



Kent Academic Repository

Abekawa, Naotoshi, Ferrè, Elisa R., Gallagher, Maria, Gomi, Hiroaki and Haggard, Patrick (2018) *Disentangling the visual, motor and representational effects of vestibular input*. *Cortex*, 104 . pp. 46-57. ISSN 0010-9452.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/114543/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2018.04.003>

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in **Title of Journal**, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Research reports

Disentangling the visual, motor and representational effects of vestibular input

Naotoshi Abekawa^{1,2*}, Elisa Raffaella Ferrè^{3*}, Maria Gallagher³, Hiroaki Gomi¹ and Patrick Haggard²

*These authors equally contributed to this work.

1. NTT Communication Science Laboratories, Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation, Wakamiya 3-1, Morinosato, Atsugi, Kanagawa-pref. 243-0198, Japan
2. Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, University College London, Alexandra House, 17 Queen Square, London WC1N 3AR, UK.
3. Department of Psychology, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, UK.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Patrick Haggard

Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience

17 Queen Square

London WC1N 3AR, UK

Telephone: 00 44 (0)20 7679 1153

Email: p.haggard@ucl.ac.uk

Research reports

1
2
3
4
5
6 Disentangling the visual, motor and representational effects of
7
8 vestibular input
9

10
11
12 Naotoshi Abekawa^{1,2*}, Elisa Raffaella Ferrè^{3*}, Maria Gallagher³, Hiroaki Gomi¹ and
13
14 Patrick Haggard²
15

16
17 *These authors equally contributed to this work.
18
19
20
21

- 22
23 1. NTT Communication Science Laboratories, Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation,
24 Wakamiya 3-1, Morinosato, Atsugi, Kanagawa-pref. 243-0198, Japan
25
26 2. Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, University College London, Alexandra House, 17
27 Queen Square, London WC1N 3AR, UK.
28
29 3. Department of Psychology, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham,
30 Surrey TW20 0EX, UK.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

42 **Patrick Haggard**
43 Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience
44 17 Queen Square
45 London WC1N 3AR, UK
46 Telephone: 00 44 (0)20 7679 1153
47 Email: p.haggard@ucl.ac.uk
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

1
2 The body midline provides a basic reference for egocentric representation of external space.
3
4 Clinical observations have suggested that vestibular information underpins egocentric
5
6 representations. Here we aimed to clarify whether and how vestibular inputs contribute to
7
8 egocentric representation in healthy volunteers. In a psychophysical task, participants were
9
10 asked to judge whether visual stimuli were located to the left or to the right of their body
11
12 midline. Artificial vestibular stimulation was applied to stimulate the vestibular organs. We
13
14 found that artificial stimulation of the vestibular system biased body midline perception.
15
16 Importantly, no effect was found on motor effector selection. We also ruled out additional
17
18 explanations based on allocentric visual representations and on potential indirect effects
19
20 caused by vestibular-driven movements of the eye, head and body. Taken together our data
21
22 suggest that vestibular information contributes to computation of egocentric representations
23
24 by affecting the internal representation of the body midline.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Keywords

33
34
35
36 Vestibular system; Egocentric Representation; Multisensory Integration.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Highlights

1. Galvanic Vestibular Stimulation (GVS) biases egocentric spatial representations.
2. This bias is dissociable from GVS effects on visual perception and on motor action.
3. Vestibular signals shape egocentric body representation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abbreviations

GVS= Galvanic Vestibular Stimulation

L-GVS= left-anodal/right-cathodal GVS

R-GVS= right-anodal/left-cathodal GVS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

The authors declared that they had no conflicts of interest with respect to their authorship or the publication of this article.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. Introduction

Judging the position of external objects relative to the body is essential for interacting with the external environment. *Egocentric representations* describe the external world as experienced from an individual's location, according to the current spatial configuration of their body (Jeannerod and Biguer, 1987). Consider, for example, a tennis player who must quickly select a forehand or backhand shot based on the ball location relative to their body. A coherent and rapid response to the approaching ball requires combining perceptual information about the ball's trajectory relative to the player with information about the player's ever-changing posture and gaze. Such egocentric representations are thought to be essential in representing the world in relation to oneself (Bermúdez, 2005; Bermúdez, 2011; Pafel et al., 1998; Cassam, 2011).

The body midline may provide a basic reference for egocentric representation of external space (Jeannerod and Biguer 1987). Everyday descriptions of spatial locations frequently begin with "on the left..." or "on the right...". The subjective body midline is considered the internal representation of the plane that divides the body in two equal left and right parts (Bower and Heilman, 1980; Jeannerod and Biguer 1987). It remains unclear whether the subjective body midline co-ordinates are a static stored representation reflecting primarily semantic knowledge about body morphology, or rather a dynamic, continuously updated sensory datum, perhaps reflecting balance between afferent signals from lateralized receptor organs (left and right eyes, ears etc.), across changing body posture and orientation (Critchley, 1953).

Visual, auditory, somatosensory, proprioceptive and vestibular inputs could all contribute to representing the body midline (Jeannerod, 1988; Blouin et al., 1996, Blouin et al., 1998). Vestibular signals seem to be particularly relevant (Schilder, 1935; Lhermitte, 1952; Bonnier, 1905; Vallar and Papagno, 2003; Vallar and Rode, 2009). The vestibular system comprises the semicircular canals that encode rotational movements, and the otolith organs that encode translational accelerations, including the current orientation of the head relative to the gravitational vertical. Both semicircular canals and otolith organs constantly

1 provide afferent information regarding body orientation and body movement. Since the
2 vestibular organs on each side of the body act in a push/pull manner, a balance between
3 vestibular signals can guide representation of the body midline. For example, a linear
4 acceleration that produces identical signals from both otolith organs must correspond to
5 movement aligned with the body midline, either in the straight-ahead or up-down direction.
6 Similarly, any head rotation away from alignment with the body midline should cause equal
7 and opposite changes in firing rate from the horizontal canals on both sides of the body.
8 Thus, vestibular information is crucial to determine the location of environmental objects in
9 respect to the body (Villard et al. 2005; Clement et al. 2009; Clement et al. 2012), and to
10 specify the body midline itself.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Several clinical observations have suggested that vestibular information underpins
23 egocentric representations. Patients with unilateral spatial neglect showed a deviation to the
24 ipsilateral half of space when they were requested to point to an imaginary location in space
25 straight ahead from their body midline (Heilman et al., 1983a). Critically, artificial stimulation
26 of the vestibular system influenced this pointing error: left cold caloric vestibular stimulation
27 temporarily reduced the rightward pointing bias characteristic of patients with left-side
28 neglect. This suggests that vestibular inputs contribute to the subject's mental
29 representation of space and subjective body orientation (Karnath, 1994). However, most of
30 these studies used *motor* pointing responses to estimate *perceptual* estimates of the body
31 midline. That is, they *assumed* that the impairment arose at the level of representation of
32 the body midline, but they could not formally exclude the possibility that vestibular
33 stimulation affected the motor pointing response, or some purely visual element of the
34 experiment. Here we aimed to clarify whether and how vestibular inputs contribute to
35 egocentric spatial representation in healthy volunteers. We have systematically investigated
36 which processing stages along the visual-motor processing chain are modulated by
37 vestibular signals. This method allowed us to dissociate vestibular effects on visual
38 perception and on motor action from effects on spatial representation, seemingly for the first
39 time.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Binaural bipolar Galvanic Vestibular Stimulation (GVS) was used to non-invasively
2 stimulate the vestibular receptors (Fitzpatrick and Day, 2004). An anode and cathode are
3 placed on the left and right mastoid, or vice versa. Perilymphatic cathodal currents
4 depolarize the trigger site and lead to excitation, whereas anodal currents hyperpolarize it
5 resulting in inhibition (Goldberg et al., 1984). GVS causes polarity-dependent modulation of
6 sensory and cognitive functions (Utz et al., 2010). Importantly, these behavioural effects are
7 consistent with neuroimaging evidence revealing asymmetrical cortical vestibular projections
8 in the non-dominant hemisphere (Dieterich et al., 2003).
9

10 We hypothesized that vestibular information might play a role in shaping the online
11 perception of the body midline, and thus contribute a basic reference for egocentric spatial
12 representation. Accordingly, we dissociated the vestibular contributions to egocentric spatial
13 representations from those to motor responses (Experiment 1). In a second experiment, we
14 investigated whether GVS-induced bias on body midline could be explained by biases in
15 visual perception, particularly in visual allocentric representation, and found that it could not
16 (Experiment 2). Finally, we showed that effects of GVS on egocentric representation were
17 qualitatively distinct from the effects of GVS on gaze location (Experiments 3 and 4).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **2. Vestibular contribution to egocentric spatial representation**

39 **2.1. Material and Methods**

40 **2.1.1. Participants**

41 Nineteen healthy participants (9 males, mean age \pm SD: 21.8 \pm 3.1 years) took part
42 in this experiment. All the participants were right-handed (Edinburgh Handedness Inventory,
43 Oldfield, 1971) with normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Exclusion criteria included
44 neurological, psychiatric or vestibular conditions, epilepsy or family history of epilepsy. The
45 experimental protocol was approved by the research ethics committee of University College
46 London. The study adhered to the ethical standards of the Declaration of Helsinki.
47 Participants gave written informed consent.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2.1.2. Galvanic Vestibular Stimulation

Bipolar GVS was applied to deliver a boxcar pulse of 1 mA using a commercial stimulator (Good Vibrations Engineering Ltd., Nobleton, Ontario, Canada). Postural studies confirm that this level of GVS activates the vestibular organs without effects persisting beyond the period of stimulation (Fitzpatrick and Day, 2004). Carbon rubber electrodes (area 10 cm²) coated with electrode gel were placed binaurally over the mastoid processes and fixed in place with adhesive tape. The area of application was first cleaned and electrode gel was applied to reduce impedance. Both left-anodal/right-cathodal (L-GVS) and right-anodal/left-cathodal (R-GVS) configurations were used (Fig. 1B). We also applied a sham stimulation using electrodes placed on the left and right side of the neck, about 5 cm below the GVS electrodes (Ferrè et al., 2013a, Ferrè et al., 2013b), with a left-anodal/right-cathodal configuration. This sham stimulation evoked similar tingling skin sensations to GVS, and so functioned as a control for non-specific effects.




Figure 1. Experimental setup and methods.

A. Apparatus. B. GVS polarities and electrodes configurations. C. Experiment 1: Participants localized visual stimuli relative to their body midline. The task was performed with the hand uncrossed or crossed. The blue arrows indicate participant's judgment. If participant judges "right", they are instructed to press the right-side button in the both hand conditions. D. Experiment 2: Participants localized visual stimulus relative to an allocentric reference.

2.1.2. Procedure

1
2 Verbal and written instructions were given to participants at the beginning of the
3 session. Participants were seated in front of a computer monitor (eye-monitor distance: 50
4 cm) with hands on a keyboard (Fig. 1A). Participants were instructed to not move their body
5 and head during the task. The participants' posture was monitored throughout the
6 experiment to ensure that the body midline was always aligned with the center of the
7 monitor. A red LED was attached to the solar plexus area of participants. The position of the
8 light, and therefore participants' posture, was recorded using a camera. To prevent the use
9 of external visual cues, participants' vision was restricted by cardboard baffles placed to the
10 left and right, as well as above the hands, and the experiment was completed in darkness
11 (Fig. 1A). Visual stimuli were presented with Cogent Graphics (MATLAB, refresh-rate: 60
12 Hz). To prevent any influence of gaze direction on judgements, participants were asked to
13 look straight ahead. No fixation markers were provided to avoid additional cues regarding
14 body midline and monitor center location.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 On each trial, a vertical line (0.5 x 2 cm) was presented for 80 ms at a randomly
32 selected location ± 3.2 cm from the center of the monitor. The stimulus was randomly
33 presented in eleven locations (-3.2, -1.6, -0.8, -0.4, -0.2, 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.8, 1.6, 3.2 cm) with
34 respect to the center of the monitor. Twenty trials were used for eccentric locations (-3.2, -
35 1.6, -0.8, 0.8, 1.6, and 3.2 cm), 30 for middle locations (-0.4 and 0.4 cm), and 40 for central
36 locations (-0.2, 0, and 0.2 cm). The stimuli were shown 4 cm above the center of the
37 monitor at the eye-line of the participants. Participants judged whether the visual target was
38 located to the left or right of their body-midline by pressing buttons located on their left or
39 right side. Participants were instructed to press the buttons as fast and accurately as
40 possible. Both accuracy and reaction times were recorded from target presentation to the
41 response.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 In half of the blocks participants completed the task with their hands uncrossed,
56 such that the left hand pressed the left-sided button and the right hand pressed the right-
57 sided button. In the other half the hands were crossed so that the left hand pressed the right-
58 sided button.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 sided button and vice versa (Fig. 1C). This allowed us to disentangle any potential effects of
2 GVS on the motor response from effects on egocentric representation. For example, if the
3 principal locus of GVS effects was to bias responding towards one hand, then performance
4 on the localization task should be strongly affected by crossing the hands.
5
6

7
8 GVS polarity and hand position were combined in a factorial design, resulting in 6
9 experimental conditions. Each condition was repeated twice giving 12 separate blocks of
10 150 trials, lasting approximately 4-5 minutes each, and with GVS/sham stimulation applied
11 continuously. The order of blocks was counterbalanced within and across participants.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **2.2. Results**

19
20 Trials with implausibly short reaction times (< 183 ms: corresponding to 1 % of
21 trials) were excluded from analysis. The proportion of right responses was estimated for
22 each condition. Reaction times did not differ significantly (Sham = 410 ± 59.0 ms, L-GVS =
23 409 ± 56.6 ms, R-GVS = 413 ± 60.9 ms, one-way ANOVA: $F(2,18) = 0.166$, $p = 0.848$).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Figure 2A shows averaged responses of participants with fitted logistic
32 psychometric functions. The point of subjective equality (PSE) and just-noticeable difference
33 (JND) were calculated from the functions for each participant in each condition. Following
34 previous studies (Ferre et al., 2013b), we analysed the data using planned comparisons, to
35 distinguish between general, non-specific effects of GVS, and effects of GVS that are
36 specific to the polarity of stimulation, and thus to our hypothesis regarding shifts of the body
37 midline. This approach is justified because of the clear mechanistic link between the polarity
38 of GVS stimulation and the predicted direction of any spatial effects.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 *Generic vestibular effect.* First, we checked whether the PSE for SHAM was
50 significantly different from 0. A direct comparison showed no differences ($t(18)=-1.52$,
51 $p=0.147$). To assess general effects of GVS independent of polarity the average of L-GVS
52 and R-GVS conditions was compared to sham stimulation in a 2 (Stimulation: generic
53 vestibular, sham stimulation) x 2 (Hand: uncrossed, crossed) ANOVA. No significant main
54 effects of Stimulation ($F(1,18) = 1.52$; $p = 0.23$), Hand ($F(1,18) = 0.62$; $p = 0.44$) or
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

interactions emerged ($F(1,18) = 0.002$; $p = 0.96$) (Fig. 2B).

1
2 *Specific vestibular effect.* We directly compared L-GVS and R-GVS conditions to
3 investigate differences in how vestibular projections in each hemisphere might influence
4 egocentric representation. The effect of GVS polarity was analyzed using a 2 (GVS polarity:
5 L-GVS, R-GVS) x 2 (Hand posture: uncrossed, crossed) ANOVA. A significant main effect of
6 GVS polarity was found ($F(1,18) = 16.2$; $p = 0.0008$, Partial $\eta^2 = 0.47$, Effect size $f = 0.95$), in
7 which the PSE shifted leftwards (0.75 cm hands uncrossed and 0.68cm hands crossed)
8 under L-GVS relative to R-GVS (Fig. 2B). There was no significant main effect of Hand
9 posture ($F(1,18) = 0.31$; $p = 0.58$) or interaction between GVS polarity and Hand posture
10 ($F(1,18) = 0.14$; $p = 0.71$). In addition, we also subtracted SHAM from R-GVS and L-GVS,
11 and directly compared the absolute magnitude of GVS effect between both polarities. No
12 statistically significant difference emerged (paired T-test, $t(18)=1.231$, $p =0.234$).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 2. Results of Experiment 1.

A. Ensemble judgment as the function of the stimulus location with psychometric curves. The data were shown for hand uncrossed (left panel) and crossed (right panel). The arrow indicates the value of PSE for each GVS condition. Error bar indicates standard error of mean. B. Averaged PSEs for all the conditions. Three asterisks: significance at $p < 0.001$. N.S.: not significant. C. Temporal change in the PSE as the function of the sub-block. The PSE gradually varied according to the GVS condition. Colours denote the GVS condition as shown in panel 2A.

Temporal effect. We also performed an exploratory analysis of the time-course of GVS effects within each block. We divided the data in each stimulation condition (150 trials, lasting approx. 4min.) into three sub-blocks having 50 trials. That is, we defined first, second, and third sub-blocks consisting of trials 1-50, 51-100, and 101-150. Since each stimulation block was repeated twice in our experimental design, we could then calculate an estimate of PSE at each window position based on 100 trials. The choice of sub-block length was arbitrary, but reflected a trade-off between the need to keep the datapoints independent for statistical analysis, and the need to have enough trials per sub-block to ensure stable fitting of the psychophysical function. Since we found no influence of hand

1 posture, the data for uncrossed and crossed hand postures were collapsed. The sign of L-
2 GVS data was inverted and a two-way (sub-block and GVS polarity) ANOVA was conducted.
3
4 A significant main effect of sub-block was found ($F(2,36) = 6.55$; $p = 0.004$; Partial $\eta^2 = 0.27$;
5
6 Effect size $f = 0.60$) indicating that the PSE gradually shifted over the course of the block
7
8 (Fig. 2C).
9

10 11 12 **2.3. Discussion**

13
14
15 These results suggested that GVS changed the participants' egocentric spatial
16
17 representation, with the perceived body midline shifting towards the anodal side. There was
18
19 no effect of crossing the hands, ruling out alternative explanations based on GVS affecting
20
21 the selection or efficiency of lateralized motor output processes. Our data therefore support
22
23 a body-related theory suggesting that GVS selectively modulates our egocentric spatial
24
25 representations (Fig. 3A). In a second experiment, we tested whether our results could be
26
27 alternatively explained by a GVS modulation of allocentric visual representations, unrelated
28
29 to the body midline (Fig. 3A).
30
31
32
33
34

35 **3. Vestibular contribution to allocentric spatial representation**

36 **3.1. Material and Methods**

37 **3.1.1. Participants**

38
39
40 Nineteen healthy, right-handed participants (6 males, mean age \pm SD: 21.9 ± 3.0
41
42 years) took part in this experiment. None of the participants had participated in the previous
43
44 experiment. Exclusion criteria were as Experiment 1.
45
46
47
48
49

50 **3.1.2. Procedure**

51
52 Participants were asked to judge whether the visual targets (as in Experiment 1)
53
54 appeared to the left or right of a visual reference. This reference was a 20 cm vertical line
55
56 presented at a fixed location 3 cm to the left or to the right of the center of the monitor (Fig.
57
58 1D). Thus, the task required a visual allocentric representation, centred on the reference,
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 and egocentric location was irrelevant. Peripheral presentation of the reference ensured
2 that the task difficulty was equal between both experiments. As there was no main effect of
3 hand position in Experiment 1, participants completed this task with hands uncrossed. The
4 two reference locations (left and right) and three GVS polarities (L-GVS, R-GVS and sham
5 stimulation) gave six conditions, repeated twice to give 12 blocks of 150 trials. The
6 experimental setup and all other procedures were as Experiment 1.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 **3.2. Results**

16
17 As in Experiment 1, we excluded trials with reaction times less than 283 ms (1 % of
18 trials). No statistical difference emerged between GVS conditions (Sham = 453 ± 53.1 ms, L-
19 GVS = 450 ± 50.3 ms, R-GVS = 441 ± 48.2 ms, one-way ANOVA, $F(2,18) = 2.52$, $p = 0.09$).
20
21
22
23

24 *Generic vestibular effect.* To assess general effects of GVS independent of polarity
25 the average of L-GVS and R-GVS conditions was compared to sham stimulation in a 2
26 (Stimulation: generic vestibular, sham) x 2 (Reference: left, right) ANOVA. A significant main
27 effect of Reference emerged ($F(1,18) = 9.89$, $p = 0.006$, Partial $\eta^2 = 0.35$, Effect size $f =$
28 0.74). No significant main effect of Stimulation ($F(1,18) = 0.36$, $p = 0.36$) or interactions
29 between factors was found ($F(1,18) = 2.38$, $p = 0.14$), suggesting a tendency to mislocalise
30 according to the location of reference, but irrespective of stimulation conditions (Fig. 3B).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *Specific vestibular effect.* The effect of GVS polarity was analyzed using a 2 (GVS
41 polarity: L-GVS, R-GVS) x 2 (Reference: left, right) ANOVA. A significant main effect of GVS
42 polarity ($F(1,18) = 8.80$, $p = 0.0082$, Partial $\eta^2 = 0.33$, Effect size $f = 0.70$) was found: the
43 PSE shifted leftward for R-GVS, and rightward for L-GVS (Fig. 3B). Thus, GVS affected
44 allocentric visual localization in a polarity-dependent manner in the opposite direction to
45 Experiment 1. In addition, the main effect of Reference was significant ($F(1,18) = 12.72$, $p =$
46 0.0022, Partial $\eta^2 = 0.41$, Effect size $f = 0.84$). However, no significant interaction was found
47 ($F(1,18) = 4.17$, $p = 0.056$), suggesting that the mislocalization was independent of GVS
48 polarity.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 *Temporal effect.* Data were analysed as Experiment 1. No significant temporal
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

pattern of GVS emerged ($F(2,36) = 0.24$; $p = 0.79$) (Fig. 3C).

Further, we compared the effects of GVS between Exp.1 and Exp.2. We performed a two-way ANOVA with Stimulation (L-GVS and R-GVS) as within factor and Experiment (Exp.1 and Exp.2) as between factor. For this analysis, we subtracted Sham-GVS from R-GVS and L-GVS as shown in Figure 3D. In addition to a significant main effect of GVS ($F(1,1) = 11.5$, $p = 0.0017$, Partial $\eta^2 = 0.24$, Effect size $f = 0.56$), significant interaction (GVS x Experiments) emerged ($F(1,36) = 20.4$, $p = 0.0001$, Partial $\eta^2 = 0.36$, Effect size $f = 0.75$). These data indicate that GVS effect differ between experiments.




Figure 3. Body vs Vision theory and results of Experiment 2.

A. Two contrasting theories for interpreting results of Experiment 1. Consider the scenario in which the visual stimulus is at the body-center, and participants judge its location “Center” for Sham-GVS. The BODY theory would explain the observed results as a rightward shift in egocentric body representation induced by R-GVS. Center-stimuli would then be judged “Left”. The VISION theory proposes a direct shift in the visual representation induced by R-GVS, without any change in the representation of the body egocentre. B. Averaged PSEs for all the conditions for Experiment 2. C. Temporal change in the PSE as the function of the sub-block. D. A direct comparison of GVS effect observed in the first and second experiment. We subtracted Sham-GVS from R-GVS and L-GVS.

3.3. Discussion

GVS significantly biased allocentric visual localization in the opposite direction compared to the egocentric localization bias of Experiment 1 (Fig. 3D). The effect of GVS

1 on allocentric representations may be explained by a GVS-induced modulation of spatial
2 attention and “foveal mislocalisation”, in which briefly-presented peripheral targets are
3 perceived as closer to the foveal location than their true location (Müsseler J. et al., 1999).
4 This effect could be observed as a positive or negative bias in the PSE depending on the
5 location of the reference (Figure 3B). For example, when R-GVS is applied, an increase in
6 activity in the left hemisphere directs spatial attention towards the right side. This shift in
7 attention would subsequently increase foveal mislocalisation for visual stimuli presented on
8 the left, and reduce mislocalisation for stimuli on the right. Hence, GVS biased allocentric
9 representations towards the left for R-GVS and towards the right for L-GVS.

10
11 Taken together, our results highlight the relationship between vestibular information
12 and egocentric body representation. Our experimental paradigm and procedures carefully
13 and systematically ruled out other explanations based on GVS affecting body motion, the
14 effector selection process, and allocentric visual localization. A final alternative explanation is
15 that GVS could induce a change in gaze location which may have affected the egocentric
16 judgement task. Thus, in two final experiments we examined the relationship between GVS,
17 gaze shift, and egocentric body representation.

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 **4. Comparison of effect on egocentric representation between vestibular stimulation** 39 **versus gaze shift**

40
41
42 We conducted two experiments to examine 1) gaze behaviour during the egocentric
43 judgment task with GVS (Experiment 3) and 2) the direct effect of gaze location on
44 egocentric body representation (Experiment 4).

45 46 47 48 49 50 51 **4.1. Experiment 3**

52 53 **4.1.1 Materials and Methods**

54 55 **Participants**

56
57
58 Thirteen participants took part in Experiment 3 (3 males, mean age \pm SD: 21.1 \pm 3.4
59 years). The sample size was a priori decided based on a power analysis with $t = 4.03$, $\alpha =$

0.05 and power = 0.80 (G*Power; Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). None of the participants had participated in the previous experiments. Exclusion criteria were as the previous experiments.

Procedure

Participants completed the egocentric localization task with GVS while their gaze location was recorded. The task was completed with hands uncrossed. Only L-GVS and R-GVS polarities were used. The two conditions were repeated twice giving 4 blocks of 150 trials. Participants were fixed in a chin-rest during each block. Gaze location was measured from continuous recording of the right eye using a video-based eye-tracking system (ASL5000, sampling frequency of 60 Hz). Procedures were otherwise as Experiment 1.

4.1.2 Results

A significant difference between L-GVS and R-GVS was found ($t(12) = 5.72$, $p = 0.001$, Effect size $d_z = 1.44$) (Fig. 4A). The PSE was shifted leftwards by 1.04 cm during L-GVS versus R-GVS, replicating the results of Experiment 1.

Eye-tracking data were processed by manual inspection and exclusion of trials with eye-blinks. Figure 4B shows a fixation map, obtained from a representative participant. Areas with longer fixation are shown with warmer colours (i.e. red). The fixation map indicates that gaze location was concentrated on the left of the body midline (vertical pink line) for L-GVS (top panel in Fig. 4B), and at the right side for R-GVS (middle panel in Fig. 4B). Averaged gaze location was statistically significant between both GVS polarities as shown in the bottom panel of Figure 4B ($t(12) = 3.80$, $p = 0.003$, Effect size $d_z = 1.05$). The average gaze location at each successive 30s time-window within a block was then calculated (average block length was 217 ± 19.7 s). Figure 4C shows the change in gaze location across time, averaged across participants. A significant difference in gaze location was found at each time window, with R-GVS shifting gaze location rightwards and L-GVS shifting gaze location leftwards (multiple comparison with Holm-Bonferroni correction: $t(12) =$

1 [4.08, 4.07, 3.88, 3.48, 3.44, 3.26, 3.06, 3.96], $p_{adj} = [0.02, 0.021, 0.019, 0.013, 0.022, 0.011,$
2 0.012, 0.011] at each time window).

3 4 5 6 **4.2. Experiment 4**

7 **4.2.1 Materials and Method**

8 **Participants**

9
10
11
12
13 Thirteen participants took part in Experiment 4 (7 males, mean age \pm SD: 36.1 ± 6.2
14 years, based on the same power calculation as for Experiment 3. None of the participants
15 had participated in the previous experiments. Exclusion criteria were as the previous
16 experiments.
17
18
19
20

21 **Procedure**

22
23
24
25
26
27 Participants completed the egocentric localization task while their gaze was directed
28 left or right. On each trial, participants were required to direct their gaze ± 4 cm from the
29 centre of the monitor. This magnitude of shift was chosen based on the results of experiment
30 3, computing the mean \pm 2SD of the gaze shift observed in Exp.3. Instead of a fixation
31 marker, sound feedback was given when the gaze was in an incorrect location. After holding
32 the correct fixation for 0.7s, the visual target was briefly flashed. No GVS was applied.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

4.2.2 Results

Figure 4D shows average PSEs across participants while gaze was directed either leftwards or rightwards. We verified that the gaze was directed to the correct location by estimating the average gaze location during the period from the onset of the target to the response (mean \pm SD: gaze-left = -3.9 ± 0.26 cm; gaze-right 4.0 ± 0.36 cm). There was no significant difference in the PSE between gaze conditions [$t(12)=0.65, p=0.53$].

4.3. Discussion

1
2 The results of Experiment 3 showed that GVS can bias not only egocentric body
3 representations (Fig. 4A), but also shift horizontal gaze location (Fig. 4B). Thus, one might
4 argue that this GVS-induced shift in gaze location could have indirectly driven the bias in
5 egocentric body representation, without any direct effect of GVS. However, in Experiment 4,
6 egocentric judgements were not significantly altered when participants were explicitly asked
7 to direct their gaze leftwards or rightwards by an amount equivalent to the GVS-induced bias
8 (Fig. 4C). Taken together, these results therefore suggest that the indirect effect of GVS
9 mediated by gaze shifts is minimal or absent. Thus, the strong biasing effect of GVS on
10 egocentric body representations is independent of changes in gaze location, and appears to
11 represent a direct vestibular input to spatial representation of the body midline.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 4. Results of Experiment 3 and 4.

A. Averaged PSE for each GVS condition in Experiment 3. Right-left judgment of the visual target relative to body-midline was biased by GVS. B. “heat map” of gaze locations obtained from a single participant for L-GVS (top panel) and R-GVS (middle panel). Vertical pink line: center of the monitor, corresponding to true body midline. Horizontal white line: vertical position of stimulus presentation. Bottom panel: Averaged gaze location across participants. C. Temporal change in horizontal gaze location during one block. D. Averaged PSE for each gaze direction in Experiment 4.

5. General Discussion

In many situations appropriate motor responses must be chosen rapidly based on the location of external objects relative to the body midline. Figure 5 depicts a conceptual model for these vision-body-action chains. In this schematic, the retinal location of a visual target is integrated with other sensory signals, and with a representation of the body itself, and particularly of the body midline, to localize the target with an egocentric frame of reference. Motor responses are then selected based on this egocentric localization. Our research has been concerned with the origin of this representation of the body midline, and

particularly with the possibility that it may depend on vestibular signals. The specific vestibular contribution to egocentric body representation has proved difficult to study because of potential confounding effects of vestibular interactions with visual and motor systems. In this series of studies, we systematically investigated the contribution of vestibular signals to egocentric spatial representations. In Experiment 1 we found that artificial stimulation of the vestibular system biased body midline perception based on GVS polarity. Importantly, no effect was found on motor effector selection. In experiments two and three we ruled out additional explanations based on allocentric visual representations and on potential indirect effects caused by vestibular-driven movements of the eye, head and body. Thus, our data suggest that vestibular information contributes to computation of egocentric representations by affecting the internal representation of the body midline.




Figure 5. A hypothetical model of the mechanisms underlying the effect of vestibular signals on vision-body-action processing. See text for explanation.

Previous research investigating the perception of the body midline involved asking participants to point straight ahead without visual information. In particular, this task has shown a systematic bias towards the ipsilesional side in patients with hemispatial neglect. This bias has been successfully remediated by artificial vestibular stimulation, suggesting that the vestibular system contributes to body representation (Cappa et al., 1987; Vallar et al., 1993; Karnath et al., 1994). However, the use of this task cannot rule out alternative

1 explanations based on vestibular contributions to motor control (Pizzamiglio et al., 2000;
2 Heilman et al., 1983b). Indeed, vestibular-motor interactions have been found for posture
3 control (Horstmann et al., 1988; Cullen, 2012) and arm-reaching/ocular movements (Itō,
4 1982; Ito 1984; Lacquaniti and Caminati, 1998; Bresciani et al., 2002). Furthermore, recent
5 imaging studies have shown that vestibular inputs project to widespread brain regions
6 including motor-related areas (Lopez et al., 2012). Our experiments however systematically
7 rule out these alternative explanations, and show that a direct vestibular contribution to
8 egocentric body representation remains, even after controlling for motor effects. Thus, in
9 Experiment 1, hand posture did not change the GVS effect on perceptual judgments (Fig. 2A
10 and 2B), and there was no GVS effect on reaction times. In addition, these findings are
11 consistent with previous studies showing no effect of GVS on the use of right or left hand
12 during free selection of manual actions (Ferrè et al., 2013a).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
In Experiment 2, we aimed to disentangle the effects of GVS on egocentric and
allocentric representations (Figure 3A). Previous imaging and neurophysiological studies
have demonstrated the tight interaction of vestibular function with visual systems (Brandt et
al., 1998; Brandt et al., 2002), however there are few studies directly examining vestibular
contributions to allocentric visual localization. The results showed that GVS slightly, but
significantly, affected allocentric visual localization (Fig. 3B). This effect could be ascribed to
“foveal mislocalization” (Müsseler et al., 1999) and its modulation by GVS. Since GVS shifts
spatial attention towards the anode, it may change the degree of mislocalization, with a
direction that depends on the side of the allocentric reference relative to central fixation.
Importantly, the GVS effect on allocentric visual perception was in the opposite direction
from the GVS effect on egocentric localization in Experiment 1 (Fig. 3D). This suggests a
clear dissociation between effects of vestibular input on visual localization and on body
representations.

Finally, we confirmed that our results were not due to physical movements of the
head or eye causing shifts in gaze location. In Experiment 3, we replicated the GVS effects
observed in Experiment 1 even when the head movements were physically restricted by a

1 chin-rest. Regarding eye movements, our results are consistent with previous studies
2 reporting reflexive and weak horizontal eye movements (slow phase nystagmus) towards the
3 anode (Cauquil et al., 2003; Curthoys and MacDougall, 2012): in Experiment 3 we found that
4 gaze location shifted toward the anode during the egocentric judgment task (Fig. 4B and
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Importantly, equivalent manipulations of gaze location by instructed voluntary fixation, without GVS, did not affect egocentric localization in Experiment 4 (Fig. 4D). Voluntary gaze shift has been reported to modulate spatial representations (Cui et al., 2010). For instance, voluntary shift in gaze location influenced head-center, but not body-center, representation (Lewald & Ehrenstein, 2000). However, our results are in line with previous studies which have shown that selectively induced change in gaze, for instance with prism adaptation, did not contribute to egocentric localization (Newport et al., 2009). Although there might be differences in the neural *mechanisms* underlying involuntary and voluntary gaze control, we were able to balance the oculomotor *behavior* between experiments 3 and 4. This rules out the possibility that the vestibular effects on egocentric localization we have obtained in this study are mediated by the consequence of gaze shift. Thus our results show that vestibular modulation of egocentric localization is independent of oculomotor *behaviour*, but cannot conclusively address whether vestibular modulation of localization is independent of oculomotor *circuits*. In addition, it has been known that GVS induces torsional eye movements (Jahn et al., 2003), but it is difficult to reproduce such eye movements voluntarily, without vestibular inputs. Thus, Experiments 3 and 4 focused on the possible effects of horizontal shift in gaze on body representation. An influence in the opposite direction is, of course, also possible, with body representation influencing gaze direction: the brain may adjust gaze location according to the shift in the representation of the body-midline. Thus, how body representation, gaze location and vestibular inputs interact is an open question for further investigation.

Which brain networks are responsible for vestibular interactions with egocentric body representations? Neuroimaging studies have demonstrated that vestibular stimulation activates widely spread cortical networks, involving the posterior and anterior insula, the

1 temporoparietal junction, the inferior parietal lobule, the somatosensory cortices, the primary
2 motor cortex and premotor cortex (Bottini et al., 1994; Bense et al., 2001; Fasold et al.,
3 2002; Emri et al., 2003). The right posterior parietal cortex is involved in spatial perception
4 and/or orienting spatial attention (Corbetta et al., 1995; Mesulam, 1999). For example, left
5 hemispatial neglect is associated with damage to the right inferior parietal or temporoparietal
6 lobe, suggesting right-hemisphere dominance in spatial perception (Driver and Mattingley,
7 1998). Accordingly, neurologically normal volunteers tend to be biased toward the left-side of
8 space in visuospatial tasks such as line-bisection, a phenomenon known as ‘pseudoneglect’
9 (Jewell and McCourt, 2000). Interestingly, we also observed a slight but nonsignificant
10 leftward bias in body-midline localisation without vestibular stimulation (SHAM condition in
11 Fig. 2B), analogous to pseudoneglect. A recent EEG study suggested that pseudoneglect
12 reflects representations of near space in the right parietal cortex (Longo et al., 2015).
13 Furthermore, an fMRI study investigated neural activation when performing a line-bisection
14 task during GVS (Fink et al., 2003). L-GVS produced unilateral activation of the right
15 vestibular cortex, while R-GVS activated the vestibular cortex bilaterally. In addition,
16 posterior parietal and ventral premotor cortex were specifically activated during the bisection
17 task with GVS, with pronounced right hemisphere activation. Finally, previous fMRI studies
18 showed that a bilateral parietal-premotor network, with larger activations in the right
19 hemisphere, was activated when participants performed visual localization relative to the
20 body-midline (Galati et al., 2000; Vallar et al., 1999). Taken together, we speculate that a
21 frontal-parietal network is involved in the egocentric localization process, and GVS induces
22 the change in the activation of these areas in a polarity specific manner.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

GVS polarity-specific effects have been previously described in the literature (see
Utz et al., 2010 for a review). For example, clinical studies have described a significant
reduction in visuospatial neglect induced by left anodal GVS compared to right-anodal GVS.
However, it is controversial to generalize these GVS polarity-specific effects to healthy
participants. For instance, changing the GVS polarity did not influence the *magnitude* of
errors in a line bisection task (although the *direction* of these errors did depend on polarity,

1 as predicted; Ferrè et al., 2013c). Similarly, we did not find a significant difference in the
2 numerical magnitude of GVS effects between R-GVS and L-GVS. Polarity effects on the
3 magnitude, as opposed to direction, of GVS effects are often interpreted in terms of
4 hemispheric specialization (Ferrè et al., 2013c). Our data therefore do not support
5 hemispheric specialization effects in egocentric localization in healthy participants.
6
7
8
9

10
11 Moreover, our temporal analysis (Experiment 1) revealed that the effect induced by
12 GVS grows with cumulating vestibular input (Fig. 2C). In fact, the perceived body midline
13 shifted gradually with increasing GVS exposure during the course of the block. This seems
14 to suggest that the representation of the midline is established by constant online integration
15 of ongoing sensory input, rather than being a systematic stored knowledge about one's own
16 body.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Our results suggest that vestibular signals contribute to a representation of the body
25 midline, and that this representation is implicit, and continuously updated by afferent input.
26 The representation of the body midline recalls the idea of an "egocentre". Most sensory
27 organs are duplicated on each side of the body, yet behavioural performance suggests
28 information is integrated into a virtual single sensory organ located closer to the midline.
29 Thus, vision from the two eyes has been referred to a "Cyclopean eye" (Julesz, 1971),
30 though this idea remains controversial (Erkelens and Van Ee, 2002). Proprioceptive inputs
31 from each arm are referred to shoulder, and the perceptual properties related to each
32 shoulder are integrated (Jola et al., 2011). Cutaneous inputs from a zone of overlap around
33 the body midline project to both hemispheres (Manzoni et al., 1989), yet touches at the
34 corresponding skin location are felt as one object rather than two. In the vestibular case,
35 rotation of the head causes a velocity signal in vestibular canal afferents. Increases in firing
36 from afferents on one side of the body are accompanied by decreases on the other side.
37 Therefore, heading direction at rest can be computed as a direction which generates no net
38 vestibular velocity signal. In our study, the head is fixed relative to the torso, so the body
39 midline and heading direction are identical. Thus, for example, a visual stimulus aligned with
40 the body midline would generate no change in canal input if a head rotation were made to
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

fixate it. In this way, the combination of signals from lateralised vestibular organs can contribute to a purely cognitive representation of the body midline.

In conclusion, our studies highlight vestibular contributions to egocentric body representations. Although the role of vestibular signals in egocentric representation has often been suggested, the dependent measures and control conditions used as operational definitions of egocentric representation in previous studies could not rule out other explanations, based on possible vestibular influences on the visual and motor processes used to measure egocentric representation. We have shown that vestibular stimulation biases participants' perception of their body-midline location, shifting it towards the anode. Importantly, we have systematically ruled out alternative explanations based on possible vestibular influences on action selection, action execution, gaze direction, and allocentric visual representation. Thus, our results suggest that vestibular information is involved in the process of egocentric visual localization, necessary for making rapid motor actions. Our results strongly support the idea of a central, cognitive representation of egocentric space, centred on the body midline, and abstracted from specific visual input and from motor output. Vestibular signals provide an ongoing input to the cognitive process which computes and maintains the representation of the body midline.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a UCL-NTT collaboration grant and by BIAL foundation bursary 269/14. P. Haggard was additionally supported by ERC Advanced Grant HUMVOL.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Reference

- 1
2 Bense, S., Stephan, T., Yousry, T. A., Brandt, T., & Dieterich, M. (2001). Multisensory
3 cortical signal increases and decreases during vestibular galvanic stimulation (fMRI).
4 *Journal of neurophysiology*, 85(2), 886-899.
5
6
7
8
9 Bermúdez, J. L. (2005). The phenomenology of bodily awareness. *Phenomenology and*
10 *philosophy of mind*, 295-322.
11
12
13 Bermúdez, J. L. (2011). *Bodily awareness and self-consciousness*. na.
14
15 Blouin, J., Gauthier, G. M., Vercher, J. L., & Cole, J. (1996). The relative contribution of
16 retinal and extraretinal signals in determining the accuracy of reaching movements in
17 normal subjects and a deafferented patient. *Experimental Brain Research*, 109(1),
18 148-153.
19
20
21
22
23
24 Blouin, J., Labrousse, L., Simoneau, M., Vercher, J. L., & Gauthier, G. M. (1998). Updating
25 visual space during passive and voluntary head-in-space movements. *Experimental*
26 *brain research*, 122(1), 93-100.
27
28
29
30
31 Bonnier, P. L'aschématie. (1905). *Rev Neurol (Paris)*. 13:605–609
32
33 Bottini G., Sterzi R., Paulesu E., Vallar G., Cappa S.F., Erminio F., Passingham R.E., Frith
34 C.D., Frackowiak R.S. (1994). Identification of the central vestibular projections in
35 man: a positron emission tomography activation study. *Experimental brain research*,
36 99(1), 164-169.
37
38
39
40
41
42 Bowers, D., & Heilman, K. M. (1980). Pseudoneglect: effects of hemispace on a tactile line
43 bisection task. *Neuropsychologia*, 18(4), 491-498.
44
45
46
47 Brandt, T., Bartenstein, P., Janek, A., & Dieterich, M. (1998). Reciprocal inhibitory visual-
48 vestibular interaction. Visual motion stimulation deactivates the parieto-insular
49 vestibular cortex. *Brain*, 121(9), 1749-1758.
50
51
52
53 Brandt, T., Glasauer, S., Stephan, T., Bense, S., Yousry, T. A., Deutschländer, A., &
54 Dieterich, M. (2002). Visual- Vestibular and Visuovisual Cortical Interaction. *Annals*
55 *of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 956(1), 230-241.
56
57
58
59
60 Bresciani, J. P., Blouin, J., Popov, K., Bourdin, C., Sarlegna, F., Vercher, J. L., & Gauthier,

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- G. M. (2002). Galvanic vestibular stimulation in humans produces online arm movement deviations when reaching towards memorized visual targets. *Neuroscience letters*, *318*(1), 34-38.
- Cappa, S., Sterzi, R., Vallar, G., & Bisiach, E. (1987). Remission of hemineglect and anosognosia during vestibular stimulation. *Neuropsychologia*, *25*(5), 775-782.
- Cassam, Q. (2011). *The embodied self*. na.
- Cauquil, A. S., Faldon, M., Popov, K., Day, B. L., & Bronstein, A. M. (2003). Short-latency eye movements evoked by near-threshold galvanic vestibular stimulation. *Experimental brain research*, *148*(3), 414-418.
- Clément, G., Fraysse, M. J., & Deguine, O. (2009). Mental representation of space in vestibular patients with otolithic or rotatory vertigo. *Neuroreport*, *20*(5), 457-461.
- Clément, G., Skinner, A., Richard, G., & Lathan, C. (2012). Geometric illusions in astronauts during long-duration spaceflight. *NeuroReport*, *23*(15), 894-899.
- Corbetta, M., Shulman, G. L., Miezin, F. M., & Petersen, S. E. (1995). Superior parietal cortex activation during spatial attention shifts and visual feature conjunction. *Science*, *270*(5237), 802.
- Critchley, M. (1953). Tactile Thought, with Special Reference to the Blind: President's Address.
- Cui Q.N., Razavi B., O'Neill W.E., & Paige G.D. (2010). Perception of Auditory, Visual, and Egocentric Spatial Alignment Adapts Differently to Changes in Eye Position. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *103*(2), 1020-1035
- Cullen, K. E. (2012). The vestibular system: multimodal integration and encoding of self-motion for motor control. *Trends in neurosciences*, *35*(3), 185-196.
- Curthoys, I. S. & MacDougall, H. G. (2012). What Galvanic Vestibular Stimulation Actually Activate. *Frontiers in neurology*, *3*: 117
- Dieterich, M., Bense, S., Lutz, S., Drzezga, A., Stephan, T., Bartenstein, P., & Brandt, T. (2003). Dominance for vestibular cortical function in the non-dominant hemisphere. *Cerebral cortex*, *13*(9), 994-1007.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Driver, J., & Mattingley, J. B. (1998). Parietal neglect and visual awareness. *Nature neuroscience*, 1(1), 17-22.
- Emri M., Kisely M., Lengyel Z., Balkay .L, Márián T., Mikó L., Berényi E., Sziklai I., Trón L., Tóth A.. (2003). Cortical projection of peripheral vestibular signaling. *Journal of neurophysiology*, 89(5), 2639-2646.
- Erkelens, C. J., & Van Ee, R. (2002). The role of the cyclopean eye in vision: sometimes inappropriate, always irrelevant. *Vision research*, 42(9), 1157-1163.
- Fasold, O., von Brevern, M., Kuhberg, M., Ploner, C. J., Villringer, A., Lempert, T., & Wenzel, R. (2002). Human vestibular cortex as identified with caloric stimulation in functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Neuroimage*, 17(3), 1384-1393.
- Faul F., Erdfelder E., Lang AG, Buchner A. (2007). G*Power 3: a flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behav Res Methods*. 39(2):175-91.
- Ferrè, E. R., Arthur, K., & Haggard, P. (2013a). Galvanic vestibular stimulation increases novelty in free selection of manual actions. *Frontiers in integrative neuroscience*, 7, 74.
- Ferrè, E. R., Vagnoni, E., & Haggard, P. (2013b). Vestibular contributions to bodily awareness. *Neuropsychologia*, 51(8), 1445-1452.
- Ferrè, E. R., Longo, M. R., Fiori, F., Haggard, P. (2013c). Vestibular modulation of spatial perception. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7, 660
- Fink, G. R., Marshall, J. C., Weiss, P. H., Stephan, T., Grefkes, C., Shah, N. J., Zilles K., Dieterich, M. (2003). Performing allocentric visuospatial judgments with induced distortion of the egocentric reference frame: an fMRI study with clinical implications. *Neuroimage*, 20(3), 1505-1517.
- Fitzpatrick, R. C., & Day, B. L. (2004). Probing the human vestibular system with galvanic stimulation. *Journal of applied physiology*, 96(6), 2301-2316.
- Galati, G., Lobel, E., Vallar, G., Berthoz, A., Pizzamiglio, L., & Le Bihan, D. (2000). The neural basis of egocentric and allocentric coding of space in humans: a functional

- magnetic resonance study. *Experimental Brain Research*, 133(2), 156-164.
- 1
2 Goldberg, J. M., Smith, C. E., & Fernandez, C. (1984). Relation between discharge
3
4 regularity and responses to externally applied galvanic currents in vestibular nerve
5
6 afferents of the squirrel monkey. *Journal of neurophysiology*, 51(6), 1236-1256.
7
8
9 Heilman, K. M., Bowers, D., & Watson, R. T. (1983a). Performance on hemispatial pointing
10
11 task by patients with neglect syndrome. *Neurology*, 33(5), 661-661.
12
13 Heilman, K. M., Watson, R. T., Valenstein, E., & Damasio, A. R. (1983b). Localization of
14
15 lesions in neglect. *Localization in neuropsychology*, 33, 471-92.
16
17
18 Horstmann, G. A., & Dietz, V. (1988). The contribution of vestibular input to the stabilization
19
20 of human posture: a new experimental approach. *Neuroscience letters*, 95(1), 179-
21
22 184.
23
24
25 Itō, M. (1984). The cerebellum and neural control. *Raven Pr.*
26
27 Itō, M. (1982). Cerebellar control of the vestibulo-ocular reflex--around the flocculus
28
29 hypothesis. *Annual review of neuroscience*, 5(1), 275-297.
30
31
32 Jahn, K., Naessl A., Strupp, M., Schneider, E., Brandt, T., Dieterich, M. (2003). Torsional
33
34 eye movement responses to monaural and binaural galvanic vestibular stimulation:
35
36 side-to-side asymmetries. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1004:485-9
37
38
39 Jeannerod M. (1988) *The Neural and Behavioural Organization of Goal-Directed*
40
41 *Movements*. (Clarendon Press, Oxford).
42
43
44 Jeannerod, M., & Biguer, B. (1987). The directional coding of reaching movements. A
45
46 visuomotor conception of spatial neglect. *Advances in Psychology*, 45, 87-113.
47
48
49 Jewell, G., & McCourt, M. E. (2000). Pseudoneglect: a review and meta-analysis of
50
51 performance factors in line bisection tasks. *Neuropsychologia*, 38(1), 93-110.
52
53
54 Jola, C., Davis, A., & Haggard, P. (2011). Proprioceptive integration and body
55
56 representation: insights into dancers' expertise. *Experimental Brain Research*, 213(2-
57
58 3), 257.
59
60
61 Julesz, B. (1971). Foundations of cyclopean perception.
62
63
64
65 Karnath, H. O. (1994). Subjective body orientation in neglect and the interactive contribution

- of neck muscle proprioception and vestibular stimulation. *Brain*, 117(5), 1001-1012.
- Lacquaniti, F., & Caminiti, R. (1998). Visuo-motor transformations for arm reaching. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 10, 195-203.
- Lewald, J., & Ehrenstein, W. H. (2000). Visual and proprioceptive shifts in perceived egocentric direction induced by eye-position. *Vision Research*, 40(5), 539–547.
- Longo, M. R., Trippier, S., Vagnoni, E., & Lourenco, S. F. (2015). Right hemisphere control of visuospatial attention in near space. *Neuropsychologia*, 70, 350-357.
- Lopez, C., Blanke, O., & Mast, F. W. (2012). The human vestibular cortex revealed by coordinate-based activation likelihood estimation meta-analysis. *Neuroscience*, 212, 159-179.
- Lhermitte, J. (1952) L'image corporelle en neurologie. *Schweiz Arch Neurol Psychiatr.*, 69, 214–236.
- Manzoni, T., Barbaresi, P., Conti, F., & Fabri, M. (1989). The callosal connections of the primary somatosensory cortex and the neural bases of midline fusion. *Experimental Brain Research*, 76(2), 251-266.
- Müsseler J., van der Heijden AH., Mahmud SH., Deubel H., Ertsey S. (1999). Relative mislocalization of briefly presented stimuli in the retinal periphery. *Percept Psychophys.*: 61(8):1646-61.
- Mesulam, M. M. (1999). Spatial attention and neglect: parietal, frontal and cingulate contributions to the mental representation and attentional targeting of salient extrapersonal events. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 354(1387), 1325-1346.
- Newport, R., Preston, C., Pearce, R., & Holton, R. (2009). Eye rotation does not contribute to shifts in subjective straight ahead: Implications for prism adaptation and neglect. *Neuropsychologia*, 47(8), 2008-2012.
- Pafel, Jürgen, Gianfranco Soldati, and Quassim Cassam. "Self and World." (1998): 314-317.
- Pizzamiglio, L., Committeri, G., Galati, G., & Patria, F. (2000). Psychophysical properties of line bisection and body midline perception in unilateral neglect. *Cortex*, 36(4), 469-

- Schilder, P. (1935). *The image and appearance of the human body*. International Univ. Press, New York
- Utz, K. S., Dimova, V., Oppenländer, K., & Kerkhoff, G. (2010). Electrified minds: transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) and galvanic vestibular stimulation (GVS) as methods of non-invasive brain stimulation in neuropsychology—a review of current data and future implications. *Neuropsychologia*, *48*(10), 2789-2810.
- Vallar, G., Bottini, G., Rusconi, M. L., & Sterzi, R. (1993). Exploring somatosensory hemineglect by vestibular stimulation. *Brain*, *116*(1), 71-86.
- Vallar, G., Lobel, E., Galati, G., Berthoz, A., Pizzamiglio, L., & Le Bihan, D. (1999). A fronto-parietal system for computing the egocentric spatial frame of reference in humans. *Experimental Brain Research*, *124*(3), 281-286.
- Vallar G., & Papagno C. (2003). Pierre Bonnier's (1905) cases of bodily "aschématie" In C. Code, C.-W. Wallesch, Y. Joannette, & A. R. Lecours (Eds.), *Classic cases in neuropsychology, volume 2* (pp. 147-170). Hove, East Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Vallar G., & Rode G. (2009). Commentary on Bonnier P. L'aschématie. *Rev Neurol (Paris)* *1905*;13:605-9. *Epilepsy Behav.*, *16*(3), 397-400
- Villard, E., Garcia-Moreno, F. T., Peter, N., & Clément, G. (2005). Geometric visual illusions in microgravity during parabolic flight. *Neuroreport*, *16*(12), 1395-1398.

Figure captions

Figure 1. Experimental setup and methods.

A. Apparatus. B. GVS polarities and electrodes configurations. C. Experiment 1: Participants localized visual stimuli relative to their body midline. The task was performed with the hand uncrossed or crossed. The blue arrows indicate participant's judgment. If participant judges "right", they are instructed to press the right-side button in the both hand conditions. D. Experiment 2: Participants localized visual stimulus relative to an allocentric

reference.

1
2
3
4 **Figure 2. Results of Experiment 1.**
5

6 A. Ensemble judgment as the function of the stimulus location with psychometric curves.
7 The data were shown for hand uncrossed (left panel) and crossed (right panel). The arrow
8 indicates the value of PSE for each GVS condition. Error bar indicates standard error of
9 mean. B. Averaged PSEs for all the conditions. Three asterisks: significance at $p < 0.001$.
10 N.S.: not significant. C. Temporal change in the PSE as the function of the sub-block. The
11 PSE gradually varied according to the GVS condition. Colours denote the GVS condition as
12 shown in panel 2A.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Figure 3. Body vs Vision theory and results of Experiment 2.**
25

26 A. Two contrasting theories for interpreting results of Experiment 1. Consider the scenario in
27 which the visual stimulus is at the body-center, and participants judge its location “Center”
28 for Sham-GVS. The BODY theory would explain the observed results as a rightward shift in
29 egocentric body representation induced by R-GVS. Center-stimuli would then be judged
30 “Left”. The VISION theory proposes a direct shift in the visual representation induced by R-
31 GVS, without any change in the representation of the body egocentre. B. Averaged PSEs
32 for all the conditions for Experiment 2. C. Temporal change in the PSE as the function of the
33 sub-block. D. A direct comparison of GVS effect observed in the first and second
34 experiment. We subtracted Sham-GVS from R-GVS and L-GVS.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Figure 4. Results of Experiment 3 and 4.**
52

53 A. Averaged PSE for each GVS condition in Experiment 3. Right-left judgment of the visual
54 target relative to body-midline was biased by GVS. B. “heat map” of gaze locations obtained
55 from a single participant for L-GVS (top panel) and R-GVS (middle panel). Vertical pink line:
56 center of the monitor, corresponding to true body midline. Horizontal white line: vertical
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

position of stimulus presentation. Bottom panel: Averaged gaze location across participants.

C. Temporal change in horizontal gaze location during one block. D. Averaged PSE for each gaze direction in Experiment 4.

Figure 5. A hypothetical model of the mechanisms underlying the effect of vestibular signals on vision-body-action processing. See text for explanation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65