2995–3011.e5.
- 696 Mento, G., Tarantino, V., Sarlo, M., and Bisiacchi, P. S. (2013). Automatic Temporal Expectancy: A High-Density
697 Event-Related Potential Study. *PLOS ONE*, 8(5):e62896.
- 698 Michon, J. A. (1990). Implicit and explicit representations of time. *Cognitive models of psychological time*, pages
699 37–58.
- 700 Miniussi, C., Wilding, E. L., Coull, J. T., and Nobre, A. C. (1999). Orienting attention in time. Modulation of brain
701 potentials. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, 122 (Pt 8):1507–1518.
- 702 Mioni, G., Capizzi, M., Vallesi, A., Correa, A., Di Giacopo, R., and Stablum, F. (2018). Dissociating Explicit and
703 Implicit Timing in Parkinson’s Disease Patients: Evidence from Bisection and Foreperiod Tasks. *Frontiers in Human
704 Neuroscience*, 12. Publisher: Frontiers.
- 705 Morillon, B. and Baillet, S. (2017). Motor origin of temporal predictions in auditory attention. *Proceedings of the
706 National Academy of Sciences*, 114(42):E8913–E8921.
- 707 Niemi, P. and Näätänen, R. (1981). Foreperiod and simple reaction time. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89(1):133–162.
- 708 Nobre, A. C., Correa, A., and Coull, J. T. (2007). The hazards of time. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 17(4):465–470.
- 709 Nobre, A. C. and van Ede, F. (2018). Anticipated moments: temporal structure in attention. *Nature Reviews.
710 Neuroscience*, 19(1):34–48.
- 711 Palva, S. and Palva, J. M. (2011). Functional roles of alpha-band phase synchronization in local and large-scale cortical
712 networks. *Frontiers in psychology*, 2:204. Publisher: Frontiers.
- 713 Pelli, D. G. (1997). The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: Transforming numbers into movies. *Spatial
714 vision*, 10(4):437–442.
- 715 Petersen, S. E. and Posner, M. I. (2012). The Attention System of the Human Brain: 20 Years After. *Annual review of
716 neuroscience*, 35:73–89.
- 717 Picton, T. W., Woods, D. L., and Proulx, G. B. (1978). Human auditory sustained potentials. I. The nature of the
718 response. *Electroencephalography and clinical neurophysiology*, 45(2):186–197. Publisher: Elsevier.
- 719 Piras, F. and Coull, J. T. (2011). Implicit, Predictive Timing Draws upon the Same Scalar Representation of Time as
720 Explicit Timing. *PLoS ONE*, 6(3):e18203.
- 721 Praamstra, P., Kourtis, D., Kwok, H. F., and Oostenveld, R. (2006). Neurophysiology of Implicit Timing in Serial
722 Choice Reaction-Time Performance. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 26(20):5448–5455.
- 723 Press, C., Kok, P., and Yon, D. (2020). The perceptual prediction paradox. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 24(1):13–24.
724 Publisher: Elsevier.
- 725 Rattat, A.-C. and Droit-Volet, S. (2012). What is the best and easiest method of preventing counting in different
726 temporal tasks? *Behavior Research Methods*, 44(1):67–80.
- 727 Rohenkohl, G. and Nobre, A. C. (2011). Alpha Oscillations Related to Anticipatory Attention Follow Temporal
728 Expectations. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 31(40):14076–14084.
- 729 Rouder, J. N., Speckman, P. L., Sun, D., Morey, R. D., and Iverson, G. (2009). Bayesian t tests for accepting and
730 rejecting the null hypothesis. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 16(2):225–237.
- 731 Sadaghiani, S., Scheeringa, R., Lehongre, K., Morillon, B., Giraud, A.-L., and Kleinschmidt, A. (2010). Intrinsic
732 Connectivity Networks, Alpha Oscillations, and Tonic Alertness: A Simultaneous Electroencephalography/Functional
733 Magnetic Resonance Imaging Study. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 30(30):10243–10250.
- 734 Schneider, D., Herbst, S. K., Klatt, L.-I., and Wöstmann, M. (2021). Target enhancement or distractor suppression?
735 Functionally distinct alpha oscillations form the basis of attention. *The European Journal of Neuroscience*.
- 736 Schütt, H. H., Harmeling, S., Macke, J. H., and Wichmann, F. A. (2016). Painfree and accurate Bayesian estimation of
737 psychometric functions for (potentially) overdispersed data. *Vision Research*, 122:105–123.

- 738 Sergent, C., Baillet, S., and Dehaene, S. (2005). Timing of the brain events underlying access to consciousness during
739 the attentional blink. *Nature neuroscience*, 8(10):1391–1400. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- 740 Sohoglu, E. and Chait, M. (2016). Detecting and representing predictable structure during auditory scene analysis.
741 *eLife*, 5:e19113. Publisher: eLife Sciences Publications, Ltd.
- 742 Solís-Vivanco, R., Jensen, O., and Bonnefond, M. (2018). Top-Down Control of Alpha Phase Adjustment in Anticipation
743 of Temporally Predictable Visual Stimuli. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 30(8):1157–1169.
- 744 Spitzer, B., Gloel, M., Schmidt, T. T., and Blankenburg, F. (2014). Working memory coding of analog stimulus
745 properties in the human prefrontal cortex. *Cerebral Cortex (New York, N.Y.: 1991)*, 24(8):2229–2236.
- 746 Spitzer, B. and Haegens, S. (2017). Beyond the Status Quo: A Role for Beta Oscillations in Endogenous Content
747 (Re)Activation. *eNeuro*, 4(4).
- 748 Strauß, A., Wöstmann, M., and Obleser, J. (2014). Cortical alpha oscillations as a tool for auditory selective inhibition.
749 *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8:350.
- 750 Taulu, S. and Simola, J. (2006). Spatiotemporal signal space separation method for rejecting nearby interference in
751 MEG measurements. *Physics in Medicine & Biology*, 51(7):1759. Publisher: IOP Publishing.
- 752 Team, R. C. (2016). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing,
753 Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 754 Todorovic, A., Schoffelen, J.-M., van Ede, F., Maris, E., and de Lange, F. P. (2015). Temporal Expectation and Attention
755 Jointly Modulate Auditory Oscillatory Activity in the Beta Band. *PLoS ONE*, 10(3):e0120288.
- 756 Toso, A., Reinartz, S., Pulecchi, F., and Diamond, M. E. (2021). Time coding in rat dorsolateral striatum. *Neuron*,
757 109(22):3663–3673.e6.
- 758 van Diepen, R. M., Cohen, M. X., Denys, D., and Mazaheri, A. (2015). Attention and Temporal Expectations Modulate
759 Power, Not Phase, of Ongoing Alpha Oscillations. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 27(8):1573–1586.
- 760 van Ede, F., Rohenkohl, G., Gould, I., and Nobre, A. C. (2020). Purpose-dependent consequences of temporal
761 expectations serving perception and action. *Journal of neuroscience*, 40(41):7877–7886. Publisher: Soc Neuroscience.
- 762 van Wassenhove, V. (2009). Minding time in an amodal representational space. *Philosophical Transactions of the
763 Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 364(1525):1815–1830. Publisher: The Royal Society London.
- 764 van Wassenhove, V. and Lecoutre, L. (2015). Duration estimation entails predicting when. *NeuroImage*, 106:272–283.
- 765 Visalli, A., Capizzi, M., Ambrosini, E., Mazzonetto, I., and Vallesi, A. (2019). Bayesian modeling of temporal
766 expectations in the human brain. *NeuroImage*, 202:116097.
- 767 Wiener, M. and Kanai, R. (2016). Frequency tuning for temporal perception and prediction. *Current Opinion in
768 Behavioral Sciences*, 8:1–6.
- 769 Wiener, M., Parikh, A., Krakow, A., and Coslett, H. B. (2018). An intrinsic role of beta oscillations in memory for time
770 estimation. *Scientific reports*, 8(1):7992.
- 771 Wiener, M., Turkeltaub, P., and Coslett, H. B. (2010). The image of time: A voxel-wise meta-analysis. *NeuroImage*,
772 49(2):1728–1740.