



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

From noise to insight: the functional role of BOLD signal variability and aperiodic neural activity in metacontrol

Zhang, C.

Citation

Zhang, C. (2024, July 4). *From noise to insight: the functional role of BOLD signal variability and aperiodic neural activity in metacontrol*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3766319>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3766319>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Chapter 3

Aperiodic neural activity reflects metacontrol

This chapter is based on:

Zhang, C., Stock, A.-K., Mückschel, M., Hommel, B., & Beste, C. (2023). Aperiodic neural activity reflects metacontrol. *Cerebral Cortex*, 33(12), 7941–7951.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhad089>

Abstract

Higher-level cognitive functions are mediated via complex oscillatory activity patterns and its analysis is dominating cognitive neuroscience research. However, besides oscillatory (period) activity, also aperiodic activity constitutes neural dynamics, but its relevance for higher-level cognitive functions is only beginning to be understood. The present study examined whether the broadband EEG aperiodic activity reflects principles of metacontrol. Metacontrol conceptualizes whether it is more useful to engage in more flexible processing of incoming information or to shield cognitive processes from incoming information (persistence-heavy processing). We examined EEG and behavioral data from a sample of N=191 healthy participants performing a Simon Go/Nogo task that can be assumed to induce different metacontrol states (persistence-biased vs. flexibility-biased). Aperiodic activity was estimated using the FOOOF toolbox in the EEG power spectrum. There was a higher aperiodic exponent and offset in Nogo trials compared to Go trials, in incongruent (Go) trials compared to congruent (Go) trials. Thus, aperiodic activity increases during persistence-heavy processing, but decreases during flexibility-heavy processing. These findings link aperiodic features of the EEG signal and concepts describing the dynamics of how cognitive control modes are applied. Therefore, the study substantially extends the importance of aperiodic activity in understanding cognitive functions.

Keywords: Aperiodic neural activity; Neural noise; EEG; Cognitive control; Persistence; Flexibility.

Introduction

Higher-level cognitive functions are mediated via complex oscillatory activity patterns (Buzsáki, 2006; Fries, 2005; Ward, 2003), and the analysis of these patterns has been dominating cognitive neuroscience research using electrophysiological methods (e.g., using the EEG) for decades. Crucially, such EEG power spectra are comprised of two components: the periodic component (also known as neural oscillations) and the aperiodic component (He, 2014; Voytek & Knight, 2015). Neural oscillations are identified as recurring patterns of brain activity with a particular temporal frequency and have been linked to a wide variety of cognitive processes and behaviors.

The aperiodic component is often described as background activity or “scale-free” broadband activity, which follows a $1/f$ -like distribution with decreasing spectral power across increasing frequency (Donoghue et al., 2020; He, 2014; Pritchard, 1992). This component can be described by a $1/f^x$ function, where f represents frequency and x reflects an exponent that determines the steepness of the decrease in power across frequencies (Donoghue et al., 2020; K. J. Miller et al., 2009; Voytek & Knight, 2015). The aperiodic component of the EEG power spectrum is characterized by the aperiodic exponent (x , $1/f$ slope) and aperiodic offset. The aperiodic exponent is analogous to the negative slope of the log-log transformed power spectrum, reflecting the steepness (or slope) of the decay of power across frequencies (Donoghue et al., 2020). The aperiodic offset denotes the broadband shift in power across frequencies.

The aperiodic component was traditionally treated either as noise or a nuisance variable to be neglected or corrected for (Groppe et al., 2013; Gyurkovics et al., 2021). Generally, the topic of “noise” in neural activity and its relevance for human (cognitive) brain function has attracted considerable importance in recent years (Nakao et al., 2019; Wolff et al., 2022; Zhang & Northoff, 2022). The neurophysiological origin and functional significance of the aperiodic component of the EEG spectrum are currently not fully understood. However, there is accumulating evidence for a cognitive importance of the aperiodic component, as well as its developmental and clinical relevance (Adelhöfer, Paulus, et al., 2021; Donoghue et al., 2020; Gyurkovics et al., 2022; He et al., 2010; Hill et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2017; Merkin et al., 2023; Münchau et al., 2021; Ostlund et al., 2021; Pertermann, Bluschke, et al., 2019; Shuffrey et al., 2022; Virtue-Griffiths et al., 2022; Voytek et al., 2015; Wainio-Theberge et al.,

2021). Of particular interest, recent studies have shown aperiodic activity to be modulated by the behavioral state (Podvalny et al., 2015), task performance (He et al., 2010), arousal level (Lendner et al., 2020), working memory (Donoghue et al., 2020; Virtue-Griffiths et al., 2022), and cognitive control processes, such as response inhibition (Pertermann, Mückschel, et al., 2019). Recent work showed a steeper $1/f$ slope (i.e., increased exponent) during the controlled inhibition of a prepotent response (Pertermann, Bluschke, et al., 2019). More recently, it has been suggested that $1/f$ slope in EEG signals may serve as a marker of “neural variability,” which enables the brain to dynamically adjust its neural activity to meet the demands of a given situation (Waschke et al. 2021b). Both the findings that $1/f$ activity may reflect a process enabling the brain to dynamically adjust its neural activity to meet the demands of a given situation, and findings underlining the relevance of $1/f$ activity in cognitive control (Pertermann, Bluschke, et al., 2019; Pertermann, Mückschel, et al., 2019) suggest that $1/f$ activity may be relevant for the understanding of how the brain dynamically adjust the processing mode/style in higher-level cognitive functions.

The cognitive-control style people prefer or engage in when facing a particular situation has been referred to as “metacontrol” (Hommel, 2015). Situations or so-called control dilemmas do not just call for cognitive functions to operate, but to operate in particular ways. For instance, some situations require or call for a persistent, focused control style—like when facing distracting but irrelevant information, while others require or call for a more flexible, open and associative control style—like when acting under uncertainty. The fact that people can deal with both kinds of situations suggests that they can adjust their control style (to some degree) between extreme persistence and extreme flexibility (Beste et al., 2018; Goschke, 2000; Goschke & Bolte, 2014; Hommel & Colzato, 2017c). A strong bias toward persistence is assumed to imply a strong focus on the current goal and the processing of task-relevant information only, whereas a strong bias toward flexibility should involve a broader focus and openness even to currently task-irrelevant information (Hommel, 2015).

The Metacontrol State Model (MSM: Hommel, 2015) assumes that cognitive control styles reflect metacontrol states that emerge from (or are represented by) the interplay of functional/neural systems promoting persistence on the one hand and flexibility on the other. A persistence bias is characterized by the increased top-down impact of the current goal and stronger competition between alternatives, which makes it easier to stick with goal-consistent

actions and suppress irrelevant information. In contrast, a flexibility bias is characterized by a reduced impact of the goal and irrelevant alternatives, which facilitates the switch to other options. Interestingly, metacontrol biases not only show systematic individual differences, but also vary with task demands (Hommel & Colzato, 2017c; Mekern et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2022). Aperiodic neural activity explains variance in human cognitive control (i.e., response inhibition) (Pertermann, Bluschke, et al., 2019; Pertermann, Mückschel, et al., 2019). If this variance reflects differences in metacontrol states, metacontrol may thus be reflected by aperiodic activity. This will considerably broaden the conceptual relevance of this aspect of neurophysiological activity. This possibility would also fit with considerations that situational noise (i.e., the presence of distracting information) may be an important parameter to adjust metacontrol biases toward more flexibility or persistence (Goschke 2000; Goschke and Bolte 2014; Hommel and Colzato 2017).

Aperiodic activity, as estimated by the slope of the $1/f$ noise function (Dave et al., 2018; He, 2014; He et al., 2010; Voytek & Knight, 2015) (for critique see Touboul & Destexhe, 2017), is determined by the level of neuronal population spiking activity (Voytek & Knight, 2015). This activity contributes to local field potentials which constitute large parts of the EEG signal (Katzner et al., 2009; Musall et al., 2014). Synchronized neuronal spiking activity is associated with reduced neuronal noise. In contrast, asynchronous spiking, related to increased neural noise levels, is associated with a flatter slope (Podvalny et al., 2015), of the $1/f$ parameter. Therefore, the $1/f$ parameter (reflecting aperiodic or “noise” activity) may be of relevance when it comes to concepts (such as metacontrol) drawing on internal “noise” as a parameter regulating the system’s state shifts more to the flexibility or the persistence. The central hypothesis of the current study is thus that metacontrol states, and their dynamic adjustment to task demands, might be reflected by, and thus associated with different levels of aperiodic neural activity.

We tested this hypothesis by assessing the level of aperiodic neural activity during a cognitive control task that can be assumed to induce different metacontrol states (persistence-biased vs. flexibility-biased). A recently developed spectral parameterization approach (Fitting Oscillations and One Over f [FOOOF] (Donoghue et al., 2020) was applied to estimate the aperiodic activity of EEG signals including aperiodic exponent and offset. We attempted to induce different metacontrol states by means of a Simon Go/Nogo task, which combines a

Simon task (Simon, 1969) with a Go/Nogo task (Chmielewski & Beste, 2017). In the Simon task, participants were required to carry out spatial responses (i.e., left and right) to a non-spatial feature of a stimulus (i.e., letter “A” and “B”) presented on the left or right side of the screen. The spatial stimuli are assumed to prime responses in corresponding locations (Hommel, 2011; Simon, 1969), which should facilitate performance if this response is the correct one (i.e., if it is signaled by the relevant stimulus—so-called congruent conditions) but impair performance if this response is the wrong one (i.e., if the relevant stimulus signals the other response)—the incongruent condition. Hence, participants face more response conflict in incongruent than congruent conditions (Hommel, 2011). Overcoming this conflict requires a more persistent control style, supporting a stronger focus on the relevant and more neglect of the irrelevant information (Botvinick, 2007; Botvinick et al., 2004). Accordingly, we expected that incongruent trials would be associated with a stronger metacontrol bias toward persistence than congruent trials.

The Simon task was combined with a Go/Nogo task, which means that in some trials, participants were to withhold their responses. Importantly for our purposes, Go stimuli were more frequently presented (70% Go trials), which can be expected to result in a prepotent Go response. Biased response probabilities are commonly assumed to reduce top-down control demands for the more frequent response(s) and accordingly increase top-down, goal-driven control demands for the less frequent response(s) (Bokura et al., 2001). Accordingly, we expected the Nogo trials to be associated with a stronger metacontrol bias toward persistence than Go trials. The combination of Simon task and Go/Nogo task yielded four conditions, which should be associated with different metacontrol biases: Whereas (frequent) Go trials and congruent conditions would be more likely to come with a comparatively stronger bias toward metacontrol flexibility, (less frequent) NoGo trials and incongruent trials should come with a comparatively stronger bias toward persistence. Moreover, as the Simon conflict in incongruent Simon trials should enhance inhibitory control, which in turn would benefit correct (no) responses in the Nogo condition (for a detailed explanation, see [Chmielewski & Beste, 2017](#)), Nogo congruent trials should come with more persistence-heavy processing (or less flexibility-heavy processing) than Nogo incongruent trials.

Intriguingly, emerging evidence indicates a role of neural activity in the pre-trial period (or between-trial period), which is the time window before the stimuli presentation

during inhibitory control (Adelhöfer, Bluschke, et al., 2021; Adelhöfer & Beste, 2020; Prochnow et al., 2022; Wendiggensen et al., 2022), as it may reflect a “stage-setting state” that affects subsequent cognitive processes. Therefore, besides the typically used within-trial period (i.e., a time window after stimulus presentation), we also assessed aperiodic activity during the pre-trial period.

Materials and methods

Participants

The current study reanalyzed existing data which were collected for other scientific aims with a cohort of $n = 204$ participants. As 13 participants were identified as outliers, the reported analyses are from $n = 191$ participants (99 females; age 18-40 years; $M=24.93$; $SD=4.28$). Participants were identified as outliers and excluded from further data analyses if one of the following criteria were met: false alarm rate in Nogo trials higher than 60%, FOOOF spectra fits (R^2) smaller than the group mean minus three times the standard deviation (SD), and aperiodic exponent or offset values exceeds group mean $\pm 3 \times SD$. All remaining participants were right-handed with no record of neurological or psychiatric illnesses. The present study was approved by the Psychology Research Ethics Committee of Leiden University and by TU Dresden. The original study was approved by the Ethics Commission of the TU Dresden, and all participants provided written informed consent for their participation. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Task

A combined Simon-Go/Nogo task (Chmielewski & Beste, 2017) was employed to assess cognitive control. The different task conditions are illustrated in Figure 1. Participants were presented with letter stimuli and were instructed to make corresponding responses or no response to a given stimulus. In each trial, a letter ‘A’ or ‘B’ was displayed either in normal font (i.e., ‘A’, ‘B’) or in bold italics (i.e., ‘**A**’ or ‘**B**’). A normal font ‘A’ or ‘B’ indicated Go trials in which participants were required to respond as fast as possible, while bold italics ‘**A**’ or ‘**B**’ represented Nogo trials in which responses had to be inhibited. In Go trials, participants were required to press the left “Ctrl” button when the stimulus was an “A” and the right “Ctrl”

button when it was a “B”, regardless of the spatial position of the stimuli. Letter stimuli pseudo-randomly appeared on the left or right side. There were two Go conditions: the congruent Go condition = stimuli were presented on the side of the hand carrying out the response (i.e., ‘A’ on the left side and ‘B’ on the right side); in the incongruent Go condition = stimuli were presented on the opposite side of the hand carrying out the response (i.e., ‘A’ on the right side and ‘B’ on the left side). In Nogo trials, left side ‘*A*’s and right side ‘*B*’s indicated congruent NoGo trials, whereas left side ‘*B*’s and right side ‘*A*’s represented incongruent NoGo trials.

All stimuli were in white color and presented on a black background. A fixation cross was always displayed in the middle of the screen and a white frame box displayed on the left and right sides of the fixation cross was also constantly presented during the task. Each trial started with the letter stimuli presented for 200 ms. In Go trials, participants were asked to respond within 250-1200 ms after stimulus presentation. If no response was made, trials were coded as misses. For NoGo trials, any response within 1200 ms after stimulus presentation was recorded as a false alarm (i.e., a failure to inhibit the response). Each trial ended after 1700 ms. The inter-trial interval (ITI) was jittered between 1100 and 1600 ms. The experiment consisted of 720 trials (70% Go and 30% NoGo trials), of which 50% were congruent trials and 50% were incongruent trials. The test was divided into six equally sized blocks, and trial types were equally distributed across blocks. Before the experiment, each participant completed a practice block of 40 trials.




Figure 1. The Simon Go/Nogo task with all possible stimulus configurations. **(A)** The Simon Go/Nogo task with all possible stimulus configurations. The upper panel displays stimuli in the Go condition. The upper left panel shows stimuli (i.e., ‘A’) which require a left-hand response, whereas the upper right panel shows stimuli (i.e., ‘B’) which require a right-hand response. The lower panel illustrates stimuli (i.e., “A” and “B”) that require no response. **(B)** The schematic of a trial. Each trial began with the letter stimuli presented for 200 ms. In Go trials, a correct response was recorded if participants responded within 250-1200 ms after stimulus presentation. In NoGo trials, any response within 1200 ms after stimulus presentation was recorded as a false alarm. A trial ended after 1700 ms, followed by the ITI jittered between 1100 and 1600 ms.

As behavioral parameters in this Simon Go/Nogo task, we calculated the rate of false alarms (FA, i.e., frequency of responding to a Nogo stimulus), the proportion of correct

responses in Go trials (i.e., hit rate), and reaction times in correct hits (i.e., hit RT) as behavior parameters of interest.

EEG recording and processing

The data were recorded at the Cognitive Neurophysiology Lab at TU Dresden, Germany. During the Simon-Go/Nogo task, the EEG activity was recorded using QuickAmp and BrainAmp amplifiers (Brain Products GmbH, Gilching, Germany) from 60 equidistantly positioned Ag/AgCl electrodes. All electrodes were referenced to Fpz. The data were recorded at a sampling rate of 500 Hz. Electrode impedances were kept below 5 k Ω . The raw EEG data were preprocessed using the “Automagic” toolbox (Pedroni et al., 2019) and EEGLAB (Delorme & Makeig, 2004) on Matlab R2021b (The MathWorks Corp.). First, the raw EEG data were down-sampled to 256 Hz. Afterward, flat channels were removed, and EEG data were re-referenced to average reference. Subsequently, the PREP preprocessing pipeline (Bigdely-Shamlo et al., 2015) was applied to remove line-noise at 50 Hz and calculate a robust average reference after removing bad channels. The EEGLAB `clean_rawdata()` pipeline was used to detrend the EEG data using an IIR high-pass filter of 0.5 Hz (slope 80 dB). Flat-line, noisy, and outlier channels were detected and removed. Epochs with extremely strong power (>15 standard deviations relative to calibration data) were reconstructed using Artifact Subspace Reconstruction (ASR; burst criterion: 15) (Mullen et al., 2013). Time windows that could not be reconstructed were removed. This is followed by a low-pass filter of 40 Hz (sinc FIR filter; order: 86) (Widmann et al., 2015). EOG artifacts were removed using a subtraction method (Parra et al., 2005). Muscle and remaining eye artifacts were classified and removed by an independent component analysis (ICA) based Multiple Artifacts Rejection Algorithm (MARS) (Winkler et al., 2011, 2014). Components containing cardiac artifacts were identified using ICLable (Pion-Tonachini et al., 2019) and removed consecutively. Finally, all removed channels were interpolated using a spherical method.

After preprocessing, the EEG data were segmented and locked to the onset of stimulus. Each segment started at 2000 ms prior to the stimulus and ended at 2000 ms after the stimulus. Segments were built for Go congruent, Go incongruent, Nogo congruent, and Nogo incongruent conditions, separately. Only correct Go and Nogo trials were analyzed further. An automated artifact rejection procedure was applied in the segmented data to remove

trials with residual artifacts (rejection criteria: maximal value difference of 200 μV in a 200 ms interval; activity below 0.5 μV in a 100 ms period). Afterward, a baseline correction was performed using EEG data from -200 to 0 ms (i.e., stimulus onset).

Parameterization of the spectral data

We used EEG data in a time window from 0 to 1000 ms after the stimulus presentation as the within-trial period and a time window from -1000 to 0 ms as the pre-trial period. The power spectral density (PSD) for each frequency was calculated using Welch's method (0.25s Hamming window, 50% overlap) (Welch, 1967). The calculation was implemented in Matlab using the 'pwelch' function. The PSDs were estimated separately for each participant, electrode, condition, and the pre-trial/within-trial period.

To estimate aperiodic activity, the Python-based FOOF toolbox (version 1.0.0; <https://github.com/foof-tools/foof>) was applied to parameterize the power spectra by decomposing the aperiodic and periodic components of the signal (for a detailed overview of this approach see: [Donoghue et al., 2020](#)) as done in previous work (Adelhöfer, Paulus, et al., 2021). The FOOF algorithm conceptualizes the power spectrum as a linear combination of aperiodic activity [$L(f)$] and periodic (oscillatory) activity [$G_n(f)$]. Precisely, the model of the power spectrum can be written as:

$$PSD(f) = L(f) + \sum_n G_n(f)$$

where f represents the frequency. The PSD is the linear combination of the aperiodic component, $L(f)$, and n total Gaussians. The aperiodic component is fit as a function across the entire fitted range of the spectrum. The function for the aperiodic component, $L(f)$, is described as:

$$L(f) = b - \log[f^x]$$

where b is the aperiodic offset reflecting the broadband power shift, and x is the aperiodic exponent which is equivalent to the slope of the line fitted to the power spectrum in a log-log space. The periodic (oscillatory) components are characterized as frequency regions of power over and above the aperiodic component. Each oscillatory component (also referred to as 'peak') is modeled with a Gaussian and characterized by three parameters that define a Gaussian. Each Gaussian fit can be modeled as:

$$G_n(f) = a_n \exp \left[- \frac{(f - \mu_n)^2}{2\sigma_n^2} \right]$$

where a_n is the amplitude, μ_n is the center frequency, and σ_n is the bandwidth of each component.

In order to obtain a reliable estimation of the aperiodic component of data, the power spectra data were fit over a broad range of frequency between 1 to 40 Hz, which is consistent with prior studies (Hill et al., 2022; Ostlund et al., 2021) and recommendations in the FOOOF documentation. The FOOOF algorithm used the settings {aperiodic mode = ‘fixed’, peak width limits = [1, 8], maximum number of peaks = 8, minimum peak height = 0.05, default settings otherwise}. The power spectra were fit for each electrode, each participant, each task condition, and each period. The average R^2 of spectral fits for all participants was 0.98 ($n = 191$).

Aperiodic exponent and offset

The aperiodic exponent and offset were extracted from the aperiodic-only signal for each participant and for each EEG electrode. Due to the absence of priori assumptions regarding the scalp distribution of the aperiodic neural activity, we adopted the “global” exponent and offset in the statistical analysis (Hill et al., 2022). The “global” exponent and offset were obtained by averaging the exponent and offset values across 60 electrodes for each participant. To analyze the scalp distribution of the aperiodic components, we performed an additional cluster-based permutation test where significant results were reached at the global level. The non-parametric cluster-based permutation test was proposed to localize effects in space, frequency, and time, while correcting the multiple comparison problem in high-dimensional EEG/MEG data (see [Maris & Oostenveld, 2007](#) for details). Here, we applied this approach to identify electrodes that differ between conditions over participants. Clusters were formed based on the adjacency of thresholded sample-level F -values ($\alpha = 0.005$). The sum of F -values in a cluster was used as the cluster-level statistics. Significant clusters were obtained based on 1,000 Monte Carlo random sampling using a 0.05 significance level.

Statistical analysis

The aperiodic exponent and offset were analyzed using two-way repeated measures ANOVAs. The factor “Go/Nogo” (Go versus Nogo) and factor “congruency” (congruent versus incongruent) were used as within-participants factors. Simple effect analyses were performed where the interaction effect is significant. All post hoc tests were Bonferroni-corrected. Wilcoxon tests were used to evaluate differences in behavioral performance between task conditions, as our behavioral data (i.e., the hit rate and hit RT in Go trials, and false alarm rate in Nogo trials) were not normally distributed. Paired-sample *t*-tests were employed to test differences in aperiodic activity between the pre-trial and within-trial period. All *t*-tests are two-tailed. Bayesian statistics were reported for all ANOVAs, Wilcoxon tests, and paired-sample *t*-tests. In ANOVAs, the inclusion Bayesian factor (BF_{incl}) was calculated to assess the evidence in the data for including a predictor (Bergh et al., 2020, 2022). For the Wilcoxon test and paired-sample *t*-test, the BF_{10} was used to quantify the evidence supporting the alternative hypothesis over the null hypothesis. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS and JASP packages.

Results

Behavior results

The descriptive results of behavioral data are illustrated in Figure 2. Wilcoxon tests showed that, within Go trials, the rate of correct responses (hit rate) in the congruent condition (0.96 ± 0.03) was significantly higher than the incongruent condition (0.95 ± 0.05) ($Z = -6.00$, $p < 0.001$; $BF_{10} = 53513.87$). Reaction times (RTs) in the congruent condition ($511 \pm 81\text{ms}$) were significantly faster than in the incongruent condition ($529 \pm 77\text{ms}$) ($Z = -9.76$, $p < 0.001$; $BF_{10} = 5.63 \times 10^6$), indicating a robust Simon effect. The false alarm rate was significantly higher in the congruent Nogo condition (0.13 ± 0.12), as compared to the incongruent Nogo condition (0.10 ± 0.10) ($Z = -8.81$, $p < 0.001$; $BF_{10} = 9.72 \times 10^6$).




Figure 2. Descriptive statistics for behavioral data. **(A)** shows the hit rate in Go trials; **(B)** displays the mean reaction time (RT) in Go trials; **(C)** depicts the false alarm rate in Nogo trials. Each violin plot contains a boxplot. The black dot within the box represents the median; the box in the center represents the interquartile range; the vertical black line depicts the remaining distribution, except for any data points identified as "outliers" (i.e., those more than 1.5 standard deviations above or below the median).

Aperiodic exponent and offset results in the pre-trial and within-trial period

Figure 3 shows the PSD in a log-log space at the frequency from 1 Hz to 40 Hz for different experimental conditions in the within-trial period and pre-trial period, separately. PSDs were averaged across electrodes and participants.




Figure 3. Log-log transformed power spectral densities averaged across electrodes and participants. **(A)** shows PSDs in the within-trial period; **(B)** displays PSDs in the pre-trial period. The left figure showed PSDs for congruent trials, and the right figure displayed PSDs for incongruent trials.

In the pre-trial period, two-way repeated measures ANOVAs revealed no significant main effect or interaction effect for either the aperiodic exponent or the aperiodic offset (all $p > 0.05$, $BF_{\text{incl}} < 1$).

In the within-trial period, the two-way repeated measures ANOVA for the aperiodic exponent revealed a significant Go/Nogo main effect ($F(1,190) = 37.64$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.17$; $BF_{\text{incl}} = 2.09 \times 10^6$). The aperiodic exponent in the Nogo condition (1.15 ± 0.13) was higher than the Go condition (1.14 ± 0.13), thus indicating more aperiodic activity in the Nogo condition than the Go condition. A significant interaction between Go/Nogo and congruency was evident ($F(1,190) = 8.98$, $p = 0.003$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.05$; $BF_{\text{incl}} = 13.53$). The simple effect analysis showed that, within Go trials, the aperiodic exponent in the incongruent condition (1.14 ± 0.13) was significantly higher than the congruent condition (1.14 ± 0.13) ($p < 0.001$; $BF_{10} = 193.72$).

Within Nogo trials, no significant difference was found in the aperiodic exponent between the congruent and incongruent condition ($p > 0.05$; $BF_{10} = 0.04$) (see Figure 4A and B).

The analysis for the within-trial aperiodic offset showed a significant Go/Nogo main effect ($F(1,190) = 60.56$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.24$; $BF_{incl} = 1.43 \times 10^{10}$). The aperiodic offset in the Nogo condition (0.61 ± 0.22) was higher than the Go condition (0.59 ± 0.21). A significant interaction effect between Go/Nogo and congruency was also found ($F(1,190) = 7.30$, $p = 0.008$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.04$; $BF_{incl} = 5.52$). More precisely, within the Go condition, the aperiodic offset was significantly higher in incongruent trials (0.59 ± 0.21) compared with congruent trials (0.58 ± 0.21) ($p = 0.001$; $BF_{10} = 51.12$). No significant difference was found between congruent and incongruent trials in offset in Nogo condition ($p > 0.05$; $BF_{10} = 0.05$) (see Figure 4C and D).




Figure 4. Descriptive results for the within-trial aperiodic exponent and offset in different Simon Go/Nogo conditions. (A) and (B) show the violin plot and line plot for the aperiodic exponent in different task conditions; (C) and (D) reveal the violin plot and line plot for the aperiodic offset in different

experimental conditions. Each violin plot contains a boxplot. The horizontal line within the box represents the median; the box in the center represents the interquartile range; the vertical black line depicts the remaining distribution, except for any data points identified as "outliers" (i.e., those more than 1.5 standard deviations above or below the median). In line plots, error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

The above analyses were based on the aperiodic exponent and offset averaged across all electrodes. To explore the scalp distribution of aperiodic parameters, we performed a cluster-based permutation test to detect electrodes contributing to significant differences between task conditions. The analysis was performed for the within-trial period only, as no difference was identified in the pre-trial period at the "global" level. The scalp topography for the aperiodic exponent and offset is shown in Figure 5. For the aperiodic exponent parameter, the "Go/Nogo \times congruency" interaction was evident at FC2, FC3, FC4, Cz, C4, and CP2. The significant "Go/Nogo \times congruency" interaction effect in the offset parameter was observed at FC1, FC2, CZ, and CP2. We found a broad range of electrodes across frontal, central, temporal, posterior, and occipital areas where aperiodic exponent and offset in Go trials were significantly different with them in Nogo trials. Vastly evident differences were observed in frontal-central and posterior regions.




Figure 5. Scalp distributions of the aperiodic exponent and offset in the within-trial period. Scalp topographies in the upper row show electrode sites with significant “Go/Nogo × congruency” interaction effect (the upper left figure) and Go/Nogo main effect (the upper right figure) in the aperiodic exponent. Scalp topographies in the lower row show electrode sites with significant “Go/Nogo × congruency” interaction effect (the lower left graph) and Go/Nogo effect (the lower right graph) in the aperiodic offset. Labels are shown for significant clusters of electrodes. The colors denote cluster-level summed F-values.

The comparison of aperiodic activity in pre-trial and within-trial period

To test the difference in aperiodic activity between the pre-trial and within-trial time window, we performed paired-sample *t*-tests for the aperiodic exponent and the aperiodic offset separately. Results reflected significantly higher aperiodic activity in the within-trial period compared to the pre-trial period in all task conditions (all $p < 0.001$, $BF_{10} \geq 2.41 \times 10^{64}$) (see Table 1), indicating increased aperiodic neural activity for task execution (i.e., in the within-trial period).

Table 1. Comparisons of aperiodic exponent and offset between the pre-trial period and within-trial period

	Exponent					Offset					
	Pre-trial	Within-trial	$t(1, 190)$	p	BF_{10}	Pre-trial	Within-trial	$t(1, 192)$	p	BF_{10}	
Conditions	Go congruent	1.03 ± 0.13	1.14 ± 0.13	31.36	<0.001	4.86 × 10 ⁷³	0.45 ± 0.21	0.58 ± 0.21	27.3	<0.001	2.40 × 10 ⁶⁴
	Go incongruent	1.03 ± 0.13	1.14 ± 0.13	32.47	<0.001	1.19 × 10 ⁷⁶	0.45 ± 0.21	0.59 ± 0.21	28.54	<0.001	2.03 × 10 ⁶⁷
	Nogo congruent	1.04 ± 0.13	1.15 ± 0.13	30.34	<0.001	2.57 × 10 ⁷¹	0.45 ± 0.21	0.61 ± 0.22	27.32	<0.001	2.55 × 10 ⁶⁴
	Nogo incongruent	1.03 ± 0.13	1.15 ± 0.13	30.82	<0.001	2.98 × 10 ⁷²	0.44 ± 0.21	0.61 ± 0.22	28.38	<0.001	8.79 × 10 ⁶⁶

Discussion

The main aim of the present study was to test whether the broadband aperiodic activity in the EEG power spectrum is associated with demand-specific biases of metacontrol toward persistence or flexibility. To achieve this, we tested the aperiodic activity in the EEG power spectrum during a Simon Go/Nogo task in the pre-trial period and within-trial period, separately. Using the cluster-based permutation test, we then examined the scalp distribution for aperiodic exponent and offset parameters. Several key findings emerged from this study: First, in the within-trial period, the aperiodic exponent and offset were higher in the Nogo condition than in the Go condition. The aperiodic activity in incongruent trials was higher than in congruent trials in the Go condition; however, the difference failed to reach significance in the Nogo condition. In contrast, in the pre-trial period, no significant difference was detected for aperiodic activity between experimental conditions. Second, we found significant Go/Nogo effects in the aperiodic exponent and offset across a number of electrodes over the scalp, and Go/Nogo \times congruency effects in several frontal and central electrodes. In addition, we observed increased aperiodic activity across task conditions in the within-trial period, as compared with the pre-trial period.

Importantly, our findings suggest that aperiodic activity measured in the EEG power spectrum reflects metacontrol states or, more specifically, dynamic adjustments of metacontrol states to task demands. More concretely, in the within-trial period, we observed increased aperiodic exponent and offset values in the Nogo condition than in the Go condition. As explained above, the infrequent Nogo trials should have induced more response conflict, which would need to be overcome with a stronger persistence bias in metacontrol (Hommel, 2015). In contrast, in Go trials, the stimulus conditions unequivocally support the correct response, so that participants can afford a more flexible metacontrol state. Another indication that metacontrol is reflected in aperiodic activity is that, in the Go condition, the aperiodic exponent and offset values were higher in (persistence-heavy) incongruent trials than in (flexibility-friendly) congruent trials. As discussed above, incongruent trials can be assumed to induce more response conflict. Given that both responses are legal responses in the task, this conflict can only be overcome by relying on goal-information, which in turn implies a stronger metacontrol bias toward persistence. Taken together, these findings suggest that

aperiodic activity increases during persistence-heavy processing, but decreases during flexibility-heavy processing.

Several studies have demonstrated that aperiodic activity is modulated by the behavioral state (Podvalny et al., 2015), task performance (He et al., 2010), and arousal level (Lendner et al., 2020). A recent study by Pertermann et al. (2019a, b) who recorded EEG activity during the motor response inhibition task, found a steeper “ $1/f$ slope” (i.e., higher aperiodic exponent) when inhibiting a prepotent response. Our results extend previous findings by demonstrating that aperiodic activity reflects the demand-specific metacontrol state, with increased values during persistence-heavy processing and reduced values during flexibility-heavy processing. It is also noteworthy that the main effect or interaction effect did not reach significance in the pre-trial period (i.e., before the stimulus presentation). This observation may suggest that the modulation of aperiodic activity is reactive and stimulus-induced—which would fit with the counter-intuitive idea that control operations may be driven by the environment (Dignath et al., 2019; Waszak et al., 2003). Based on MEG data, recent research has shown that aperiodic activity demonstrates less significant task-related changes than oscillatory activity, indicating a more stable aspect of brain activity (Wainio-Theberge et al., 2022). Our results expand upon prior findings and indicate that, while aperiodic activity can serve as a stable background for neural activity, it also demonstrates the capacity to adapt to changing cognitive demands. Furthermore, the observation of higher aperiodic activity in the within-trial period than in the pre-trial period indicates a tight connection between aperiodic activity and metacontrol states, in keeping with recent findings that the steepness of $1/f$ activity increases after auditory stimulation (Gyurkovics et al., 2022).

Although the precise neurophysiological and cognitive mechanisms underlying aperiodic activity remain under discussion, several potential explanations for the aperiodic exponent in EEG signals have been proposed. The “neural noise” account assumes that aperiodic exponent in EEG signals is a measure of the level of noise in the underlying neural circuits (Dave et al., 2018; Gao, 2016; He et al., 2010; Voytek et al., 2015; Voytek & Knight, 2015). Synchronized neural spiking activity results in a steeper $1/f$ slope and is associated with an increased signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) in the nervous system, whereas asynchronous spiking activity gives rise to a flatter $1/f$ slope and decreased SNR (Podvalny et al., 2015; Voytek et al., 2015; Voytek & Knight, 2015). The neural noise account of aperiodic activity has been

extensively employed to gain a better understanding of clinical phenomena, such as schizophrenia (Wolff et al., 2022), Tourette syndrome (Adelhöfer, Paulus, et al., 2021; Münchau et al., 2021), ADHD (Ostlund et al., 2021), and age-related cognitive decline (Dave et al., 2018; Voytek et al., 2015). Recently, researchers have considered that $1/f$ slope in EEG signals may serve as a marker of “neural variability”, which enables the brain to dynamically adjust its neural activity to meet the demands of a given task or situation (Waschke, Kloosterman, et al., 2021). Hence, our findings may indicate that different metacontrol states manifest in altered levels of neural variability, with decreased neural noise/variability during persistence-heavy and increased neural noise/variability during flexibility-heavy processing.

The potential mechanisms underlying the link between aperiodic activity and metacontrol are not yet fully understood. One possible account is that neural variability may be related to the dynamics of cortical network states, which could be associated with the representation of goal- and task-related information (Armbruster-Genç et al., 2016; Deco, Rolls, et al., 2009; Nogueira et al., 2018; Tsujimoto et al., 2008). In persistence-heavy processing, the system needs to maintain a stable representation of task goals to focus on task-relevant stimuli and ignore task-irrelevant stimuli (Hommel, 2015). The sustained representation of task goals may require fewer transitions between cortical network states, reflected by lower neural variability (Armbruster-Genç et al., 2016; Durstewitz & Seamans, 2008; Tsujimoto et al., 2008). Therefore, lower aperiodic activity may be associated with more stable cortical network states and sustained representations of the task goal. However, in flexibility-heavy processing, the system is less bounded by the task goal and sensitive to task-irrelevant stimuli (Hommel, 2015). This may require/result in more frequent and easier transitions between cortical network states (Armbruster-Genç et al., 2016; Durstewitz & Seamans, 2008; Tsujimoto et al., 2008). Thus, higher neural variability may be associated with easier switches between cortical network states and unstable representations of goal-information. However, this interpretation is currently speculative and requires further research in the future.

In a broader sense, the link between neural noise/aperiodic activity and metacontrol is consistent with previous fMRI findings showing that higher levels of brain variability (i.e., high brain noise) facilitate cognitive flexibility, but impair cognitive stability (Armbruster-Genç et al., 2016). Recent work found that higher levels of resting-state fMRI signal variability

are associated with increased flexibility bias of metacontrol (or decreased persistence bias of metacontrol), which also points to an association between neural “noise” and individual metacontrol policies (Zhang et al., 2022). The present findings provide evidence for an interesting connection between neural noise in terms of EEG signal and cognitive metacontrol states.

Moreover, physiological evidence has shown that the balance between excitation and inhibition (E/I) can be estimated from the exponent of the EEG power spectrum (Gao et al. 2017; Lombardi et al. 2017). A flatter exponent is assumed to be driven by an increased E/I ratio, whereas a steeper exponent is assumed to be induced by a decreased E/I ratio (Gao et al., 2017; Lombardi et al., 2017). The association between E/I balance and aperiodic activity has been implicated in several studies. For example, Lendner and colleagues discovered that aperiodic exponent can distinguish arousal levels, and higher values found in REM sleep than in NREM sleep, and higher values in NREM sleep than during wakefulness (Lendner et al., 2020). These findings align with *in vivo* calcium imaging evidence in mice that indicates a shift toward predominant inhibition in cortical networks during REM sleep (Niethard et al., 2016). More recently, a study revealed that aperiodic exponent increased under propofol anesthesia (which results in a relative increase of inhibition), and decreased under ketamine anesthesia (which results in a relative increase of excitation) (Waschke, Donoghue, et al., 2021). The present findings may indicate a decreased E/I ratio during persistence-heavy processing, whereas an increased E/I ratio during flexibility-heavy processing. Our results suggest that the state of metacontrol might be associated with a shift toward increased inhibitory tone or toward increased excitatory tone within neural circuits. Even though the aperiodic exponent has been demonstrated to approximate E/I balance (Gao et al., 2017; Lombardi et al., 2017), evidence for joint changes between E/I balance, aperiodic variability, and behavior is still lacking.

Future work may test whether control-related changes in aperiodic activity affect behavior in a direct or indirect manner. The scalp distribution results indicate that the difference in aperiodic activity between the Go and Nogo condition is relatively global, given that a broad range of electrodes on the scalp showed a significant Go/Nogo effect for both exponent and offset. In contrast, only a few electrodes in the frontal and central scalp contribute to the congruency effect in the Go condition, indicating a region-specific

congruency effect. The finding that aperiodic offset reflects metacontrol states also warrants further investigation. Evidence from humans and macaques demonstrated that broadband power shifts are positively correlated to neuronal population spiking (Manning et al., 2009; Ray & Maunsell, 2011). Thus, our present observation of an enlargement in aperiodic offset during persistence-heavy processing and a reduction during flexibility-heavy processing could be tentatively interpreted to reflect control-state dependent changes in the spiking rates of cortical neurons. The current study opens a window on the role of aperiodic activity in metacontrol, but the precise mechanisms underlying this association remain to be determined.