

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/105413/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Megardon, Geoffrey and Sumner, Petroc 2018. The fate of non-selected activity in saccadic decisions: distinct goal-related and history-related modulation. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 119 (2) , pp. 608-620. 10.1152/jn.00254.2017

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00254.2017>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



1 **The fate of non-selected activity in**
2 **saccadic decisions: distinct goal-related**
3 **and history-related modulation.**

4 **AUTHORS:**

5 **Affiliations:**

6 Geoffrey Megardon^{1,3} and Petroc Sumner²

7 1- Cardiff University Brain Research Imagery Centre, School of Psychology, Cardiff University,
8 Maindy Road, Cardiff, CF24 4HQ, UK

9 2- School of Psychology, Cardiff University, Tower Building, 70 Park Place, Cardiff, CF10 3AT,
10 UK

11 **Contact Mails:**

12 geoffrey.megardon@gmail.com

13 sumnerp@cardiff.ac.uk

16 **ABBREVIATED TITLE:**

17 The fate of non-selected activity

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27 1 ABSTRACT

28 *The Global Effect (GE) traditionally refers to the tendency of effectors (e.g. hand, eyes) to first land in
29 between two nearby stimuli – forming a unimodal distribution. By measuring a shift of this distribution,
30 recent studies used the GE to assess the presence of decision-related inputs on the motor map for eye
31 movements. However, this method cannot distinguish whether one stimulus is inhibited or the other is
32 facilitated and could not detect situations where both stimuli are inhibited or facilitated.*

33 *Here, we detect deviations in the bimodal distribution of landing positions for remote stimuli, and find
34 that this bimodal GE reveals the presence, location and polarity (facilitation or inhibition) of history-
35 related and goal-related modulation of the non-selected activity (e.g. the distractor activity in correct
36 trials, and the target activity in error trials). We tested, for different inter-stimulus distances, the effect
37 of the rarity of double-stimulus trials, and the difference between performing a discrimination task
38 compared to free choice.*

39 *Our work shows that the effect of rarity is symmetric and decreases with inter-stimulus distances, while
40 the effect of goal-directed discrimination is asymmetric – occurring only when the distractor is selected
41 for the saccade – and maintained across inter-stimulus distances. These results suggest that the former
42 effect changes the response property of the motor map, while the latter specifically facilitates the target
43 location.*

45 2 NEW & NOTEWORTHY:

46 *Deviations in landing positions for saccades to targets and distractors reveal the presence, location and
47 polarity of history-related or goal-related signals.*

48 *Goal-directed discrimination appears to facilitate the target location, rather than inhibiting the
49 distractor location,*

50 *Rare occurrence of a choice appears to indiscriminately increase the neural response for both locations.*

51 **3 INTRODUCTION**

52 No matter how efficient a decision-making system, its expression will ultimately be limited by the
53 mechanisms used to translate decisions into actions. Those mechanisms can be seen as an encryption
54 key to decipher decision-related signals from motor responses (e.g. eye or hand movement
55 trajectories). In the context of saccadic eye movements, the Superior Colliculus (SC) is a key motor
56 interface (a role shared with the Frontal Eye Field), integrating several sources of input to produce
57 motor signals guiding the eye trajectories (for eye trajectories and SC activity, see, for instance,
58 Goossens & van Opstal, 2012; White & Munoz, 2011 for a review on SC).

59 To model the saccadic motor interface it is common to use a race-to-threshold mechanism allied with
60 a winner-take-all policy (Kopecz 1995; Kopecz and Schöner 1995; Trappenberg et al. 2001; Bompas
61 and Sumner 2011, 2015, Satel et al. 2011, 2014; Wang et al. 2011; Marino et al. 2012). In these
62 models, the race-winner both triggers (in time) and selects the destination for the next saccade;
63 ‘when’ and ‘where’ are tightly coupled. Although these modelling efforts help us deduce the temporal
64 dynamics of decision-related signals, they have not focused on the details of spatial selection (Wang
65 et al. 2012a). In short, these models are optimized to explain only one side of the coin.

66 In other models the ‘where’ and ‘when’ processes are more loosely coupled (Findlay and Walker
67 1999; Arai and Keller 2004; Wilimzig et al. 2006). This low coupling is twofold: 1) the ‘where’
68 processes are not necessarily completed when the ‘when’ processes trigger a saccade; 2) all the
69 activity present on the motor map is taken into account to generate the ‘where to move’ motor
70 response (except in Findlay & Walker, 1999). The first idea can be illustrated with the saccadic
71 curvature literature, where the incomplete interplay between target and distractor signals changes
72 with saccade latency to produce curvature either towards or away from the distractor (McPeek et al.
73 2003; McSorley 2006). The second point was demonstrated by observing the SC/FEF activity during
74 saccade curvature (McPeek et al. 2003; McPeek 2006) or by reconstructing saccade trajectories from
75 activity recorded in the SC (Goossens and Van Opstal 2006). Finally, the low coupling between ‘when’
76 and ‘where’ is in line with recent results suggesting there is no winner-take-all in the SC motor
77 interface in mice (Phongphanphanee et al. 2014). The rationale, then, is that using a model of spatial
78 interactions with a low coupling between ‘where’ and ‘when’ as a decryption key, saccade metrics
79 can be used to characterize specific decision-related signals projecting onto the SC.


80 When two close visual stimuli are presented simultaneously, eye movements directed to one of them
81 tend to land in between the two stimuli, betraying a spatial interaction (Findlay 1982; the Global

82 Effect, Deubel et al. 1984; see also Sailer et al. 2002 for hand movements), illustrated in Figure 1E,F.
83 This Global Effect (GE) has been the topic of intensive investigation in the eye movement community
84 to understand how visual stimuli interact in, or upstream of, the saccadic motor interface (Casteau
85 and Vitu 2012; Tandonnet et al. 2012; Tandonnet and Vitu 2013; Van der Stigchel and Nijboer 2013).
86 Two main accounts for the GE have been suggested (reviewed in the discussion of Katnani and
87 Gandhi 2011) and they mainly differ in the order of their operations: the averaging mechanism and
88 the transformation from SC space to visual/saccadic space.

89 The first account, which is compatible with winner-take-all models, assumes a merging mechanism
90 driven by a specific pattern of lateral interactions in the SC (short range excitation, long range
91 inhibition). Regions of activity induced by two *close* stimuli would merge into a single zone of activity
92 located between them, as illustrated in Figure 1A/E (Arai et al. 1994; Kopecz and Schöner 1995;
93 Wilimzig et al. 2006). To apply a winner-take-all in this case is equivalent to taking the average
94 position between stimuli in SC space and then project the result to saccadic/visual space. Thus the
95 landing positions of saccades would form a straight line in SC space, and an outward C-curve in the
96 visual space (for a more detailed explanation, see Katnani and Gandhi 2011).

97 The second account suggests that vector averaging occurs when the population activity of the SC is
98 decoded into a command for the extra-ocular muscles. Regions of activity of any two stimulations
99 would *not* merge; the mechanism downstream would simply program the saccade corresponding to
100 the average of all the saccadic vectors activated in the SC (Lee et al. 1988; Goossens and Van Opstal
101 2005; Van Opstal and Goossens 2008; Gandhi and Katnani 2011; Katnani et al. 2012), as illustrated
102 in Figure 1B/F. Note that this vector averaging mechanism has also been used to explain trajectory
103 curvatures in hand and eye movements (Tipper et al. 1997; McSorley et al. 2004; Walton et al. 2005).
104 Here, the averaging is applied directly on the saccadic vectors, which means that the average happens
105 in visual/saccadic space. Thus the landing positions of the saccades would form a straight line in
106 visual space and an inward C-curve in SC space (for a more detailed explanation, see Katnani and
107 Gandhi 2011).

108



109

110 **Figure 1:Schematic of different mechanisms that could be involved in the spatial decision process. On the**
 111 **top row, we represent different mechanisms that have been proposed for the saccadic motor map or**
 112 **downstream machinery. The dark-edged and bright-edged curves stand for the activity of the target and**
 113 **distractor, respectively. The horizontal dashed line represents a hypothetical saccade initiation threshold. On the**
 114 **bottom row, we represent the effect of those mechanisms on saccade direction. The arrows represented the**
 115 **average saccadic vector for each distribution mode while the dots draw the distribution of the saccade**
 116 **endpoints. The bright-edged and dark-edged disks represent, respectively the distractor and the target on the**
 117 **monitor screen. The black cross is the fixation stimulus. Panel A/E present the merging mechanism proposed to**
 118 **explain the unimodal Global Effect. We highlight that this mechanism works on stimuli that are close enough for**
 119 **their activity to overlap. Panel B/F show the vector averaging mechanism – where the overall activity on the**
 120 **motor map is integrated by the Long Lead Burst Neurons (LLBN, dark-edged disk) – that has also been suggested**
 121 **to explain the unimodal Global Effect. We highlight that it would work on remote stimuli. Panel C/G represent a**
 122 **race-to-threshold mechanism that triggers and generates the saccade corresponding to the first point of activity**
 123 **to reach the threshold on the motor map. In Panel D/H we suggest that a combination of the race-to-threshold**
 124 **mechanism (C) and vector averaging (B) would lead to a bimodal Global Effect (see text for more details).**

125

126 When two simultaneous visual stimuli are remote rather than close, the landing position of the
 127 saccades tends to form a bimodal distribution. Such bimodal distribution can be explained by a race-
 128 to-threshold model combined with a winner-take-all mechanism (**Figure 1C/G**). In such a model, the
 129 first zone to reach threshold would simply trigger an eye movement to the corresponding stimulus,
 130 as illustrated in Figure 1C. As this system only retains the race winner, this would mean saccades are
 131 directed either to one stimulus or the other; in such models the losing stimulus could affect the
 132 latency (e.g. via lateral inhibition) but not the final destination of the action (Figure 1G).

133 However, while the GE traditionally refers to circumstances in which a unimodal distribution of
 134 landing positions is observed between two relatively close stimuli (“genuine global effect”, Van der


135 Stigchel and Nijboer 2013), there are indications that spatial interactions continue to occur for
136 bimodal distributions when stimuli are further apart (Arai et al. 2004; Van der Stigchel et al. 2011).
137 More evidence can be found in the saccade curvature literature in which a correlation between the
138 initial directions and the landing positions of the saccades was reported (Van der Stigchel et al. 2007)
139 for inter-stimulus distances that do not evoke unimodal GE. Based on this evidence, it seems that,
140 even when saccades appear to be successfully directed to one stimulus or another, and do not land
141 half way in between, close examination of the endpoints reveals some attraction or repulsion to/from
142 the other stimulus (Figure 1H). This phenomenon, which we will refer to as the bimodal GE, could be
143 explained neither by a merging nor by a vector averaging mechanism taken alone. The first aim of
144 our article is to confirm and characterize the bimodal GE, and propose a simple model that can
145 account for it.

146 This 'bimodal GE' could be explained by a model that features a low coupling between 'when' and
147 'where' to move. It would combine a race-to-threshold mechanism, which triggers the saccade, with
148 a vector averaging mechanism specifying the spatial destination (**Figure 1D**). Such a model is similar
149 to that of Arai and Keller (2004) or Wilimzig et al. (2006). It would have to feature relatively low
150 mutual inhibition so that the race loser maintains some activity at saccade onset (such as in McPeek
151 et al. 2003) to influence the saccade metrics through the vector averaging (Figure 1D, and such as in
152 Goossens and Van Opstal 2005; Van Opstal and Goossens 2008), predicting small deviations of the
153 endpoints towards the losing stimulus (Figure 1H). This simple model predicts that such deviations
154 ought to lie on a straight line in visual space and an inward curve in SC space, given that they are not
155 occurring through merging within the SC.

156 If the bimodal GE is robust and our logic holds that it reflects residual activity for the *loser* in an
157 incomplete decision process, then systematic modulation in bimodal GE should reflect the strength
158 of this losing activity. This activity should change over time, being stronger at earlier points in the
159 decision process. It has often been suggested that the relative importance of non-specific signals and
160 discriminatory signals changes with latency, such that early inaccurate responses are relatively more
161 driven by non-specific transient visual responses in the SC/FEF drive, while later more accurate
162 responses are more driven by slower signals carrying more task-relevant information (Bompas and
163 Sumner 2011, 2015; see also Boehnke and Munoz 2008; Schall et al. 2011). Heeman et al. (2014)
164 found this relationship in the unimodal GE in a discrimination task: smaller GE was associated with
165 longer latency. Our conceptual model for the bimodal GE predicts this same relationship: larger GE
166 should be associated with shorter latency when the decision process is least complete.

167 Once we establish that the bimodal GE is systematically modulated in a way consistent with changing
168 activity for the losing action option, it becomes a means to test aspects of theory that could not be
169 tested with the unimodal GE, such as whether distractors are inhibited or targets facilitated during
170 target selection. This can be achieved in a straightforward paradigm where the participant starts a
171 trial by fixating a fixation cross and is instructed to make a saccade to peripheral stimuli as soon as
172 they are presented. Single stimulus trials, in which only one peripheral stimulus is presented, are
173 interleaved with double stimulus trials, in which two peripheral stimuli are presented. In the latter
174 condition, the participant faces a choice situation (section 4.3 describes our paradigm in more detail).
175 The type and context of the double stimulus trials can then be manipulated to assess how endpoint
176 deviations at distractor and target locations are affected differently by endogenous signals.

177 Two types of endogenous signals can be fundamentally distinguished: goal-related and history-
178 related (Awh et al. 2012). In the traditional GE paradigm, goal-related signals have been probed by
179 comparing a discrimination task to a free choice condition – i.e. whether one stimulus is designated
180 a target, or saccades to either stimulus are allowed. Although early studies failed to demonstrate goal-
181 related effects (Ottes et al. 1985), more recent evidence clearly shows it (Heeman et al. 2014) while
182 some clinical studies used it to probe the role of FEF in shaping the target discrimination signal (Van
183 der Stigchel et al. 2013). Note that Heeman et al. (2014)'s results were predicted by the
184 aforementioned model of Wilimzig et al. (2006), which features a low coupling between 'where' and
185 'when' to move. However, the unimodal GE could not distinguish whether goal-related signals
186 enhance the target or inhibit the distractor. This is also difficult to distinguish in term of latencies,
187 where global slowing due to mutual inhibition, slower perceptual discrimination or increased
188 caution could mask or interact with any facilitation or inhibition effects on target and distractor
189 individually. With the bimodal GE, the distinction should be clearer: target enhancement would
190 manifest as increased GE for saccades to the distractor (i.e. when the target *loses* the race), while
191 inhibiting the distractor would diminish GE on saccades to the target (when the distractor loses the
192 race; see **Figure 2**).



193

194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207


Figure 2: Hypotheses for the Effect of Discrimination Task. Rows 1 and 2 depict the activity for the target and the distractor (dark and bright curves, respectively) on the motor map when one of them reaches the threshold to trigger a saccade. Row 3 shows the predicted distributions of saccade endpoints. The participant is presented with a pair of similar stimuli and is either required to make a saccade to the target and ignore the distractor (discrimination condition), or is able to freely select one of them to make a saccade (free choice condition; for consistency, we call one stimulus the target and one the distractor in all conditions). In free choice (Column 1), we expect the bimodal Global Effect will be similar on S1 and S2 side, since the participant should treat them as equivalent (Row 1). In the discrimination task, we expect the target stimulus to be relatively advantaged, and thus the pattern may not be symmetrical. Under the assumption that the distractor is inhibited while the discrimination progresses (Column 2), the activity of a loser distractor (Row 1) would be less than that of a loser target (Row 2), leading to less bimodal GE on Target side – as compared with free choice (Row 3, dark dashed line). Under the assumption that the target is boosted (Column 3), we would predict an opposite pattern (Row 1 & 2), and the bimodal GE on the Distractor side would be larger compared to free choice (Row 3, bright dashed line).

208

209 History-related signals, such as the spatial probability of the target, are also known to affect the GE
210 (He and Kowler 1989; Wang et al. 2012b). However, history-related signals that are spatially
211 nonspecific –such as the probability of occurrence of double-stimulus trials – would affect equally
212 both stimuli and could not be detected with the unimodal GE. Thus, their effect is unknown. When
213 comparing a condition with rare double-stimulus trials to a condition with frequent double-stimulus
214 trials, we hypothesized that rarity of double-stimulus trials could make both stimuli more salient,

215 leading to an increase of the bimodal GE for saccades to both stimuli (see **Figure 3**). Alternative
216 hypotheses would be no effect for spatially non-specific history, or an enhancement for frequent
217 conditions as occurs for spatially specific history effects.

218 Finally, because the bimodal GE can be measured over a large range of inter-stimulus distances, we
219 expect that it can be used to assess the spatial properties of the above signals. Specifically, we aimed
220 to investigate whether the effect of probability (or relative surprise) is similar to goal-related signals
221 (and at the same time, we explore which distance is best to study the bimodal GE).



222
223 **Figure 3: Hypothesis for the effect of Rarity.** Row 1 and 2 depict the stimulus-related activity on the motor
224 map when one of the stimuli (S_1 and S_2 , respectively in dark and bright gray contours) wins the race-to-
225 threshold to trigger a saccade. Row 3 presents the predicted distributions of saccade landing positions. We
226 hypothesized that there could be a homogenous boost of the signals reaching the motor map when the context is
227 unfamiliar (a surprise effect). In the control condition (Column 1, Pair Frequency 80%), the pair of stimuli is
228 presented only for 80% of the trials while in the test condition (Column 2, Pair Frequency 20%), the pair of
229 stimuli is presented only for 20% of the trials. Under the above assumption, we predict that the activity of any
230 race looser (S_1 or S_2 , first and second row) should be greater in Pair Frequency 20% than in Pair Frequency
231 80%. Thus the bimodal Global Effect would be larger on both stimulus side (third row) when compared to
232 control.
233

234

4 METHODOLOGY

235

4.1 PARTICIPANTS

236 Four naive individuals and the author (25-27 years old; 3 males and 2 females) participated in the
237 experiment. All had normal visual acuity, were postgraduate at Cardiff University, had given their
238 written informed consent and received payment for their time. No participants reported drug or
239 alcohol dependencies or sleeping disorders. Ethical approval was obtained through the local ethics
240 committee. All but one were naïve to the purpose of the experiment

241

4.2 APPARATUS

242 Participants performed the experiment in a quiet dark room. They sat at a distance of 72 cm from a
243 CRT monitor (ViewSonic P225f) with a 100 Hz refresh rate. Its dimensions were 36.60 cm in width
244 and 29.30 cm in height for a density of pixels approximately 35 PPCM (pixels per centimeter). The
245 monitor was covered with a red filter. Eye movements were recorded with an Eyelink 2000 system
246 (Tower mount system; SR Research Ltd., Canada), an infra-red video-based eye tracker that has a
247 spatial resolution of 0.01° and a typical average accuracy between 0.25° and 0.5°. It was used at a
248 time resolution of 1000 Hz while the participant's chin was resting on the headset pad. Only the left
249 eye was recorded. The experiment was programmed with *pygame*, a python library that provides
250 graphic and input management, and *pylink*, the official Eyelink library for python. All the analyses
251 were conducted with *scipy* (McKinney 2010), the scientific package for python (e.g.
252 www.python.org), and with *ipython* 2.0 (Perez and Granger 2007). The source code and data are
253 available on the open science framework (<https://osf.io/9adbk/>).

254

255

4.3 STIMULI AND PROCEDURE

256 All the trials followed the same template: the participant started by staring at a white fixation cross
257 of radius 0.4° (luminance: 4.5 cd/m^2 except when stated otherwise) on a black background at the
258 center of the screen. After a random interval of 500-1000ms, the fixation cross disappeared and a
259 target element was presented at an eccentricity of 13.5° (see **Figure 4A** and B) while its direction
260 could have been any one of the 32 directions tested. We tested 8 directions per quadrant (given in
261 directional angles, see **Figure 4A**): from +5.625° to +45° by steps of 5.625° for the top right quadrant;
262 and reciprocally for the other quadrants (see Figure 4A). For a certain percentage of the trials (double

263 stimulus trials), an additional stimulus is simultaneously displayed at the horizontal mirror image of
264 the target: if the target is presented in the top part of the screen (e.g. at 45°), the additional stimuli
265 will be displayed symmetrically in the bottom part of the screen (e.g. at -45°). The stimuli remained
266 present until after the end of the saccades analyzed here. Following this, the screen was cleared and
267 a new trial began.


268 We tested the effect of the task performed by the participants when a pair of stimuli was presented
269 (Task-Type). In Free Choice Task conditions (Free Choice), the additional stimulus was identical to
270 the target but 12.5% brighter. For these conditions, the participants were simply asked to move their
271 eye to any presented stimulus as quickly and precisely as possible. They did not receive further
272 instructions for the case of double-stimulus trials. In the Discrimination Task (Discrimination), the
273 additional stimulus was of a different shape to the target and was also 12.5% brighter. For these
274 conditions, the participants were instructed to ignore the distractor and to move their eyes to the
275 target as quickly and precisely as possible. For different blocks, the distractor and the target of
276 *Discrimination* conditions could either be a circle or a diagonal-cross of 0.8°. The distractor logically
277 inherited the remaining shape: it was a circle if the target was a diagonal-cross and vice versa.

278 We tested the effect of frequency of occurrence of the pair of stimuli: in High Frequency conditions
279 (F-80), the additional stimulus was presented 80% of the time, while, in Low Frequency conditions
280 (F-20), its frequency was set up at 20%.

281 One experimental session would test one of the 4 following combinations: *F-20/Free Choice, F-*
282 *20/Discrimination, F-80/Free Choice, F-80/Discrimination*. For all the participants, the sessions were
283 ordered as follows: *F-20/Free Choice, F-20/Discrimination, F-80/Free Choice, F-80/Discrimination, F-*
284 *80/Discrimination, F-80/Free Choice, F-20/Discrimination, F-20/Free Choice*. While we would usually
285 counterbalance the order across participants, here we thought it was useful to keep this order since
286 surprise in F-20 conditions is part of the design rationale and participants were not told whether
287 there will be double-stimulus trials. The palindrome order within participant was used to minimize
288 any linear training effects. We also check that our results hold when order effects are taken into
289 account.

290 The participants were required to undertake 8 sessions of 1600 trials each (8x60min); each session
291 being separated at least by one night. A break was offered every 200 trials while a break and a
292 calibration on 13 points were imposed at every 400 trials.

293



294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302

Figure 4: Summary of the Paradigm. A: the possible positions of the stimulus on the monitor's display during a trial (light gray dots); the eccentricity of the stimuli was always of 13.5° while their directional angles varied from 5.625 to 45° (by step of 5.625). The stimulus pair in double-stimulus trials was always symmetrical that one stimulus was presented in the upper hemi-field and the other in the lower hemi-field (same eccentricity, opposite directional angles). The schematic illustrates a Discrimination Task trial where the S1(in dark gray) is a diagonal-cross and the additional stimulus S2 (in dark gray) is a circle. Note that the color of the background and stimuli are not respected in this schematic, and the array of possible stimulus locations (light grey dots) was not visible to the participant. **B:** A pair of stimuli -S1 and S2- appeared on the screen simultaneously after the offset of the fixation cross F.

303

304 4.4 DATA ANALYSIS


305 4.4.1 Saccade Detection and Cleaning

306 Saccade end points were detected as the first data point with a velocity below $10^{\circ} \cdot s^{-1}$, an acceleration
 307 below $6000^{\circ} \cdot s^{-2}$, and a shift from the previous fixation above 1.0° . Then saccade start points were
 308 detected as the last data point (backward from the saccade end point) at which the eyes had a velocity
 309 below $30^{\circ} \cdot s^{-1}$, an acceleration below $6000^{\circ} \cdot s^{-2}$, and a shift from previous fixation below 0.3° . The
 310 difference in criteria for saccade end and start points were implemented to deal with an artifact that

311 can occur at the end of saccades (see (Nyström et al. 2013), for more information of this post-saccadic
312 oscillation artifact). Trials were automatically marked as suspect and inspected if: 1) there were
313 missing values or gaze positions outside the monitor during the saccade, 2) no entire saccade was
314 detected, 3) the reaction time from target onset was less than 80ms, 4) the saccade duration was
315 longer than the reaction time, and 5) the position shift from the fixation was less than 7.5°. In
316 addition, the experimenter could allow some trials that presented a position outside the monitor
317 display, or reject a trial that presented a blink. After cleaning, the loss rates were 1.7%, 1.5%, 4.5%,
318 3.4% and 2.2% (given for each of the 5 participants). Note that we included all the saccades made
319 toward Target and Distractor side in the Discrimination task. We also included all the saccades
320 toward S1 and S2 in the Free Choice task.

321 **4.4.2 Measure of the Global Effect: Distance From the Closest Attractor**

322 The landing positions correspond to the endpoint positions of the first saccade produced after the
323 onset of the stimuli. Note that for each of the 8 stimulus distances that we tested, there were 4
324 possible target positions (one per quadrant); for the analysis, the data were mirrored and combined
325 across these.



326

327 **Figure 5: Landing Positions and Distance From the Closest Attractor.** We used violin plots to present the
 328 data distributions – the larger the violin, the denser the data points at that y-position. For instance, in A, the
 329 dark violin for the inter-stimulus distance 11.25 shows a unimodal distribution of landing positions centered on 0
 330 – that is exactly between the two stimuli. The brighter violin is the control distribution from single-stimulus trials
 331 with the same locations. The dashed lines are the means of the control modes. While the inter-stimulus distance
 332 increases, the distribution splits progressively into a bimodal distribution that is eventually indistinguishable
 333 from control. In B, we plot the distance from closest attractor (DFCA), so that the transformation can be
 334 observed by comparing the top plot and the bottom plot (see section 4.4.2 for further details). The DFCA on each
 335 side is simply the landing positions in double-stimulus trials centered on the mean of the landing positions in
 336 single-stimulus trials. The lines with dots represent the means of the distributions. The data are from all the
 337 participants and all conditions.

338

339 To measure the bimodal GE, we divided the landing positions into two groups one directed towards
 340 the target, and another directed towards the distractor. For each group, we computed a control
 341 landing position from the single-stimulus trials. We then examined the deviation of each group from
 342 their control. The controls were computed across the four screen quadrants (we mirrored the data
 343 and collapsed them to one quadrant), and are distance specific (e.g. one control per distance),
 344 participant specific, and block specific (to correct for calibration discrepancies). We named the

345 measure the Distance From the Closest Attractor (DFCA) – the attractors being the control positions.
346 For the landing position i and on the y-axis, this is defined mathematically, by:

347
$$DFCA_i = \min(|C_1 - y_i|, |C_2 - y_i|)$$

348 Where C1 and C2 are the control position. **Figure 5** shows the DFCA for saccades directed toward the
349 target. Note that another major difference with the usual measure of the GE is that we get one
350 measure per trial, which increases the statistical power.

351 **4.4.3 Statistical analysis**

352 To test statistically the difference in DFCA across conditions and distances, the saccades of all the
353 participants were gathered (as in Van der Stigchel & Nijboer, 2013). This led to an average of 389
354 trials for each distance in each condition for the conditions *Free Choice / F-20* and *Discrimination / F-*
355 *20* and an average of 1,543 trials for conditions *Free Choice / F-80* and *Discrimination / F-80*. The
356 proportion of landing positions between the two stimuli was reasonably balanced in all conditions
357 and participants. Given that the distributions of DFCA are clearly non-normal and have different
358 shapes across distances, we used the non-parametric independent 2-group Mann-Whitney U-test to
359 test for mean differences (the `wilcox.test(x, y, paired=FALSE)` in R). In order to focus on
360 differences within participants, and because the U-test does not apply this by itself, we applied a
361 within-subject correction (Cousineau 2005) by centering the data of each participant on the same
362 mean.

363 Using the DFCA, we ran one U-test for each of the eight stimuli distances testing for an effect of *Task-*
364 *Type (Discrimination against FreeChoice)*. The same procedure was repeated to test the effect of *Pair-*
365 *Frequency* across stimuli distances (level *F-20* against level *F-80*). The p-values for a set of tests were
366 corrected according to Hommel's correction, which has been recommended for adjusting mildly
367 correlated p-values (Blakesley et al. 2009). We report, in Figure 7, the Hodges-Lehmann estimator
368 ($HL\Delta$) – i.e., the median of pairwise differences in bimodal GE between two conditions. This can be
369 interpreted as the GE modulation between the two tested conditions. A complete report of the U-test
370 statistic can be found on the OSF repository.

371

5 RESULTS: DISTANCE FROM CLOSEST ATTRACTOR

372


5.1 OVERVIEW OF THE BIMODAL GE

373 Observation of **Figure 6A** reveals a clear bimodal GE effect, and that the DFCA initially increases and
374 then decreases with stimulus distance (one-way ANOVA, $F(7, 28)=2.9$, $p = .02$, $\eta_g^2=.42$), which is how
375 the GE was expected to fluctuate. **Figure 6B** reveals that latencies increase with stimulus distance in
376 all conditions (one-way ANOVA, $F(7,28)=9.9$, $p<.001$, $\eta_g^2=.712$); this could, at least partially, explain
377 the aforementioned decrease of bimodal GE. Note that this tendency is also present in FreeChoice,
378 where there is no discrimination to perform. Thus, lesser Global Effect with longer latency could be
379 interpreted as a stronger commitment to one stimulus with time.


380 Figure 7 shows landing positions of a representative participant both in visual and SC space. The
381 landing positions are distributed along a straight line (slightly curved inward) in visual space and
382 along a C-curve when projected in an approximation of the human SC space (based on the monkey
383 data in Robinson 1972; according to Ottes et al. 1986 's equations). As discussed in Introduction, this
384 pattern is what we would expect from a saccadic vector averaging mechanism; and it echoes back to
385 the pattern obtained when applying simultaneous, weighted supra-threshold micro-stimulations to
386 the SC (Katnani and Gandhi 2011; Katnani et al. 2012).

387

A Global Effect Across Conditions



B Latencies Across Conditions




388

389 **Figure 6: Overview of the Distance From the Closest Attractor (DFCA) and Latencies over stimuli**
390 **distances and between conditions.** The figure shows the mean of the distributions with the parametric 95%

391 **confidence intervals; the top part displays the curves for the DFCA on the target side, and the bottom part**

392 **displays the curves for the DFCA on the distractor side.**

393



394

395 **Figure 7: Distribution of Landing Positions in visual space and Superior Colliculus (SC) space from a**
 396 **representative participant.** Distributions are shown for inter-stimulus distances 90° (light grey dots), 67.5°
 397 (medium grey dots) and 33.75° (dark grey dots) in F80/Discrimination Task. The distributions followed an
 398 inwards C-curve on the SC space; this was a consistent pattern across conditions and participants (the figures for
 399 all participants are accessible on the OSF repository). The landing position were projected to an approximation
 400 of the human SC space; using Ottes et al.(1986)'s equations and its original set of parameters that estimates the
 401 electrical stimulation data from Robinson (1972) on monkey.

402

403 As noted in introduction, it is important to establish that the bimodal GE is modulated in size in a
 404 systematic way consistent with representing the losing activity in an incomplete decision process.
 405 We expect that saccades landing in between the two stimuli would have the shorter latencies, driven
 406 by early nonspecific visual transients that are equivalent for both stimuli. Smaller deviations and
 407 accurate saccades (to either the target or distractor) would be associated with longer latency when
 408 the decision process has progressed towards a unique winner (i.e. the losing activity has diminished).
 409 Figure 10 shows that these predictions are confirmed in our data, consistently for every condition
 410 and every distance between the stimuli. Note also that saccades with larger GE (i.e. around the

411 midpoint of the two stimuli) are more similar in latency across all conditions than saccades with
412 smaller GE, consistent with our understanding of non-specific early visual transients followed by
413 slower signals that are more task-modulated.


414

415

416

417

418



419

420 **Figure 8: Reaction times in relation to the bimodal GE (or Distance from the Closest Attractor).** The mean
421 reaction times are plotted for each 2 degree bins of the Distance from the Closest Attractor distribution. The
422 DFCA was introduced in Figure 5 and is our measure of the bimodal GE.

423

424

425 5.2 ASYMMETRIC EFFECT OF TASK-TYPE ON BIMODAL GE


426 **Figure 9A** corresponds to the effect of *Task-Type* on GE, which is the difference between the dark
427 and light gray curves in **Figure 6A**. The U-tests revealed a significant effect on the DFCA only at one
428 distance (45°) on the target side, but a consistently significant effect for all distances but one (56.25°)
429 on the distractor side. Furthermore, the effect observed at 45° on the target side is a decrease in GE
430 (shift toward the target) whereas the effect on the distractor side is a consistent increase in GE (shift
431 toward the center) (**Figure 9A**, the exact statistical values are reported in the appendix). In
432 particular, that increase of GE on the distractor side is rather regular over stimulus distances if we
433 ignore the decrease at 56.25° ; certainly, it does not show a monotonic decrease with distance. In
434 summary, we observe an asymmetric increase in the GE when the participant is asked to aim towards
435 a target and avoid a distractor (Discrimination) – the clearest effect is that the saccades directed to
436 the distractor tend to be shifted toward the center (towards the target). That result when interpreted
437 along with the **Figure 2** suggests that the discrimination mechanism is applying a boost on the target
438 side and little or no inhibition on the distractor side: when the target loses the race, its activity at the
439 moment the saccade was executed was higher in the discrimination task than in the free choice task,
440 but when the distractor loses the race there is not much detectable difference in its activity level
441 between tasks.

442 These GE modulations are not likely to be explained by the latencies. **Figure 10A** shows the effect of
443 Task-Type on latencies, which is the difference between the dark and light gray curves in **Figure 6B**.
444 The U-tests revealed that latencies are greater in the Discrimination task than in the Free Choice task
445 on both stimulus sides (Target and Distractor). The effect size is slightly greater on Target side (mean
446 $HL\Delta \sim 20$ ms) than Distractor side (mean $HL\Delta \sim 13$ ms; Welch Two Sample $t(9.12) = -4.55$, $p = .001$).
447 Although the GE is known to negatively correlate with latencies, that difference of 7 ms is not likely
448 to explain the asymmetry in GE observed in **Figure 9A**. In comparison, the work of Heeman et al.
449 (2014) suggests that a difference of ~ 120 ms is needed to observe a total suppression of GE. Finally,
450 **Figure 6B**, suggests an interaction effect of Frequency with Task Type on latencies (confirmed
451 below); the effect of Discrimination (over FreeChoice) is less in F20 (compare the dashed curves)
452 than in F80 (compared the solid curves). Such an interaction effect does not seem to be present for
453 the GE (**Figure 6A**) and could not explain the GE modulation observed in **Figure 9A**.

454 **5.3 SYMMETRIC EFFECT OF PAIR-FREQUENCY ON BIMODAL GE**

455 **Figure 9B** shows the effect of *Pair-Frequency* on GE, which is the difference between the dashed and
456 solid curves in **Figure 6**. The U-tests yielded significant effects of *Pair-Frequency* both on S1 side and
457 S2 side (we are now ignoring whether they were target or distractor). In particular, **Figure 9B**
458 suggests a symmetric increase of the GE when double-stimulus trials are rare (F-20), which tends to
459 increase progressively with the inter-stimulus distance up to distance 45°, upon which it decreases.
460 The only possible asymmetry is that the effect of F-20 on the S2 side tends to decrease more rapidly
461 with the inter-stimulus distance in comparison with the S1 side. This small asymmetry could be
462 attributed to the slight difference in luminance between stimulus S1 and S2. In summary, this pattern
463 of results, when interpreted in light of the **Figure 3**, suggests that the effect of rarity is to generally
464 increase stimulus-related activity on the motor map (i.e. to both stimulus sides).

465 Again, these GE modulations are not likely to be explained by differences in latencies. **Figure 10B**
466 shows the effect of Frequency on latencies, which is the difference between the dashed and solid
467 curves in **Figure 6B**. The U-tests revealed that there is no obvious latency modulation between F20
468 and F80 conditions, so that it cannot explain the GE modulations. This lack of effect is explained by
469 the interaction of Frequency with Task Type on latencies that we noted above (**Figure 6B**). F20
470 (when compared to F80) increases the latencies in the Free Choice task (see the difference between
471 the light gray curves) while decreasing the latencies in the Discrimination task (see the difference
472 between the black curves). The sum of these positive and negative effects leads to a null effect.



473

474

475

476

477


478

479

480

481

Figure 9: Summary of the Mann-Whitney U-tests on Global Effect. Each plot shows the difference in DFCA between the two conditions, which we name the GE modulation: a positive number means that there is a larger GE (greater deviation towards the center) in Discrimination than in Free Choice conditions (in subplot A) or a larger GE in F-20 than in F-80 conditions (in subplot B). The modulation in GE – thick dark curves - is estimated with the Hedges-Lehmann estimators (HLD) with 95% confidence intervals. The stars represent the level of significance (** $p<.001$; ** $p<.01$; * $p<.05$; . $p<.1$). Finally, the thin gray curves display separately the GE modulation in the first and second block of each conditions (see method). **A:** We ignored the factor Pair-Frequency, mixing the conditions F-20 and F-80. **B:** We ignored the factor Task-Type, mixing the conditions Free Choice and Discrimination. Note that we refer to S1 and S2 as the two stimuli presented simultaneously; S2 corresponds to the slightly brighter one in Free Choice conditions and to the distractor in Discrimination conditions.



482

483

484

Figure 10: Summary of the Mann-Whitney U-tests on Latencies. Each plot shows the difference in Latency between the two conditions, which we named RT modulation. The organization is the same as in **Figure 9**.

485

486 In order to test whether there is indeed an interaction of Frequency and Task Type on latencies, we
487 ran a Bayesian Top-down analysis, using R's BayesFactor package (Raftery 1995; Rouder and Morey
488 2012), where we compared a full model (explicitly given in the caption of Table 1) to models that
489 omit one main effect or interaction from that full. From this analysis, we can see that there is indeed
490 an interaction effect between Task Type and Frequency on reaction times (row 4 of Table 1, $BF >$
491 1000). Note that we could not run this test on bimodal GE because its distribution varies across
492 distances.

493 Table 1. Bayesian Top-down Analysis on Reaction times.

Omitted variable	BF or 1/BF	Polarity	Interpretation
[1] Frequency:Side:TaskType	1.8 ±4.9%	none	weak
[2] Frequency:Side	8.1 ±6.3%	against	positive
[3] Side:TaskType	>1000 ±10%	in favor	very strong
[4] Frequency:TaskType	>1000 ±92 %	in favor	very strong
[5] Participant	>1000 ±5.9%	in favor	very strong
[6] Distance	>1000 ±12%	in favor	very strong
[7] Side	>1000 ±12%	in favor	very strong
[8] Frequency	>1000 ±10%	in favor	very strong
[9] TaskType	>1000 ±11%	in favor	very strong

494 Note. BF stands for Bayes Factor. We inversed (1/BF) the BFs less than 1 for easier reading. We add a
495 Polarity column that tells if the evidence quantified by the BF is against or in favor of an effect of the
496 omitted variable (e.g. Side:TaskType). The interpretation tags give a qualitative scale to that evidence,
497 as in Raftery (1995). The symbol ':' denotes an interaction. For instance, the third row reads: there is
498 very strong evidence in favor of an interaction effect between Side and TaskType. The BFs are given
499 against the full model: $RT \sim TaskType * Frequency * Side + Distance + Participant$ with Participant as a
500 random variable (to account for the within participant design). Side refers to the side
501 (Target/Distractor or S1/S2) on which are the landing positions.

502

503

504



505

506 **5.4 INTRA-INDIVIDUAL LATENCIES AND BIMODAL GE**

507 Finally, although we checked whether the change in mean latency across conditions could explain the
508 change in bimodal GE, the intra-participant latency distributions could still explain part of our results.
509 For instance, it can be argued that the lack of effect on the GE modulation on Target side (**Figure 9**)
510 originates from a mixture of a positive GE modulation for early saccades and a negative GE
511 modulation for late saccades. This explanation would echo the early deviation toward and late
512 deviation away found in saccade curvature (McSorley 2006). **Figure 11** shows the same data as in
513 **Figure 9**, except that we divided the saccade distribution into early, middle and late saccades (see
514 the light gray, dark gray and black curves respectively). We found no consistent effect of latency
515 groups on the bimodal GE across distances on the Target side (Figure 9A) so that the lack of target-
516 side effect observed in Figure 7A cannot be accounted by an interaction with latencies. On the
517 Distractor side, a more consistent pattern is observed: no effect of latencies for distances below 56.25
518 after which early saccades lead to small or no GE modulation while late saccades lead to large and
519 positive GE modulation (this ordering may be present for these distances for the target side as well).
520 We will come back to this interesting pattern in the discussion. Finally, concerning the effect of rarity,
521 it seems that there is no obvious effect of the latency groups on the GE modulation.

522 Recall that we used a particular palindromic ordering for the different conditions. A Wilcoxon rank
523 sum test on the DFCA between the first block and the second block of *F-20/Free Choice* reports a
524 significant difference ($W = 12E+7$, $p=0.002$) with a small effect size (-0.04°) compared to the effects
525 observed in **Figure 9** (from 0.2° to 0.4°). Thus, it appears that any extra surprise effect in the first
526 block was small or did not last long enough within the block to produce a large overall effect. Finally,
527 it is important to note that our results are robust despite order effects. Figure 7 shows no great
528 change in GE modulation when taking into account either the first or the second block of each
529 condition (thin gray curves).

530



531

532

533

Figure 11: Effect of Latency Quantile on GE modulation. The organization is the same as in **Figure 9** except that we split the GE modulation into three groups: early, middle, and late latency saccades, respectively in light gray, dark gray and black.

534

535

536

6 DISCUSSION

537 In the present study, we demonstrated that, when using a pair of remote stimuli, a bimodal Global
538 Effect (GE) occurs – i.e., both distribution modes deviated toward the other stimulus. This confirms
539 previous reports where such an effect was shown or appeared present (Arai et al. 2004; Van der
540 Stigchel et al. 2007, 2011). Moreover, 1) this deviation appears to occur on a nearly- straight line in
541 visual space, and a strong curve in SC space – rather than a straight line in SC space and an outward
542 curve (a circumference around fixation) in visual space; 2) larger deviations are associated with
543 shorter latency. These patterns are consistent with the model architecture illustrated in Figure 1D,
544 whereby a strong region of activity triggers a saccade while the decision process is not fully complete.
545 Other activity remains on the map and contributes towards saccade vector programming
546 downstream of the SC.

547 From this perspective, the deviation of the landing position from the race winner –that is the closest
548 stimulus - gives an estimate of the activity of the race loser. It can then be used to assess endogenous
549 enhancements or inhibition that the traditional GE could not distinguish. Furthermore, it can assess
550 these signals over a wider range of interstimulus distances. We found that Task-Type and Pair-
551 Frequency draw two clearly distinguishable patterns in terms of modulating the GE. We discuss
552 further below the interpretation of our results, in terms of their spatial profile, underlying
553 mechanisms, and their link with the previous literature.

554

555

6.1 EFFECT OF DISTANCE ON THE BIMODAL GLOBAL EFFECT

556 According to Walker et al. (1997) and Van der Stigchel and Nijboer (2013), the genuine (unimodal)
557 GE is expected to decrease with stimulus distances. We also found this relationship in the bimodal
558 GE (see **Figure 6A**). This may be partly explained by RT increasing with distances. However, the
559 range of 20ms may be too small to explain the total disappearance of GE (~120ms needed in Heeman
560 et al. 2014). In our frame of explanation, this decrease in GE with stimulus distance may also be
561 caused either by: 1) a hypothetical stronger mutual inhibition between the two stimuli whilst their
562 distance increases – decreasing the activity of the loser or 2) a spatially localized release of the
563 inhibition exerted by substantia nigra pars reticulata (SNr) on the SC – remote losers would benefit
564 less from disinhibition centered on target location (Hikosaka and Wurtz 1983; Handel and Glimcher
565 1999; Basso and Wurtz 2002). Note that 1) would contradict the relatively flat curve of inhibition

566 reported in previous modelling and neurophysiological work (Arai et al. 1994; Trappenberg et al.
567 2001).

568

569 **6.2 MODULATION OF THE GLOBAL EFFECT BY DISCRIMINATION SIGNAL**

570 It is often assumed in discrimination tasks that top-down mechanisms facilitate the target-related
571 activity and/or inhibit the distractor-related activity (Schall and Hanes 1993; Schall et al. 1995;
572 Wardak et al. 2002; Ipata et al. 2006; Thomas and Paré 2007). Our work shows that the
573 discrimination signal consistently increases the bimodal GE on the distractor side and had no
574 consistent effect on the GE on the Target side. If we recall the predictions of **Figure 2**, which use the
575 model described in **Figure 1D**, the increase of GE on the distractor side means that that the activity
576 of competition loser – the target – was stronger in the Discrimination Task than in Free Choice (right-
577 hand column in Figure 2). In other words, our results suggest that the discrimination signal is
578 facilitating/boosting the target rather than inhibiting the distractor. This result is in line with
579 neurophysiological data reporting more post-stimulus activity in FEF and SC on the target side during
580 visual search (McPeek and Keller 2002; Fecteau and Munoz 2006) and no obvious inhibition on the
581 distractor side in the SC before the saccadic burst (White et al. 2012).

582 However, this conclusion may seem to be in opposition with some previous work. Although it has
583 been shown that saccade planning enhances processing at target location (Kowler et al. 1995; Deubel
584 2008), it was also shown that saccade execution suppresses processing at non-target locations (Khan
585 et al. 2015). Similarly, the Basal Ganglia appear to enhance target location and inhibit distractor
586 locations (Van Schouwenburg et al. 2013). Finally, it was suggested that local inhibition of the
587 distractor location could explain saccadic curvature away from a distractor (Tipper et al. 2001;
588 McSorley et al. 2004). Thus, it seems that further implementation of our paradigm could explore
589 whether the appearance of inhibition on the distractor can be systematically controlled.

590 The effect of discrimination did not decrease with stimulus distances. This suggests that its
591 mechanism is not interacting directly with the GE mechanism itself – which does decline with
592 distance. If that decline is caused by mutual inhibition or the SNr's influence on the SC (hypothesis 1)
593 and 2) discussed above), then the goal-directed boost seems simply additive with those mechanisms.
594 It is known that the FEF is involved in target discrimination (Schall and Hanes 1993) and has direct
595 projections to the brainstem saccade burst generator (although their functional role has been
596 questioned, Hanes and Wurtz 2001), bypassing the SC to control saccades (Schiller et al. 1980;

597 Schiller and Sandell 1983; Schiller and Chou 1998). In the eventuality that the boost to the target is
598 provided by the FEF, it follows that at least part of this enhancing effect is not altered by the mutual
599 inhibition and/or the SNr's action in the SC.

600

601 **6.3 MODULATION OF THE GLOBAL EFFECT BY FREQUENCY**

602 Previous studies have shown that the probability of a stimulus appearing at a *specific location* can
603 influence the GE (He and Kowler 1989). Location probability is thought to increase the strength of
604 the preparatory signal in the SC (Basso and Wurtz 1998; Dorris and Munoz 1998), possibly from the
605 FEF (Liu et al. 2011), and therefore to decrease the reaction time. Our work goes further and suggests
606 that probability of occurrence, which, unlike location probabilities, has no spatial dimension, can also
607 influence the GE. According to our results, the rarity of occurrence of a pair of stimuli increases the
608 bimodal GE symmetrically, as predicted in Figure 3, and this effect could not be explained by a change
609 in reaction times. Thus, probability of occurrence tends to enhance the activity related to rare stimuli
610 configurations and has the opposite effect of the location probability, which enhances the activity of
611 common locations.

612 It can also be observed that the effect of rarity on GE decreases with stimulus distance, just as the GE
613 itself decreases with stimulus distance. In other words, rarity is modulating – rather than being
614 additive with – the underlying GE itself. There are at least two possible ways this could occur: 1) an
615 increase of the responsiveness of the neurons on the motor map; 2) a decrease of lateral inhibition
616 on the motor map. The former would modify the gain function of the neurons (i.e. increasing function,
617 typically sigmoid, linking input current to firing rate) – varying its x offset (gating) and/or slope.

618 Interestingly, the norepinephrine system has been suggested to modify the gain function of neurons
619 in diffuse parts of the brain involved in decision making through coarse projections (Hurley et al.
620 2004; Aston-Jones and Cohen 2005). Several studies have suggested that the norepinephrine system
621 responds to the relevance, novelty, and rarity of stimuli (Alexinsky et al. 1990; Privitera et al. 2010;
622 Preuschoff et al. 2011) with more or less habituation effect (Aston-Jones et al. 1994; Vankov et al.
623 1995). Direct projections of the Locus Coeruleus to the SC have been found (Edwards et al. 1979;
624 Mooney et al. 1990; Arce et al. 1994) while high and stable concentration of norepinephrine
625 decreased the spontaneous and/or stimulus-evoked responses in SC (Mooney et al. 1990; Tan et al.
626 1999; Zhang et al. 1999). Taken together, these findings would encourage investigations into whether
627 the norepinephrine system could be the mechanism behind the effect of rarity on the strength of the

628 GE. If this is indeed the case, it would open a new avenue of experimental work to test the effect of
629 the norepinephrine on decision making.

630 Regarding the latencies for our rarity manipulation, we believe there are three interacting factors
631 acting in different directions: the rarity boost discussed above; caution; spatial probability. In **Figure**
632 **6B**, in the Discrimination Task condition, the reaction times are smaller in F20 than in F80 while in
633 the Free Choice condition, reaction times are smaller in F80 than in F20. Concerning the
634 Discrimination task, an explanation is that frequent discrimination trials (i.e. F80) raises caution,
635 which leads to slower reaction times. In that case, rare discrimination trials (see black dashed curve)
636 would lead to lower caution and to similar reaction times as rare free choice (gray dashed curve) –
637 which is what we observe. Concerning the Free Choice condition, we can consider the opposite effect
638 of spatial probability: in F80, there is a rate of 1.8 stimuli per trial appearing on the 13.5° eccentricity
639 ring, while in F20, this rate drops to 1.2. The higher rate leads to a higher spatial probability, which
640 leads to faster reaction time in F80 as we observed. To conclude, our results suggest that once other
641 factors are brought into play, what increases the bimodal GE does not necessarily decrease the
642 reaction times, and vice-versa.

643 In the literature, it has been shown that high probability of occurrence of the target in a go/no-go
644 paradigm increases the proportion of express saccade (Jüttner and Wolf 1992) while the high
645 probability of a distractor being present seems to decrease the reaction time on trials in which it is
646 indeed present (Goldstein and Beck 2013). However, these paradigms may not be testing the same
647 mechanisms as ours. In Jüttner and Wolf (1992), the saccadic system likely learns to inhibit the go-
648 signal when the go-trials are rare while our paradigm only has go-trials. In Goldstein and Beck
649 (2013), it is possible that, because the distractor is informative of the future target timing and
650 position, it acts as a warning cue.

651 **6.4 CONCLUSION:**

652 The present work has generated a novel way to assess decision processes and signals occurring in an
653 action selection map such as the SC. In particular, we have examined a different aspect of the Global
654 Effect which we have termed the bimodal Global Effect (GE). Unlike the traditionally defined Global
655 Effect (Walker et al. 1997), the bimodal GE can be observed for distant stimuli and for bimodal
656 distributions. We see it as a tool to measure the modulations that occur on the side of the stimulus
657 that loses the race to trigger a saccade. Using this framework allowed us to assess in more depth the

658 effect of frequency of choice and of active discrimination on the action selection map. We believe that
659 this framework opens a new avenue to explore decision making in general.

660 **7 APPENDICES**

661 [The following tables are given for the reviewers, but they may not be included in the final version.
662 They can be found on the open science framework webpage.]

663 **7.1 TABLES**

664 The condition effects (difference between conditions) are reported with the Hodges–Lehmann
665 estimator ($HL\Delta$). It is the median of all possible differences between the N measures in one condition
666 and the M measures in another condition (N x M combinations).

667 A non-parametric 0.95 confidence interval for $HL\Delta$ accompanies these estimates. Finally, the
668 Common Language Effect Size (CLES) (McGraw and Wong 1992; Vargha and Delaney 2000) from the
669 R package `orddom` is reported. Indeed, the CLES simply estimates the probability that a DFCA
670 randomly picked from one distribution is higher than a DFCA randomly picked from another
671 distribution – also known as the Probability of Superiority. Generally speaking, a CLES of 0% (or
672 100%) would mean that the first distribution is lower (or higher) and does not overlap with the
673 second distribution. When the CLES is at 50% the medians of both distributions are aligned.

674

675 *Table 1: Target Side U-tests over distances for a distractor type effect (Free Choice against Discrimination):*

Distance	U-stat	p-value	n.Td	n.Ts	CLES	HLΔ	95% CI
11.25	433851	1.00E+00	981	915	51.67%	-0.040	-0.102 0.022
22.5	460714	1.00E+00	997	909	49.16%	0.028	-0.059 0.115
33.75	458158	1.00E+00	983	930	49.88%	0.005	-0.101 0.110
45	412946	**	2.78E-03	998	54.73%	-0.219	-0.338 -0.099
56.25	432647	2.55E-01	1063	863	52.84%	-0.119	-0.230 -0.011
67.5	479230	1.00E+00	1065	925	51.35%	-0.056	-0.161 0.049
78.75	430544	1.00E+00	1035	858	51.52%	-0.062	-0.168 0.045
90	451448	1.00E+00	1007	881	49.11%	0.037	-0.070 0.143

676 *Note. Refer to Table 2 note.*

677 *Table 2: Distractor Side, U-tests over distances for a distractor type effect (Free Choice against Discrimination):*

Distance	U-stat	p-value	n.F8	n.F2	CLES	HLΔ	95% CI
11.25	452304	**	5.10E-03	970	54.42%	-0.118	-0.185 -0.050

22.5	423556	***	5.45E-06	950	1024	56.46%	-0.205	-0.285	-0.125
33.75	413434	***	3.81E-07	948	1017	57.12%	-0.275	-0.373	-0.177
45	451307	*	3.88E-02	953	1022	53.66%	-0.166	-0.282	-0.051
56.25	442758		8.91E-01	877	1054	52.10%	-0.091	-0.204	0.021
67.5	397084	*	3.35E-02	869	990	53.84%	-0.157	-0.266	-0.050
78.75	415780	***	7.91E-06	904	1055	56.40%	-0.265	-0.372	-0.159
90	406350	***	2.51E-06	915	1026	56.72%	-0.284	-0.394	-0.176

678 Note. Refer to Table 2 note.

679

680 Table 3: Target Side, U-tests over distances for a distractor frequency effect (F-20 against F-80):

Distance	U-stat	p-value	n.F8	n.F2	CLES	HLD	95% CI		
11.25	225235	***	2.52E-05	1550	346	58.00%	-0.192	-0.273	-0.111
22.5	259148	**	1.35E-03	1516	390	56.17%	-0.202	-0.309	-0.097
33.75	252640	.	5.10E-02	1555	358	54.62%	-0.193	-0.332	-0.055
45	228095	***	3.26E-05	1566	346	57.90%	-0.384	-0.549	-0.219
56.25	245242	***	7.39E-04	1565	361	56.59%	-0.297	-0.449	-0.148
67.5	279013		6.15E-01	1625	365	52.96%	-0.126	-0.268	0.014
78.75	267306		1.00E+00	1536	357	51.25%	-0.051	-0.186	0.085
90	287083		1.00E+00	1525	363	48.14%	0.074	-0.059	0.207

681 Note. Refer to Table 2 note.

682

683 Table 4: Distractor Side, U-tests over distances for a distractor frequency effect (F-20 against F-80):

Distance	U-stat	p-value	n.F8	n.F2	CLES	HLD	95% CI		
11.25	376754	**	4.34E-03	1556	437	44.59%	0.142	0.062	0.222
22.5	344744	**	4.80E-03	1582	392	44.41%	0.176	0.076	0.275
33.75	360737	*	1.44E-02	1538	427	45.07%	0.198	0.074	0.320
45	387352	***	1.15E-05	1537	438	42.46%	0.356	0.210	0.503
56.25	323915		1.00E+00	1517	414	48.42%	0.069	-0.069	0.208
67.5	299833		1.00E+00	1451	408	49.35%	0.027	-0.105	0.158
78.75	302211		1.29E-01	1532	427	53.80%	-0.154	-0.281	-0.028
90	295816		1.00E+00	1540	401	52.10%	-0.090	-0.226	0.047

684 Note. Refer to Table 2 note.

685

686

8 REFERENCES

- 688 **Alexinsky T, Aston-Jones G, Rajkowski J, Revay RS.** Physiological correlates of adaptive behavior
689 in a visual discrimination task in monkeys. In: *Society for Neuroscience Abstracts*. 1990, p. b1.
- 690 **Arai K, Keller EL.** A model of the saccade-generating system that accounts for trajectory variations
691 produced by competing visual stimuli. *Biol Cybern* 92: 21–37, 2004.
- 692 **Arai K, Keller EL, Edelman JA.** Two-dimensional neural network model of the primate saccadic
693 system. *Neural Netw* 7: 1115–1135, 1994.
- 694 **Arai K, McPeek RM, Keller EL.** Properties of Saccadic Responses in Monkey When Multiple
695 Competing Visual Stimuli Are Present. *J Neurophysiol* 91: 890–900, 2004.
- 696 **Arce EA, Bennett-Clarke CA, Rhoades RW.** Ultrastructural organization of the noradrenergic
697 innervation of the superficial gray layer of the hamster's superior colliculus. *Synapse* 18: 46–54,
698 1994.
- 699 **Aston-Jones G, Cohen JD.** An integrative theory of locus coeruleus-norepinephrine function:
700 adaptive gain and optimal performance. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 28: 403–450, 2005.
- 701 **Aston-Jones G, Rajkowski J, Kubiak P, Alexinsky T.** Locus coeruleus neurons in monkey are
702 selectively activated by attended cues in a vigilance task. *J Neurosci* 14: 4467–4480, 1994.
- 703 **Awh E, Belopolsky AV, Theeuwes J.** Top-down versus bottom-up attentional control: a failed
704 theoretical dichotomy. *Trends Cogn Sci* 16: 437–443, 2012.
- 705 **Basso MA, Wurtz RH.** Modulation of Neuronal Activity in Superior Colliculus by Changes in Target
706 Probability. *J Neurosci* 18: 7519–7534, 1998.
- 707 **Basso MA, Wurtz RH.** Neuronal Activity in Substantia Nigra Pars Reticulata during Target
708 Selection. *J Neurosci* 22: 1883–1894, 2002.
- 709 **Blakesley RE, Mazumdar S, Dew MA, Houck PR, Tang G, Reynolds CF, Butters MA.** Comparisons
710 of Methods for Multiple Hypothesis Testing in Neuropsychological Research. *Neuropsychology* 23:
711 255–264, 2009.
- 712 **Boehnke SE, Munoz DP.** On the importance of the transient visual response in the superior
713 colliculus. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 18: 544–551, 2008.
- 714 **Bompas A, Sumner P.** Saccadic Inhibition Reveals the Timing of Automatic and Voluntary Signals
715 in the Human Brain. *J Neurosci* 31: 12501–12512, 2011.
- 716 **Bompas A, Sumner P.** Saccadic inhibition and the remote distractor effect: One mechanism or two?
717 *J Vis* 15: 15–15, 2015.
- 718 **Casteau S, Vitu F.** On the effect of remote and proximal distractors on saccadic behavior: A
719 challenge to neural-field models. *J Vis* 12, 2012.

- 720 **Cousineau D.** Confidence intervals in within-subject designs: A simpler solution to Loftus and
721 Masson's method. *Tutor Quant Methods Psychol* 1: 42–45, 2005.
- 722 **Deubel H.** The time course of presaccadic attention shifts. *Psychol Res* 72: 630, 2008.
- 723 **Deubel H, Wolf W, Hauske G.** The evaluation of the oculomotor error signal. *Adv Psychol* 22: 55–
724 62, 1984.
- 725 **Dorris MC, Munoz DP.** Saccadic Probability Influences Motor Preparation Signals and Time to
726 Saccadic Initiation. *J Neurosci* 18: 7015–7026, 1998.
- 727 **Edwards SB, Ginsburgh CL, Henkel CK, Stein BE.** Sources of subcortical projections to the
728 superior colliculus in the cat. *J Comp Neurol* 184: 309–329, 1979.
- 729 **Fecteau JH, Munoz DP.** Salience, relevance, and firing: a priority map for target selection. *Trends
730 Cogn Sci* 10: 382–390, 2006.
- 731 **Findlay JM.** Global visual processing for saccadic eye movements. *Vision Res* 22: 1033–1045, 1982.
- 732 **Findlay JM, Walker R.** A model of saccade generation based on parallel processing and competitive
733 inhibition. *Behav Brain Sci* 22: 661–674, 1999.
- 734 **Gandhi NJ, Katnani HA.** Motor Functions of the Superior Colliculus. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 34: 205–
735 231, 2011.
- 736 **Goldstein RR, Beck MR.** The Effect of Distractor Presentation Frequency on Saccade Reaction
737 Times & Curvature. *trials* 24: 001, 2013.
- 738 **Goossens HHLM, Van Opstal AJ.** Dynamic Ensemble Coding of Saccades in the Monkey Superior
739 Colliculus. *J Neurophysiol* 95: 2326–2341, 2005.
- 740 **Goossens HHLM, Van Opstal AJ.** Dynamic Ensemble Coding of Saccades in the Monkey Superior
741 Colliculus. *J Neurophysiol* 95: 2326–2341, 2006.
- 742 **Goossens HHLM, Van Opstal AJ.** Optimal control of saccades by spatial-temporal activity patterns
743 in the monkey superior colliculus. *Plos Comput Biol* 8: e1002508–e1002508, 2012.
- 744 **Handel A, Glimcher PW.** Quantitative Analysis of Substantia Nigra Pars Reticulata Activity During
745 a Visually Guided Saccade Task. *J Neurophysiol* 82: 3458–3475, 1999.
- 746 **Hanes DP, Wurtz RH.** Interaction of the Frontal Eye Field and Superior Colliculus for Saccade
747 Generation. *J Neurophysiol* 85: 804–815, 2001.
- 748 **He P, Kowler E.** The role of location probability in the programming of saccades: Implications for
749 center-of-gravity=tendencies. *Vision Res* 29: 1165–1181, 1989.
- 750 **Heeman J, Theeuwes J, Van der Stigchel S.** The time course of top-down control on saccade
751 averaging. *Vision Res* 100: 29–37, 2014.

- 752 **Hikosaka O, Wurtz RH.** Visual and oculomotor functions of monkey substantia nigra pars
753 reticulata. IV. Relation of substantia nigra to superior colliculus. *J Neurophysiol* 49: 1285–1301,
754 1983.
- 755 **Hurley L, Devilbiss D, Waterhouse B.** A matter of focus: monoaminergic modulation of stimulus
756 coding in mammalian sensory networks. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 14: 488–495, 2004.
- 757 **Ipata AE, Gee AL, Goldberg ME, Bisley JW.** Activity in the Lateral Intraparietal Area Predicts the
758 Goal and Latency of Saccades in a Free-Viewing Visual Search Task. *J Neurosci* 26: 3656–3661, 2006.
- 759 **Jüttner M, Wolf W.** Occurrence of human express saccades depends on stimulus uncertainty and
760 stimulus sequence. *Exp Brain Res* 89: 678–681, 1992.
- 761 **Katnani HA, Gandhi NJ.** Order of operations for decoding superior colliculus activity for saccade
762 generation. *J Neurophysiol* 106: 1250–1259, 2011.
- 763 **Katnani HA, Van Opstal AJ, Gandhi NJ.** A test of spatial temporal decoding mechanisms in the
764 superior colliculus. *J Neurophysiol* 107: 2442–2452, 2012.
- 765 **Khan AZ, Blohm G, Pisella L, Munoz DP.** Saccade execution suppresses discrimination at
766 distractor locations rather than enhancing the saccade goal location. *Eur J Neurosci* 41: 1624–1634,
767 2015.
- 768 **Kopecz K.** Saccadic reaction times in gap/overlap paradigms: a model based on integration of
769 intentional and visual information on neural, dynamic fields. *Vision Res* 35: 2911–2925, 1995.
- 770 **Kopecz K, Schöner G.** Saccadic motor planning by integrating visual information and pre-
771 information on neural dynamic fields. *Biol Cybern* 73: 49–60, 1995.
- 772 **Kowler E, Anderson E, Dosher B, Blaser E.** The role of attention in the programming of saccades.
773 *Vision Res* 35: 1897–1916, 1995.
- 774 **Lee C, Rohrer WH, Sparks DL.** Population coding of saccadic eye movements by neurons in the
775 superior colliculus. *Nature* 332: 357–360, 1988.
- 776 **Liu C-L, Tseng P, Chiau H-Y, Liang W-K, Hung DL, Tzeng OJL, Muggleton NG, Juan C-H.** The
777 Location Probability Effects of Saccade Reaction Times Are Modulated in the Frontal Eye Fields but
778 Not in the Supplementary Eye Field. *Cereb Cortex* 21: 1416–1425, 2011.
- 779 **Marino RA, Trappenberg TP, Dorris M, Munoz DP.** Spatial interactions in the superior colliculus
780 predict saccade behavior in a neural field model. *J Cogn Neurosci* 24: 315–336, 2012.
- 781 **McGraw KO, Wong SP.** A common language effect size statistic. *Psychol Bull* 111: 361, 1992.
- 782 **McKinney W.** Data structures for statistical computing in Python [Online]. In: *Proceedings of the 9th*
783 *Python in Science Conference*, p. 51–56.
784 <http://204.236.236.243/proceedings/scipy2010/pdfs/mckinney.pdf> [22 May 2015].
- 785 **McPeek RM.** Incomplete Suppression of Distractor-Related Activity in the Frontal Eye Field Results
786 in Curved Saccades. *J Neurophysiol* 96: 2699–2711, 2006.

- 787 **McPeek RM, Han JH, Keller EL.** Competition Between Saccade Goals in the Superior Colliculus
788 Produces Saccade Curvature. *J Neurophysiol* 89: 2577–2590, 2003.
- 789 **McPeek RM, Keller EL.** Saccade Target Selection in the Superior Colliculus During a Visual Search
790 Task. *J Neurophysiol* 88: 2019–2034, 2002.
- 791 **McSorley E.** Time Course of Oculomotor Inhibition Revealed by Saccade Trajectory Modulation. *J*
792 *Neurophysiol* 96: 1420–1424, 2006.
- 793 **McSorley E, Haggard P, Walker R.** Distractor modulation of saccade trajectories: spatial
794 separation and symmetry effects. *Exp Brain Res* 155: 320–333, 2004.
- 795 **Mooney RD, Bennett-Clarke C, Chiaia NL, Sahibzada N, Rhoades RW.** Organization and actions of
796 the noradrenergic input to the hamster's superior colliculus. *J Comp Neurol* 292: 214–230, 1990.
- 797 **Nyström M, Hooge I, Holmqvist K.** Post-saccadic oscillations in eye movement data recorded with
798 pupil-based eye trackers reflect motion of the pupil inside the iris. *Vision Res* 92: 59–66, 2013.
- 799 **Ottes FP, Van Gisbergen JA, Eggermont JJ.** Latency dependence of colour-based target vs
800 nontarget discrimination by the saccadic system. *Vision Res* 25: 849–862, 1985.
- 801 **Ottes FP, Van Gisbergen JA, Eggermont JJ.** Visuomotor fields of the superior colliculus: a
802 quantitative model. *Vision Res* 26: 857–873, 1986.
- 803 **Perez F, Granger BE.** IPython: A System for Interactive Scientific Computing. *Comput Sci Eng* 9: 21–
804 29, 2007.
- 805 **Phongphanphanee P, Marino RA, Kaneda K, Yanagawa Y, Munoz DP., Isa T.** Distinct local circuit
806 properties of the superficial and intermediate layers of the rodent superior colliculus. *Eur J Neurosci*
807 40: 2329–2343, 2014.
- 808 **Preuschoff K, 't Hart BM, Einhäuser W.** Pupil Dilation Signals Surprise: Evidence for
809 Noradrenaline's Role in Decision Making. *Front Neurosci* 5, 2011.
- 810 **Privitera CM, Renninger LW, Carney T, Klein S, Aguilar M.** Pupil dilation during visual target
811 detection. *J Vis* 10: 3, 2010.
- 812 **Raftery AE.** Bayesian model selection in social research. *Sociol Methodol* 25: 111–164, 1995.
- 813 **Robinson DA.** Eye movements evoked by collicular stimulation in the alert monkey. *Vision Res* 12:
814 1795–1808, 1972.
- 815 **Rouder JN, Morey RD.** Default Bayes factors for model selection in regression. *Multivar Behav Res*
816 47: 877–903, 2012.
- 817 **Sailer U, Eggert T, Ditterich J, Straube A.** Global effect of a nearby distractor on targeting eye and
818 hand movements. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform* 28: 1432, 2002.
- 819 **Satell J, Fard FS, Wang Z, Trappenberg TP, others.** Simulating oculomotor inhibition of return
820 with a two-dimensional dynamic neural field model of the superior colliculus [Online]. *Aust J Intell*
821 *Inf Process Syst* 14, 2014.

- 822 https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jason_Satel/publication/267990591_Simulating_oculomotor_inhibition_of_return_with_a_two-dimensional_dynamic_neural_field_model_of_the_superior_colliculus/links/550624b80cf24cee3a051f00.pdf [16 Feb. 2016].
- 826 **Satel J, Wang Z, Trappenberg TP, Klein RM.** Modeling inhibition of return as short-term depression of early sensory input to the superior colliculus. *Vision Res* 51: 987–996, 2011.
- 828 **Schall JD, Hanes DP.** Neural basis of saccade target selection in frontal eye field during visual search. *Nature* 366: 467–469, 1993.
- 830 **Schall JD, Hanes DP, Thompson KG, King DJ.** Saccade target selection in frontal eye field of macaque. I. Visual and premovement activation. *J Neurosci* 15: 6905–6918, 1995.
- 832 **Schall JD, Purcell BA, Heitz RP, Logan GD, Palmeri TJ.** Neural mechanisms of saccade target selection: gated accumulator model of the visual-motor cascade: Gated accumulator for visuomotor cascade. *Eur J Neurosci* 33: 1991–2002, 2011.
- 835 **Schiller PH, Chou IH.** The effects of frontal eye field and dorsomedial frontal cortex lesions on visually guided eye movements. *Nat Neurosci* 1: 248–253, 1998.
- 837 **Schiller PH, Sandell JH.** Interactions between visually and electrically elicited saccades before and after superior colliculus and frontal eye field ablations in the rhesus monkey. *Exp Brain Res* 49: 381–392, 1983.
- 840 **Schiller PH, True SD, Conway JL.** Deficits in eye movements following frontal eye-field and superior colliculus ablations. *J Neurophysiol* 44: 1175–1189, 1980.
- 842 **Tan H, Mooney RD, Rhoades RW.** Effects of norepinephrine upon superficial layer neurons in the superior colliculus of the hamster: in vitro studies. *Vis Neurosci* 16: 557–570, 1999.
- 844 **Tandonnet C, Massendari D, Vitu F.** When larger visual distractors become less disruptive: Behavioral evidence for lateral inhibition in saccade generation. *J Vis* 12: 2, 2012.
- 846 **Tandonnet C, Vitu F.** Stimulus properties and saccade metrics: When local features are more critical than global features. *Behav Neurosci* 127: 121, 2013.
- 848 **Thomas NWD, Paré M.** Temporal Processing of Saccade Targets in Parietal Cortex Area LIP During Visual Search. *J Neurophysiol* 97: 942–947, 2007.
- 850 **Tipper SP, Howard LA, Jackson SR.** Selective reaching to grasp: Evidence for distractor interference effects. *Vis Cogn* 4: 1–38, 1997.
- 852 **Tipper SP, Howard LA, Paul MA.** Reaching affects saccade trajectories. *Exp Brain Res* 136: 241–249, 2001.
- 854 **Trappenberg TP, Dorris MC, Munoz DP, Klein RM.** A model of saccade initiation based on the competitive integration of exogenous and endogenous signals in the superior colliculus. *J Cogn Neurosci* 13: 256–271, 2001.

- 857 **Van der Stigchel S, Meeter M, Theeuwes J.** The spatial coding of the inhibition evoked by
858 distractors. *Vision Res* 47: 210–218, 2007.
- 859 **Van der Stigchel S, Nijboer TC, Bultitude JH, Rafal RD.** Delayed oculomotor inhibition in patients
860 with lesions to the human frontal oculomotor cortex: Evidence from a study on saccade averaging.
861 *Brain Cogn* 82: 192–200, 2013.
- 862 **Van der Stigchel S, Nijboer TCW.** How global is the global effect? The spatial characteristics of
863 saccade averaging. *Vision Res* 84: 6–15, 2013.
- 864 **Van der Stigchel S, Vries JP, Bethlehem R, Theeuwes J.** A global effect of capture saccades. *Exp
865 Brain Res* 210: 57–65, 2011.
- 866 **Van Opstal AJ, Goossens HHL.** Linear ensemble-coding in midbrain superior colliculus specifies
867 the saccade kinematics. *Biol Cybern* 98: 561–577, 2008.
- 868 **Van Schouwenburg MR, Den Ouden HEM, Cools R.** Selective Attentional Enhancement and
869 Inhibition of Fronto-Posterior Connectivity by the Basal Ganglia During Attention Switching. *Cereb.
870 Cortex* (December 15, 2013). doi: 10.1093/cercor/bht345.
- 871 **Vankov A, Hervé-Minvielle A, Sara SJ.** Response to Novelty and its Rapid Habituation in Locus
872 Coeruleus Neurons of the Freely Exploring Rat. *Eur J Neurosci* 7: 1180–1187, 1995.
- 873 **Vargha A, Delaney HD.** A critique and improvement of the CL common language effect size
874 statistics of McGraw and Wong. *J Educ Behav Stat* 25: 101–132, 2000.
- 875 **Walker R, Deubel H, Schneider WX, Findlay JM.** Effect of remote distractors on saccade
876 programming: evidence for an extended fixation zone. *J Neurophysiol* 78: 1108–1119, 1997.
- 877 **Walton MMG, Sparks DL, Gandhi NJ.** Simulations of Saccade Curvature by Models That Place
878 Superior Colliculus Upstream From the Local Feedback Loop. *J Neurophysiol* 93: 2354–2358, 2005.
- 879 **Wang Z, Kruijne W, Theeuwes J.** Lateral interactions in the superior colliculus produce saccade
880 deviation in a neural field model. *Vision Res* 62: 66–74, 2012a.
- 881 **Wang Z, Satel J, Hilchey MD, Klein RM.** Averaging saccades are repelled by prior uninformative
882 cues at both short and long intervals. *Vis Cogn* 20: 825–847, 2012b.
- 883 **Wang Z, Satel J, Trappenberg TP, Klein RM.** Aftereffects of saccades explored in a dynamic neural
884 field model of the superior colliculus. *J Eye Mov Res* 4: 1–16, 2011.
- 885 **Wardak C, Olivier E, Duhamel J-R.** Saccadic Target Selection Deficits after Lateral Intraparietal
886 Area Inactivation in Monkeys. *J Neurosci* 22: 9877–9884, 2002.
- 887 **White BJ, Munoz DP.** The superior colliculus. *Lateral* 3: 4, 2011.
- 888 **White BJ, Theeuwes J, Munoz DP.** Interaction between visual-and goal-related neuronal signals on
889 the trajectories of saccadic eye movements. *J Cogn Neurosci* 24: 707–717, 2012.
- 890 **Wilimzig C, Schneider S, Schöner G.** The time course of saccadic decision making: Dynamic field
891 theory. *Neural Netw* 19: 1059–1074, 2006.

892 **Zhang Y, Mooney RD, Rhoades RW.** Effects of norepinephrine on the activity of visual neurons in
893 the superior colliculus of the hamster. *Vis Neurosci* 16: 541–555, 1999.

894

895

896

9 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

897

GM was supported by Cardiff University. PS was supported by the ESRC (ES/K002325/1).

898

