Listening to speech recruits specific tongue motor synergies as revealed by transcranial magnetic stimulation and tissue-Doppler ultrasound imaging
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The activation of listener’s motor system during speech processing was first demonstrated by the enhancement of electromyographic tongue potentials as evoked by single-pulse transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) over tongue motor cortex. This technique is, however, technically challenging and enables only a rather coarse measurement of this motor mirroring. Here, we applied TMS to listeners’ tongue motor area in association with ultrasound tissue Doppler imaging to describe fine-grained tongue kinematic synergies evoked by passive listening to speech. Subjects listened to syllables requiring different patterns of dorso-ventral and antero-posterior movements (/ki/, /ko/, /ti/, /to/). Results show that passive listening to speech sounds evokes a pattern of motor synergies mirroring those occurring during speech production. Moreover, mirror motor synergies were more evident in those subjects showing good performances in discriminating speech in noise demonstrating a role of the speech-related mirror system in feed-forward processing the speaker’s ongoing motor plan.

1. Introduction

Actions are central components of social interaction and communication among individuals [1,2]. Among interactive actions, speech is a special case. In fact, speech is the only complex motor behaviour that is inherently human and constitutes a fundamental means to convey intentions and beliefs during social interaction. Speech, defined as the ability to produce sounds by coordinating and moving specific oral motor structures, has indeed shown to elicit mirror-like activities in the listener. The first and most convincing proof on the activation of motor areas during listening of speech sounds came from transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS). Fadiga et al. [3] demonstrated a modulation of tongue motor-evoked potentials (MEPs) while listening to words and pseudo-words containing an alveolar trill (i.e. /birro/ for pseudo-words as opposed to /birra/ for words). The study designed by Fadiga et al. [3] had supra-threshold TMS delivered in a time-locked manner to speech stimuli (100 ms after the onset of the critical sound). Watkins et al. [4] were able to show that speech, in either auditory or visual form, induced larger orbicularis oris MEPs only for the stimulation of the left hemisphere. These pioneering studies demonstrated that the motor system is somatotopically [3] activated by both listening and watching speech stimuli, with a left hemisphere advantage [4].

An additional critical aspect that emerged in these studies was related to the temporal deployment of speech listening-evoked motor resonance. Roy et al. [5] explicitly manipulated TMS timing with respect to the presentation of speech sounds (words and pseudo-words) by taking into account word frequency as well. Interestingly, they found that TMS-revealed motor facilitation was related to word frequency. Frequency effects were not present in the first 100 ms,
whereas at 200 and 300 ms, MEPs were found to be much larger for the rare words than for common words and pseudo-words. According to these results, it seems that motor resonance is critical during early phonological parsing for speech processing in general but, at later stages, lexical frequency overrides such a mechanism by eventually exploiting top-down completion.

More recently, D’Ausilio et al. [6] recorded tongue cortico-bulbar excitability during phoneme expectation induced by stimulus predictability (the stimulus characteristics could be anticipated with 75% probability). Results showed that motor mirroring is not merely a passive and automatic response to environmental stimuli but that it normally anticipates incoming sensory events by formulating specific feed-forward hypotheses. This feed-forward motor activity is continuously tested against incoming and subtle cues, such as co-articulation features.

Summing up, 20 years after the discovery of mirror neurons [7] and 10 years after the discovery of the same mechanism in speech perception [3], just a handful of papers have been published on this topic. The reason is probably not owing to the lack of interest on the topic. The fact that the listeners’ motor system participates in speech perception has important and wide implications for many disciplines. One possible reason why there are few TMS studies on this topic is probably owing to the additional complexity in recording electromyography (EMG) responses from the tongue and the impossibility of discriminating motor synergies from the electric patterns. In fact, using the traditional surface electrode placement tongue muscles cannot be dissociated. The tongue is indeed characterized by many degrees of freedom (at least six, as shown by [8]) supported by a complex muscles anatomy [9]. Furthermore, and more in general, the combined use of TMS and EMG to analyse changes in cortico-bulbar excitability has proved more challenging than the study of the cortico-spinal pathway [10–13].

In this study, we seek to deploy and test the potentiality of a new method to record whole tongue movement synergies evoked by TMS. We used ultrasound tissue Doppler imaging (UTDI) to measure local tongue kinematics during both speech production and perception. UTDI is a standard ultrasound technique, mainly used in cardiology to analyse the local functionality of heart, which employs the Doppler effect to assess structures moving towards or away from the probe, and their relative velocity. To our knowledge, there is only one study using UTDI on speech production, but authors used very different data processing and visualization techniques, which, unfortunately, did not allow full tongue visualization (M-mode; [14]). On the other hand, ultrasound data were successfully used since the 1980s to measure kinematic features of tongue dorsum movements [15]. In those cases, position data had to be tracked frame by frame in order to extract velocity and acceleration profiles from consecutive frames. UTDI data, instead, are better suited for the extraction of velocity information from single snapshots following a given event of interest.

In this study, we first verified the reliability of this approach in recording tongue movements during speech production. Afterwards, we ran a study where subjects were passively listening to some syllables, selected for their mutual distance in terms of motor patterns, while single-pulse TMS was applied to subjects’ tongue motor cortex in the exact moment at which the syllables where maximally different during production and a UTDI image was acquired. Subsequently, by using a series of image-processing tools to extract movement features, we were able to demonstrate dissociable patterns in the listeners in agreement with production patterns. Showing the modulation of local patterns of motion during speech listening, specifically matching the patterns of articulation is an additional strong proof that the motor system deploys a specific mirroring of heard speech gestures.

2. Material and methods

This work consists of a pilot–UTDI study and a TMS–UTDI study. The first one was used to decide the experimental stimuli and the optimal timing of TMS delivery for the TMS–UTDI study. The pilot–UTDI study consisted in the recording of UTDI data during speech production. The TMS–UTDI study was divided into three consecutive sessions: speech production, speech listening and speech discrimination (see Experimental procedure and figure 1a).

(a) Subjects

The pilot–UTDI study was run on one right-handed participant (M, age 33). Eleven right-handed subjects participated in the TMS–UTDI study (three males; mean age: 25.7±s.d., 3.9). All subjects had normal hearing abilities and gave informed consent to the experimental procedures, according to the Declaration of Helsinki and the local ethics committee. Subjects were all screened for contraindications to TMS and no immediate or delayed undesired effects of stimulation were produced. Subjects were paid for their participation. The pilot–UTDI study lasted approximately 2 h, and the TMS–UTDI study lasted less than 90 min.

(b) Ultrasound tissue Doppler imaging

A colour Doppler ultrasonic machine (Philips, CX30 CompactX-treme Ultrasound System) was used with a specific TDI transducer (S4–2, Broadband Sector Array Transducer; 4–2 MHz extended frequency range) with TDI acquisition depth of 9 cm and velocity range of ±2.5 cm. UTDI images acquire data about local motion away or towards the transducer, thus ignoring any component tangential to the probe.

UTDI images could be acquired either in a continuous or triggered mode (figure 1b). The triggered mode acquires one single image. Ultrasound or UTDI images acquisition, by definition, requires time. The temporal resolution is limited by the sweep speed of the acoustic beam. And the sweep speed is limited by the speed of sound, as the echo from the deepest part of the image has to return before the next pulse is sent out at a different angle in the neighbouring beam. Our acquisition parameters (depth and number of lines) were constrained by the necessity to record the whole tongue. Therefore, the maximal acquisition frequency was 83 Hz, and thus each image was acquired in about 12 ms, starting from the trigger we provided. Thus, velocity is referred to events happening after 10 ms and no later than the subsequent frame acquisition at 22 ms. Here, we used the continuous mode to record tongue movements during speech productions and the triggered mode during recording of TMS-evoked responses. Continuous acquisitions were performed at 83 frames per second (12.048 ms interval between two consecutive images).

UTDI data acquisition, in the triggered mode, was synchronized by using an Arduino board [16]. A transistor-transistor logic pulse was sent to the UTDI machine (0.5 Hz) as the Philips CX30 can acquire single snapshots following a rhythmic input. The Arduino board also sent triggers to the psychtoolbox script controlling the audio stimuli and to the TMS machine (figure 1d). Timing of all triggers, data acquisition and audio output was checked beforehand by using an external I/O board with microsecond precision (Power 1401 CED, Cambridge Electronics, UK).

UTDI raw data were converted in portable network graphics (PNG) files by the XMedCon software (Free Software Foundation). The PNG images were converted to the Hue Saturation Value
TMS was delivered through a figure-of-eight coil (70 mm) using a monophasic stimulator (Bistim, Magstim Co., Whitland, UK). The left tongue primary motor cortex was first functionally localized by means of visual online inspection of triggered UTDI images. The best spot was identified by progressively decreasing TMS intensity during the mapping procedure [17] and marked on the scalp. Intensity of stimulation during the experiment was the lowest capable of evoking a detectable UTDI pattern in the tongue muscles, five times out of five consecutive pulses (mean 56.3% of stimulator output maximum intensity; s.d., 4.6). TMS was triggered through the Arduino system [16] controlled by custom-made software. TMS was delivered 200 ms after auditory stimuli onset. Previous studies [5] suggest that TMS stimulation applied between 100 and 300 ms after stimulus onset maximize motor response amplitude and selectivity. Such temporal window is also in agreement with the results of the pilot study (figure 2) showing the maximal difference between tongue positions starting around 200 ms after voice onset.

In the TMS study, the use of the UTDI-triggered mode was motivated by the short average latency of tongue MEPs (starting at 8 ms [5,10]) relative to the sampling rate of UTDI. The continuous mode cannot be triggered and thus, considering an 83 Hz acquisition frequency, the TMS-induced tongue twitch might have occurred between frames. Single images were thus acquired 10 ms after the delivery of the TMS, given the fact that the UTDI machine requires some time to acquire an image, velocity is referred to events happening after 10 ms and no later than 22 ms. However, MEPs and tongue movements elicited by TMS are coupled and have different latency and duration [18]. In general, the electromechanical delay during voluntary movement is owing to biomechanical properties of the muscles and joints as well as the resistance of the measuring device [19]. In our case, we had no measuring device on the tongue to impede motion. Also, the tongue is characterized by peculiar biomechanical properties (e.g. no elastic component in series, type of motor units, weight/force ratio, etc.) that minimize such a delay. Furthermore, TMS-evoked twitches are generated by the activation properties (e.g. no elastic component in series, type of motor units, weight/force ratio, etc.) that minimize such a delay. Furthermore, TMS-evoked twitches are generated by the activation
and position data. In both tests, TMS (monophasic stimulator; Please note, in figure 3 on the three axis and then subtracted the average pre-TMS values. We computed the vector norm of the positions EMG (ZeroWire wireless system, sampling at 2 Khz) and synchro-

ject. We used an Optotrak Certus system (NDI, Inc., sampling at 1.2 Khz) with active markers. We recorded 25 trials with both and accelerometric data onset. In the second test, we recorded the tongue MEPs together with tongue kinematics in another sub-

of many upper motor neurons in an almost synchronous manner, leading to a contraction that is faster than voluntary movements. Therefore, in our specific case, such an electromechanical delay is minimal, in the range of few milliseconds and, if we add that the UTDI machine itself needs some computing time to extract velocity data, 10 ms was the optimal time interval between triggers to TMS and UTDI.

Further confirmation that such a delay was in the range of few milliseconds come from two additional tests we run. In the first one, we measured MEPs co-registered with accelerometer of the tongue (figure 3a), whereas in the second, high-speed tongue tip position data and MEPs (figure 3b). In the first test, we recorded the tongue MEPs together with tongue motion via an accelerometer in one subject. The three-axis analogue accelerometer was custom built by our electronic laboratory facility to be extremely light (only 20 g, 8 × 8 × 1.5 mm, to reduce the problems with measuring true electromechanical delays). We recorded 25 trials with both EMG (ZeroWire wireless system, sampling at 5 Khz) and synchronized accelerometer data (same sampling). We computed the vector norm of the accelerations on the three axis and then subtracted the average pre-TMS values. Please note, in figure 3a the negligible delay between MEP onset and accelerometric data onset. In the second test, we recorded the tongue MEPs together with tongue kinematics in another sub-

(e) Syllables stimuli
The stimuli (/ki/, /ti/, /ko/, /to/) are characterized by different points of articulation. The critical articulator is the tongue, as the velar phoneme /k/ requires a more posterior realization than the coronal phoneme /t/. When considering vowels, the realization of /i/ is more anterior than /o/. Their combinations produce a large variation in tongue movements, which was con-

Magstim Co., Whitland, UK) was applied on the tongue motor area at 120% of the resting motor threshold. These tests were con-

ducted on laboratory members according to international safety and ethical standards.

(f) Experimental procedure
The TMS–UTDI study consisted of three sessions, which were con-

ducted during the same day. In the speech production session, participants read aloud the four syllables while recording continuous UTDI data (see the electronic supplementary material, figure S1 for
Each trial consisted of the presentation of only one syllable, through headphones by using the psychtoolbox functions in MATLAB (Mathworks, Inc.; 280 trials composed by 4 syllables per condition). Audio stimuli were presented through headphones by using the psychtoolbox functions in MATLAB (Mathworks, Inc.). Each condition (four syllables, noise and silence) was repeated 15 times for a total of 90 trials. Inter-trial intervals ranged from 10 to 20 s. On 10% of the trials, they were asked to perform a one-back task (i.e. to repeat which was the last sound heard) in order to control for attention. When recording UTDI, subjects were leaning their chin on a chinrest and their forehead on an adjustable head harness (figure 1a). The transducer was placed externally along the inferior midline of the mandible, just anterior to the hyoid bone (figure 1c).

In the speech discrimination session, we measured subjects’ ability to discriminate syllables in noise. The auditory syllables (/ti/, /ka/, /ki/, /ka/) were embedded in seven levels of increasing grey-noise (see Syllables stimuli). Audio files were randomly presented through earphones, by using the psychtoolbox functions of MATLAB (Mathworks, Inc.; 280 trials composed by 4 syllables × 7 noise levels × 10 repetitions). The task was to identify as fast and as accurately as possible the last presented syllable by pressing, with the right index finger, one of the four buttons associated with the auditory presentation of the syllables (button-stimulus association was counterbalanced across subjects). We measured reaction times (RTs) and accuracy. In the first training session, subjects learned how to use the response pad, supported by feedback about correctness (all four syllables at 5% of the grey-noise level, repeated three times each, for a total of 12 trials). The second training session was devised to familiarize with different noise levels in the stimuli, without feedback about the correctness. Finally, subjects did the task with the two extremes of noise levels (5% and 95%, for each of the four syllables, with two repetitions and a total of 16 trials).

(g) Analyses

(i) Transcranial magnetic stimulation–ultrasound tissue Doppler imaging

Each image collected during the speech listening session was preprocessed (see Ultrasound tissue Doppler imaging) to obtain numerical matrices (600 × 800 pixels) with positive or negative values coding for the intensity of the pixelwise velocity with respect to the transducer. Images displaying less than 1% of pixels with non-zero values were excluded from subsequent analysis (29 images excluded from a total of 990 images). Those images were characterized by almost no motion, which could have been induced by technical problems. At a single-subject level, each condition was averaged. Images for ‘noise’ and ‘silence’ conditions were averaged and used as a baseline. The baseline was then subtracted from the average images of the four syllables. For each of these resulting images, three features were extracted: mean velocity, negative percentage and positive percentage. Mean velocity is the average value of the non-zero pixels. Negative and positive percentage is the number of pixels with either negative or positive values respect to the total number of pixels in the image.

In the second step, each image was divided into four clusters on the basis of the spatial distribution of pixels in the whole image. Clustering was performed by using the k-mean function with the Hartigan–Wong algorithm. The four clusters were labelled as anterior, posterior, dorsal and ventral and coordinates of the geometrical centroids were calculated (figure 5a). Mean velocity, percentage of negative and positive pixels were calculated for each cluster.

All variables were analysed by means of a repeated measure analysis of variance, using as within-subject factors vowel (two levels: ‘I’, ‘O’) and consonant (two levels: ‘K’, ‘T’). All analyses were run using the R statistical package [20].
RTs with increasing levels of noise (mean $z_F$ + 0.387 no significant interaction ($S_3: 0.051\% ; S_4: 0.087\% ; S_5: 0.294\% ; S_6: 0.136\% ; S_7: 0.113\% ; 0.387 \pm 0.16$). The main effect for vowel was also significant ($F_{1,10} = 15.18, p < 0.01$), caused by longer RTs for the identification of /i/ sounds ($0.31 \pm 0.07$) with respect to /o/ sounds ($-3.1 \pm 0.07$). No other main effects or interactions were found.

The central scope of this experiment was to measure individual differences in coping with different levels of noise when actively discriminating the experimental stimuli. In order to obtain an individual measure of the increase in RTs depending on noise level, we fitted a linear model using the $z$-transformed RTs as a dependent variable and noise as the independent variable. The linear fit was applied at the single-subject level and for each vowel and consonant, separately. The estimated slope resulting from the linear model fit was considered as an indicator of the degree of change of RTs depending on noise. This measure was then used to seek for correlations with TMS–UTDI results.

3. Results

(a) Transcranial magnetic stimulation–ultrasound tissue Doppler imaging

Every syllable was repeated a variable number of times (four to eight) and magnetic stimulation was delivered only during the last repetition. During no-TMS trials, images were acquired for each audio stimulus with the same timing. We extracted one image per trial, for all subjects, while listening to the syllable preceding and no TMS stimulation. The mean percentage of active pixels for each subject, while passively listening to syllables and no TMS, was always lower than 0.3% and on average 0.11%. Please note that such amount of activity is one order of magnitude smaller than our instrument artefact rejection criteria (Subject1: 0.017%; S2: 0.252%; S3: 0.051%; S4: 0.087%; S5: 0.294%; S6: 0.136%; S7: 0.113%; S8: 0.039%; S9: 0.028%; S10: 0.159%; S11: 0.126%).

For the TMS trials, the mean velocity of tongue showed no significant interaction ($F_{1,10} = 0.002, p = 0.96$) but significant consonant main effect ($F_{1,10} = 6.498, p = 0.05$) and vowel main effects ($F_{1,10} = 5.011, p = 0.05$), with a prevalence of negative velocities for /k/ (−0.11 ± 0.15 arb. units) and /o/ sounds (−0.18 ± 0.11) and a prevalence of positive velocities for /t/ (0.06 ± 0.12) and /i/ sounds (0.13 ± 0.17) (figure 4a).

The percentage of positive pixels showed no significant interaction ($F_{1,10} = 1.81, p = 0.21$) but a significant consonant main effect ($F_{1,10} = 5.838, p < 0.05$) and no significant vowel main effect ($F_{1,10} = 3.786, p = 0.08$), with a larger percentage of negative pixels during the listening of /k/ sounds (7.78 ± 0.34%) with respect to /t/ sounds (7.33 ± 0.40%) together with a slight, but not significant, increase during the listening of /o/ sounds (7.97 ± 0.37%) with respect to /i/ sounds (7.15 ± 0.46%) (figure 4c).

The percentage of positive pixels showed no significant interaction ($F_{1,10} = 0.171, p = 0.69$), no significant consonant main effect ($F_{1,10} = 4.33, p = 0.064$) as well as no significant vowel main effect ($F_{1,10} = 2.5, p = 0.14$; figure 4d).

Analyses on the four regions identified by the K-means clustering analysis showed dissociative patterns of UTDI signals specific to these regions. In the posterior cluster, main velocity showed no significant interaction ($F_{1,10} = 0.682, p = 0.43$) but a significant consonant main effect ($F_{1,10} = 5.628, p < 0.05$) and no significance for the vowel main effect ($F_{1,10} = 0.337, p = 0.57$), owing to a prevalence of negative velocities for the /k/ sound (−0.20 ± 0.16 arb. units) with respect to a substantially neutral balance between positive and negative motions in /t/ (0.03 ± 0.21), as shown in figure 5c.

In the ventral cluster, main velocity showed no significant interaction ($F_{1,10} = 1.833, p = 0.21$) but a significant consonant main effect ($F_{1,10} = 5.683, p < 0.05$) and no significance for the vowel main effect ($F_{1,10} = 4.413, p = 0.062$) owing to a prevalence of positive velocities for the /i/ sound (0.21 ± 0.15 arb. units) and /o/ sounds (0.27 ± 0.19) with respect to a neutral balance between positive and negative motions in /k/ (−0.09 ± 0.15) and a negative prevalence in /o/ (−0.15 ± 0.15), as shown in figure 5d.

In the dorsal cluster, the percentage of positive pixels showed no significant interaction ($F_{1,10} = 0.721, p = 0.42$), no significant consonant main effect ($F_{1,10} = 1.142, p = 0.31$) but a significant vowel main effect ($F_{1,10} = 5.536, p < 0.05$), showing greater percentage of positive pixels during the listening of /i/ (2.34 ± 0.14% of pixels) with respect to /o/ sounds (1.97 ± 0.15%), as shown in figure 5e.

Moreover, the distance between the centroid of the posterior cluster and the most anterior portion of active tongue muscle on the antero-posterior axis was calculated and analysed, showing no significant interaction ($F_{1,10} = 0.842, p = 0.38$), no significant consonant main effect ($F_{1,10} = 0.95, p = 0.35$) but a vowel main effect ($F_{1,10} = 4.994, p < 0.05$). The effect was owing to a greater distance between these points (as shown in figure 5b), thus showing a more anterior extension for the tongue, during the listening of syllables containing the /i/ (281.2 ± 13.1 pixels) with respect to the /o/ sounds (276.6 ± 12.7 pixels).

(b) Transcranial magnetic stimulation–ultrasound tissue Doppler imaging and speech discrimination during speech discrimination

The slope values obtained from the linear fit between RTs and noise levels at individual-subject level were correlated with the variables that showed a modulation in the TMS–UTDI experiment. No correlations were found between slope values and mean velocity or the percentage of negative pixels. A strong positive correlation between slope and the percentage of positive pixels was found for /o/ ($r = 0.75$, $p < 0.01$) and /k/ sounds ($r = 0.75, p < 0.001$), to a lesser extent for /i/ sounds ($r = 0.62, p < 0.05$) and no significant correlation for /t/ sounds ($r = 0.55, p = 0.08$). The presence of these correlations means that the more the participants were affected by noise in speech discrimination the greater was the percentage of positive pixels evoked by TMS for the same stimulus.

As the second step, we focused on the significant effects shown in the clustered data. We correlated RT slope values
Figure 4. UTDI–TMS results. The figure shows the UTDI–TMS results by measuring the mean velocity (a). Panel (b) shows the schematic of tongue positions for each of the two consonants (/t/ and /k/) and two vowels (/i/ and /o/). The lower part of the figure contains the negative (c) or positive (d) motion. Area of motion is defined as the percentage positive or negative pixels over the total number of pixels. Asterisks denote significant comparisons and bars represent the standard error of the mean. (Online version in colour.)

Figure 5. Tongue regional kinematic differences. Panel (a) shows the clustering results in an exemplar UTDI–TMS image. K-means clustering separated the images into a dorsal, ventral, anterior and posterior clusters based only on spatial distribution of data. Crosses represent the centroid of each cluster. Note that here the tongue image has been rotated. Panel (b) shows the distance between the posterior cluster and the most anterior activity in the anterior cluster for the two vowels /i/ and /o/. Panel (c) shows the percentage of positive pixels in the dorsal cluster for the two vowels. Panels (d,e) show the mean velocity in the ventral and posterior clusters, respectively, for the two consonants (/t/ and /k/) separately. Asterisks denote significant comparisons and bars represent the standard error of the mean. (Online version in colour.)
4. Discussion

The idea that listener’s motor representations contribute to speech perception has been the central prediction of several theoretical models [21–23]. By contrast, several competing theories have suggested that a purely sensory analysis is sufficient for speech classification [24]. The discovery of mirror neurons [7] has provided the direct neural demonstration that the motor system becomes activated during perception. This evidence has been shown valid for speech as well by TMS studies on motor facilitation during speech perception, as revealed by tongue EMG [3,25].

Here, we show a new method that combines TMS and UTDI to gain a new level of detail when studying speech-induced motor mirroring. In fact, previous TMS recording of corticobulbar excitability could only show a rather coarse picture of the activation in the motor system [3–6,26,27]. UTDI, instead, can visualize local tongue motion with great spatial detail. We were thus able to reliably separate patterns of movements evoked by TMS during listening to four different syllables (figure 4a) varying in place of articulation (coronal versus velar) and position in vowel space (frontal versus posterior).

The pattern of motor-evoked activities was in agreement with the expected direction of velocities. In fact, the pilot-UTDI study (figure 2) showed movements towards the transducer (red shifts in two out of three ROIs) for the /i/, as opposed to that of the /o/ vowel (blue solid line shift in one ROI, red (dash-dotted) line shift in one ROI) starting at 200 ms after speech onset. Accordingly, TMS applied at 200 ms evoked more positive (red or dash-dotted) activity during the listening of syllables containing the /i/ as opposed to negative (blue or solid) activity evoked by the /o/ sounds. Interestingly, we could elicit a pattern that is specific both in terms of motion type and temporal deployment, suggesting that the motor system, during passive speech listening, employs a mirroring strategy that is extremely accurate.

When looking at the different clusters, a larger positive motion for /i/ with respect to /o/ was present in the dorsal area (figure 5c) suggesting that the global movement towards the transducer was mostly accounted by the postero-dorsal aspect of the tongue. This is in agreement with tongue position during the vocalization of /i/ where the anterior part moves anteriorly and the tongue back is lowered (figure 4b). Here, for the /i/ sound, we observe the tongue back moving towards the transducer, whereas motion towards the alveolar ridge is perpendicular to the recording probe and thus invisible to the machine. However, the antero-posterior extension of the tongue could be derived by measuring cluster centroid distances. Such a measure was significantly larger when listening to /i/ as opposed to /o/ (figure 5b).

The differences between coronal and velar sounds were on larger negative values for /k/ as opposed to /t/ sounds (figure 4a,c). The global larger negative motion for /k/ was clarified by the clustered analyses. In fact, most of the negative shift was accounted by the posterior cluster and to a minor extent by the ventral cluster. Such pattern of spatial segregation of velocities is in agreement with speech production patterns. In fact, velar sounds production requires the raising of the posterior part of the tongue towards the velum and away from the transducer (figure 4b), which is exactly what we observed when subjects listened to /k/ as opposed to /t/.

Summing up, in this work we describe a complex regional pattern of movements elicited by TMS during passive listening to speech sounds, which are in detailed agreement with known articulatory descriptions of speech production. This evidence was provided by using TMS in conjunction with
UTDI to extract complex motor synergies from tongue kinematics with an unprecedented level of fine-grained details. Previous research demonstrated that single-pulse TMS can elicit complex patterns of hand movement synergies representing the most frequent grasping configurations [28]. However, this is the first time, to our knowledge, that TMS-induced tongue motor synergies are described and that specific motor patterns can be selected by passive listening speech. Such an improvement in descriptive power shows a clear theoretical advancement with respect to previous studies [3–6,26,27] and opens up to more studies that can be implemented with such a technology. In fact, the selective recruitment of tongue motor synergies during passive listening to speech is the critical prediction of any mirroring hypothesis on brain speech sound classification.

In addition to that, we also show that motor recruitment during speech perception predict subjects’ ability to discriminate speech in noise. From a computational perspective, the role of the motor system can be that of compensating for the increased ambiguity of the stimuli [29,30]. Subjects that are more impaired by increasing levels of noise should be in principle relying less on a motor compensation strategy. Here, we show that subjects with a decreased ability to discriminate speech in high levels of noise were those with globally more positive activations in the UTDI–TMS images. Correlation run on clustered data shows that such increase in positive motion was in the direction of reducing differences across motor-evoked patterns (figure 6). This latter results suggest that subjects relying less on a motor simulative strategy when actively discriminating speech, were those that evoked less detailed motor patterns when passively listening to the same material.

As a matter of fact, our previous investigations, with a TMS interference paradigm [31–34], show that the contribution of the motor system to speech discrimination is associated with the signal-to-noise ratio. We suggested that the motor system contributes to speech discrimination, with a process of stimuli reconstruction, when the signal is ambiguous [34]. Such hypothesis was based only on behavioural data (RTs and accuracy). In this study, we find that greater efficiency in discriminating speech in noise is associated with the activation of very detailed motor synergies when passively listening. This is a strong neurophysiological confirmation that the degree of articulatory mirroring is associated with the amount of environmental noise and variability. This result is in agreement with our previous data [31,32] and gives important support to the hypothesis that mirroring in speech is an active process of distal articulatory inference in service of stimuli discrimination.

Motor theories of speech perception started from different assumptions but all converged on the prediction that motor activities should have been observed during passive listening to speech [21–23]. This was long before modern neuroimaging could show that, as it was possible with TMS, such a prediction was true. With the present result, we move one step further by showing that the motor system, during speech listening, replicates the complexity of the motor patterns involved in production. From our results, it emerges that the motor system does not just resonate passively to global effectorwise features [3,4] but that it rather implements a refined simulation of the speaker motor control features. Moreover, the granularity level of the evoked motor representation may vary between individuals and could explain individual differences in discriminating speech in noise. Indeed, this is an additional and radically novel proof that, when dealing with ambiguous speech signals, we implement a compensation strategy that is specifically motor rather than a-modal.

All subjects in the study gave informed consent to the experimental procedures according to the Declaration of Helsinki and the local ethics committee.
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