



Published in final edited form as:

Trends Cogn Sci. 2017 June ; 21(6): 434–448. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2017.03.008.

Neural Noise Hypothesis of Developmental Dyslexia

Roeland Hancock, PhD¹, Kenneth R. Pugh, PhD^{2,3,4,5}, and Fumiko Hoeft, MD, PhD^{1,2,6}

¹Department of Psychiatry and Weill Institute for Neurosciences, University of California, San Francisco (UCSF). 401 Parnassus Ave. Box-0984, San Francisco, CA 94143

²Haskins Laboratories. 300 George Street, New Haven, CT 06511

³Department of Linguistics, Yale University. 370 Temple Street, New Haven, CT 06520

⁴Department of Radiology and Biomedical Imaging, Yale University. 330 Cedar Street, New Haven, CT 06520

⁵Department of Psychological Sciences, University of Connecticut. 406 Babbidge Road, Storrs, CT 06269

⁶Department of Neuropsychiatry, Keio University School of Medicine. 35 Shinanomachi, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, Japan 160

Abstract

Developmental dyslexia (decoding-based reading disorder; RD) is a complex trait with multifactorial origins at the genetic, neural and cognitive levels. There is evidence that low-level sensory processing deficits precede and underlie phonological problems, which are one of the best-documented aspects of RD. RD is also associated with impairments in integrating visual symbols with their corresponding speech sounds. Although causal relationships between sensory processing, print-speech integration and fluent reading, and their neural bases are debated, these processes all require precise timing mechanisms across distributed brain networks. Neural excitability and neural noise are fundamental to these timing mechanisms. We propose that neural noise stemming from increased neural excitability in cortical networks implicated in reading is one key, distal contributor to RD.

Keywords

Reading; neural oscillation; neurogenetics; excitability; glutamate

Premise of the neural noise hypothesis

Developmental dyslexia (specific reading disabilities, or decoding-based reading disorders; RD) is a neurodevelopmental disorder contributed to by multiple genetic, neural and

Correspondence: fumiko.hoeft@ucsf.edu (F. Hoeft) and roeland.hancock@ucsf.edu (R. Hancock).

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

cognitive factors [1], yet neurobiological models that account for the diversity of RD phenotypes remain elusive. An increasing number of studies have investigated the function of RD risk genes in animal models [2–13], and the neurobiological and behavioral consequences of RD risk variants in humans [14–31], motivating the need for a synthesis of these findings, especially as they relate to emerging avenues of human research on the role of neurochemistry [32] and neural oscillations [33–36] in RD. We present a timely integration of diverse lines of current research linking some of the key neural and behavioral deficits associated with RD to basic neural processes.

A variety of neurobiological contributors to RD have been proposed, ranging from disrupted structural and functional connectivity [37,38] to atypical neural migration [39]. Recent work has investigated the neural dynamics that support language and sensory processing [40–42] and how these dynamics may be altered in RD [36,43]. We integrate these emerging lines of research to propose that excess neural noise (Box 1) within cortical regions implicated in reading may be a distal contributor to RD. We suggest that multifactorial sources of neural noise, for example arising from neural hyperexcitability related to RD risk genes, may disrupt two key processes important for reading—**phonological awareness** [44] (see glossary) and **multisensory integration** of visual symbols with their corresponding speech sounds [45,46]—through the impact of excess noise on neural synchrony and sensory representations (Figure 1). The neural noise hypothesis of RD synthesizes a range of neurobiological findings, providing a mechanistic framework for understanding the deficits observed in RD and identifying targets for systems-level intervention. While the potential for noisy processing in RD has been previously considered at the levels of perceptual processes [47,48], phenomenological computational models [49,50], and subcortical neurophysiology [51], we present a novel neural hypothesis that grounds noisy processing in a neurobiological framework from genetics to behavioral phenotypes. This opinion highlights potential sources of neural noise in RD, the potential impact of neural noise on sensory processing as it relates to phonological processing and reading, and how different regional sources of neural noise may produce deficits that can be relatively specific to reading and its subcomponent processes.

Box 1

Neural Noise

Broadly defined, neural noise refers to sources of random variability in the firing activity of neural networks and membrane voltage of single neurons. Noise can originate from multiple sources, such as physical fluctuations in the function of ion channels and the release of neurotransmitters into the synapse, or synaptic activity from other neurons, mediated by network connectivity. Operationally, neural noise can be considered as stochastic variability in the neural response to repeated presentations of the same stimulus (as opposed to non-stochastic response variability, such as adaptation effects). For example, we consider a neuron that spikes at widely variable intervals in response to a repeated stimulus presentation to be noisier than one that spikes at nearly the same time following each presentation.

Neural noise, particularly that mediated by the activity of other neurons, is closely linked to neural excitability and the balance of excitatory and inhibitory activity within a neural network. Local excitatory neural activity produces feedback neural inhibition, through excitatory synaptic connections with inhibitory interneurons which in turn synapse onto the original pyramidal cells (Figure 2a). This produces a rapid rise in inhibitory synaptic conductance that is time-locked to the initial stimulus-dependent rise in excitation, producing a narrow time window for neural firing and enabling temporally precise and synchronized neural responses [110]. Dysregulation of the excitation-inhibition balance can lead to neural noise reflected in increased variability in neural firing and a loss of spike timing precision (Figure 2b,c).

Neural information processing may be optimal with respect to cognitive processing within a range of moderate noise. While we focus on the detrimental effects of excess neural noise, some level of neural noise can facilitate information transfer through stochastic resonance. Stochastic resonance occurs when weak periodic inputs combine with noise to trigger neuronal firing that is synchronized with the input. In the absence of noise, such weak inputs would normally be below the threshold for inducing neural activity and would not be retransmitted through the brain effectively increasing the signal-to-noise ratio of neural processing [113]. On the other hand, when a neuron is close to or above the firing threshold, neural noise will lead to spontaneous neural activity that can reduce synchronization between neural activity within a network and external inputs. The neural noise hypothesis of RD is an attempt to account for some features of RD in terms of this noise-related loss of synchronization.

Potential sources of neural noise in RD

RD has a partially genetic basis [52] and is associated with neural anomalies that appear before formal literacy instruction [53]. These anomalous regions in temporoparietal and occipitotemporal cortices also have high expression of RD risk genes [28], although these genes are also expressed elsewhere in the brain. Several genetic risk variants have been associated with RD, with an average allele frequency of .28 in a U.S. RD population [28]. In a German population, short DCDC2 deletions were found in 18% of RD individuals vs. 9% of controls [30]. The moderate to high heritability of RD suggests that other, unidentified, genes are also involved in RD. Much of the research in humans and animal systems has focused on two RD risk genes, KIAA0319 and DCDC2.

Severe disruptions, using gene knockout or knockdown techniques, to the rodent homologs of these two genes have been associated with abnormal neural migration in rodents. In humans, polymorphisms and small deletions in these RD risk genes have been associated with macroscopic changes in cortical structure [22,27] and functional activation [17,20] in analogous regions within the human reading network, and reading-related behavioral impairments in multiple languages [16,19,21,26,54]. Animal models inform speculation into the origins of RD, although there is a substantial gap between animal models and the effects of common allelic variants in the human brain. RD risk genes suggest two pathways—enhanced **glutamatergic** signaling and disrupted neural migration—to increased neural

noise. Each of these pathways may increase neural noise by creating a state of neural hyperexcitability, in which the normal balance of neural excitation and inhibition is shifted. Balanced levels of excitation and inhibition within cortical pyramidal-interneuron networks are important for the developmental tuning of cortex to sensory input, maintaining neural timing and information processing [55] (Figure 2a). Hyperexcitability in these local networks can disrupt excitation-inhibition balance and the precise timing of neural activity. Although neural noise can arise from multiple sources, we focus on cortical hyperexcitability as a plausible source of noise in RD. We review evidence for neural noise stemming from these two genetically-mediated pathways in RD as examples of multiple noise sources in RD, and discuss the downstream consequences of increased neural noise as it relates to key reading-related processes.

Glutamatergic signaling

Evidence that DCDC2 modifies neural activity within the excitatory glutamatergic pathway implicates increased neural excitability as a source of neural noise in RD. Mice with reduced or disabled function of the **homologous** *Dcdc2* gene have increased release of glutamate, expression of glutamate (N-methyl-D-aspartate [NMDA]) receptor genes, NMDA excitability and spontaneous activity, and spike timing variability [5,56] in cortical neurons. These phenotypes can be rescued using NMDA antagonists [5]. Other *Dcdc2* animal models show impaired rapid auditory processing [3,8], similar to the deficits found in children at risk for RD [57]. These auditory deficits may be partially accounted for by the increase in glutamatergic excitability associated with loss of *Dcdc2* function. As shown schematically in Figure 2b, increased glutamatergic activity disrupts the excitation-inhibition balance of cortical neurons, decreasing the precision of spike timing and increasing neural noise. Another RD risk gene homolog, *Kiaa0319*, has also been associated with greater trial-by-trial firing rate variability in response to speech and non-speech sounds and with increased neural excitability in primary auditory cortex [10].

These models are complemented by human studies of neurochemistry and brain stimulation. Excitatory left hemisphere **transcranial direct current stimulation** (tDCS) has been shown to impair rapid auditory processing [58], consistent with a link between hyperexcitability and impairments in the prerequisite analysis of rapidly changing auditory stimuli needed for phonological processing [59]. However, excitatory tDCS [60] and **transcranial magnetic stimulation** (TMS) [61,62] over temporoparietal regions have also been found to improve reading skills indicating a high degree of inconsistency in past findings. Even within studies, there are inconsistencies; for example, excitatory left temporoparietal tDCS was found to improve only speeded real worded reading, but not reading accuracy or nonword reading [60]. In contrast, excitatory TMS over either right or left temporoparietal regions (including STG and IPL) yielded improvements only in nonword reading accuracy, but not real word reading or speed in both typical and RD adults [61,62]. These studies suggest that modulating cortical excitability may have consequences for reading. It is currently unclear however, which aspects of reading these techniques affect. These studies also provide conflicting evidence in terms of whether RD might be associated with high (as predicted by our hypothesis) or low excitability.

Studies of endogenous neurochemistry in humans also point towards increased excitability. Recently, we reported increased levels of glutamate in RD, measured from occipital visual cortex using **magnetic resonance spectroscopy** (MRS), and an overall negative association between children's reading skill and glutamate [32]. Although MRS measurements of glutamate do not allow inference about a neural mechanism for increased excitability, MRS glutamate concentrations are positively correlated with cortical excitability [63]. More generally, left-lateralized expression of genes associated with glutamatergic function has been found within the superior temporal gyrus and auditory cortex [64], suggestive of a relationship between glutamatergic signaling and lateralized auditory processing, which is thought to be significant in language processing [65]. Collectively, these studies suggest hyperexcitability in RD due to enhanced glutamatergic signaling as a source of deficits in rapid auditory processing and reading.

Disrupted neural migration

A second source of hyperexcitability-related neural noise arises from interactions between neurons. Local cortical circuits are networks of excitatory pyramidal neurons and inhibitory interneurons, and both excitatory and inhibitory synaptic connections are needed to maintain excitation-inhibition balance. Thus, the synaptic structure of a cortical microcircuit is an important determinant of its noise characteristics, and disruptions to the development of typical interconnections may have consequences for neuronal excitability and noise (Figure 2c). Animal research suggests that RD risk genes play a role in neural migration processes, and that mutant versions of these genes can produce abnormal cortical structure and synaptic connectivity. For example, *Dcdc2* has been linked to the abnormal migration of pyramidal neurons [28] and reduced dendrite growth, although *Dcdc2* mutations alone may not be sufficient to produce abnormal neural abnormalities [9]. Neural migration, of both pyramidal and **GABAergic** interneurons, is also associated with *Kiaa0319* [12] and *Dyx1c1*, another RD risk homolog [6]. At the macroscopic scale, there is convergent evidence for altered cortical structure in RD throughout the reading network [28,39,66], which may be mediated by risk genes such as *DCDC2* [27,28]. While more work is needed to understand how disrupted neural migration associated with RD risk genes affects the organization of cortical microcircuits, it is unlikely that excitation-inhibition balance is maintained in abnormally migrating circuits.

The animal research summarized here implicates two key RD risk genes—*DCDC2* and *KIAA0319*—in abnormal cortical development, increased neural noise and degraded auditory processing, based on neural phenotypes found when expression of these genes is silenced or reduced. Translating these findings, which involve dramatic gene disruptions in rodents, to an understanding of how common variants affect the function of the human brain remains a challenge for future research. Although the genetic variants associated with RD are suspected to result in reduced gene expression (for example, of *KIAA0319* [67,68]), the level of reduction may not be comparable to the levels induced in model organisms, so it is currently unknown how well these model phenotypes reflect those of humans with RD risk alleles. In addition, there is evidence that the interference technique used to produce knockdown phenotypes (employed by Centanni et al. [3,10]) can have phenotypic effects unrelated to the target gene [69,70]. Finally, we note that these genes have also been

associated with neurobiological phenotypes other than those discussed, such as corpus callosum area in rats (Kiaa0319 [13]) and white matter integrity in humans, in both corpus callosum and left arcuate fasciculus (DCDC2 del[25]).

Collectively, evidence from animal models, along with convergent findings in humans, suggests a link between RD risk genes and abnormal cortical microcircuits.

Electrophysiological studies of RD risk gene function have provided direct evidence for hyperexcitability and increased neural noise (albeit in animals). Although more speculative as a mechanism, disrupted neural migration associated with genetic RD risk is also predicted to lead to hyperexcitability and noisy neural processing.

Downstream neural effects of neural noise in RD

Neural noise has multiple consequences for cognition and brain function, particularly sensory processing [71]. We highlight the loss of neural synchronization as a consequence of neural noise and discuss the impact of noise on encoding speech stimuli, a process particularly relevant to developing phonological awareness.

The synchronized activity of large numbers of neurons forms the basis for information processing [72], perception, particularly multisensory perception [73], and integrating and encoding sensory inputs. Synchronization at both exogenous and endogenous levels is important for sensory processing. At the exogenous level, the activity of the local circuits becomes entrained to external stimuli. At delta (2–4 Hz) and theta (4–7 Hz) frequencies, fluctuations in neural membrane potentials become entrained to quasi-periodic features in stimuli, for example speech stress patterns. Neural entrainment to external stimuli paces periods of local neural excitability, producing cross-frequency coupling with gamma oscillations (~30–50Hz) [42,74,75], and may play a key role in encoding speech (Box 2). Low frequency phase-resetting may also be important in multisensory integration [76], e.g. print-speech integration. Together, exogenous and endogenous synchronization are thought to form a basis for integrating and encoding sensory information over multiple time scales from slow prosodic and stress contours to more rapid changes that distinguish phonemes.

Box 2

Sensory coding by neural oscillations

Sensory stimuli, such as speech, is processed in multiple time windows of neural processing. These windows determine the rate at which sensory information is sampled, which in turn determines which features of the sensory stimuli can be encoded and differentiated. Neural time windows for this process of temporal integration is closely linked to neural excitability. At the level of local neural circuits, excitatory activity triggers a closely following period of inhibition during which sensory input is integrated in the interval before the next spike. This cyclic process, synchronized across a large number of neurons, imposes a physiological constraint on sensory processing [114], notably on the encoding of phonemic changes important in phonological processing. Excitation-inhibition balance is critical in regulating the frequency of these excitation-inhibition cycles [115]. Recent models [108,109] of this process show that phonemic

transitions can be encoded in three such ~25 ms cycles of excitation-inhibition (or gamma cycles, referring to the frequency [$\sim 30\text{--}50\text{Hz}$] of the associated oscillations). These models provide insight into the dependence of phonological representations on the frequency of neural oscillations and their dependence on neural noise and spike variability. In particular, stimulus representations become less robust (i.e., more easily confusable in terms of neural activity) in the presence of neural noise [109], which may be a source of phonological processing difficulty in RD (Figure 1).

In addition to the general consequence of noise-induced synchronization loss, changes in excitation-inhibition balance, as in the case of hyperexcitability, affect the time window available for sensory processing. Changes in the time window for sensory integration—either increases or decreases from the typical window period—are likely to have negative consequences for phonological processing. Reducing the time window of integration, effectively averaging stimulus changes over a shorter time period, can reduce the reliability of sensory processing. Increasing the integration window can reduce sensitivity to rapid changes in the stimulus, such as phonemic transitions and produce overly broad phonetic sensitivity, which has been observed in RD [116,117].

Hyperexcitability can affect synchronous neural processing, the rate at which sensory stimuli are sampled and encoded, the precise spike timing needed for multisensory integration, and spike timing dependent plasticity needed for learning multisensory associations [77–79]. At an exogenous level, thalamocortical projections deliver the filtered speech signal to auditory cortex. If the receiving neurons in auditory cortex are hyperexcitable, these thalamocortical projections could trigger spikes at input levels below those associated with onsets in the speech signal, disrupting delta/theta **phase-locking** that normally serves to entrain neural oscillations to speech [75]. As a consequence, periods of neural excitability within auditory cortex may become misaligned with the speech signal. Thus, hyperexcitability may provide a mechanism for the loss of exogenous synchronization between speech and neural oscillations found in RD. For example, low frequency phase-locking of neural oscillations to the **speech envelope** is reduced in RD [43,80]. This failure to synchronize to external input at low frequencies has previously been proposed to account for many features of RD [81].

At the endogenous level, hyperexcitability may affect the sampling and encoding of speech, a prerequisite for phonological awareness. Gamma oscillations reflect underlying periods of neural excitability and the frequency of these oscillations may be a critical factor in how rapidly sensory stimuli is sampled (Box 2). Since phonemes are distinguished by fairly rapid acoustic changes, aligning the neural sampling rate is critical for establishing neural representations that distinguish phonemes. In RD, the rate of gamma oscillations has been found to be abnormally fast [35,36], which may link increased neural noise to atypical phonemic representations, leading to impaired phonological processing in RD.

Reading-related consequences of neural noise observed in RD

Reading development is a process of multimodal integration, critically dependent on tuning phonological and orthographic neural representations and establishing mappings between these. Reading relies on multiple component processes, including sensory processing (often

under perceptually noisy conditions), intact phonological awareness, orthographic processing and the ability to map graphemes to their corresponding speech sounds. The implications of neural noise for some of these critical processes are discussed below.

Sensory processing

As we have discussed above, neural noise can impact the low-level perceptual processes, such as processing temporally varying auditory stimuli, that may contribute to the development of phonological representations [82]. A review [59] found a moderate effect size ($d=.6$) for impaired discrimination of frequency modulated (FM) stimuli at slow (2 Hz) modulation rates in RD in both children and adults. Although FM discrimination has been found to be a predictor of reading ability [82], some studies have failed to find FM discrimination differences between RD and typical readers [83]. For example, a comparison between children with RD, and typical readers with and without hearing loss found that FM discrimination differed significantly only in the hearing loss group [84]. However, another study found no behavioral difference in 5 Hz FM discrimination, but found reduced mismatch negativity amplitudes in RD adults [83], suggesting there may be subtle auditory processing impairments in RD, even when these are not behaviorally evident.

Perceptual noise exclusion and learning

Behavioral studies in humans suggest that perceptual noise exclusion is impaired in RD in both visual [47,48] and auditory domains [85]. Results from modelling of in vivo responses from gerbil primary auditory cortex in response to phonemes in noise suggest that the dynamic nonlinear control of neural thresholds, requiring both synaptic depression and gain adjustments, is critical for reducing the effects of perceptual noise [86]. In particular, synaptic depression was found to be necessary for suppressing additive perceptual noise of the type used in studies in noise exclusion in RD [85]. In the case of neural hyperexcitability, this necessary synaptic depression may be limited, producing the perceptual noise exclusion deficits found in RD. As Ziegler et al. [85] suggested, a perceptual noise exclusion deficit offers a simple explanation for RD: children cannot adequately extract phonemic information needed to learn phoneme-grapheme mappings in the noisy classroom environment. However, our hypothesis suggests that a deeper impairment—neural noise—limits the development of phonological awareness in RD, even under ideal listening conditions.

Phonological awareness

Phonological awareness is an early prerequisite skill for successfully learning to read and its deficit often considered one of the central features of RD [44]. Phonological awareness includes the ability to identify and manipulate linguistic units at both the phonemic and syllabic levels. Sublinguistic acoustic features appear to be encoded within the spectrotemporal fields of auditory cortex [87], and may be expected to lead to phonological awareness deficits with less precision in the presence of neural noise (see Box 2). More generally, excess neural noise also impairs the capacity of populations of neurons to maintain stable patterns of activity, which is detrimental to both forming and maintaining representations. Under low signal-to-noise ratio conditions, activity in neural populations, such as those tuned to represent phonemes and other higher order features [88] may

spontaneously fluctuate [89], disrupting information processing. This consequence of neural noise has potentially wide implications in RD, from developing phonological awareness to degrading phonological memory.

Degraded phonemic representations (above and Box 2) are expected to compromise phonological awareness at the phonemic level and lead to many of the behavioral deficits observed in RD, as detailed in early connectionist models of noisy processing in RD [50]. Neural noise is also expected to impact awareness at the syllabic level through reduced neural synchronization to the speech envelope (above). We suggest that noisy firing at the arriving projections to local cortical circuits will prevent selective oscillatory entrainment to speech features, such as onsets [75]. Several studies have found that individuals with RD have reduced sensitivity to rhythmic patterns in the speech envelope, particularly at the syllabic rate [90,91], which some studies have attributed to impaired neural entrainment to the speech signal at low frequencies relevant to stress and syllabic segmentation [34]. There is also evidence for deficient phase locking to both the fine structure of speech [92] and speech envelope in RD [81], consistent with the hyperexcitability-related spike timing variability observed in animal models [5,56].

Learning phoneme-grapheme mappings

Reading relies on the ability to reorganize left hemisphere speech/language sensitive networks to allow print-speech integration [46,93–95], enabling phoneme-grapheme correspondences to be learned. The neural noise hypothesis predicts that multisensory integration, e.g. between print and speech, should be consistently impacted in RD. Neural noise may be present in specific subsets of the brain regions involved in reading, and these subsets may vary from individual to individual, producing individual variability in the RD phenotype. For example, disruptions to some reading subprocesses, e.g. orthographic or phonological processing, may be closely linked to cortical hyperexcitability in the corresponding visual or auditory sensory areas. However, multisensory integration deficits may arise from disruptions to any one of these processes or from hyperexcitability localized to heteromodal or crossmodal brain regions, such as temporoparietal cortex.

In addition to offering multiple spatial points of noise susceptibility, multimodal integration and coordinated processing across brain regions is also highly sensitive to the loss of spike timing precision. Multisensory integration occurs over a restricted time window [73,96] that may be susceptible to variability in neural spike activity and learning multisensory associations relies on spike timing dependent synaptic plasticity during critical periods of development. Considering the number of possible paths to disrupted multisensory integration and its sensitivity on neural timing, deficits in multisensory processing are expected to be a reliable feature of RD and several studies have reported deficits in print-speech integration in RD [45,95,97,98].

Counter-evidence to the neural noise hypothesis & considerations

The neural noise hypothesis draws on recent findings in animal models and the role of neural oscillations in sensory processing to suggest a specific pathway through which reading deficits may arise. However, the precise nature of neural noise in RD remains poorly

characterized and other neurobiological mechanisms, such as atypical structural connectivity, are also supported. We briefly consider these alternative mechanisms and speculate on how variability in sources of neural noise may contribute to heterogeneity in RD and specificity to reading-related processes.

We have emphasized cortical processing as the target of neural noise and source of RD impairments. However, other factors such as connectivity between brain regions involved in reading may also be important contributors to RD. For example, one study [37] provides evidence that poor access to phonological representations, arguably reflected in reduced functional connectivity with temporoparietal regions, is impaired, while phonological representations remain intact, although this study did not examine the detailed properties of phoneme encoding (as has been done in other studies [87]). RD risk mutations in DCDC2 have also been linked to structural connectivity within the reading network [25] and children at-risk for RD have persistently reduced temporoparietal white matter integrity [99]. While these studies do highlight the importance of connectivity in RD, and the need for systems-levels approaches to studying RD, these results are not necessarily incompatible with the neural noise hypothesis. For example, neurochemistry has been related to **functional connectivity** [100]. It is currently unknown if structural connectivity findings can be accounted for by excess neural noise, e.g. reflective of noise-driven differences in plasticity and axon growth, or if these represent an independent neurobiological mechanism.

Heterogeneity

We propose that local cortical abnormalities (as in other models of RD [39]) of cortical excitability disrupt the sensory and cognitive functions associated with those areas, but the location of dysregulated excitability is expected to vary across individuals, due to unidentified genetic and/or environmental factors. The location of excitation-inhibition imbalance within the network of brain regions associated with reading will differentially affect reading subprocesses, producing heterogeneous phenotypes in RD. For example, a given case of RD might be characterized primarily by poor phonological awareness (if excitability is primarily increased in auditory cortex) or in decoding (if excitability is primarily increased in heteromodal regions important for print-speech integration). While accommodating wide, non-specific variability may appear to lessen the strength of our model, this accurately reflects the complex genetic underpinnings of cortical development [101]. In addition, there is not a uniform level of cortical excitability across the brain—endogenous levels of GABA and glutamate also vary across the brain, and show regional correlations with specific functional networks [102]. However, our model predicts that multisensory integration of graphemes and phonemes should be consistently deficient in RD, due to the cascading effects of increased neural noise from both heteromodal and cross-modal regions on interregional synchronization and integration of possible poor representations across modalities.

Specificity

Neural noise is not linked specifically to RD and has been proposed as an explanation for other neurodevelopmental disorders, notably autism [103] and schizophrenia [104]. Neural noise can result from multiple etiological sources and elucidating these neurobiological

origins may improve the specificity of the neural noise hypothesis with respect to RD. For example, the neural noise hypothesis of RD can be readily distinguished from models of neural noise due to dopaminergic dysregulation [105], since RD deficits are predominately associated with brain regions that have little dopaminergic innervation.

In the case of RD, evidence suggests a more general source for hyperexcitability: an imbalance in the glutamatergic system. Since pyramidal-interneuron circuits comprise much of neocortex, some explanation is needed for how the proposed glutamatergic imbalance might manifest in the comparatively restricted range of RD phenotypes. One possibility is that neural noise in RD stems from spatially localized genetic effects, such as those associated with KIAA0319 or DCDC2. Indeed, polymorphisms on KIAA0319 show regionally-specific associations within language resting state networks [17], illustrating that these genetic pathways may have relatively focal impacts on brain function (see also an fMRI study [20] of reading). Even among sources of hyperexcitability that may have some specificity to RD, different origins for hyperexcitability may produce subtle phenotypic differences. For example, both *Kiaa0319* and *Dcdc2* mutations produce phenotypes with increased neural excitability, but are associated with distinct auditory processing deficits [3,10].

Although RD is not characterized by clinically significant general cognitive impairments, the deficits associated with RD are not limited to reading and related processes. A recent study [106] shows that adults with RD do not exhibit a reduced neural response to repeated stimulus presentation (i.e., neural adaptation) to the same extent as typical readers. This reduced neural adaptation was found in response to both linguistic and non-linguistic auditory and visual stimuli, suggesting a domain general feature of neural processing.

Testing the neural noise hypothesis

Our hypothesis is an effort to coherently synthesize a limited body of often disconnected findings to provide a basis for future work. Our hypothesis is in principle directly falsifiable by showing that individuals with RD do not, in general, have noisy, hyperexcitable cortex. This is an empirically difficult, but not impossible, test. For example, induced pluripotent human stem cells from individuals with RD could be used to confirm or deny the prediction that noisy neural firing would be observed and correlated with reading ability. Our hypothesis also makes multiple links at multiple levels of analysis that can be readily investigated to produce results incompatible with our hypotheses. Some of these predictions, where negative findings would be clearly inconsistent with our hypothesis, are outlined below.

Neurochemical measurement of excitation/inhibition balance in auditory cortex will be negatively associated with phonological processing

Recently, we have shown that glutamate, in occipital cortex, is associated with a composite measure of reading skill [32]. However, this region is not strongly linked to reading and future studies need to examine the relationship between neurochemistry throughout the brain and phonological and orthographic processing. We predict that glutamate:GABA ratios in

left superior temporal regions, but not prefrontal regions outside the reading network, will negatively correlate with phonological awareness.

RD risk alleles will be associated with impaired cortical auditory processing in humans

Evidence from animal models that RD risk genes can impair the discrimination and processing of temporally dynamic auditory stimuli [3,10] provides a link from genetics to behavioral phenotypes. An important test for our hypothesis is whether similar loss of response consistency is present in humans carrying RD risk alleles. In the only study [31] to examine association between RD risk genes and the consistency of human neural responses to auditory stimuli, KIAA0391 risk alleles were associated with less consistent auditory brainstem responses (ABRs) in preliterate children. In the same study, DCDC2 risk alleles were associated with a trend towards more stable ABRs. While subcortical auditory function has an important role in RD, our hypothesis primarily draws on evidence for the effects of *Dcdc2* and *Kiaa0319* in pyramidal cells and the dynamics of cortical pyramidal-interneuron networks (rather than the lower auditory pathways, which have substantially different neural architecture) and it remains necessary to investigate cortical response variability in RD. Extending the results from rodent literature, we predict that cortical response consistency to auditory stimuli (e.g. using ERP measures or EEG phase-locking) will be reduced in individuals carrying RD risk alleles.

Computational models of perceptual noise exclusion and phonological awareness

The neural noise hypothesis can most productively be tested through the use of biologically plausible neural models to generate, and then empirically test, novel hypotheses. For example, a previous study [86] used simple filter models to investigate the mechanisms involved in auditory noise exclusion, a deficit in RD [85]. Importantly, these models perform differently under different noise conditions, allowing them to be empirically distinguished in vivo (in gerbils). Spectrotemporal receptive fields can also be mapped in humans using fMRI [107]. More sophisticated models that parameterize neural excitability may predict results that depend on noise distributions—predictions that can then be tested in fMRI studies of RD. More generally, neural models of acoustic encoding [108,109] should be extended to model the effects of excitation/inhibition on sensory processing and integrated—based on the fidelity with which phonemic features can be encoded—with more phenomenological models of reading [50].

Concluding Remarks and Future Perspectives

We propose a biological mechanism—increased cortical excitability producing increased neural noise—that provides a mechanistic framework for disrupted unisensory and multisensory processing in RD that ultimately manifests as characteristic impairments in phonological awareness and/or grapheme-phoneme mapping. The hypothesis is consistent with current understanding of the neurogenetics of RD and accounts for deficits in processing rapidly presented auditory stimuli [3], and discriminating time-varying, but not static auditory stimuli [110]. Our proposal also provides a novel foundation for intervention through brain stimulation techniques such as tDCS and TMS or pharmacological agents. To date, only a few studies have examined the effects of brain stimulation on reading and

related skills, with mixed results [60–62]. The ability to rescue phenotypes in RD risk gene animal models using NMDA antagonists [5] also raises the possibility of using pharmacological agents for RD intervention, although it is not possible to pharmacologically target specific brain regions. Research in this area has been limited to **comorbid** RD-ADHD individuals, where dopaminergic agonists [111] and norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (with NMDA antagonist action) [112] have been found to improve reading. A recent study suggests that drug-related improvements in reading skill may occur through mechanisms independent of those associated with ADHD symptom improvement, suggesting these drugs act on the reading system beyond modulating attention and control [112].

Considerable research is still needed to test the neural noise hypothesis, resolve outstanding questions and translate this model into practice (see Outstanding Questions). Systems-level multimodal imaging studies that measure response variability in RD, e.g. using phase-locking measures in EEG or single trial estimates of BOLD response, in conjunction with MRS from multiple cortical regions can provide a direct test of the basic premise of our hypothesis. Studies at this macroscopic scale also need to be linked more closely to underlying neurobiological and genetic risk factors in order to understand how specific sources of excitability can be linked to behavioral and cognitive deficits. As reading is a multifactorial process that recruits a broad network of brain regions, it also is important that future studies take a systems-level, individual differences approach, ideally aided by biologically plausible neural models, to examining the biological factors underlying RD and probing the gene-brain-behavior pathway that we have outlined here.

Outstanding Questions

1. **How do the increases in single neuron excitability found in animal models (e.g. in *Dcdc2* knockdowns) affect processing at the level of cortical microcircuits? For example, are these increases in single unit excitability also associated with changes in local connectivity?**
2. **How does disrupted neural migration, e.g. associated with *Dcdc2* and *Dyx1c1*, affect local neural connectivity and function, particularly connectivity within pyramidal-interneuron networks?**
3. **What are the functional consequences of atypical neural migration in RD in terms of excitation-inhibition balance?**
4. **How does excitation-inhibition balance change through development and how does this affect neural plasticity during critical developmental stages?**
5. **How may neural noise characteristics be different in RD versus other conditions that have been associated with neural noise?**
6. Are there regional differences in neural noise characteristics and neurochemistry that may drive neural noise? If so, what are the mechanisms that causes these regional differences?

7. Use of hypothesis-driven pharmacological and magnetic/electrical brain modulation techniques in combination with multi-modal imaging in humans to understand causal links between neural excitability and cognition.
8. Studies have yielded mixed evidence regarding noisy subcortical processing, measured in terms of variability in the auditory brainstem response. What is the relationship between noisy subcortical and cortical processing?
9. How is print-speech multisensory integration coordinated by neural oscillations across regions and what is the impact of trial-by-trial variability in synchronization on this integration? For example, is print-speech integration sensitive to phase resetting in auditory and/or visual cortices? How does neurochemistry affect print-speech integration?

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Albert Galaburda and Mark Seidenberg for discussions of these issues. This work is supported by a grant from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R01HD086168 to K.R.P. and F.H.).

Glossary

Co-morbidity

The presence of multiple conditions, disorders or symptoms within an individual, for example ADHD and RD. Highly frequent co-morbidity may be evidence in favor of common origins.

Gamma aminobutyric acid (GABA)

The principal inhibitory neurotransmitter, released by interneurons.

Glutamate

The principal excitatory neurotransmitter, released by pyramidal cells.

Functional connectivity

The exchange of information between brain regions. Measures such as temporally correlated BOLD fluctuations and **phase-locked** EEG signals are often taken as evidence for functional connectivity in the human brain.

Homologous genes

Genes having common ancestry. Homologous genes may share large portions of their genetic sequence across species and serve similar functions.

Multisensory integration

the process through which sensory information from multiple modalities (e.g. visual and auditory) is integrated into a coherent representation. Multisensory integration is frequently associated with crossmodal interactions, in which the neural response to a stimulus in one modality is affected by a stimulus in another modality, depending on the timing and congruency of the stimuli.

Magnetic resonance spectroscopy (MRS)

A technique that uses a conventional magnetic resonance imaging machine to measure the concentration of selected molecules in vivo. Notably, GABA and glutamate are visible in MRS.

N-methyl D-aspartate (NMDA)

A glutamate receptor that is particularly important in synaptic plasticity.

Phase-locking

Phase-locking occurs when a periodic signal, for example rhythmic neural activity, reaches the same point each time a second periodic signal, for example the speech envelope, reaches a given point.

Phonological awareness

the knowledge of the sound structure of words, including phonemes, syllables and onset/rime structure and ability to manipulate these units.

Speech envelope

The amplitude of the speech signal, changes in which provide syllabic, stress and prosodic cues important for speech intelligibility and neural entrainment to the speech signal.

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS)

A non-invasive method of modulating cortical excitability over large regions by applying a weak electrical current to the scalp.

Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS)

A non-invasive method of inducing and modulating cortical activity using a focal magnetic field. TMS can be used to both increase and decrease cortical excitability, depending on the stimulation parameters.

References

1. Pennington B. From single to multiple deficit models of developmental disorders. *Cognition*. 2006; 101:385–413. [PubMed: 16844106]
2. Burbridge TJ, et al. Postnatal analysis of the effect of embryonic knockdown and overexpression of candidate dyslexia susceptibility gene homolog Dcdc2 in the rat. *Neuroscience*. 2008; 152:723–733. [PubMed: 18313856]
3. Centanni TM, et al. Knockdown of Dyslexia-Gene Dcdc2 Interferes with Speech Sound Discrimination in Continuous Streams. *J Neurosci*. 2016; 36:4895–4906. [PubMed: 27122044]
4. Che A, et al. Mutation of the dyslexia-associated gene Dcdc2 enhances glutamatergic synaptic transmission between layer 4 neurons in mouse neocortex. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2015
5. Che A, et al. The dyslexia-associated gene Dcdc2 is required for spike-timing precision in mouse neocortex. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2014; 76:387–396. [PubMed: 24094509]
6. Currier TA, et al. The effects of embryonic knockdown of the candidate dyslexia susceptibility gene homologue *Dyx1c1* on the distribution of GABAergic neurons in the cerebral cortex. *Neuroscience*. 2011; 172:535–546. [PubMed: 21070838]
7. Gabel LA, et al. Mutation of the dyslexia-associated gene Dcdc2 impairs LTM and visuo-spatial performance in mice. *Genes, Brain and Behavior*. 2011; 10:868–875.
8. Truong DT, et al. Mutation of Dcdc2 in mice leads to impairments in auditory processing and memory ability. *Genes, Brain and Behavior*. 2014; 13:802–811.

9. Wang Y, et al. Dcdc2 knockout mice display exacerbated developmental disruptions following knockdown of doublecortin. *Neuroscience*. 2011; 190:398–408. [PubMed: 21689730]
10. Centanni TM, et al. Knockdown of the Dyslexia-Associated Gene Kiaa0319 Impairs Temporal Responses to Speech Stimuli in Rat Primary Auditory Cortex. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2014; 24:1753–1766. [PubMed: 23395846]
11. Peschansky VJ, et al. The Effect of Variation in Expression of the Candidate Dyslexia Susceptibility Gene Homolog Kiaa0319 on Neuronal Migration and Dendritic Morphology in the Rat. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2010; 20:884–897. [PubMed: 19679544]
12. Peschansky VJ, et al. The Effect of Variation in Expression of the Candidate Dyslexia Susceptibility Gene Homolog Kiaa0319 on Neuronal Migration and Dendritic Morphology in the Rat. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2009; 20:bhp154–897.
13. Szalkowski CE, et al. The effects of Kiaa0319 knockdown on cortical and subcortical anatomy in male rats. *International Journal of Developmental Neuroscience*. 2013; 31:116–122. [PubMed: 23220223]
14. Czamara D, et al. Association of a Rare Variant with Mismatch Negativity in a Region Between KIAA0319 and DCDC2 in Dyslexia. *Behav Genet*. 2010; 41:110–119. [PubMed: 21104116]
15. Elbert A, et al. Genetic Variation in the KIAA0319 5' Region as a Possible Contributor to Dyslexia. *Behav Genet*. 2011; 41:77–89. [PubMed: 21207242]
16. Harold D, et al. Further evidence that the KIAA0319 gene confers susceptibility to developmental dyslexia. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2006; 11:1085–91. 1061. [PubMed: 17033633]
17. Jamadar S, et al. Genetic influences of resting state fMRI activity in language-related brain regions in healthy controls and schizophrenia patients: a pilot study. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*. 2013; 7:15–27. [PubMed: 22669497]
18. Lind PA, et al. Dyslexia and DCDC2: normal variation in reading and spelling is associated with DCDC2 polymorphisms in an Australian population sample. *Eur J Hum Genet*. 2010; 18:668–673. [PubMed: 20068590]
19. Matsson H, et al. Polymorphisms in DCDC2 and S100B associate with developmental dyslexia. *J Hum Genet*. 2015; 60:399–401. [PubMed: 25877001]
20. Pinel P, et al. Genetic Variants of FOXP2 and KIAA0319/TTRAP/THEM2 Locus Are Associated with Altered Brain Activation in Distinct Language-Related Regions. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2012; 32:817–825. [PubMed: 22262880]
21. Venkatesh SK, et al. Analysis of genetic variants of dyslexia candidate genes KIAA0319 and DCDC2 in Indian population. *J Hum Genet*. 2013; 58:531–538. [PubMed: 23677054]
22. Darki F, et al. DCDC2 Polymorphism Is Associated with Left Temporoparietal Gray and White Matter Structures during Development. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2014; 34:14455–14462. [PubMed: 25339756]
23. Gori S, et al. The DCDC2 Intron 2 Deletion Impairs Illusory Motion Perception Unveiling the Selective Role of Magnocellular-Dorsal Stream in Reading (Dis)ability. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2015; 25:1685–1695. [PubMed: 25270309]
24. Ludwig KU, et al. Investigation of the DCDC2 intron 2 deletion/compound short tandem repeat polymorphism in a large German dyslexia sample. *Psychiatr Genet*. 2008; 18:310–312. [PubMed: 19018237]
25. Marino C, et al. The DCDC2/intron 2 deletion and white matter disorganization: focus on developmental dyslexia. *CORTEX*. 2014; 57:227–243. [PubMed: 24926531]
26. Marino C, et al. DCDC2 genetic variants and susceptibility to developmental dyslexia. *Psychiatr Genet*. 2012; 22:25–30. [PubMed: 21881542]
27. Meda SA, et al. Polymorphism of DCDC2 Reveals Differences in Cortical Morphology of Healthy Individuals—A Preliminary Voxel Based Morphometry Study. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*. 2007; 2:21–26.
28. Meng H, et al. DCDC2 is associated with reading disability and modulates neuronal development in the brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2005; 102:17053–17058.
29. Schumacher J, et al. Strong genetic evidence of DCDC2 as a susceptibility gene for dyslexia. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*. 2006; 78:52–62. [PubMed: 16385449]

30. Wilcke A, et al. The role of gene DCDC2 in German dyslexics. *Ann of Dyslexia*. 2009; 59:1–11. [PubMed: 19238550]
31. Neef NE, et al. Dyslexia risk gene relates to representation of sound in the auditory brainstem. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*. 2017; 24:63–71.
32. Pugh KR, et al. Glutamate and choline levels predict individual differences in reading ability in emergent readers. *J Neurosci*. 2014; 34:4082–4089. [PubMed: 24623786]
33. Lallier M, et al. Amodal Atypical Neural Oscillatory Activity in Dyslexia. *Clinical Psychological Science*. 2016; 29:216770261667011–23.
34. Molinaro N, et al. Out-of-synchrony speech entrainment in developmental dyslexia. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2016; doi: 10.1002/hbm.23206
35. Lehongre K, et al. Impaired auditory sampling in dyslexia: further evidence from combined fMRI and EEG. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2013; 7:454. [PubMed: 23950742]
36. Lehongre K, et al. Altered low- γ sampling in auditory cortex accounts for the three main facets of dyslexia. *Neuron*. 2011; 72:1080–1090. [PubMed: 22196341]
37. Boets B, et al. Intact but less accessible phonetic representations in adults with dyslexia. *Science*. 2013; 342:1251–1254. [PubMed: 24311693]
38. Finn ES, et al. Disruption of Functional Networks in Dyslexia_ A Whole-Brain, Data-Driven Analysis of Connectivity. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2013; doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2013.08.031
39. Ramus F. Neurobiology of dyslexia: a reinterpretation of the data. *Trends in Neurosciences*. 2004; 27:720–726. [PubMed: 15541512]
40. Arnal, LH., et al. Temporal coding in the auditory cortex. 1. Elsevier B.V; 2015. p. 129
41. Doelling KB, et al. Acoustic landmarks drive delta-theta oscillations to enable speech comprehension by facilitating perceptual parsing. *NeuroImage*. 2014; 85:761–768. [PubMed: 23791839]
42. Giraud AL, Poeppel D. Cortical oscillations and speech processing: emerging computational principles and operations. *Nature Publishing Group*. 2012; 15:511–517.
43. Soltész F, et al. Differential Entrainment of Neuroelectric Delta Oscillations in Developmental Dyslexia. *PLoS ONE*. 2013; 8:e76608–11. [PubMed: 24204644]
44. Stanovich KE, Siegel LS. Phenotypic performance profile of children with reading disabilities: A regression-based test of the phonological-core variable-difference model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 1994; 86:24–53.
45. Blau V, et al. Reduced Neural Integration of Letters and Speech Sounds Links Phonological and Reading Deficits in Adult Dyslexia. *Current Biology*. 2009; 19:503–508. [PubMed: 19285401]
46. Preston JL, et al. Print-Speech Convergence Predicts Future Reading Outcomes in Early Readers. *Psychological Science*. 2015; doi: 10.1177/0956797615611921
47. Sperling AJ, et al. Motion-perception deficits and reading impairment: it's the noise, not the motion. *Psychological Science*. 2006; 17:1047–1053. [PubMed: 17201786]
48. Sperling AJ, et al. Deficits in perceptual noise exclusion in developmental dyslexia. *Nat Neurosci*. 2005; 8:862–863. [PubMed: 15924138]
49. Seidenberg MS. Connectionist models of word reading. *Current Directions in Psychol Sci*. 2005; 14:238–242.
50. Harm MW, Seidenberg MS. Phonology, reading acquisition, and dyslexia: insights from connectionist models. *Psychological Review*. 1999; 106:491–528. [PubMed: 10467896]
51. Hornickel J, Kraus N. Unstable Representation of Sound: A Biological Marker of Dyslexia. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2013; 33:3500–3504. [PubMed: 23426677]
52. Grigorenko EL. Genetic bases of developmental dyslexia: A capsule review of heritability estimates. *Enfance*. 2004; 56:273–17.
53. Raschle NM, et al. Structural brain alterations associated with dyslexia predate reading onset. *NeuroImage*. 2011; 57:742–749. [PubMed: 20884362]
54. Shao S, et al. The Roles of Genes in the Neuronal Migration and Neurite Outgrowth Network in Developmental Dyslexia: Single- and Multiple-Risk Genetic Variants. *Mol Neurobiol*. 2016; 53:3967–3975. [PubMed: 26184631]

55. Isaacson JS, Scanziani M. How Inhibition Shapes Cortical Activity. *Neuron*. 2011; 72:231–243. [PubMed: 22017986]
56. Che A, et al. Mutation of the Dyslexia-Associated Gene *Dcdc2* Enhances Glutamatergic Synaptic Transmission Between Layer 4 Neurons in Mouse Neocortex. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2016; 26:3705–3718. [PubMed: 26250775]
57. Raschle NM, et al. Altered neuronal response during rapid auditory processing and its relation to phonological processing in prereading children at familial risk for dyslexia. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2014; 24:2489–2501. [PubMed: 23599167]
58. Heimrath K, et al. Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) traces the predominance of the left auditory cortex for processing of rapidly changing acoustic information. *Neuroscience*. 2014; 261:68–73. [PubMed: 24374325]
59. Hämäläinen JA, et al. Basic auditory processing deficits in dyslexia: systematic review of the behavioral and event-related potential/field evidence. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 2013; 46:413–427. [PubMed: 22323280]
60. Turkeltaub PE, et al. Left lateralizing transcranial direct current stimulation improves reading efficiency. *Brain Stimulation*. 2012; 5:201–207. [PubMed: 22305346]
61. Costanzo F, et al. How to improve reading skills in dyslexics_ The effect of high frequency rTMS. *Neuropsychologia*. 2013; 51:2953–2959. [PubMed: 24184439]
62. Costanzo F, et al. High frequency rTMS over the left parietal lobule increases non-word reading accuracy. *Neuropsychologia*. 2012; 50:2645–2651. [PubMed: 22820638]
63. Stagg CJ, et al. Relationship between physiological measures of excitability and levels of glutamate and GABA in the human motor cortex. *The Journal of Physiology*. 2011; 589:5845–5855. [PubMed: 22005678]
64. Karlebach G, Francks C. Lateralization of gene expression in human language cortex. *CORTEX*. 2015; 67:30–36. [PubMed: 25863470]
65. Boemio A, et al. Hierarchical and asymmetric temporal sensitivity in human auditory cortices. *Nat Neurosci*. 2005; 8:389–395. [PubMed: 15723061]
66. Galaburda AM, et al. Developmental dyslexia: four consecutive patients with cortical anomalies. *Ann Neurol*. 1985; 18:222–233. [PubMed: 4037763]
67. Dennis MY, et al. A common variant associated with dyslexia reduces expression of the *KIAA0319* gene. *PLoS Genet*. 2009; 5:e1000436. [PubMed: 19325871]
68. Paracchini S, et al. The chromosome 6p22 haplotype associated with dyslexia reduces the expression of *KIAA0319*, a novel gene involved in neuronal migration. *Human Molecular Genetics*. 2006; 15:1659–1666. [PubMed: 16600991]
69. Baek ST, et al. Off-Target Effect of doublecortin Family shRNA on Neuronal Migration Associated with Endogenous MicroRNA Dysregulation. *Neuron*. 2014; 82:1255–1262. [PubMed: 24945770]
70. Alvarez VA, et al. Retraction of Synapses and Dendritic Spines Induced by Off-Target Effects of RNA Interference. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2006; 26:7820–7825. [PubMed: 16870727]
71. Bertone A. Enhanced and diminished visuo-spatial information processing in autism depends on stimulus complexity. *Brain*. 2005; 128:2430–2441. [PubMed: 15958508]
72. Singer W. Synchronization of cortical activity and its putative role in information processing and learning. *Annual review of physiology*. 1993
73. Senkowski D, et al. Crossmodal binding through neural coherence: implications for multisensory processing. *Trends in Neurosciences*. 2008; 31:401–409. [PubMed: 18602171]
74. Arnal LH, Giraud AL. Cortical oscillations and sensory predictions. *Trends Cogn Sci (Regul Ed)*. 2012; 16:390–398. [PubMed: 22682813]
75. Gross J, et al. Speech Rhythms and Multiplexed Oscillatory Sensory Coding in the Human Brain. *PLoS Biol*. 2013; 11:e1001752–14. [PubMed: 24391472]
76. Mercier MR, et al. Neuro-oscillatory phase alignment drives speeded multisensory response times: an electro-corticographic investigation. *J Neurosci*. 2015; 35:8546–8557. [PubMed: 26041921]
77. Meredith MA, Stein BE. Interactions among converging sensory inputs in the superior colliculus. *Science*. 1983; 221:389–391. [PubMed: 6867718]

78. Bizley JK, et al. Physiological and anatomical evidence for multisensory interactions in auditory cortex. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2007; 17:2172–2189. [PubMed: 17135481]
79. Holmes NP, Spence C. Multisensory Integration: Space, Time and Superadditivity. *Current Biology*. 2005; 15:R762–R764. [PubMed: 16169476]
80. Hämäläinen JA, et al. Reduced phase locking to slow amplitude modulation in adults with dyslexia: An MEG study. *NeuroImage*. 2012; 59:2952–2961. [PubMed: 22001790]
81. Goswami U. A temporal sampling framework for developmental dyslexia. *Trends Cogn Sci (Regul Ed)*. 2011; 15:3–10. [PubMed: 21093350]
82. Boets B, et al. Preschool impairments in auditory processing and speech perception uniquely predict future reading problems. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2011; 32:560–570. [PubMed: 21236633]
83. Stoodley CJ, et al. Auditory event-related potentials differ in dyslexics even when auditory psychophysical performance is normal. *Brain Research*. 2006; 1121:190–199. [PubMed: 17010945]
84. Halliday LF, Bishop DVM. Is poor frequency modulation detection linked to literacy problems? A comparison of specific reading disability and mild to moderate sensorineural hearing loss. *Brain and Language*. 2006; 97:200–213. [PubMed: 16330093]
85. Ziegler JC, et al. Speech-perception-in-noise deficits in dyslexia. *Developmental Science*. 2009; 12:732–745. [PubMed: 19702766]
86. Mesgarani N, et al. Mechanisms of noise robust representation of speech in primary auditory cortex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2014; 111:6792–6797.
87. Mesgarani N, et al. Phonetic Feature Encoding in Human Superior Temporal Gyrus. *Science*. 2014; 343:1006–1010. [PubMed: 24482117]
88. Hullett PW, et al. Human Superior Temporal Gyrus Organization of Spectrotemporal Modulation Tuning Derived from Speech Stimuli. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2016; 36:2014–2026. [PubMed: 26865624]
89. Durstewitz D, Seamans JK. Beyond bistability: Biophysics and temporal dynamics of working memory. *Neuroscience*. 2006; 139:119–133. [PubMed: 16326020]
90. Leong V, Goswami U. Assessment of rhythmic entrainment at multiple timescales in dyslexia: Evidence for disruption to syllable timing. *Hearing Research*. 2013; doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2013.07.015
91. Leong V, et al. Rise time perception and detection of syllable stress in adults with developmental dyslexia. *Journal of Memory and Language*. 2011; 64:59–73.
92. McAnally, KI., Stein, JF. Auditory temporal coding in dyslexia. presented at the Proceedings of the Royal ...; 1996. p. 17-25.
93. Frost SJ, et al. Phonological awareness predicts activation patterns for print and speech. *Ann of Dyslexia*. 2009; 59:78–97. [PubMed: 19306061]
94. Pugh KR, et al. The relationship between phonological and auditory processing and brain organization in beginning readers. *Brain and Language*. 2013; 125:173–183. [PubMed: 22572517]
95. Kronschnabel J, et al. The level of audiovisual print–speech integration deficits in dyslexia. *Neuropsychologia*. 2014; 62:245–261. [PubMed: 25084224]
96. Senkowski D, et al. Good times for multisensory integration: Effects of the precision of temporal synchrony as revealed by gamma-band oscillations. *Neuropsychologia*. 2007; 45:561–571. [PubMed: 16542688]
97. Hahn N, et al. Impairments of multisensory integration and cross-sensory learning as pathways to dyslexia. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2014; 47:384–392. [PubMed: 25265514]
98. Harrar V, et al. Multisensory integration and attention in developmental dyslexia. *Curr Biol*. 2014; 24:531–535. [PubMed: 24530067]
99. Wang Y, et al. Development of Tract-Specific White Matter Pathways During Early Reading Development in At-Risk Children and Typical Controls. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2016; doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhw095

100. Duncan NW, et al. Associations of regional GABA and glutamate with intrinsic and extrinsic neural activity in humans—a review of multimodal imaging studies. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2014; 47:36–52. [PubMed: 25066091]
101. Chen CH, et al. Genetic topography of brain morphology. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2013; 110:17089–17094. [PubMed: 24082094]
102. Kapogiannis D, et al. Posteromedial cortex glutamate and GABA predict intrinsic functional connectivity of the default mode network. *NeuroImage*. 2013; 64:112–119. [PubMed: 23000786]
103. Rubenstein J, Merzenich MM. Model of autism: increased ratio of excitation/inhibition in key neural systems. *Genes*. 2003; doi: 10.1034/j.1601-183X.2003.00037.x/pdf
104. Winterer G, Weinberger DR. Genes, dopamine and cortical signal-to-noise ratio in schizophrenia. *Trends in Neurosciences*. 2004; 27:683–690. [PubMed: 15474169]
105. Winterer G, et al. Prefrontal broadband noise, working memory, and genetic risk for schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2004; 161:490–500. [PubMed: 14992975]
106. Perrachione TK, et al. Dysfunction of Rapid Neural Adaptation in Dyslexia. *Neuron*. 2016; 92:1383–1397. [PubMed: 28009278]
107. Schönwiesner M, Zatorre RJ. Spectro-temporal modulation transfer function of single voxels in the human auditory cortex measured with high-resolution fMRI. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2009; 106:14611–14616. [PubMed: 19667199]
108. Hyafil A, et al. Speech encoding by coupled cortical theta and gamma oscillations. *eLife*. 2015; 4:e06213. [PubMed: 26023831]
109. Shamir M, et al. Representation of Time-Varying Stimuli by a Network Exhibiting Oscillations on a Faster Time Scale. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2009; 5:e1000370–12. [PubMed: 19412531]
110. Wehr M, Zador AM. Balanced inhibition underlies tuning and sharpens spike timing in auditory cortex. *Nature*. 2003; 426:442–446. [PubMed: 14647382]
111. Ballinger CT, et al. Effects of methylphenidate on reading in children with attention deficit disorder. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1984; 141:1590–1593. [PubMed: 6507665]
112. Shaywitz S, et al. Effect of Atomoxetine Treatment on Reading and Phonological Skills in Children with Dyslexia or Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder and Comorbid Dyslexia in a Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Trial. *J Child Adolesc Psychopharmacol*. 2016; doi: 10.1089/cap.2015.0189
113. Stein RB, et al. Neuronal variability: noise or part of the signal? *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2005; 6:389–397. [PubMed: 15861181]
114. Schroeder CE, Lakatos P. Low-frequency neuronal oscillations as instruments of sensory selection. 2009; 32:9–18.
115. Buzsáki G, Wang XJ. Mechanisms of gamma oscillations. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*. 2012; 35:203–225.
116. Gabay Y, Holt LL. Incidental learning of sound categories is impaired in developmental dyslexia. *CORTEX*. 2015; 73:131–143. [PubMed: 26409017]
117. Vandermosten M, et al. Adults with dyslexia are impaired in categorizing speech and nonspeech sounds on the basis of temporal cues. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2010; 107:10389–10394.

Trends Box

- Increasing evidence from animal work suggests that reading-related risk genes affect cortical excitability and neural noise.
- Oscillatory models of sensory processing indicate a close link between the regulation of excitation-inhibition cycles and stimulus encoding.
- We propose neural noise as a distal mechanism in reading disorder that can account for deficits in phonological processing and establishing multisensory grapheme-phoneme mappings through its effects on neural timing.




Figure 1 (Key Figure). The neural noise hypothesis
 Schematic of the neural noise hypothesis, illustrated through two genetic pathways known to affect neural noise within the domain of auditory processing and their downstream consequences on reading. Some genetic risk factors, such as DCDC2 mutations, increase neural noise through a direct effect on glutamatergic signaling and hyperexcitability. Other genetic risk factors, such as KIAA0319 mutations, may disrupt the formation of local excitatory-inhibitory circuits thereby increasing neural noise. There are likely other risk genes that act through similar pathways. Excess neural noise disrupts neural synchronization across multiple scales, leading to deficits in low-level temporal auditory processing, and the oscillatory neural processes that sample and encode sensory information. Loss of synchronization and precise neural spike timing also impairs multisensory integration. Ultimately, the downstream effects of neural noise lead to impairments in phonological awareness and multisensory integration, two key components of reading development. Although we focus our discussion on the consequences of neural noise in the auditory domain, similar consequences are predicted in the visual domain, ultimately impacting orthographic processing and reading. This speculative pathway is shown on the right. Dashed boxes and arrows reflect more speculative links in need of further study. Processes in light text are not discussed in detail in the main text. Numbers by arrows refer to supporting references in the main text.




Figure 2. Possible mechanisms of neural noise in RD

Schematic illustration of excitation-inhibition imbalance within a local network of excitatory pyramidal cells (grey triangles) and inhibitory GABAergic interneurons (blue circles) with feedback inhibition (red) and corresponding trial-by-trial spiking activity above. (a) **Typical excitation-inhibition balance.** In a balanced excitation-inhibition regime, stimuli evoke excitatory (green) synaptic conductances followed by comparable inhibitory conductances (red) within a few milliseconds. Together these conductances regulate spike activity to produce neural activity that is precisely timed with respect to the input. (b) **Consequence of increased glutamatergic activity.** Animal models suggest RD risk genes modulate excitatory postsynaptic activity, which may result in greater and more temporally extended increases in excitatory conductances and reduced spike timing precision, in the absence of compensatory increases in feedback inhibition to restore excitation-inhibition balance. (c)

Consequence of abnormal neural migration. RD risk genes have also been linked to disrupted neural migration and dendritic spine formation on pyramidal cells. One possible consequence of this is disrupted feedback connectivity (dashed arrows) between GABAergic interneurons and pyramidal cells, reducing feedback inhibition available to dampen neural activity and again producing temporally extended responses. Figure based on [110]. See also Box 1.