



## 20 **Abstract**

21           This study focuses on the approbation of the Keen Eye method for diagnosing visual  
22 neglect. A total of 102 patients with right hemisphere damage participated in the study, 38 of whom  
23 were diagnosed with neglect. The primary goal was to assess the effectiveness of Keen Eye in  
24 comparison with traditional paper-based tests. Keen Eye is based on a dual-task paradigm,  
25 integrating target identification and visual stimulus localization tasks, with stimuli presented in  
26 different areas of the screen. The results demonstrated the high diagnostic accuracy of the method,  
27 enabling the detection of covert forms of neglect. The study showed that the method allows for the  
28 assessment of both horizontal and vertical neglect severity and the identification of patients with  
29 neglect combined with non-lateralized attention deficits. The method exhibited high criterion and  
30 construct convergent validity and holds significant potential for clinical application.

## 31 **Introduction**

### 32 **Neglect Syndrome**

33           Unilateral spatial neglect is a heterogeneous and multi-component syndrome [1]  
34 characterized by the lack of conscious perception of stimuli in the space contralateral to the brain  
35 lesion, as well as by non-lateralized attention deficits [2]. Neglect syndrome is a common  
36 consequence of right hemisphere damage, with prevalence rates ranging from 43% to 82% among  
37 patients in the acute phase of stroke [3-6]. Neither gender nor handedness significantly affects the  
38 likelihood of developing neglect following right hemisphere damage [4]. Neglect syndrome  
39 manifests across various sensory modalities [1], with visual neglect (VN) being the most  
40 functionally limiting for patients. VN significantly impairs daily functioning, affecting essential  
41 activities such as eating, personal hygiene, and mobility [7].

42 Left-sided neglect is a significant negative prognostic factor for post-brain injury  
43 functioning. It is reliably associated with poor functional recovery outcomes, and research has  
44 shown that the severity of VN serves as an independent predictor of lower recovery outcomes in  
45 daily activities after stroke [8, 9]. In everyday life, VN has a substantial negative impact on  
46 independence in daily activities—patients tend to ignore the left side while reading, writing,  
47 navigating, and working [10].

48 VN following right hemisphere damage is more common than neglect in other sensory  
49 modalities [11]. While neglect can manifest in visual, tactile, and auditory modalities—either in  
50 isolated or combined forms—its severity is often greater in the visual domain [11, 12]. This  
51 disproportionate severity may be related to the more significant role of automatic attentional  
52 processes toward ipsilateral stimuli in the visual modality compared to tactile and auditory  
53 modalities.

54 VN can manifest in both the horizontal and vertical planes, affecting patients' perception  
55 of near and far space [13]. The primary symptoms of VN have been predominantly described in  
56 the horizontal plane as an inability to attend to stimuli on the left side of space [14]. When  
57 performing visuospatial tests, patients may fail to notice targets on the left side, deviate to the right  
58 when bisecting lines, and omit the left side of drawings [15].

59 Vertical neglect often coexists with horizontal neglect [16, 17]. This condition manifests  
60 as inattention to stimuli in the upper or lower parts of the visual field. When combined with  
61 horizontal neglect, it frequently results in neglect of the lower left portion of the visual field [16,  
62 18]. Vertical neglect may also be associated with radial neglect, affecting perception in near or far  
63 peripersonal space. Studies have shown that patients with VN are more likely to ignore objects in

64 the lower far space [19]. This phenomenon can be explained by differences in spatial reference  
65 frames, with errors in radial and vertical bisection likely stemming from impairments in the  
66 retinotopic reference system [20]. Vertical neglect can significantly impact daily activities, such  
67 as wheelchair navigation and stair climbing, underscoring the importance of its clinical assessment  
68 and treatment [21].

69 In contemporary neglect classification, a subtype of neglect known as vertical neglect is  
70 described [22]. Studies have shown that patients with VN tend to ignore the lower portion of the  
71 visual field, as evidenced by multiple studies utilizing visual search and line bisection tasks. For  
72 example, one study found that 13 patients with VN following a right hemisphere stroke detected  
73 fewer targets and made more fixations in the lower-left quadrant [23]. Similar results were  
74 obtained from line cancellation tasks in 23 patients with right-sided stroke and experiments using  
75 central cues, where more pronounced deficits were observed in the lower part of the visual field  
76 [24]. Deviations upwards were often observed in vertical line bisection tests, indicating a lack of  
77 attention to lower stimuli [25]. In one case, a 72-year-old patient who had experienced a stroke  
78 showed an upward deviation, while in another case, quadrant-specific retinotopic defects persisted  
79 irrespective of the direction of gaze [26]. These defects are thought to be linked to disruptions in  
80 attention networks, with dysfunction in the dorsal attention network associated with vertical  
81 neglect, and damage to the right temporal lobe linked to neglect in the upward direction [25].

## 82 **Diagnosis of Visual Neglect**

83 Currently, more than 90 different tests are available for identifying neglect [27]. However,  
84 systematic studies indicate that most of these methods lack sufficient validity and reliability [28].

85 The primary diagnostic approaches include questionnaires, behavioral tests, and traditional paper-  
86 and-pencil methods.

87 Traditional paper-and-pencil tests include cancellation tasks, line bisection tasks, and  
88 drawing tests. Among these, the most widely used are the Bell's Test [29] and letter cancellation  
89 tasks, which have demonstrated high accuracy in detecting signs of spatial inattention. However,  
90 the line bisection test has limited sensitivity and may fail to identify up to 40% of VN cases [30].

91 Despite their widespread use, paper-and-pencil methods have low ecological validity,  
92 limiting their predictive power for real-world functioning. Additionally, milder forms of VN often  
93 go undetected in these tests, and diagnosis may only be possible through the analysis of indirect  
94 indicators, such as a right-to-left visual scanning strategy [31].

95 To address these limitations, more ecologically valid assessment tools have been  
96 developed. Among them, the Catherine Bergego Scale (CBS) stands out for its reliability, validity,  
97 and sensitivity to changes during rehabilitation [32]. Furthermore, functional tests, computer-  
98 based programs, and virtual reality technologies have proven to be more effective in detecting VN  
99 compared to paper-and-pencil tests [33, 34].

100 Given the advantages and limitations of different diagnostic approaches, a combined  
101 diagnostic strategy is recommended, incorporating various types of neglect assessments. A  
102 comprehensive diagnostic approach integrates traditional paper-and-pencil tests, computer-based  
103 tools, and behavioral assessments. This allows for a more precise identification of VN subtypes  
104 while ensuring high ecological validity for both clinical practice and research [35, 36]. Thus,  
105 modern approaches to VN diagnosis aim for standardization and improved validity, which is

106 particularly important for enhancing diagnostic accuracy and developing effective rehabilitation  
107 strategies.

## 108 **Dual-Task Paradigm**

109 A modern approach to the diagnosis of VN, particularly its mild forms, involves creating  
110 conditions of increased cognitive load to reveal hidden forms of inattention. One such approach is  
111 the dual-task paradigm, which encompasses a broad class of methods requiring the simultaneous  
112 performance of two tasks—a combination of cognitive/motor, motor/motor, or cognitive/cognitive  
113 tasks [37]. The dual-task paradigm is applicable to the study of attention, executive functions [37]  
114 working memory [38], and problem-solving [39]. Performing two tasks simultaneously typically  
115 leads to interference effects, reflecting the increased demands on the information-processing  
116 system [40]. This paradigm has shown promise in detecting mild cognitive impairments and as a  
117 rehabilitation tool [37].

118 Performing two or more tasks simultaneously, especially when each of the parallel tasks is  
119 not highly automated, can lead to cognitive overload. A phenomenon known as "attentional  
120 blindness" has been described in the context of visual search, occurring when individuals fail to  
121 notice unexpected stimuli while engaged in complex tasks [41]. Various neural indicators of  
122 different aspects of attentional blindness have been identified: parieto-occipital potentials reflect  
123 deficits in target detection, while frontoparietal coherence signals deficits in discrimination [42].  
124 Numerous studies have reported decreased activity in the temporoparietal regions under working  
125 memory overload [43-45]. Attentional blindness also modulates activity in the primary visual  
126 cortex, leading to reduced responses in visual areas V3 and, possibly, V2 and V1, accompanied by  
127 decreased activation in the inferior parietal cortex [46]. Additionally, multitasking affects the

128 awareness of distractors: the higher the load on the selective attention system, the more irrelevant  
129 information is ignored [47, 48].

130 Another related phenomenon is "attentional blink"—a temporary reduction in attention  
131 following the detection of a visual target [49]. This occurs when processing a large amount of  
132 rapidly incoming information. Attentional blink is observed when two stimuli are presented in  
133 quick succession, typically within 200–500 ms [50, 51]. Experiments have demonstrated this  
134 phenomenon: if stimuli are presented at high speed in the foveal or peripheral visual field,  
135 perception of the target stimulus may be impaired if it appears immediately after the preceding one  
136 [52, 53]. From a neural perspective, attentional blink involves the right temporoparietal junction  
137 (rTPJ) and the left inferior frontal junction (lIFJ) [54].

138 The right hemisphere plays a particularly significant role in attentional blink. Studies on  
139 split-brain patients have shown that when the second target was presented to the right hemisphere,  
140 attentional blink lasted significantly longer, indicating the key role of the right hemisphere in  
141 processing visual information under limited capacity conditions [55]. In patients with right-  
142 hemisphere stroke, the effective field of vision is reduced, and the attentional blink interval is  
143 prolonged, particularly for left-sided stimuli [56]. Additionally, transcranial magnetic stimulation  
144 (TMS) of the right posterior parietal cortex reduces the magnitude of attentional blink, further  
145 confirming the critical role of the right hemisphere in the temporal aspects of visual attention [57].

146 The right hemisphere is critically important for multitasking in various contexts. Studies  
147 have shown that lesions in the right temporoparietal region can lead to chronic multitasking  
148 impairments, even after the initial deficits, such as neglect, have been rehabilitated [58].  
149 Neuroimaging research has identified a predominantly right-lateralized frontoparietal network and

150 the cerebellum as key regions activated during dual-task performance [59]. A meta-analysis has  
151 revealed a multitasking-related neural network that includes the bilateral intraparietal sulcus, left  
152 dorsal premotor cortex, and right anterior insula [60]. However, multitasking and task switching  
153 have distinct neural correlates: task switching activates the left premotor and inferior parietal areas,  
154 whereas multitasking engages the right prefrontal and inferior parietal cortex [59].

155 Thus, the limitations of simultaneous and successive cognitive task performance are natural  
156 even in a healthy brain, but brain pathology exacerbates the depletion of cognitive resources. It is  
157 suggested that cognitive reserve helps protect against the consequences of brain damage. However,  
158 the effectiveness of cognitive reserve decreases under multitasking conditions, exposing a "gray  
159 zone" between hidden and overt behavioral deficits [62].

160 The dual-task paradigm is widely used to assess and rehabilitate VN in post-stroke patients.  
161 Studies have demonstrated that dual-task conditions, which increase attentional load, can  
162 exacerbate VN symptoms and reveal subtle, well-compensated forms of dysfunction [63-65].  
163 Research has also shown that computer-based tasks requiring higher attentional demands are more  
164 sensitive than traditional paper-and-pencil tests in detecting VN, as they are less affected by  
165 compensatory strategies often employed by patients during recovery [66].

166 Computerized dual-task assessments lead to more contralesional omissions [66, 67] and  
167 slower contralesional reaction times [68] than single-task conditions. Increased cognitive load can  
168 reveal left-sided spatial neglect, bilateral extinction, and even vertical extinction in chronic patients  
169 [69]. Additionally, large-screen dual-task presentations have been effective in detecting subclinical  
170 forms of VN [64]. VN symptoms that remain hidden during single-task conditions may emerge  
171 under multitasking demands [62].

172 Dual-task conditions are not only useful for diagnosing VN but also for its rehabilitation.  
173 While some studies indicate that dual-task training improves gait, cognitive processes, and skill  
174 transfer across various neurological disorders [70], others have found no significant additional  
175 benefits over single-task training in neglect rehabilitation [71]. The effectiveness of multitasking-  
176 based interventions may depend on factors such as training duration, task complexity, and  
177 individual patient characteristics. Despite mixed findings, dual-task paradigms remain a promising  
178 therapeutic approach in neurological rehabilitation, with the potential to target deficits in both  
179 spatial and non-spatial attention [70, 71].

## 180 **Materials and Methods**

### 181 **Participants**

182 The study sample included 102 participants with right hemisphere damage, of whom 38  
183 were diagnosed with visual neglect (VN) and 64 did not exhibit VN. The average age of patients  
184 with neglect was  $65.6 \pm 10.7$  years (range: 28–80), and the average age of those without neglect  
185 was  $60.9 \pm 12.3$  years (range: 29–82). The sample comprised 46 women and 57 men.

186 All participants underwent a preliminary comprehensive neuropsychological examination  
187 to assess higher mental functions [72], as well as standardized quantitative assessments of visual  
188 neglect. Exclusion criteria included severe speech or perceptual disorders, disorientation,  
189 confusion, and affective states that interfered with effective interaction with the examiner.

190 This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Federal Scientific  
191 Center of Psychological and Multidisciplinary Research (Protocol No. 5, May 16, 2024).  
192 Prospective recruitment took place between May 17, 2024, and January 30, 2025. Written

193 informed consent was obtained from all participants, including information about voluntary  
194 participation, the nature of the study, and permission for the use of anonymized data. Each  
195 participant was assigned a unique six-digit code to ensure confidentiality. To prevent the  
196 possibility of identifying individuals, one neuropsychologist conducted the assessment, while a  
197 second researcher independently received and processed the anonymized data. No minors were  
198 included in the sample; all participants were adults recruited in a clinical setting. The study was  
199 conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

## 200 **Materials**

201 To carry out the method, a laptop with a screen size of at least 28 cm and a wireless mouse  
202 with a mousepad were required. PsychoPy software was used for the study. A study was conducted  
203 on a standard laptop with a 15.6-inch screen and Windows 11 system. The method's functionality  
204 was also tested on other operating systems, including Linux (with a recommendation to check the  
205 system locale for correct data storage if the system language was English) and Mac OS, as well as  
206 on laptops with smaller screen sizes.

## 207 **Procedure of One Trial**

208 The main task for the participant is to determine the location of a circle with a diameter of  
209 8 mm. Simultaneously, the participant performs the task of identifying the central digit (1, 2, 3, or  
210 4). Each trial starts with the presentation of a fixation cross for 1000 ms. Then, a circle appears on  
211 the periphery, and a digit appears at the center of the screen for 100 ms. Afterward, a black-and-  
212 white mask (in the form of a randomly generated dot diagram) appears on the screen for 2000 ms  
213 (Fig 1). At the end of one trial, the participant orally reports to the experimenter which digit was  
214 in the center of the screen and on which side the circle was located. After the mask, a response

215 input screen appears, where the experimenter enters the participant's verbal report about what was  
216 seen on the screen.

## 217 **Figure 1. Sequence of events in a single trial.**

### 218 **Instruction**

219 The participant is given the following standard instruction:  
220 "Watch closely what happens on the screen. First, a cross will appear in the center of the screen;  
221 focus on it. Then a digit will appear at the cross's location. Simultaneously with the digit, a circle  
222 will appear – either on the right, left, or both sides. The circle can appear in different parts of the  
223 screen. Be attentive: the digit and the circle will appear for a very short time! Try to see them.  
224 Then say aloud what you managed to notice: the digit and the side where the circle was, for  
225 example, 'One on the right.'"

### 226 **Trial Parameters**

227 Before the experiment begins, a screen displaying an example of how the fixation cross,  
228 digit, and circle (placed 13.5 cm to the right of the center) will appear is shown. This allows the  
229 participants to become familiar with the stimuli and their sizes, and the experimenter can check  
230 the settings to ensure proper display of distances on the specific device.  
231 At the beginning of the experiment, participants complete a training series consisting of 7 trials.  
232 During the training, participants familiarize themselves with the possible trial variations, where  
233 parameters such as the number of circles (1 or 2), presentation side, and distance from the screen's  
234 center (both vertically and horizontally) are varied. The stimulus presentation time decreases from  
235 1 second to 100 ms during the training series.

236 Following the training, the participant proceeds to the main series. The main series consists  
237 of 75 trials: 42 unilateral presentations (21 with a circle on the right side of the center and 21 with  
238 a circle on the left side) and 33 bilateral presentations. All trials are presented in a randomized  
239 order. There are 7 possible positions for the circle on each side, resulting in 14 possible circle  
240 positions on the screen (Fig 2).

241 **Figure 2. Fixed positions of the target stimulus – circle.**

242 The distance at which each of the 14 circles is located from the center of the screen is  
243 presented in Table 1.

244 **Table 1. Circle positions relative to the center of the screen.**

Target position number	Horizontal distance from the center of the screen (cm)	Vertical distance from the center of the screen (cm)
1	-13.5	8
2	-13.5	0
3	-13.5	-8
4	-7.5	4
5	-7.5	0
6	-7.5	-4
7	-1.5	0
8	13.5	8
9	13.5	0
10	13.5	-8
11	7.5	4
12	7.5	0
13	7.5	-4
14	1.5	0

245 Table 2 and Fig 3 provide characteristics of all 75 trials in the main series.

246 **Figure 3. All possible combinations of circles presented in the method.**

247 **Table 2. All possible combinations presented in the method.**

Type of exposure	Target position numbers	Number of exposures
Unilateral	1	3

		2	3
		3	3
		4	3
		5	3
		6	3
		7	3
		8	3
		9	3
		10	3
		11	3
		12	3
		13	3
		14	3
<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Symmetrical to the vertical axis</b>	1 + 8	3
		2 + 9	3
		3 + 10	3
		4 + 11	3
		5 + 12	3
		6 + 13	3
		7 + 14	3
	<b>Symmetrical to the diagonal axis</b>	1 + 10	3
		3 + 8	3
		4 + 13	3
		6 + 11	3

## 248 **Data Processing in the Keen Eye Method**

249 Based on the analysis of the method, the following variables are computed:

- 250
- 251 ● 1-14 – number of errors in the corresponding sectors of the screen (see Fig 2);
  - 252 ● right\_skipped\_unilateral (RSU) – number of missed right stimuli in the unilateral presentation;
  - 253 ● left\_skipped\_unilateral (LSU) – number of missed left stimuli in the unilateral presentation;
  - 254 ● right\_skipped\_bilateral (RSB) – number of missed right stimuli in the bilateral presentation;
  - 255
  - 256



277 **KPrR\_bilateral** – right productivity coefficient in the bilateral presentation of circles. This  
278 describes the proportion of "caught" circles on the right during bilateral presentations and ranges  
279 from 0 to 1. It is calculated as:

$$280 \quad KPrR_{bilateral} = \frac{BP - RSB}{BP}$$

281 **KPrL\_bilateral** – left productivity coefficient in the bilateral presentation of circles. This  
282 describes the proportion of "caught" circles on the left during bilateral presentations and ranges  
283 from 0 to 1. It is calculated as:

$$284 \quad KPrL_{bilateral} = \frac{BP - LSB}{BP}$$

285 **KA\_all** – overall asymmetry coefficient. This coefficient ranges from -1 to +1 and allows  
286 the assessment of neglect during both bilateral and unilateral stimulus perceptions. In the absence  
287 of a lateralized attention deficit, this parameter should approach 0. It is calculated as:

$$288 \quad KA_{all} = \frac{LSB + LSU - RSB - RSU}{2LP - RSB - RSU - LSB - LSU}$$

289 where LP equals 54, indicating the total number of lateralized (left and right) circle presentations.

290 **KEf\_all** – overall efficiency coefficient. It ranges from 0 to 1 and takes into account the  
291 number of errors (incorrectly identifying the sides of the presented circles). It is calculated as:

$$292 \quad KEf_{all} = \frac{2LP - RSB - RSU - LSB - LSU - RH - LH}{2LP - RSB - RSU - LSB - LSU + RH + LH}$$

293

294 **KPrR\_all** – overall right productivity coefficient. This describes the proportion of  
295 "caught" circles on the right during all circle presentations and ranges from 0 to 1. It is calculated  
296 as:

$$297 \quad KPrR_{all} = \frac{LP - RSB - RSU}{LP}$$

298 **KPrL\_all** – overall left productivity coefficient. This describes the proportion of "caught"  
299 circles on the left during all circle presentations and ranges from 0 to 1. It is calculated as:

$$300 \quad KPrL_{all} = \frac{LP - LSB - LSU}{LP}$$

301 For the justification of convergent validity, Albert's Test [74] and The Bells Test [29] were  
302 selected. These standardized methods were chosen because they are widely recognized techniques  
303 used for the quantitative and qualitative diagnosis of patients with unilateral spatial neglect in the  
304 visual modality.

## 305 **Statistical Analysis**

306 All statistical analyses were performed using RStudio 2023.12.1 Build 402 (packages:  
307 rattle, rpart, rpart.plot) and jamovi (version 2.3.18). Descriptive statistics, including mean values,  
308 standard deviations, medians, and interquartile ranges, were calculated for all variables. The  
309 Mann-Whitney U test was used for non-parametric data. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used for  
310 multiple group comparisons, and the post hoc DSCF test with Holm's correction was applied for  
311 multiple comparisons.

312 The effect size was calculated using rank-biserial correlation for non-parametric tests. To  
313 assess the relationship between the severity of neglect and frontal dysfunction, a correlation

314 analysis was performed. Cluster analysis was conducted in jamovi using k-means clustering with  
315 silhouette analysis to determine the optimal number of clusters.

## 316 Results

### 317 Comparison Between Groups on the Keen Eye Method Indicators

318 Descriptive statistics were calculated for all sample parameters. Table 3 presents the mean,  
319 standard deviation (SD), minimum, and maximum values for each variable in the control group  
320 and the patient group with VN. The results indicate that the average number of omissions on the  
321 left side is consistently higher in patients with neglect, with some individuals reaching the  
322 maximum possible number of errors on specific measures. Additionally, in patients with VN, the  
323 minimum number of errors for certain parameters (e.g., LSB) is notably distant from zero,  
324 suggesting variability in performance even among affected individuals.

325 **Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for the Control and Visual Neglect Groups.**

Variable	Control Group (M ± SD)	Min - Max	VN group (M ± SD)	Min - Max
1	2.422 ± 2.580	0 - 9	6.289 ± 1.228	3 - 9
2	1.281 ± 1.598	0 - 6	3.421 ± 1.154	1 - 6
3	2.594 ± 2.975	0 - 9	6.263 ± 1.519	2 - 9
4	1.609 ± 2.201	0 - 7	5.842 ± 1.443	2 - 9
5	0.968 ± 1.333	0 - 4	3.211 ± 1.212	0 - 6
6	2.016 ± 2.427	0 - 9	6.000 ± 1.644	2 - 9
7	0.688 ± 1.022	0 - 3	3.184 ± 1.557	0 - 6
8	2.922 ± 3.184	0 - 9	7.974 ± 1.684	3 - 9
9	1.766 ± 2.114	0 - 6	5.342 ± 1.097	2 - 6
10	2.969 ± 3.266	0 - 9	8.289 ± 1.137	6 - 9
11	2.266 ± 2.857	0 - 9	7.421 ± 2.176	1 - 9
12	1.359 ± 1.947	0 - 6	4.868 ± 1.436	1 - 6
13	2.141 ± 2.689	0 - 9	7.974 ± 1.636	2 - 9
14	0.953 ± 1.430	0 - 6	4.395 ± 1.994	0 - 6
RSU	1.922 ± 2.978	0 - 14	4.289 ± 4.299	0 - 16
LSU	4.656 ± 5.782	0 - 21	16.368 ± 5.749	1 - 21

<b>RSB</b>	4.531 ± 6.510	0 - 32	6.500 ± 6.479	0 - 27
<b>LSB</b>	7.953 ± 10.045	0 - 33	29.815 ± 4.980	14 - 33
<b>NIR</b>	3.984 ± 4.971	0 - 21	10.500 ± 8.013	0 - 21
<b>NIL</b>	3.609 ± 4.699	0 - 21	9.816 ± 7.651	0 - 21
<b>NIB</b>	5.250 ± 6.785	0 - 33	12.421 ± 11.337	0 - 33
<b>RH</b>	0.391 ± 0.866	0 - 5	1.632 ± 3.062	0 - 16
<b>LH</b>	0.125 ± 0.333	0 - 1	0.132 ± 0.343	0 - 1
<b>KA bilateral</b>	0.101 ± 0.324	-0.941 - 1	0.826 ± 0.239	0.136 - 1
<b>KPrR bilateral</b>	0.863 ± 0.197	0.030 - 1	0.803 ± 0.196	0.182 - 1
<b>KPrL bilateral</b>	0.759 ± 0.304	0 - 1	0.097 ± 0.151	0 - 0.576
<b>KA all</b>	0.104 ± 0.274	-0.479 - 0.927	0.746 ± 0.247	0.182 - 1
<b>KEf all</b>	0.987 ± 0.033	0.760 - 1	0.927 ± 0.126	0.407 - 1
<b>KPrR all</b>	0.881 ± 0.164	0.278 - 1	0.800 ± 0.197	0.204 - 1
<b>KPrL all</b>	0.767 ± 0.285	0.037 - 1	0.145 ± 0.172	0 - 0.667

326 A comparison was made between groups of right hemisphere patients without neglect and  
 327 those with neglect using the Mann-Whitney U test. The results of the analysis are presented in  
 328 Table 4. Significant differences, accounting for Holm's correction, were found in all indicators  
 329 ( $p < 0.01$ ), except for LH ( $p = 0.684$ ) and RSB ( $p = 0.096$ ). Among the error omission sums, the most  
 330 important indicators are LSB and LSU, which highlights the specificity of this task for patients  
 331 with left-sided neglect. Both indicators are important, but they can dissociate, allowing for the  
 332 diagnosis not only of neglect but also of visual extinction.

333 Table 4 presents the results of the intergroup comparison for the asymmetry coefficients.  
 334 Among the asymmetry coefficients, KA\_all and KA\_bilateral are the most significant and may be  
 335 used as indicators of neglect severity. In contrast to the omission error count, this indicator is  
 336 independent of the number of stimuli and serves as a convenient ordinal index of neglect severity,  
 337 ranging from -1 to 1.

338 **Table 4. Intergroup Comparisons of All Parameters Using the Mann-Whitney Test and**  
 339 **Rank-Biserial Correlation.**

Variable	U	p	$r_{rb}$
----------	---	---	----------

<b>1</b>	350	< 0.001	0.720
<b>2</b>	406	< 0.001	0.675
<b>3</b>	467	< 0.001	0.626
<b>4</b>	278	< 0.001	0.777
<b>5</b>	359	< 0.001	0.712
<b>6</b>	301	< 0.001	0.759
<b>7</b>	283	< 0.001	0.773
<b>8</b>	338	< 0.001	0.730
<b>9</b>	324	< 0.001	0.740
<b>10</b>	300	< 0.001	0.760
<b>11</b>	290	< 0.001	0.768
<b>12</b>	286	< 0.001	0.771
<b>13</b>	171	< 0.001	0.863
<b>14</b>	296	< 0.001	0.763
<b>RSU</b>	739	< 0.001	0.408
<b>LSU</b>	276	< 0.001	0.779
<b>RSB</b>	935	0.096	0.251
<b>LSB</b>	201	< 0.001	0.839
<b>NIR</b>	685	< 0.001	0.451
<b>NIL</b>	661	< 0.001	0.471
<b>NIB</b>	754	< 0.001	0.396
<b>RH</b>	871	0.008	0.303
<b>LH</b>	1212	0.684	0.029
<b>KA_bilateral</b>	188	< 0.001	0.850
<b>KPrR_bilateral</b>	935	0.128	0.251
<b>KPrL_bilateral</b>	201	< 0.001	0.839
<b>KA_all</b>	177	< 0.001	0.858

<b>KEf_all</b>	813	< 0.001	0.349
<b>KPrR_all</b>	862	0.045	0.309
<b>KPrL_all</b>	186	< 0.001	0.851

## 340 **Diagnostic Criterion Selection Using Decision Trees**

341 To identify the most significant diagnostic criteria for neglect using the Keen Eye method,  
342 decision tree analyses were conducted. This approach allows data classification based on features  
343 selected from the original dataset, with the goal of building a predictive model for diagnosis using  
344 specified predictor variables. The following parameters were used to evaluate model quality:  
345 accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score.

346 The predictors for classification models 1 and 2 included total error counts (RSU, LSU,  
347 RSB, LSB, RH, and LH). Model 1 (Fig 4) was constructed using cross-validation (Accuracy =  
348 0.90, Precision = 0.82, Recall = 0.95, F1 Score = 0.88, Sensitivity = 0.95, Specificity = 0.88).

### 349 **Figure 4. Decision Tree Model 1 for Predicting Visual Neglect Diagnosis.**

350 Model 2 (Fig 5) was designed to maximize recall and improve specificity (Accuracy =  
351 0.87, Precision = 0.75, Recall = 1.00, F1 Score = 0.85, Sensitivity = 1.00, Specificity = 0.80).

### 352 **Figure 5. Decision Tree Model 2 for Predicting Visual Neglect Diagnosis.**

353 Model 3 (Fig 6) was developed using predictors based on asymmetry coefficients  
354 (KA\_bilateral, KPrR\_bilateral, KPrL\_bilateral, KA\_all, KEf\_all, KPrR\_all, and KPrL\_all)  
355 (Accuracy = 0.90, Precision = 0.79, Recall = 1.00, F1 Score = 0.88, Sensitivity = 1.00, Specificity  
356 = 0.84).

### 357 **Figure 6. Decision Tree Model 3 for Predicting Visual Neglect Diagnosis.**

358 All three models demonstrated high sensitivity; however, some patients without a  
359 diagnosed neglect condition were incorrectly classified into the neglect group. This may suggest  
360 that the Keen Eye method is capable of detecting hidden forms of VN, including well-compensated  
361 neglect.

362 From a diagnostic standpoint, the most important indicator is LSB. The LSB value is  
363 particularly useful for identifying visual extinction and can dissociate from LSU when a patient  
364 recognizes a single left-side presentation but fails to acknowledge the left side when two objects  
365 are presented in the perceptual field. When using Models 2 and 3 for diagnosing neglect, the  
366 method exhibits high specificity.

## 367 **Diagnosis of Vertical Neglect Using the Keen Eye Method**

368 To identify vertical neglect, we selected 48 patients who, according to the Keen Eye  
369 method, were classified as "neglect" based on the criterion  $KA_{all} \geq 0.17$  (Model 3).

370 The following indicators were calculated to detect vertical neglect:

- 371 • up: the number of missed circles in positions above the horizontal line (positions 1, 4, 8,  
372 11).
- 373 • down: the number of missed circles in positions below the horizontal line (positions 3, 6,  
374 10, 13).

375 According to the literature, the left lower portion of the visual field tends to be neglected.  
376 Therefore, we used a directional hypothesis (down > up). The Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used  
377 to compare the related samples.

378 Results from the within-group comparison showed significant differences ( $W = 251$ ,  $df =$   
379  $47$ ,  $p = 0.025$ ). The mean number of left-sided lower and upper omissions in the group of patients  
380 with neglect is presented in Fig 7.

381 **Figure 7. Descriptive graph of vertical misses (up vs. down) in the neglect group.**

382 Thus, the Keen Eye method aligns with findings of predominant neglect in the lower-left  
383 visual field in patients with neglect.

384 **Criterion and Construct Convergent Validity**

385 Convergent validity was assessed using Guilford's Phi coefficient. The calculation was  
386 based on a comparison between the neuropsychologist's diagnosis and the diagnosis derived from  
387 test performance. The Keen Eye method identified  $LSB \geq 12$  as the threshold for diagnosing  
388 neglect, as determined by the classification tree method. Neglect was also diagnosed based on  
389 performance in paper-and-pencil tests, including the Bells Test and Albert's Test. Table 5 presents  
390 the correlation between the Keen Eye results and traditional neglect assessments.

391 **Table 5. Correlation Between Keen Eye Results and Paper-and-Pencil Tests (Bells Test and**  
392 **Albert's Test) Using the Phi Coefficient.**

	<b>diagnosis</b>	<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Albert's Test</b>	<b>The Bell's Test</b>
<b>Diagnosis</b>						
<b>Model 1</b>	0.802***					
<b>Model 2</b>	0.771***	0.871***				
<b>Model 3</b>	0.817***	0.924 ***	0.943 ***			
<b>Albert's Test</b>	0.481***	0.487***	0.512***	0.513***		

<b>The Bell's Test</b>	0.515***	0.496***	0.469***	0.473***	0.570***	
------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	--

393 Note. \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

394 From the perspective of criterion validity, the Keen Eye method shows high scores,  
395 surpassing the diagnostic results of The Bell's Test and Albert's Test, which also suggests high  
396 incremental and concurrent validity for the computer-based method. From the perspective of  
397 convergent validity, the Keen Eye test shows moderate similarity to The Bell's Test and Albert's  
398 Test. This is explained by the fact that the paper-and-pencil tests are designed to diagnose a more  
399 severe form of left-sided neglect, and many patients perform these tests with few or no errors.  
400 During paper-and-pencil testing, patients may use compensatory strategies, and the time to  
401 complete the tasks is not limited. In contrast, when using the computer-based method, it is virtually  
402 impossible to use compensatory strategies for visual search due to the time constraints imposed on  
403 stimulus presentation.

## 404 **Cluster Analysis of Patients Based on Keen Eye Results**

405 A k-means cluster analysis was conducted using the parameters RSU, LSU, RSB, LSB,  
406 NIR, NIL, NIB, RH, and LH. The analysis identified three distinct patient groups (Fig 8):

- 407 1. Patients with minimal errors, demonstrating near-perfect accuracy in both circle and  
408 number identification.
- 409 2. Patients with a high number of circle omissions on the left but accurate number  
410 identification.

411 3. Patients with a high number of circle omissions on the left, in both unilateral and bilateral  
412 presentations, along with errors in number identification.

### 413 **Figure 8. Mean Values of Keen Eye Parameters Across Clusters 1, 2, and 3.**

414 Thus, the Keen Eye method allows for the identification not only of a lateralized attention  
415 deficit but also of a general reduction in cognitive resources for attention allocation, which,  
416 according to studies, is also characteristic of patients with neglect [58, 75].

### 417 **Relationship Between Attention Distribution Deficit Across Two** 418 **Tasks and Frontal Dysfunction**

419 The identification of Cluster 3 (patients with difficulties in distributing attention across two  
420 tasks) raised the question of whether these types of errors are related to impairments in executive  
421 functions. We hypothesized that omissions or incorrect identification of digits may be associated  
422 with frontal dysfunction. However, omissions in digit identification could also result from a non-  
423 lateralized attention deficit, which is theorized to be linked to neglect severity. To test this  
424 hypothesis, we conducted a correlation analysis between FAB battery scores [76], neglect severity  
425 indicators assessed using the Keen Eye method (KA\_bilateral, KA\_all), and errors in digit  
426 identification (NIR, NIL, NIB).

427 **Table 6. Correlation Between Asymmetry Coefficients, Digit Omissions, and FAB Scores**  
428 **Using Spearman's Rho.**

	FAB	KA_bilateral	KA_all	NIR	NIL	NIB
FAB						
KA_bilateral	0.384***					
KA_all	0.363***	0.960***				
NIR	0.436***	0.401***	0.434***			

NIL	0.339***	0.388***	0.422***	0.850***		
NIB	-0.327***	0.379***	0.402***	0.742***	0.690***	

429 Note. \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

430 The correlation analysis revealed a moderate relationship between digit identification  
431 errors and frontal dysfunction, as well as a moderate relationship between digit identification errors  
432 and the severity of neglect.

433 Subsequently, a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to determine whether  
434 Cluster 1 differed from Clusters 2 and 3 in terms of FAB scores. Significant results were obtained  
435 using the Kruskal-Wallis test ( $\chi^2 = 18.1$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.19$ ). Post hoc pairwise comparisons  
436 using the DSCF test with Holm's correction revealed significant differences between Cluster 1 and  
437 Cluster 2 ( $W = -5.029$ ,  $p = 0.03$ ), and between Cluster 1 and Cluster 3 ( $W = -5.017$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ). No  
438 significant differences were found between Clusters 2 and 3. The mean number of FAB scores  
439 obtained by patients from different clusters is presented in Fig 9.

#### 440 **Figure 9. FAB scores between clusters.**

441 These pairwise comparisons demonstrate that both neglect patient clusters (Clusters 2 and  
442 3) have significantly lower FAB scores compared to Cluster 1, but no differences were found  
443 between the two neglect clusters.

## 444 **Discussion**

445 The results obtained indicate that the Keen Eye method is suitable for detecting VN. The  
446 most diagnostically significant indicators are the omissions of circles to the left of the center of the  
447 screen during unilateral and bilateral presentations. These omissions allow for a quantitative

448 assessment not only of inattention to single stimuli on the left but also of visual extinction  
449 phenomena. Additionally, the method allows for the calculation of various asymmetry coefficients  
450 for each subject. It has been shown that the most crucial criterion for diagnosing neglect is the  
451 KA\_all coefficient. This coefficient is convenient for quantitatively expressing the severity of VN,  
452 as it varies from -1 to 1, with a value of 0 for healthy subjects.

453         Thanks to the various positions of the circles relative to the horizontal line, the method can  
454 detect vertical neglect. It has been shown that patients with VN predominantly ignore the lower-  
455 left portion of the space. This finding aligns with literature data, according to which vertical neglect  
456 is often combined with horizontal neglect and primarily affects the lower part of the visual field  
457 [16, 18]. This phenomenon is linked to both cortical and subcortical lesions, especially in the  
458 temporal lobe [16]. Vertical neglect can manifest as an allocentric form of spatial neglect: it is  
459 proposed that allocentric representations influence the distribution of attention resources in the  
460 vertical dimension [77]. Patients with VN demonstrate impairment in automatic, externally  
461 controlled covert attention orientation in the contralesional visual field, particularly in the lower  
462 quadrant [18]. This vertical shift, it seems, depends on time: patients require more visual fixations  
463 and more time to find a target in the lower-left quadrant [23]. This suggests that primarily  
464 involuntary automatic attention is impaired.

465         The Keen Eye method demonstrates high sensitivity compared to existing paper-and-pencil  
466 methods that are predominantly used for neuropsychological diagnosis of VN. The Keen Eye  
467 method uncovers hidden forms of VN that are not detected during paper-and-pencil testing.  
468 Notably, it is important to emphasize that Keen Eye reduces the influence of compensatory  
469 strategies due to strict time limitations: with stimuli presented for 100 ms, patients cannot perform

470 voluntary visual search for the target. The high sensitivity of the method is ensured by the increased  
471 load on the attention distribution system through the simultaneous presentation of two tasks.  
472 Studies show that multitasking and increased cognitive load can reveal hidden forms of spatial  
473 neglect in patients who have had a stroke. It has been shown that a dual-task paradigm, combining  
474 spatial monitoring with additional tasks, enhances the contralesional deficit in patients with  
475 damage to either hemisphere, even when standard tests show no impairments [69, 79]. Such  
476 computer-based methods can uncover subclinical VN and extinction along both the horizontal and  
477 vertical axes [64, 69]. The exacerbation of VN under increased cognitive load may be associated  
478 with deficits in spatial and sustained attention following damage to the right hemisphere [78].

479         Multitasking and high cognitive load lead to disruptions in attention processes even in  
480 healthy individuals [41, 42], but these effects are more pronounced in patients with right  
481 hemisphere lesions [55, 56]. It has been shown that the right hemisphere plays a crucial role in  
482 multitasking, and its damage results in a chronic deficit in distributing attention across multiple  
483 tasks, even after the regression of other symptoms [58]. Thus, limitations in multitasking are  
484 natural for a healthy brain, but in pathologies such as stroke, cognitive resources are significantly  
485 more impaired. Cognitive reserve, which typically protects against the consequences of brain  
486 damage, becomes less effective under multitasking conditions, making it possible to identify the  
487 "borderline area" between hidden and overt behavioral impairments [62]. This is especially  
488 important for diagnosing subclinical forms of VN, which can only be detected under increased  
489 cognitive load.

490         Moreover, the RH and LH parameters allow for the diagnosis of optical allesthesia, which  
491 is impossible in paper-and-pencil diagnostics. Optical allesthesia, or allochiria [80], is a rare

492 phenomenon in which visual stimuli are mislocalized on the opposite side and can occur in patients  
493 with neglect. Studies have shown that increased attention load can cause false spatial localization,  
494 including allesthesia, in patients with right hemisphere damage [81]. Allochiria in VN can manifest  
495 in various modalities [82], which can be explained by a disturbance in mental spatial representation  
496 [83]. Another potential explanation is the model of attention disturbance in neglect syndrome,  
497 according to which the body-centered matrix responsible for controlling spatial attention is  
498 impaired [84]. Altered attention distribution in neglect occurs due to changes in the neural  
499 representation of egocentric space. Normally, any action in space, including voluntary control of  
500 attention via eye, head, and hand movements, is organized based on the body's position. To acquire  
501 information about the environment in an egocentric coordinate system, integration of sensory  
502 information from various spatial sources is required. The primary afferent signals related to the  
503 egocentric coordinate system are proprioceptive signals from the neck muscles and vestibular  
504 information. In patients with neglect, the process of information integration occurs with systematic  
505 errors, leading to a rotation of the entire egocentric reference system around the vertical axis to a  
506 new "equilibrium position" on the right side. It is suggested that neglect results from damage to  
507 cortical structures responsible for converting this sensory information into egocentric internal  
508 "reference matrices." It has been shown that vestibular stimulation reduces neglect symptoms [85].

509         Additionally, the method does not require motor responses from the subjects, allowing it  
510 to diagnose patients with motor impairments and differentiate between motor and visual forms of  
511 neglect. Research shows that with traditional paper-and-pencil tests, it is difficult to distinguish  
512 between motor and sensory neglect. It was found that neglect is typically associated with the "input  
513 channel," but the temporal and spatial aspects of neglect related to the "output channel" may  
514 require more nuanced differentiation [85]. Research also demonstrates that task-specific

515 requirements influence the classification of attention subtypes [86]. Additionally, researchers have  
516 described differences in attention deficits between groups with perceptual and motor neglect,  
517 emphasizing the need to use both paper-and-pencil and computer-based tests to identify spatially  
518 specific and non-lateralized attention deficits [35]. Collectively, these studies highlight the  
519 complexity of assessing neglect and the limitations of traditional tests, underscoring the need for  
520 more comprehensive and sensitive assessment methods to accurately differentiate motor and  
521 sensory neglect subtypes.

522         Cluster analysis of patients based on stimulus omission rates and identification errors  
523 revealed three distinct groups. One group included patients with a non-lateralized attention deficit,  
524 characterized by difficulties in distributing attention between two tasks. Another group  
525 demonstrated classic signs of VN without pronounced difficulties in attention distribution.  
526 Interestingly, patients with a non-lateralized attention deficit did not show significant differences  
527 from patients with neglect (without this deficit) on the FAB test. This may be due to the FAB  
528 evaluating a wide range of executive functions, whereas the attention distribution deficit more  
529 specifically reflects disturbances in the fronto-parietal network. Impairments in this network may  
530 not always be accompanied by significant frontal dysfunction, as measured by standard  
531 neuropsychological tests. Additionally, reduced attention to peripheral stimuli and errors in digit  
532 identification may be more closely linked to the severity of neglect rather than a separate cognitive  
533 deficit, which may also explain the absence of significant differences between the groups on the  
534 FAB.

535         These findings align with results from other studies, supporting the idea that damage to the  
536 right temporo-parietal region can disrupt the frontoparietal attention network, impairing the ability

537 to maintain multiple tasks in working memory [58]. Moreover, Bayesian analysis of EEG data has  
538 revealed reduced effective connectivity between the right parietal and frontal cortex in patients  
539 with neglect, particularly when stimuli appear in the ignored field [87]. Structural neuroimaging  
540 studies further emphasize the role of white matter tracts linking the frontal and parietal cortices in  
541 spatial attention. Damage to these connections has been associated with more severe forms of  
542 neglect and reduced functional connectivity within attention networks [88, 89, 90]. In particular,  
543 lesions in the superior longitudinal fasciculus and the supramarginal gyrus have been strongly  
544 linked to chronic neglect [91]. These results suggest that non-lateralized attention deficit may be  
545 due to impaired fronto-parietal connections rather than primary frontal dysfunction. We suggest  
546 that when attention allocation deficits are detected by Keen Eye findings, it is advisable to diagnose  
547 impairment of the patient's executive functions [92]. The impairment of control functions  
548 complicates neuropsychological rehabilitation of patients with VN, as it leads to decreased  
549 criticality to their condition and difficulties in learning and using voluntary visual search strategies.

550         Similar effects of impaired attention distribution are also observed in conditions such as  
551 acute or chronic mental fatigue, depression, and cognitive aging. For example, studies have shown  
552 that moderate mental fatigue reduces the efficiency of attention switching between tasks, which is  
553 presumed to be related to the depletion of non-specific cognitive resources [93]. Fatigue has been  
554 shown to modulate activity in fronto-parietal and occipital regions, negatively affecting cognitive  
555 flexibility [94]. Research indicates that under high cognitive demands, both internal and external  
556 attention processes draw from a shared pool of non-specific resources [95]. Similar effects have  
557 been described in depression, where excessive rumination and divided attention overload  
558 executive control, leading to increased switch costs and impaired divided attention [96]. Likewise,  
559 aging is associated with deficits in global task switching, which correlate with reduced working

560 memory capacity, although local switching remains relatively preserved [97]. These examples  
561 suggest that the difficulties in attention distribution observed in patients with neglect may result  
562 from a broader deficit in cognitive control mechanisms, linked to cognitive resource depletion and  
563 extending beyond spatial processing. Understanding these commonalities may provide further  
564 insight into the cognitive underpinnings of neglect and aid in developing rehabilitation strategies.

565         Despite its high diagnostic value, the Keen Eye methodology has some limitations. First,  
566 diagnostic accuracy may depend on equipment characteristics, such as screen size and resolution.  
567 Furthermore, task performance requires high attention concentration, which may make it difficult  
568 to use the methodology with elderly patients. Regarding clinical application, data analysis is  
569 conducted using specialized software, requiring staff training. There are also specific visual  
570 requirements for patients, as, in clinical practice, it has been difficult for patients to complete the  
571 program without glasses. Moreover, the program is unsuitable for patients with severe  
572 neurodynamic impairments, as they are unable to complete all 75 trials due to fatigue.

573         Implementing this methodology into clinical practice could significantly improve neglect  
574 diagnosis. Automated data processing can reduce diagnostic time and increase result objectivity.  
575 Keen Eye could also be integrated into neurorehabilitation systems to assess patient recovery  
576 dynamics after stroke. Furthermore, the methodology could be used for the early detection of  
577 cognitive impairments and the monitoring of rehabilitation program efficacy.

578         For future development of the methodology, several steps are required:

- 579 1. Expanding the sample size to include testing with healthy subjects and patients with left  
580 hemisphere lesions. This would allow for refinement of diagnostic criteria and increase the  
581 specificity of the method.
- 582 2. Adapting the methodology for diagnosing neglect in other sensory modalities, such as  
583 auditory neglect.
- 584 3. Developing mobile versions of the test for convenient use in clinical settings.

585 The current discussion does not address how specific the methodology is for neglect and  
586 how it differentiates neglect from other perception and attention disorders. Future research should  
587 include control groups with various visual perception and attention disorders due to brain damage.

## 588 **Conclusion**

589 The computerized Keen Eye method has demonstrated high effectiveness in diagnosing  
590 neglect, surpassing traditional tests in sensitivity. The study confirmed that the method can detect  
591 subtle manifestations of attention impairments and diagnose non-lateralized attention deficits  
592 associated with neglect. The dual-task paradigm allows for a comprehensive assessment of  
593 attention distribution. By analyzing different indicators, the method can determine the severity of  
594 neglect in both horizontal and vertical dimensions. Despite some methodological limitations, Keen  
595 Eye has significant potential for clinical application and research, offering an objective, efficient,  
596 and adaptable approach for assessing VN and related cognitive disorders.

## 597 **References**

- 598 1. Rode G, Pagliari C, Huchon L, Rossetti Y, Pisella L. Semiology of neglect: An update.  
599 *Ann Phys Rehabil Med.* 2017 Jun;60(3):177-185. doi: 10.1016/j.rehab.2016.03.003.

- 600 2. Husain M, Rorden C. Non-spatially lateralized mechanisms in hemispatial neglect. Nat  
601 Rev Neurosci. 2003 Jan;4(1):26-36. doi: 10.1038/nrn1005.
- 602 3. Buxbaum LJ, Ferraro MK, Veramonti T, Farne A, Whyte J, Ladavas E, et al. Hemispatial  
603 neglect: Subtypes, neuroanatomy, and disability. Neurology. 2004 Mar 9;62(5):749-56.  
604 doi: 10.1212/01.wnl.0000113730.73031.f4.
- 605 4. Ringman JM, Saver JL, Woolson RF, Clarke WR, Adams HP. Frequency, risk factors,  
606 anatomy, and course of unilateral neglect in an acute stroke cohort. Neurology. 2004 Aug  
607 10;63(3):468-74. doi: 10.1212/01.wnl.0000133011.10689.ce.
- 608 5. Stone SP, Halligan PW, Greenwood RJ. The incidence of neglect phenomena and related  
609 disorders in patients with an acute right or left hemisphere stroke. Age Ageing. 1993  
610 Jan;22(1):46-52. doi: 10.1093/ageing/22.1.46.
- 611 6. Li K, Malhotra PA. Spatial neglect. Pract Neurol. 2015 Oct;15(5):333-9. doi:  
612 10.1136/practneurol-2015-001115.
- 613 7. Mark VW. Acute versus chronic functional aspects of unilateral spatial neglect. Front  
614 Biosci. 2003 Jan 1;8:e172-89. doi: 10.2741/973.
- 615 8. Halligan PW, Marshall JC. Toward a principled explanation of unilateral neglect.  
616 Cognitive Neuropsychology. 1994;11(2): 167-206. doi: 10.1080/02643299408251973.
- 617 9. Di Monaco M, Schintu S, Dotta M, Barba S, Tappero R, Gindri P. Severity of unilateral  
618 spatial neglect is an independent predictor of functional outcome after acute inpatient  
619 rehabilitation in individuals with right hemispheric stroke. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2011  
620 Aug;92(8):1250-6. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2011.03.018.
- 621 10. Bosma MS, Nijboer TCW, Caljouw MAA, Achterberg WP. Impact of visuospatial neglect  
622 post-stroke on daily activities, participation and informal caregiver burden: A systematic

- 623 review. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med.* 2020 Jul;63(4):344-358. doi:  
624 10.1016/j.rehab.2019.05.006.
- 625 11. Gainotti G. The role of automatic orienting of attention towards ipsilesional stimuli in non-  
626 visual (tactile and auditory) neglect: a critical review. *Cortex.* 2010 Feb;46(2):150-60. doi:  
627 10.1016/j.cortex.2009.04.006.
- 628 12. Brozzoli C, Demattè ML, Pavani F, Frassinetti F, Farnè A. Neglect and extinction: within  
629 and between sensory modalities. *Restor Neurol Neurosci.* 2006;24(4-6):217-32.
- 630 13. Van der Stoep N, Visser-Meily JM, Kappelle LJ, de Kort PL, Huisman KD, Eijsackers AL,  
631 et al. Exploring near and far regions of space: distance-specific visuospatial neglect after  
632 stroke. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol.* 2013;35(8):799-811. doi:  
633 10.1080/13803395.2013.824555.
- 634 14. Harvey M. Perspectives on visuospatial neglect. In Milner AD, editor, *Comparative*  
635 *neuropsychology.* Oxford University Press. 1998. p. 213 - 227.
- 636 15. Bartolomeo P. A parietofrontal network for spatial awareness in the right hemisphere of  
637 the human brain. *Arch Neurol.* 2006 Sep;63(9):1238-41. doi: 10.1001/archneur.63.9.1238.
- 638 16. Moretta P, Cavallo ND, Fonzo E, Maiorino A, Ferrante C, Ambrosino P, et al. Visual  
639 vertical neglect in acquired brain injury: a systematic review. *Front Psychol.* 2024 Mar  
640 11;15:1360057. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1360057.
- 641 17. Shelton PA, Bowers D, Heilman KM. Peripersonal and vertical neglect. *Brain.* 1990  
642 Feb;113 ( Pt 1):191-205. doi: 10.1093/brain/113.1.191.
- 643 18. Làdavas E, Carletti M, Gori G. Automatic and voluntary orienting of attention in patients  
644 with visual neglect: horizontal and vertical dimensions. *Neuropsychologia.* 1994  
645 Oct;32(10):1195-208. doi: 10.1016/0028-3932(94)90102-3.

- 646 19. Pitzalis S, Di Russo F, Spinelli D, Zoccolotti P. Influence of the radial and vertical  
647 dimensions on lateral neglect. *Exp Brain Res.* 2001 Feb;136(3):281-94. doi:  
648 10.1007/s002210000580.
- 649 20. Adair JC, Williamson DJ, Jacobs DH, Na DL, Heilman KM. Neglect of radial and vertical  
650 space: importance of the retinotopic reference frame. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry.* 1995  
651 Jun;58(6):724-8. doi: 10.1136/jnnp.58.6.724.
- 652 21. Kageyama S, Imagase M, Okubo M, Takayama Y. Neglect in three dimensions. *Am J*  
653 *Occup Ther.* 1994 Mar;48(3):206-10. doi: 10.5014/ajot.48.3.206.
- 654 22. Heilman KM, Lamb D, Williamson JB. Vertical Neglect. In: Kreutzer J, DeLuca J, Caplan  
655 B, editors. *Encyclopedia of Clinical Neuropsychology.* 2nd ed. Cham: Springer; 2018. pp.  
656 3582-83. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-56782-2\_9100-2.
- 657 23. Cazzoli D, Nyffeler T, Hess CW, Müri RM. Vertical bias in neglect: a question of time?  
658 *Neuropsychologia.* 2011 Jul;49(9):2369-74. doi:  
659 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.04.010.
- 660 24. Halligan PW, Marshall JC. Is neglect (only) lateral? A quadrant analysis of line  
661 cancellation. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol.* 1989 Dec;11(6):793-8. doi:  
662 10.1080/01688638908400936.
- 663 25. Julayanont P, Burks DW, Heilman KM. Vertical and Radial Attentional Neglect in  
664 Corticobasal Syndrome. *Cogn Behav Neurol.* 2019 Sep;32(3):208-213. doi:  
665 10.1097/WNN.0000000000000204.
- 666 26. Morris M, Mańkowska A, Heilman KM. Upper Vertical Spatial Neglect With A Right  
667 Temporal Lobe Stroke. *Cogn Behav Neurol.* 2020 Mar;33(1):63-66. doi:  
668 10.1097/WNN.0000000000000221.

- 669 27. Williams LJ, Kernot J, Hillier SL, Loetscher T. Spatial Neglect Subtypes, Definitions and  
670 Assessment Tools: A Scoping Review. *Front Neurol.* 2021 Nov 24;12:742365. doi:  
671 10.3389/fneur.2021.742365.
- 672 28. Williams LJ, Loetscher T, Hillier S, Hreha K, Jones J, Bowen A, et al. Identifying spatial  
673 neglect - an updated systematic review of the psychometric properties of assessment tools  
674 in adults post-stroke. *Neuropsychol Rehabil.* 2025 Apr;35(3):628-667. doi:  
675 10.1080/09602011.2024.2346212.
- 676 29. Gauthier L, Dehaut F, Joannette Y. The Bells Test: A quantitative and qualitative test for  
677 visual neglect. *The International journal of clinical neuropsychology.* 1989;11:49-54.
- 678 30. Ferber S, Karnath HO. How to assess spatial neglect--line bisection or cancellation tasks?  
679 *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol.* 2001 Oct;23(5):599-607. doi: 10.1076/jcen.23.5.599.1243.
- 680 31. Jalas MJ, Lindell AB, Brunila T, Tenovu O, Hämäläinen H. Initial rightward orienting  
681 bias in clinical tasks: normal subjects and right hemispheric stroke patients with and  
682 without neglect. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol.* 2002 Jun;24(4):479-90. doi:  
683 10.1076/jcen.24.4.479.1036.
- 684 32. Azouvi P. The ecological assessment of unilateral neglect. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med.* 2017  
685 Jun;60(3):186-190. doi: 10.1016/j.rehab.2015.12.005.
- 686 33. Grattan ES, Woodbury ML. Do Neglect Assessments Detect Neglect Differently? *Am J*  
687 *Occup Ther.* 2017 May/June;71(3):7103190050p1-7103190050p9. doi:  
688 10.5014/ajot.2017.025015.
- 689 34. Baheux K, Yoshizawa M, Seki K, Handa Y. Virtual reality pencil and paper tests for  
690 neglect: a protocol. *Cyberpsychol Behav.* 2006 Apr;9(2):192-5. doi:  
691 10.1089/cpb.2006.9.192.

- 692 35. de Los Angeles Hoffmann M, Gall C, Kaufmann C, Fydrich T, Kasten E, Sabel B. Spatially  
693 specific and non-lateralised attention deficits in patients with perceptual and premotor  
694 neglect. *NeuroRehabilitation*. 2011;28(2):129-42. doi: 10.3233/NRE-2011-0641.
- 695 36. Azouvi P, Bartolomeo P, Beis JM, Perennou D, Pradat-Diehl P, Rousseaux M. A battery  
696 of tests for the quantitative assessment of unilateral neglect. *Restor Neurol Neurosci*.  
697 2006;24(4-6):273-85.
- 698 37. Piqueres-Juan I, Tirapu-Ustárroz J, García-Sala M. Paradigmas de ejecución dual: aspectos  
699 conceptuales [Dual performance paradigms: their conceptual aspects]. *Rev Neurol*. 2021  
700 May 16;72(10):357-367. Spanish. doi: 10.33588/rn.7210.2020200.
- 701 38. Olive T. Working memory in writing: Empirical evidence from the dual-task technique.  
702 *Eur Psychol* 2004; 9: 32-42. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040.9.
- 703 39. Lebed AA, Korovkin SY. The unconscious nature of insight: A dual-task paradigm  
704 investigation. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*. 2017;10(3): 107-119. doi:  
705 10.11621/pir.2017.0307.
- 706 40. Watanabe K, Funahashi S. A dual-task paradigm for behavioral and neurobiological studies  
707 in nonhuman primates. *J Neurosci Methods*. 2015 May 15;246:1-12. doi:  
708 10.1016/j.jneumeth.2015.03.006.
- 709 41. Gil-Gómez de Liaño B, Castelletti C, Perez-Hernandez E, Quirós-Godoy M, Wolfe JM.  
710 Attentional development can help us understand the inattention blindness effect in visual  
711 search. *Front Cognit*. 2023;2:1134505. doi: 10.3389/fcogn.2023.1134505.
- 712 42. Halder S, Raya DV, Sridharan D. Distinct neural bases of subcomponents of the attentional  
713 blink. *BioRxiv [Preprint]*. 2024 bioRxiv 2024.03.04.583330 [posted 2024 March 4; cited  
714 2025 Mar 30]: [62 p.]. Available from:

- 715 <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.03.04.583330v1> doi:  
716 10.1101/2024.03.04.583330.
- 717 43. Emrich SM, Burianová H, Ferber S. Transient perceptual neglect: visual working memory  
718 load affects conscious object processing. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2011 Oct;23(10):2968-82. doi:  
719 10.1162/jocn\_a\_00028.
- 720 44. Shulman GL, McAvoy MP, Cowan MC, Astafiev SV, Tansy AP, d'Avossa G, et al.  
721 Quantitative analysis of attention and detection signals during visual search. *J*  
722 *Neurophysiol*. 2003 Nov;90(5):3384-97. doi: 10.1152/jn.00343.2003.
- 723 45. Todd JJ, Fougny D, Marois R. Visual short-term memory load suppresses temporo-parietal  
724 junction activity and induces inattentive blindness. *Psychol Sci*. 2005 Dec;16(12):965-  
725 72. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01645.x.
- 726 46. Hein G, Alink A, Kleinschmidt A, Müller NG. The attentional blink modulates activity in  
727 the early visual cortex. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2009 Jan;21(1):197-206. doi:  
728 10.1162/jocn.2008.21026.
- 729 47. Lavie N, Hirst A, de Fockert JW, Viding E. Load theory of selective attention and cognitive  
730 control. *J Exp Psychol Gen*. 2004 Sep;133(3):339-54. doi: 10.1037/0096-3445.133.3.339.
- 731 48. Lavie N, Beck DM, Konstantinou N. Blinded by the load: attention, awareness and the role  
732 of perceptual load. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2014 Mar  
733 17;369(1641):20130205. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2013.0205.
- 734 49. Ghorashi SM, Smilek D, Di Lollo V. Visual search is postponed during the attentional  
735 blink until the system is suitably reconfigured. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform*. 2007  
736 Feb;33(1):124-36. doi: 10.1037/0096-1523.33.1.124.

- 737 50. Wyble B, Bowman H, Nieuwenstein M. The attentional blink provides episodic  
738 distinctiveness: sparing at a cost. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform.* 2009  
739 Jun;35(3):787-807. doi: 10.1037/a0013902.
- 740 51. Martens S, Wyble B. The attentional blink: past, present, and future of a blind spot in  
741 perceptual awareness. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2010 May;34(6):947-57. doi:  
742 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.12.005.
- 743 52. Shapiro KL, Raymond JE. Temporal allocation of visual attention: Inhibition or  
744 interference? In: Dagenbach D, Carr TH, editors. *Inhibitory processes in attention,*  
745 *memory, and language.* San Diego: Academic Press; 1994. pp. 151-188.
- 746 53. Webster RG, Haslerud GM. Influence on extreme peripheral vision of attention to a visual  
747 or auditory task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology.* 1964 Sep;68(3):269–72.  
748 doi:10.1037/h0043256.
- 749 54. Liqin Zhou, Zonglei Zhen, Jia Liu, Ke Zhou; Neural mechanisms underlying individual  
750 differences in attentional blink. *Journal of Vision* 2019;19(10):108. doi:  
751 10.1167/19.10.108.
- 752 55. Giesbrecht B, Kingstone A. Right hemisphere involvement in the attentional blink:  
753 evidence from a split-brain patient. *Brain Cogn.* 2004 Jul;55(2):303-6. doi:  
754 10.1016/j.bandc.2004.02.026.
- 755 56. Russell C, Malhotra P, Deidda C, Husain M. Dynamic attentional modulation of vision  
756 across space and time after right hemisphere stroke and in ageing. *Cortex.* 2013 Jul-  
757 Aug;49(7):1874-83. doi: 10.1016/j.cortex.2012.10.005.

- 758 57. Cooper AC, Humphreys GW, Hulleman J, Praamstra P, Georgeson M. Transcranial  
759 magnetic stimulation to right parietal cortex modifies the attentional blink. *Exp Brain Res.*  
760 2004 Mar;155(1):24-9. doi: 10.1007/s00221-003-1697-9.
- 761 58. Lazar RM, Festa JR, Geller AE, Romano GM, Marshall RS. Multitasking disorder from  
762 right temporoparietal stroke. *Cogn Behav Neurol.* 2007 Sep;20(3):157-62. doi:  
763 10.1097/WNN.0b013e31804c703f.
- 764 59. Deprez S, Vandenbulcke M, Peeters R, Emsell L, Amant F, Sunaert S. The functional  
765 neuroanatomy of multitasking: combining dual tasking with a short term memory task.  
766 *Neuropsychologia.* 2013 Sep;51(11):2251-60. doi:  
767 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2013.07.024.
- 768 60. Worringer B, Langner R, Koch I, Eickhoff SB, Eickhoff CR, Binkofski FC. Common and  
769 distinct neural correlates of dual-tasking and task-switching: a meta-analytic review and a  
770 neuro-cognitive processing model of human multitasking. *Brain Struct Funct.* 2019  
771 Jun;224(5):1845-1869. doi: 10.1007/s00429-019-01870-4.
- 772 61. Ward N, Hussey EK, Cunningham EC, Paul EJ, McWilliams T, Kramer AF. Building the  
773 multitasking brain: An integrated perspective on functional brain activation during task-  
774 switching and dual-tasking. *Neuropsychologia.* 2019 Sep;132:107149. doi:  
775 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2019.107149.
- 776 62. Blini E, D'Imperio D, Romeo Z, De Filippo De Grazia M, Passarini L, Pulosio C, et al.  
777 Susceptibility to multitasking in chronic stroke is associated to damage of the multiple  
778 demand system and leads to lateralized visuospatial deficits. *BioRxiv [Preprint].* 2023  
779 bioRxiv 2023.10.11.561866 [posted 2023 Oct 16; cited 2025 March 30]: [44 p.]. Available

- 780 from: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.10.11.561866v1> doi:  
781 10.1101/2023.10.11.561866.
- 782 63. van Kessel ME, Geurts AC, Brouwer WH, Fasotti L. Visual Scanning Training for Neglect  
783 after Stroke with and without a Computerized Lane Tracking Dual Task. *Front Hum*  
784 *Neurosci.* 2013 Jul 10;7:358. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00358.
- 785 64. Villarreal S, Linnavuo M, Sepponen R, Vuori O, Jokinen H, Hietanen M. Dual-Task in  
786 Large Perceptual Space Reveals Subclinical Hemispatial Neglect. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc.*  
787 2020 Nov;26(10):993-1005. doi: 10.1017/S1355617720000508.
- 788 65. Robertson I, Manly T. Cognitive routes to the rehabilitation of unilateral neglect. In:  
789 Karnath HO, Milner AD, Vallar G, editors. *The Cognitive and Neural Bases of Spatial*  
790 *Neglect.* New York: Oxford University Press; 2002. pp. 365-373.
- 791 66. Bonato M, Priftis K, Umiltà C, Zorzi M. Computer-based attention-demanding testing  
792 unveils severe neglect in apparently intact patients. *Behav Neurol.* 2013;26(3):179-81. doi:  
793 10.3233/BEN-2012-129005.
- 794 67. Bonato M. Neglect and extinction depend greatly on task demands: a review. *Front Hum*  
795 *Neurosci.* 2012 Jul 17;6:195. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2012.00195.
- 796 68. Deouell LY, Sacher Y, Soroker N. Assessment of spatial attention after brain damage with  
797 a dynamic reaction time test. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc.* 2005 Oct;11(6):697-707. doi:  
798 10.1017/S1355617705050824.
- 799 69. Andres M, Geers L, Marnette S, Coyette F, Bonato M, Priftis K, Masson N. Increased  
800 Cognitive Load Reveals Unilateral Neglect and Altitudinal Extinction in Chronic Stroke. *J*  
801 *Int Neuropsychol Soc.* 2019 Jul;25(6):644-653. doi: 10.1017/S1355617719000249.

- 802 70. Mendel T, Barbosa WO, Sasaki AC. Dual task training as a therapeutic strategy in  
803 neurologic physical therapy: a literature review. *CEP*. 2015;41810:480.
- 804 71. van Kessel ME, Geurts AC, Brouwer WH, Fasotti L. Visual Scanning Training for Neglect  
805 after Stroke with and without a Computerized Lane Tracking Dual Task. *Front Hum*  
806 *Neurosci*. 2013 Jul 10;7:358. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00358.
- 807 72. Luria AR. *Higher Cortical Functions in Man*. 2nd ed. New York: Basic Books; 1980.
- 808 73. Kotik BS. Issledovanie lateralizatsii rechi metodom dikhoticheskogo proslushivaniya  
809 [Study of speech lateralization by means of dichotic listening method]. In: Leontyev AN,  
810 editor. *Psikhologicheskie issledovaniya*. Vyp. 6. [Psychological research. Vol. 6].  
811 Moscow: Moscow University Press; 1974. pp. 67–77. Russian.
- 812 74. Albert ML. A simple test of visual neglect. *Neurology*. 1973 Jun;23(6):658-64. doi:  
813 10.1212/wnl.23.6.658.
- 814 75. Robertson IH. Do we need the "lateral" in unilateral neglect? Spatially nonselective  
815 attention deficits in unilateral neglect and their implications for rehabilitation. *Neuroimage*.  
816 2001 Jul;14(1 Pt 2):S85-90. doi: 10.1006/nimg.2001.0838.
- 817 76. Dubois B, Slachevsky A, Litvan I, Pillon B. The FAB: a Frontal Assessment Battery at  
818 bedside. *Neurology*. 2000 Dec 12;55(11):1621-6. doi: 10.1212/wnl.55.11.1621.
- 819 77. Martin J, Vuilleumier P, Assal F, Ronchi R. Neglecting the bottom space: an object-based  
820 disorder? A two-case observational study. *Neurocase*. 2023 Aug;29(4):121-131. doi:  
821 10.1080/13554794.2024.2315860.
- 822 78. Ricci R, Salatino A, Garbarini F, Ronga I, Genero R, Berti A, Neppi-Mòdona M. Effects  
823 of attentional and cognitive variables on unilateral spatial neglect. *Neuropsychologia*. 2016  
824 Nov;92:158-166. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.05.004.

- 825 79. Blini E, Romeo Z, Spironelli C, Pitteri M, Meneghello F, Bonato M, Zorzi M. Multi-  
826 tasking uncovers right spatial neglect and extinction in chronic left-hemisphere stroke  
827 patients. *Neuropsychologia*. 2016 Nov;92:147-157. doi:  
828 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.02.028.
- 829 80. Cubelli R. Definition: Spatial neglect. *Cortex*. 2017 Jul;92:320-321. doi:  
830 10.1016/j.cortex.2017.03.021.
- 831 81. Bonato M, Cutini S. Increased attentional load moves the left to the right. *J Clin Exp*  
832 *Neuropsychol*. 2016;38(2):158-70. doi: 10.1080/13803395.2015.1091065.
- 833 82. Halligan PW, Marshall JC, Wade DT. Left on the right: allochiria in a case of left visuo-  
834 spatial neglect. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 1992 Aug;55(8):717-9. doi:  
835 10.1136/jnnp.55.8.717.
- 836 83. Lepore M, Conson M, Ferrigno A, Grossi D, Trojano L. Spatial transpositions across tasks  
837 and response modalities: exploring representational allochiria. *Neurocase*. 2004  
838 Oct;10(5):386-92. doi: 10.1080/13554790490892275.
- 839 84. Karnath HO. Spatial attention systems in spatial neglect. *Neuropsychologia*. 2015  
840 Aug;75:61-73. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.05.019.
- 841 85. Vallar G, Bottini G, Rusconi ML, Sterzi R. Exploring somatosensory hemineglect by  
842 vestibular stimulation. *Brain*. 1993 Feb;116 ( Pt 1):71-86. doi: 10.1093/brain/116.1.71.
- 843 86. Loetscher T, Nicholls ME, Brodtmann A, Thomas NA, Brugger P. Disentangling input and  
844 output-related components of spatial neglect. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2012 Jun 13;6:176. doi:  
845 10.3389/fnhum.2012.00176.


- 846 87. Na DL, Adair JC, Williamson DJ, Schwartz RL, Haws B, Heilman KM. Dissociation of  
847 sensory-attentional from motor-intentional neglect. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 1998  
848 Mar;64(3):331-8. doi: 10.1136/jnnp.64.3.331.
- 849 88. Dietz MJ, Nielsen JF, Roepstorff A, Garrido MI. Dysconnection of right parietal and  
850 frontal cortex in neglect syndrome. *BioRxiv [Preprint]*. 2017 bioRxiv 192583 [posted 2017  
851 Sept 22; cited 30 March 2025]: [13 p.]. Available from:  
852 <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/192583v1> doi: 10.1101/192583.
- 853 89. He BJ, Snyder AZ, Vincent JL, Epstein A, Shulman GL, Corbetta M. Breakdown of  
854 functional connectivity in frontoparietal networks underlies behavioral deficits in spatial  
855 neglect. *Neuron*. 2007 Mar 15;53(6):905-18. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2007.02.013.
- 856 90. Bartolomeo P, Thiebaut de Schotten M, Doricchi F. Left unilateral neglect as a  
857 disconnection syndrome. *Cereb Cortex*. 2007 Nov;17(11):2479-90. doi:  
858 10.1093/cercor/bhl181.
- 859 91. Doricchi F, Tomaiuolo F. The anatomy of neglect without hemianopia: a key role for  
860 parietal-frontal disconnection? *Neuroreport*. 2003 Dec 2;14(17):2239-43. doi:  
861 10.1097/00001756-200312020-00021.
- 862 92. Baulina ME, Grigorieva VN, Varako NA, Zinchenko YP, Kovyazina MS, Mikadze YV, et  
863 al. Neyropsikhologicheskaya diagnostika i reabilitatsiya patsientov s narusheniyami  
864 regulyatornykh (upravlyayushchikh) funktsiy pri porazheniyakh golovnoy mozga  
865 razlichnoy etiologii [Neuropsychological assessment and rehabilitation of patients with  
866 impaired regulatory (executive) functions in brain damage of various etiologies]. *Natl*  
867 *Psychol J*. 2023;18(4):63–77. Russian. doi:10.11621/npj.2023.0406

- 868 93. Velichkovsky BB. Kognitivnye efekty umstvennogo utomleniya [Cognitive effects of  
869 mental fatigue]. Vestn Mosk Univ Ser 14 Psicol. 2019;1:108–22. Russian.
- 870 94. Guastello SJ, Boeh H, Gorin H, Huschen S, Peters NE, Fabisch M, Poston K. Cusp  
871 catastrophe models for cognitive workload and fatigue: a comparison of seven task types.  
872 Nonlinear Dynamics Psychol Life Sci. 2013 Jan;17(1):23-47.
- 873 95. Verschooren S, Schindler S, De Raedt R, Pourtois G. Switching attention from internal to  
874 external information processing: A review of the literature and empirical support of the  
875 resource sharing account. Psychon Bull Rev. 2019 Apr;26(2):468-490. doi:  
876 10.3758/s13423-019-01568-y.
- 877 96. De Lissnyder E, Koster EH, Everaert J, Schacht R, Van den Abeele D, De Raedt R. Internal  
878 cognitive control in clinical depression: general but no emotion-specific impairments.  
879 Psychiatry Res. 2012 Sep 30;199(2):124-30. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2012.04.019.
- 880 97. Wasylshyn C, Verhaeghen P, Sliwinski MJ. Aging and task switching: a meta-analysis.  
881 Psychol Aging. 2011 Mar;26(1):15-20. doi: 10.1037/a0020912.


## 882 **Supporting Information**

883 **S1 File. Database.** This table contains the raw data collected from all study participants using the  
884 Keen Eye method and related diagnostic assessments. It includes individual performance metrics  
885 such as stimulus omissions, identification errors, and asymmetry coefficients across different  
886 conditions and tasks. These data form the basis for the statistical analyses and decision tree models  
887 described in the manuscript. Each row corresponds to a single participant, with variables  
888 representing key diagnostic indicators.

1000 ms



100 ms



2000 ms





Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 7




Figure 8




Figure 9




Figure 5




Figure 6