Sensorimotor cortex forms prism adaptation memories in older adults and stroke patients.

Gershon Spitz^{a,b,*}, Pierre Petitet^{a,*}, Janet Bultitude^{b,d}, Alessandro Farnè^{e,g,h,i}, Jacques Luaute^{e,f,g}, Jacinta O'Shea^{a,j,**}

^a*Wellcome Centre for Integrative Neuroimaging, Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Oxford, United Kingdom*

^b*Turner Institute for Brain and Mental Health, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia*

^c*Centre for Pain Research, University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom*

^d*Department of Psychology, University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom*

^e*Integrative Multisensory Perception Action Cognition Team - ImpAct, Lyon Neuroscience Research Center, INSERM U1028, CNRS U5292, Lyon, France*

^f*Rehabilitation department, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Henry Gabrielle, Hospital, Saint Genis Laval, France*

^g*University of Lyon 1, Lyon, France*

^h*Hospices Civils de Lyon, Mouvement Handicap, Neuro-immersion, Lyon, France*

ⁱ*Center for Mind/Brain Sciences, University of Trento, Rovereto, Italy*

^j*Wellcome Centre for Integrative Neuroimaging, Oxford Centre for Human Brain Activity (OHBA), University of Oxford Department of Psychiatry, Warneford Hospital, Warneford Lane, Oxford, United Kingdom*

Abstract

Stroke is the largest cause of complex disability in adults. Approximately half of right-hemisphere stroke survivors suffer spatial neglect—an inability to voluntarily orient to people or objects in contralesional space. Neglect is a significant impediment to successful community reintegration. Prism adaptation (PA) is a promising behavioural intervention that can alleviate

*These authors contributed equally to this manuscript

**Correspondance to Jacinta.Oshea@psych.ox.ac.uk

symptoms of spatial neglect. PA induces a leftward pointing bias—the prism after-effect (AE). In neglect, the prism AE generalises to improve other sensory, motor, and cognitive domains. Although the formation of an AE is a key index in neglect, we do not yet know where it is formed in the brain. Here, we used a novel computational fMRI-based approach to study, for the first time, the brain circuits that mediate the formation of PA in stroke survivors and age matched controls. Healthy individuals ($n = 17$) and stroke patients ($n = 11$) performed prism adaptation during fMRI. Temporal signatures of memory formation were extracted from the behavioural data using a state-space model and regressed against the fMRI data. This revealed that, in both groups, fMRI signal in left sensorimotor cortex correlated with the gradual formation of the prism after-effect during adaptation. This indicates that the sensorimotor cortex may be a useful target for neuromodulation that aims to improve the persistence of therapeutic prism after effects.

Keywords: prism adaptation, stroke, neglect, spatial attention, computational neuroimaging

1. Introduction

Stroke is the largest cause of complex disability in adults ([Adamson et al., 2004](#)). Half of right-hemisphere stroke survivors experience spatial neglect—characterised by a failure to orient voluntarily to people or objects in contralesional space ([Stone et al., 1993](#), [Ringman et al., 2004](#)). Spatial neglect is a significant source of long-term disability, resulting in poorer engagement with occupational, social, and leisure activities ([Di Monaco et al., 2011](#), [Katz et al., 1999](#)). Despite spatial neglect being a profound source of disability, there is limited evidence that current rehabilitation approaches lead to consistent and sustained improvements in function ([Bowen et al., 2013](#), [Azouvi et al., 2017](#)).

Prism adaptation (PA) is a promising behavioural paradigm that can reduce the symptoms of spatial neglect under controlled experimental conditions ([Rossetti et al., 1998](#), [O'Shea et al., 2017](#)). Glasses fitted with prismatic lenses are used to induce a rightward shift in the visual field causing individuals to make rightward errors during pointing movements to visual targets. Individuals learn to correct these errors through feedback from successive pointing movements. Subsequent removal of the prism glasses results in a

19 leftward pointing bias – the prism after-effect. In neglect, this leftward bias
20 generalises to improve other sensory, motor, and cognitive impairments in
21 neglect (Jacquin-Courtois et al., 2013). This generalisation makes prism
22 adaptation one of the more promising treatments for spatial neglect.

23 However, these prism after effects are short-lasting. While a single ses-
24 sion of prism adaptation can induce improvements that last for up to a few
25 days (Rossetti et al., 1998, Farnè et al., 2002, Pisella et al., 2002, Jacquin-
26 Courtois et al., 2008), repeated sessions are required to prolong benefit
27 (Serino et al., 2006), while others have not found any long-term beneficial ef-
28 fects (Rousseaux et al., 2006, Rode et al., 2015). We, and others, have argued
29 that the efficacy of prism therapy for neglect could be improved through bet-
30 ter characterisation, and subsequent targeted neuromodulation, of the key
31 brain circuitry that drives prism adaptation behaviour, specifically the for-
32 mation and persistence of the prism after effect (Barrett et al., 2012, Petit-
33 et al., 2017, O’Shea et al., 2017).

34 A recent review of the literature on the neural bases of prism adaptation
35 (Panico et al., 2019). concluded that: 1. cerebellar-parietal networks medi-
36 ate the sensorimotor aspects of prism adaptation, 2. temporal and prefrontal
37 regions mediate generalization to other cognitive domains, and 3. that for-
38 mation and retention of the prism after-effect depends on the motor cortex.
39 The latter arose from our previous work in which we showed that stimulating
40 left sensorimotor cortex during adaptation caused longer lasting sensorimotor
41 and cognitive prism after-effects in healthy volunteers and neglect patients
42 (O’Shea et al., 2017).

43 Previous neuroimaging studies of adaptation have focused on localizing pro-
44 cesses of error correction. Here, instead, we aimed to identify the neural cir-
45 cuits that mediate the formation of the prism after-effect. To identify brain
46 signals associated with the gradual development of the prism effect during
47 adaptation, we fitted a state-space model to the behavioural data. Adapta-
48 tion is well-described by state space models that account for behaviour as
49 the output of two or more parallel learning systems operating on different
50 timescales, fast and slow (Smith et al., 2006, Kording et al., 2007, Joiner and
51 Smith, 2008, Kim et al., 2015). We developed a state space model variant
52 that captured the gradually changing magnitude and stability of the prism
53 after effect during adaptation (Petit et al., 2018). We used this to iden-
54 tify functional brain signals whose timecourse correlated with the fast and

slow learning dynamics that underpin the formation of the behavioural after effect.

Healthy individuals and stroke patients performed prism adaptation during fMRI (Bultitude et al., 2016). Using a similar approach to Kim et al. (2015), a computational model was fitted to prism adaptation behaviour to extract time-varying regressors of brain activity that follow a fast or slow time-scale (Petitet et al., 2018). In both healthy individuals and stroke patients, functional signal in left sensorimotor cortex correlated with the slow timescale dynamics, indicating that this brain region mediates the formation of the prism after effect.

2. Materials and Methods

Description of the study apparatus construction and evaluation, participant samples, MRI acquisition, and initial behavioural results are published elsewhere (Bultitude et al., 2016).

2.1. Participants

The study was approved according to ***omitted text for preprint**. All Healthy subjects and patients provided written informed consent. Eighteen healthy controls and 12 stroke patients volunteered for the current study. All participants were right-hand dominant. Stroke patients suffered a first-time right-hemisphere stroke and displayed symptoms of spatial neglect at some point following their injury (see Appendix .1 for lesion overly figure). At the time of testing only two stroke patients presented with symptoms of neglect. This was defined as at least two target omissions on the left of the page compared to the right on the Bell's cancellation test (Azouvi et al., 2002). Stroke patients and healthy controls had no other history of neurological injury or illness. One stroke patient was excluded due to a piece of occluding material becoming dislodged from the head of the MRI coil, preventing the participant from seeing all task targets. One healthy control participant was excluded due to discomfort during the session, making them unable to reach the leftmost task target. The final study sample comprised 17 healthy controls (mean age = 61, SD = 13.9) and 11 stroke patients (mean age = 52, SD = 10.4, Table 1).

Table 1: Patient demographics

Patient	Age (years)	Sex	Handedness	Chronicity (weeks)	Stroke type	Neurological test outcome	Bell's cancellation test		
							Left omissions	Right omissions	Total omissions
<i>Note:</i>									
M male, F female, H hemorrhagic, I ischemic, He hemiplegia, S sensory loss, V visual field loss									

*Detailed participant characteristics in Table 1 have been omitted in preprint to reduce identifying information.

2.2. Behavioural protocol

Participants completed a prism adaptation behavioural paradigm while in the MRI scanner. The protocol comprised two consecutive fMRI runs: a) a sham run, in which participants made pointing movements towards an LED target on a screen, seen through a neutral, clear, Perspex sheet, and b) a real prism run, in which participants made pointing movements towards a target viewed through a Fresnel sheet that applied a 7.7° prismatic shift to the visual field.

Each run comprised 20 behavioural blocks, each consisting of six pointing trials. Each sham and prism run comprised a total of 120 pointing trials. The inter-trial interval was 6.5 ± 1 sec and inter-block interval was 7.5 ± 1 sec. Pointing blocks alternated between blocks of prism exposure, in which participants learned from feedback to correct their errors, and blocks of after-effect measurement, in which no visual feedback was provided. During prism exposure blocks, participants made rapid reaching movements towards an LED target located at either left or right positions on a screen located in front of them. Visual feedback was limited to the second portion of movement to minimise the effect of 'online' corrections on pointing trajectory. During after-effect trials, participants reached and pointed at an LED target at the center of the screen, viewed through the neutral Perspex sheet. Visual feedback was occluded via a panel that was lowered at the initiation of each pointing movement.

2.3. MRI acquisition protocol

Neuroimaging data were acquired at *omitted text for preprint, France, on a Siemens Magnetom Sonata 1.5T scanner with a circularly polarized head coil with two integrated preamplifiers. Anatomical images were acquired

115 with a MPRT1 sequence (176 slices, FOV = 256 mm, TR/TE/flip angle =
116 1.97/3.93/15°, 1.0 × 1.0 × 1.0 mm voxels) taking 8.26 minutes. Functional
117 MRI of the whole brain was acquired in the axial plane (26 slices, FOV =
118 220 × 220mm², TR/TE/flipangle = 2,500ms/60ms/90, 3.4 × 3.4 × 5.0 mm
119 voxels). Each of the two functional runs lasted 12.35 min.

120 2.4. Data analysis

121 2.4.1. Modelling pointing accuracy

122 Reach endpoint errors were measured as the lateral deviation relative to the
123 LED screen targets (measured in pixels, Px), which formed the behavioural
124 measure of pointing accuracy. During the *real prism* run, rightward point-
125 ing errors were expected at prism onset, which would gradually be corrected
126 across trials until baseline accuracy was restored. Interleaved between blocks
127 of prism exposure the after effect was measured as a leftward pointing error
128 that would gradually stabilize over time. A linear mixed-effect model was
129 used to test for this expected behavioural profile. The analysis compared
130 behaviour in the real versus sham prism runs and had the following fac-
131 tors: trial number, session (sham vs prism), group (control vs stroke), and a
132 session × group interaction term. Participant (random intercept) and trial
133 number (Random slope) were entered as random factors. Statistical analyses
134 of behaviour were performed using R (R Core Team, 2017) in conjunction
135 with the the lme4 package (Bates et al., 2015).

136 2.4.2. Weighted two-state model of prism adaptation

137 A linear time-invariant weighted two-state model was used to estimate the
138 contribution of fast and slow learning dynamics to the pointing behaviour
139 during adaptation (see Petit et al. (2018) for full characterisation and val-
140 idation of this model). The model describes adaptation behaviour as the
141 summed output of two parallel interacting systems that each learn and for-
142 get at different rates - one *fast* one *slow* system. The rapid error correction
143 that occurs early during prism exposure is dominated by the fast system,
144 whereas the stable pointing behaviour when adaptation has reached asymp-
145 tote is primarily accounted for by the slow system. On error correction trials

146 during prism exposure, the model is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 p(n) &= d - X(n) \\
 X(n) &= x_f(n) + x_s(n) \\
 x_f(n) &= A_f e^{\frac{-T(n)}{\tau_f}} x_f(n-1) + B_f p(n-1) \\
 x_s(n) &= A_s e^{\frac{-T(n)}{\tau_s}} x_s(n-1) + B_s p(n-1) \\
 0 < A_f < A_s < 1; 0 < B_s < B_f < 1
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

147 where the endpoint error on the n -th trial $p(n)$ is modelled as the direct effect
 148 of the prism d minus the sum of the state of the two systems $X(n)$. The direct
 149 effect d is a fixed parameter and is the group-averaged error magnitude on the
 150 first trial of prism exposure. It therefore represents the maximum rightward
 151 pointing error that the systems learn to gradually correct over time. Owing
 152 to online error corrections during the reach trajectory, d is typically 60-
 153 80% of the 7.7° optical displacement. On any given trial the total amount
 154 of adaptation $X(n)$ corresponds to the sum of the states of the fast system
 155 $x_f(n)$ and the slow system $x_s(n)$. These systems produce a trial-by-trial
 156 estimate of d based on pointing error feedback. The learning rate B dictates
 157 the proportion of error added to the state of the systems from one trial to
 158 the next. Larger B means faster learning, i.e. a larger proportion of error on
 159 the $(n-1)$ -th trial is corrected for on trial n . Time decay (i.e. proportion
 160 of state that is remembered from one time point to the next) is modelled
 161 as an exponential decay function of time where A is an intercept (starting
 162 point), τ is a time constant and $T(n)$ is the inter-trial interval between trial
 163 $n-1$ and n .

164 On prism after-effect trials, d , B_f and B_s are set to zero to reflect the removal
 165 of the prismatic shift and the absence of visual feedback of the endpoint error.

166 In addition, weighting factors are introduced for each system as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 e(n) &= -X(n) \\
 X(n) &= w_f x_f(n) + w_s x_s(n) \\
 x_f(n) &= A_f e^{\frac{-T(n)}{\tau_f}} x_f(n-1) \\
 x_s(n) &= A_s e^{\frac{-T(n)}{\tau_s}} x_s(n-1) \\
 0 &< A_f < A_s < 1; 0 < B_s < B_f < 1 \\
 0 &< w_f < 5; 0 < w_s < 5
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

167 where w_f and w_s are weighting factors that introduce a dissociation between
 168 the state of a given system on prism exposure blocks and the total amount of
 169 learning by each system that is expressed in after-effect blocks. With these
 170 free parameters the after-effect is now modelled as a weighted sum of the
 171 states of the two systems. For each system, having a weight lower than 1
 172 means a downscaling of the learning by that system that is expressed in the
 173 after-effect, whereas a weight greater than 1 means an over-expression.

174 The model was fitted using a least squares procedure with the *fmincon* func-
 175 tion in MATLAB (The MathWorks inc., version 2014b). Because of the MRI
 176 scanning environment, obtaining a reliable measure of endpoint errors posed a
 177 challenge, particularly for stroke patients (Bultitude et al., 2016). As a result,
 178 individual behavioural datasets were noisier than those typically collected
 179 outside the scanner. This prevented us from obtaining separate model pa-
 180 rameter estimates for each participant. To overcome this issue, the weighted
 181 two-state model was fitted to the averaged pointing data of the healthy con-
 182 trol group. Individual time courses of the fast and slow system dynamics
 183 were subsequently generated for each participant using participant-specific
 184 event onset information. The use of control participant dynamics to model
 185 learning and forgetting in stroke patients was validated using behavioural

186 data collected outside the scanner. That is, we compared model compu-
187 tational parameters between healthy adults and neglect patients, showing
188 similar estimates for both groups (see [Appendix .2](#)).

189 *2.4.3. Modelling fast and slow systems using computational fMRI*

190 Two computational time-course regressors, representing the states of the fast
191 and slow system, were extracted from the group averaged behavioural data
192 and yoked to each participant's (healthy control and stroke patient) fMRI
193 event timings for the real prism adaptation run. The values for the fast
194 and slow system states were yoked to two time-points for each trial: a) the
195 presentation of the pointing target, and b) when participants touched the
196 presentation screen. That is, the state of the two systems was sampled twice
197 per trial to capture two key time points within each trial: a) movement
198 preparation, and b) error feedback. The FMRIB Software Library v6.0 was
199 used for processing and analysis of fMRI data ([Jenkinson et al., 2012](#)).

200 A lesion mask was manually created for each stroke patient from the struc-
201 tural scan using FSLview software under the direction of a neurologist. Le-
202 sion masks were used to optimise image registration for stroke patients. The
203 fMRI pre-processing steps comprised: a) brain extraction, b) geometrical
204 distortion correction using participant-specific field maps, and c) denoising
205 using Independent Components Analysis (ICA). Seven explanatory variables
206 were used to model blood-oxygen-level dependent (BOLD) activity during
207 sham and real prism runs using FSL's FEAT toolbox ([Woolrich et al., 2001,](#)
208 [2004](#)): 1) the timing of each target presentation and screen touch during
209 error correction trials, modelled as a constant 'stick' function, 2) the timing
210 of each target presentation and screen touch during after effect trials, mod-
211 elled as a constant 'stick' function, 3) a linear trend spanning the length of
212 the fMRI run, ranging from 1 to -1 to account for linear habituation effect
213 in BOLD signal owing to repeated pointing over time, 4) the value of the
214 fast system during error correction trials, 5) the value of the fast system
215 during after-effect trials, 6) the value of the slow system during error correc-
216 tion trials, and 7) the value of the slow system during after-effect trials. A
217 task-average prethreshold mask was applied to increase analysis sensitivity,
218 defined as regions activated by the group average activation map across sham
219 and real prism adaptation runs, constrained to gray matter regions (refer to
220 [Appendix .3](#) for images of the fMRI EVs and pre-threshold masks). Group

effects were estimated using FSL’s Flame 1 + 2 with outlier detection. The main contrasts of interest were the average activation maps for the fast and slow systems during the real prism adaptation runs. Significant activation clusters during the real prism run for the fast and slow computational regressors were interrogated by comparing percent signal change between sham and prism runs using binarised cluster masks. These contrasts were conducted using one-tailed paired-samples t-tests [prism>sham] .

3. Results

The primary goal of the study was to identify brain regions where the time-course of functional activation was correlated with the gradual stabilization of the prism after-effect, represented in the computational modeling as the timecourse of the slow system. The fast and slow time-courses were modelled based on the age-matched healthy control behavioural data and applied to both healthy and stroke participants. Brain regions displaying significant activation to fast or slow system regressors were further interrogated by comparing percent signal change between sham and real prism adaptation runs.

3.1. Behaviour: real, compared to sham, prism adaptation results in a leftward pointing bias in after effect trials

Between-group (control vs stroke) and within session (sham vs real) differences in leftward pointing errors were evaluated using a linear mixed effect model (Figure 1). The real prism adaptation run resulted in significantly greater leftward error deviation ($M = -43.6$ pixels, $SD = 45.58$) compared to the sham run ($M = .7$ pixels, $SD = 63.32$) (Run parameter estimate = -40.4 , 95% CI $[-45.24, -35.64]$, $p < .001$). There was no difference in leftward after effect magnitude between healthy controls ($M = -26.0$ pixels, $SD = 57.1$) and stroke participants ($M = -13.1$ pixels, $SD = 62.7$), indicating similar behavioural adaptation across the two groups (Group parameter estimate = -1.1 , 95% CI $[-24.86, 22.42]$, $p = .92$). There was also no interaction between group and run (Group x Run parameter estimate = -3.3 , 95% CI $[-9.36, -2.68]$, $p = .276$). That is, the magnitude of leftward after effects did not differ between groups for the sham (Control:

254 $M = -4.4$ pixels, $SD = 61.61$, Stroke: $M = 8.9$ pixels, $SD = 65.20$) or real
 255 (Control: $M = -48.0$ pixels, $SD = 41.81$, Stroke: $M = -36.29$ pixels, $SD =$
 256 50.42) fMRI runs.

Figure 1: **Prism adaptation results in an after-effect in both healthy controls and stroke patients.** The figure shows trial-by-trial pointing errors in the sham run (left panel) followed by the prism run (right panel). Blocks E1-16 show error correction trials during prism exposure. Interleaved blocks (AE1-10) show blocks of after-effect measurement. During the AE blocks there was significantly greater leftward pointing errors (after-effects) during real, compared to sham, prism adaptation. **a.** Trial-by-trial pointing errors by healthy controls ($n = 17$). **b.** Trial-by-trial pointing errors by stroke patients ($n = 11$). Prism exposure blocks (white columns) and after effect blocks (grey shaded columns) show trials averaged across participants together with ± 1 standard error of the mean error bars (ribbon shading). A linear mixed-effect regression indicated a significant main effect of Run [prism vs sham] (Run parameter estimate = -40.4 , 95% CI $[-45.24, -35.64]$, $p < .001$), but no effect of Group [patients vs controls] (Group parameter estimate = -1.1 , 95% CI $[-24.86, 22.42]$, $p = .92$) and no Run x Group interaction effect (Group x Run parameter estimate = -3.3 , 95% CI $[-9.36, -2.68]$, $p = .276$). Thus patients and healthy controls showed behavioural adaptation to prisms that differed from behaviour during the sham run but that did not differ between the groups **E** = Prism exposure block, **AE** = After-effect block

257 3.2. *A weighted two-state computational model accounts for prism adaptation* 258 *behaviour*

259 A weighted two-state computational model was fitted to the averaged real
260 prism adaptation behavioural data of healthy control participants (Figure 2,
261 panel A). The model showed a good fit to the data ($R^2 = .93$, $RMSE =$
262 8.279). This model displays predicted behaviour: a) fast system dynamics
263 (red) display rightward errors at prism onset that are corrected quickly across
264 subsequent trials; b) slow system dynamics (blue) increasingly dominate as
265 prism after-effects stabilize across trials. Owing to a high amount of noise in
266 stroke patients' in-scanner pointing, fitting the model using the stroke patient
267 pointing data resulted in a poor model fit $R^2 = .74$, $RMSE = 14.328$. This
268 poor fit is indicated by: a) the fast system (red) dominating at all stages
269 during the prism adaptation procedure; b) the weight of the slow system
270 estimated to be 0 during after-effect trials. Because of this the model fit
271 (purple) during after-effect trials is equivalent to the value of the fast system,
272 rather than being a weighted averaged of both systems. Given the poor fit
273 of the model using stroke participant data, instead we inferred the internal
274 state dynamics of stroke patients using the computational model developed
275 on control data. To validate this approach, we compared pointing dynamics
276 outside the scanner, which confirmed behavioural similarity between healthy
277 and stroke cohorts (see [Appendix .2](#)),

Figure 2: Fitting the weighted two-state computational model to prism adaptation behaviour. This figure shows a good fit of the weighted two-state model to healthy control pointing dynamics over time (panel a), but poor fit to stroke patients (panel b). **a.** The overall $R^2 = .93$ (higher is better) and $RMSE = 8.28$ (lower is better), measures of the overall model fit, show a good fit to the healthy control data. The overall model fit (purple) is the sum of two underlying computational systems: a fast system (red) that is expressed maximally early in the adaptation process and gradually dissipates, and a slow system (blue) that increases in magnitude throughout adaptation as the after effect stabilizes over time. Parameters from this model were used for subsequent control and stroke participant fMRI analyses. **b.** The overall $R^2 = .74$ and $RMSE = 14.33$ indicate a poorer fit to stroke patient pointing dynamics. Poor model fit is also illustrated in the following ways: a) the fast system (red) is dominant at all stages during the prism adaptation procedure; b) the weight of the slow system is estimated to be 0 during after effect trials.

278 3.3. Prism adaptation after-effect stabilization in sensorimotor cortex

279 The fast and slow computational time-courses were fitted to prism adap-
 280 tation behaviour and regressed against BOLD fMRI activity. The pri-
 281 mary contrasts of interest were the average activation maps for the fast
 282 and slow system timecourses during the error correction and after effect
 283 blocks of the real prism adaptation run. During the real prism adapta-
 284 tion run there were no significant activations for the fast system time-course,
 285 neither for control nor for stroke patients. However, for healthy controls
 286 the slow system time-course correlated with BOLD activity in a single left
 287 sensorimotor cortex cluster (Figure 3, panel A (red); cluster information:
 288 136 voxels, $p = .004$, peak $Z = 4.26$, peak MNI coordinates = [x: -34,
 289 y: -38, z: 70]). This region showed greater percent signal change dur-
 290 ing the real ($M = .55\%$, $SD = .59$, 95% CI [.27, .83]) compared to sham
 291 ($M = .13\%$, $SD = .24$, 95% CI [.02, .25]) prism adaptation run (Figure 3,
 292 panel A right; $t(16) = 2.59$, $p = .01$, *one - tailed*). For participants with
 293 stroke, the slow system time-course also correlated with BOLD activity in
 294 left sensorimotor cortex (Figure 3, panel B (red); cluster information: 98 vox-
 295 els, $p = .002$, peak $Z = 4.05$, peak MNI coordinates = [x: -24, y: -28, z: 60])
 296 as well as in the right cerebellum (Figure 3, panel C (red); cluster informa-
 297 tion: 111 voxels, $p = .001$, peak $Z = 4.94$, peak MNI coordinates = [x: 8, y:
 298 -52, z: -12]). The sensorimotor cluster showed greater percent BOLD signal
 299 change during the real ($M = .82\%$, $SD = .95$, 95% CI [.26, 1.38]) compared
 300 to sham ($M = .24\%$, $SD = .21$, 95% CI [.12, .36]) prism run (Figure 3, panel
 301 B; $t(10) = 1.83$, $p = .048$, *one - tailed*). There was no difference in percent
 302 BOLD signal change between the real ($M = .69$, $SD = .39$, 95% CI [.46, .92])
 303 and sham ($M = .52$, $SD = .96$, 95% CI [-.05, 1.08]) runs for the cerebellar
 304 cluster (Figure 3, panel C right; $t(10) = .52$, $p = .31$, *one - tailed*).

a. Healthy control sensorimotor cluster

b. Stroke patient sensorimotor cluster

c. Stroke patient cerebellar cluster

Figure 3: Sensorimotor cortex correlates with stabilization of the prism adaptation after effect in healthy controls and stroke patients. The figure shows BOLD activity clusters that correlate significantly with the slow system computational timecourse for healthy controls and stroke patients. **a.** Significant activation cluster (red) for the slow system time-course for healthy controls. A single activation cluster was found in left sensorimotor cortex. Panel a, right compared percent signal change between the sham and real prism adaption runs. Violin plots illustrate the distribution of signal within each run, and are overlaid by boxplots and individual participant datapoints. The sensorimotor cluster demonstrated significantly greater percent signal change in the real prism run compared to the sham run ($t(16) = 2.59, p = .01, one - tailed$). **b.** Significant sensorimotor activation cluster (red) for the slow system time-course for stroke patients (Frequency lesion mask is overlaid; brighter colours = greater lesion overlap across patients). Panel b, right compared percent signal change between the sham and real prism adaption runs. The sensorimotor cluster demonstrated significantly greater percent signal change in the real prism run compared to the sham session ($t(10) = 1.83, p = .048, one - tailed$). **c.** Significant cerebellar activation cluster (red) for the slow system time-course for stroke patients. Panel c, right compared percent signal change between the sham and real prism adaption runs. There was no difference in percent signal change between real and sham runs ($t(10) = .52, p = .31, one - tailed$).

305 4. Discussion

306 In this study, we aimed to identify the brain circuits in which functional
307 activity tracks the development and stabilization of the prism adaptation
308 after effect. This is a critical gap in the field, given that the consolida-
309 tion, and persistence, of the after-effect is arguably the key behaviour that
310 drives the therapeutic response to prism adaptation in neglect rehabilitation
311 (Jacquin-Courtois et al., 2013, O'Shea et al., 2017). To do so, we leveraged
312 computational modelling approaches to prism adaptation (Körding, 2007,
313 Joiner and Smith, 2008, Petit et al., 2018), in conjunction with fMRI. This
314 approach enabled us to identify a slowly evolving computational timecourse
315 during prism adaptation that correlates with activity in sensorimotor cor-
316 tex and gradual stabilization of the prism after effect. The same region was
317 activated both in healthy controls and stroke patients.

318 As summarised by Panico et al. (2019), only a small number of fMRI studies
319 of prism adaptation have been performed (Clower et al., 1996, Danckert
320 et al., 2008, Luaute et al., 2009, Chapman et al., 2010, Küper et al., 2014,
321 Saj et al., 2013, 2019). In part, this is due to technical and design challenges,
322 such as arm movement related artifacts (Bultitude et al., 2016). Studies to
323 date have primarily focused on the initial phase of prism adaptation, which
324 is dominated by strategic error correction (Clower et al., 1996, Danckert
325 et al., 2008, Luaute et al., 2009), for example, by contrasting brain activity
326 during the first few pointing trials with the last few trials. Such studies
327 have identified cortical regions crucial for error detection and correction,
328 including the posterior parietal cortex, anterior cingulate, intraparietal, and
329 medial cerebellar regions. In the current study, we found no correlation
330 between the fast computational timecourse—a putative measure of strategic
331 error correction—and brain activity. It might be that the temporal resolution
332 of fMRI hemodynamic responses are simply too slow to detect rapid changes
333 associated with strategic error correction. Indeed, prior studies may have
334 been able to detect brain activation related to strategic error correction by
335 examining cumulative brain activity averaged across trials.

336 From a neuro-rehabilitation perspective, identifying the neural correlates of
337 prism after effect formation and stabilization is arguably of greater relevance,
338 due to the perceived importance of pointing after effects for knock-on ther-
339 apeutic effects on cognition. Whilst inter-related, error correction and after
340 effect consolidation are independent processes—the time-course of the latter

cannot readily be inferred from the former (Michel et al., 2007, Newport and Jackson, 2006). Luaute et al. (2009) were the first to use a protocol that enabled the examination of brain activity beyond the initial error correction phase. Whereas parietal and occipital regions were active early in adaptation, the cerebellum and superior temporal regions were active during late stages when errors had been corrected back to baseline levels of accuracy. Subsequent studies have implicated similar, but also divergent, brain regions (Chapman et al., 2010, Küper et al., 2014, Saj et al., 2019). In a study with neglect patients, for example, the therapeutic effects were associated with activity of posterior parietal and mid-frontal cortex (Saj et al., 2013).

In contrast to these prior studies, the present work aimed to characterize the neural correlates of prism after effect formation and consolidation (Bultitude et al., 2016). Instead of the traditional three-stage prism adaptation paradigm comprising baseline, exposure, and post-exposure, we interleaved blocks throughout the prism adaptation procedure that captured the development of an after-effect by removing visual feedback of pointing movements. Using a computational neuroimaging framework, we were able to identify for the first time that trial-by-trial activity in sensorimotor cortex tracks the slow system process of after effect consolidation over time. One of the limitations of contrasting early vs late pointing trials is the inability to disentangle the contribution of multiple cognitive processes that coexist in time. That is, signal in the early and late stages are a combination of multiple processes. Because the time-course of different processes are not explicitly modelled in such approaches, it is similarly difficult to establish the temporal course of brain activation at different stages. For example, a region may be deactivated early, returning to its normal level of activation in late stages, whilst another region may become activated only in a later stage.

Only one other recent fMRI study has used a similar analytic approach—extracting internal system states using computational modelling and regressing those behavioral signatures against fMRI brain activity (Kim et al., 2015). That study found that fast internal states correlated with activity in frontal and parietal cortices as well as posterior-lateral cerebellum, intermediate internal states with the inferior parietal lobe, and slow states with the anterior-medial cerebellum. The findings of the current study, implicating sensorimotor cortex, differ from those reported by Kim et al. (2015), likely due to key differences in study methodology. Kim et al. (2015) employed a visuomotor rotation task requiring participants to adapt to two opposing visual pertur-

378 bations using small joystick movements. Visual feedback of performance was
 379 provided by the position of a dot on a screen. This is in contrast to our prism
 380 adaptation paradigm that requires participants to adapt to, and consolidate,
 381 a single visual perturbation using hand movements. Visual feedback was of
 382 the participant's own hand position at the end of the pointing movement.
 383 That is, these two studies differed both in terms of *type of movement* and
 384 *visual feedback*. Whilst prism adaptation has consistently been shown to in-
 385 duce a proprioceptive after-effect—a change in the experience of the limb in
 386 space—it is unclear whether a similar after-effect is induced by the visual ro-
 387 tation paradigm employed by Kim et al. (2015), Facchin et al. (2019), using
 388 a joystick rather than whole-arm movements. Differences between the stud-
 389 ies might also relate to the way in which individuals assign the 'credit', or
 390 reason, for their performance errors (Kording et al., 2007). That is, in the
 391 joystick-task individual's may have learned more about how to manipulate
 392 the tool, rather than their own body, to solve the problem (Kluzik et al.,
 393 2008, Yamamoto et al., 2006), consequently forming an internal model of the
 394 tool (joystick) rather than of their own arm movements (Fleury et al., 2019).

395 Involvement of sensorimotor cortex in adaptation, learning, and skill acqui-
 396 sition is supported in a number of studies (Muellbacher et al., 2002, Landi
 397 et al., 2011, Hadipour-Niktarash et al., 2007, Ogawa and Imamizu, 2013, Paz
 398 et al., 2005). For example, by employing a visuomotor rotation task in mon-
 399 keys, Paz et al. (2005) found that dynamic reorganisation of distinct cortical
 400 areas took place at different time-points during adaptation. Whereas supple-
 401 mentary motor areas mediated the early stage of adaptation, changes in the
 402 primary motor cortex were observed at only the late stage of adaptation. As
 403 interpreted by the authors, the late activation in the primary motor cortex
 404 could reflect the shift of the new acquired skill from working- to long-term
 405 memory. Thus, it is possible that the critical role of the sensorimotor cor-
 406 tex may have gone unnoticed in previous prism adaptation studies due to
 407 a) lack of a clear timecourse representing motor memory consolidation, and
 408 b) the paradigms themselves did not sufficiently elicit the need for brain cir-
 409 cuitry crucial for longer-term consolidation, instead stressing strategic error
 410 detection and correction mediated by cerebellar, parietal, and frontal cortical
 411 regions.

412 One major limitation of this study was the reliance on a computational model
 413 that was developed solely on healthy control pointing movements. That is,
 414 due to unacceptable levels of noise in pointing dynamics for stroke patients,

the model parameters that best fit healthy controls were used to fit the fMRI data both healthy and stroke patients. Although we confirmed similar prism adaptation pointing behaviour and comparable model parameters out-of-scanner for healthy and stroke patients, the results of the current study need to be interpreted within this constraint. That is, our findings should be interpreted with regards to similarities, rather than differences, between healthy controls and stroke patients. Specifically, in this study we were only able to ascertain whether similar brain circuitry encoded a latent memory trace that represents consolidation. Encouragingly, we show that the same behavioural computation is mediated by similar brain circuitry. This is especially relevant to experimental studies in healthy individuals that may more readily translate or generalise their findings to stroke populations.

Despite the translational relevance of the current findings, another important study limitation was that the majority of stroke patients were not presenting with symptoms of visuospatial neglect at the time of study participation. Therefore, we do not know to what extent the sensorimotor regions identified in the study relate to presence or severity of attentional neglect, or whether activity in the sensorimotor region identified in the current study is causally implicated in the therapeutic effect of prism adaptation. Previous work has shown that noninvasive brain stimulation of sensorimotor cortex can prolong retention of the prism after-effect (O'Shea et al., 2017). Future studies can strengthen current findings by having clinical pre-post measures following prism adaptation and examining how neurostimulation of sensorimotor cortex alters slow system dynamics (and consequently the therapeutic effect).

This paper moves the field forward by identifying sensorimotor cortex as a key brain region mediating the consolidation of prism after effects. This is useful for future studies attempting to increase the longevity of the therapeutic effects of prism adaptation. Enhancing/optimising sensorimotor cortex functional activation in this may lead to greater reductions in spatial neglect following stroke.

5. References

- J. Adamson, A. Beswick, and S. Ebrahim. Is stroke the most common cause of disability? *J. Stroke Cerebrovasc. Dis.*, 13(4):171–177, July 2004.

449 P. Azouvi, C. Samuel, A. Louis-Dreyfus, T. Bernati, P. Bartolomeo, J.-M.
450 Beis, S. Chokron, M. Leclercq, F. Marchal, Y. Martin, G. De Montety,
451 S. Olivier, D. Perennou, P. Pradat-Diehl, C. Prairial, G. Rode, E. Siéroff,
452 L. Wiart, M. Rousseaux, and French Collaborative Study Group on As-
453 sessment of Unilateral Neglect (GEREN/GRECO). Sensitivity of clinical
454 and behavioural tests of spatial neglect after right hemisphere stroke. *J.*
455 *Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry*, 73(2):160–166, Aug. 2002.

456 P. Azouvi, S. Jacquin-Courtois, and J. Luauté. Rehabilitation of unilateral
457 neglect: Evidence-based medicine. *Ann. Phys. Rehabil. Med.*, 60(3):191–
458 197, June 2017.

459 A. Barrett, K. M. Goedert, and J. C. Basso. Prism adaptation for spatial
460 neglect after stroke: translational practice gaps. *Nature Reviews Neurology*,
461 8(10):567–577, 2012.

462 D. Bates, M. Mächler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. Fitting linear mixed-effects
463 models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1):1–48, 2015. doi:
464 10.18637/jss.v067.i01.

465 A. Bowen, C. Hazelton, A. Pollock, and N. B. Lincoln. Cognitive rehabili-
466 tation for spatial neglect following stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.*,
467 (7):CD003586, July 2013.

468 J. H. Bultitude, A. Farnè, R. Salemme, D. Ibarrola, C. Urquizar, J. O’Shea,
469 and J. Luauté. Studying the neural bases of prism adaptation using fMRI:
470 A technical and design challenge. *Behav. Res. Methods*, Dec. 2016.

471 H. L. Chapman, R. Eramudugolla, M. Gavrilescu, M. W. Strudwick, A. Lof-
472 tus, R. Cunningham, and J. B. Mattingley. Neural mechanisms underlying
473 spatial realignment during adaptation to optical wedge prisms. *Neuropsy-*
474 *chologia*, 48(9):2595–2601, July 2010.

475 D. M. Clower, J. M. Hoffman, J. R. Votaw, T. L. Faber, R. P. Woods, and
476 G. E. Alexander. Role of posterior parietal cortex in the recalibration of
477 visually guided reaching. *Nature*, 383(6601):618–621, Oct. 1996.

478 J. Danckert, S. Ferber, and others. Direct effects of prismatic lenses on visuo-
479 motor control: an event-related functional MRI study. *European Journal*
480 *of*, 2008.

- 481 M. Di Monaco, S. Schintu, M. Dotta, S. Barba, R. Tappero, and P. Gin-
482 dri. Severity of unilateral spatial neglect is an independent predictor of
483 functional outcome after acute inpatient rehabilitation in individuals with
484 right hemispheric stroke. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.*, 92(8):1250–1256, Aug.
485 2011.
- 486 A. Facchin, A. Folegatti, Y. Rossetti, and A. Farnè. The half of the story we
487 did not know about prism adaptation. *Cortex*, 119:141–157, Oct. 2019.
- 488 A. Farnè, Y. Rossetti, S. Toniolo, and E. Làdavas. Ameliorating neglect with
489 prism adaptation: visuo-manual and visuo-verbal measures. *Neuropsychologia*, 40(7):718–729, 2002.
- 491 L. Fleury, C. Prablanc, and A.-E. Priot. Do prism and other adaptation
492 paradigms really measure the same processes? *Cortex*, 119:480–496, Oct.
493 2019.
- 494 A. Hadipour-Niktarash, C. K. Lee, J. E. Desmond, and R. Shadmehr. Im-
495 pairment of retention but not acquisition of a visuomotor skill through
496 time-dependent disruption of primary motor cortex. *J. Neurosci.*, 27(49):
497 13413–13419, Dec. 2007.
- 498 M. Inoue, M. Uchimura, A. Karibe, J. O’Shea, Y. Rossetti, and S. Kitazawa.
499 Three timescales in prism adaptation. *J. Neurophysiol.*, 113(1):328–338,
500 Jan. 2015.
- 501 S. Jacquin-Courtois, G. Rode, L. Pisella, D. Boisson, and Y. Rossetti. Wheel-
502 chair driving improvement following visuo-manual prism adaptation. *Cortex*, 44(1):90–96, 2008.
- 504 S. Jacquin-Courtois, J. O’Shea, J. Luauté, L. Pisella, P. Revol, K. Mizuno,
505 G. Rode, and Y. Rossetti. Rehabilitation of spatial neglect by prism adap-
506 tation: a peculiar expansion of sensorimotor after-effects to spatial cogni-
507 tion. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.*, 37(4):594–609, May 2013.
- 508 M. Jenkinson, C. F. Beckmann, T. E. J. Behrens, M. W. Woolrich, and S. M.
509 Smith. FSL. *Neuroimage*, 62(2):782–790, Aug. 2012.
- 510 W. M. Joiner and M. A. Smith. Long-term retention explained by a model of
511 short-term learning in the adaptive control of reaching. *J. Neurophysiol.*,
512 100(5):2948–2955, Nov. 2008.

- 513 N. Katz, A. Hartman-Maeir, H. Ring, and N. Soroker. Functional disability
514 and rehabilitation outcome in right hemisphere damaged patients with
515 and without unilateral spatial neglect. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.*, 80(4):
516 379–384, Apr. 1999.
- 517 S. Kim, K. Ogawa, J. Lv, N. Schweighofer, and H. Imamizu. Neural sub-
518 strates related to motor memory with multiple timescales in sensorimotor
519 adaptation. *PLoS Biol.*, 13(12):e1002312, Dec. 2015.
- 520 J. Kluzik, J. Diedrichsen, R. Shadmehr, and A. J. Bastian. Reach adaptation:
521 what determines whether we learn an internal model of the tool or adapt
522 the model of our arm? *J. Neurophysiol.*, 100(3):1455–1464, Sept. 2008.
- 523 K. Körding. Decision theory: what “should” the nervous system do? *Science*,
524 318(5850):606–610, Oct. 2007.
- 525 K. P. Kording, J. B. Tenenbaum, and R. Shadmehr. The dynamics of memory
526 as a consequence of optimal adaptation to a changing body. *Nat. Neurosci.*,
527 10(6):779–786, June 2007.
- 528 M. Küper, M. J. S. Wünnemann, M. Thürling, R. M. Stefanescu, S. Mader-
529 wald, H. G. Elles, S. Göricke, M. E. Ladd, and D. Timmann. Activation of
530 the cerebellar cortex and the dentate nucleus in a prism adaptation fMRI
531 study. *Hum. Brain Mapp.*, 35(4):1574–1586, Apr. 2014.
- 532 S. M. Landi, F. Baguear, and V. Della-Maggiore. One week of motor adap-
533 tation induces structural changes in primary motor cortex that predict
534 long-term memory one year later. *J. Neurosci.*, 31(33):11808–11813, Aug.
535 2011.
- 536 J. Luauté, S. Schwartz, Y. Rossetti, M. Spiridon, G. Rode, D. Boisson, and
537 P. Vuilleumier. Dynamic changes in brain activity during prism adaptation.
538 *J. Neurosci.*, 29(1):169–178, Jan. 2009.
- 539 C. Michel, L. Pisella, C. Prablanc, G. Rode, and Y. Rossetti. Enhancing
540 visuomotor adaptation by reducing error signals: single-step (aware) versus
541 multiple-step (unaware) exposure to wedge prisms. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.*, 19
542 (2):341–350, Feb. 2007.

- 543 W. Muellbacher, U. Ziemann, J. Wissel, N. Dang, M. Kofler, S. Facchini,
544 B. Boroojerdi, W. Poewe, and M. Hallett. Early consolidation in human
545 primary motor cortex. *Nature*, 415(6872):640–644, Feb. 2002.
- 546 R. Newport and S. R. Jackson. Posterior parietal cortex and the dissociable
547 components of prism adaptation, 2006.
- 548 K. Ogawa and H. Imamizu. Human sensorimotor cortex represents conflicting
549 visuomotor mappings. *J. Neurosci.*, 33(15):6412–6422, Apr. 2013.
- 550 J. O’Shea, P. Revol, H. Cousijn, J. Near, P. Petitet, S. Jacquin-Courtois,
551 H. Johansen-Berg, G. Rode, and Y. Rossetti. Induced sensorimotor cortex
552 plasticity remediates chronic treatment-resistant visual neglect. *Elife*, 6,
553 Sept. 2017.
- 554 F. Panico, Y. Rossetti, and L. Trojano. On the mechanisms underlying
555 prism adaptation: A review of neuro-imaging and neuro-stimulation stud-
556 ies. *Cortex*, 123:57–71, Nov. 2019.
- 557 R. Paz, C. Natan, T. Boraud, H. Bergman, and E. Vaadia. Emerging patterns
558 of neuronal responses in supplementary and primary motor areas during
559 sensorimotor adaptation. *J. Neurosci.*, 25(47):10941–10951, Nov. 2005.
- 560 P. Petitet, J. X. O’Reilly, and J. O’Shea. Towards a neuro-computational
561 account of prism adaptation. *Neuropsychologia*, Dec. 2017.
- 562 P. Petitet, J. X. O’Reilly, A. M. Goncalves, P. Salvan, S. Kitazawa,
563 H. Johansen-Berg, and J. O’Shea. Causal explanation of individual differ-
564 ences in human sensorimotor memory formation. Jan. 2018.
- 565 L. Pisella, G. Rode, A. Farne, D. Boisson, and Y. Rossetti. Dissociated long
566 lasting improvements of straight-ahead pointing and line bisection tasks in
567 two hemineglect patients. *Neuropsychologia*, 40(3):327–334, 2002.
- 568 R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*.
569 R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2017. URL
570 <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 571 J. M. Ringman, J. L. Saver, R. F. Woolson, W. R. Clarke, and H. P. Adams.
572 Frequency, risk factors, anatomy, and course of unilateral neglect in an
573 acute stroke cohort. *Neurology*, 63(3):468–474, Aug. 2004.

- 574 G. Rode, S. Lacour, S. Jacquin-Courtois, L. Pisella, C. Michel, P. Revol,
575 N. Alahyane, J. Luauté, S. Gallagher, P. Halligan, D. Pélisson, and Y. Ros-
576 setti. Long-term sensorimotor and therapeutical effects of a mild regime
577 of prism adaptation in spatial neglect. a double-blind RCT essay. *Ann.*
578 *Phys. Rehabil. Med.*, 58(2):40–53, Apr. 2015.
- 579 Y. Rossetti, G. Rode, L. Pisella, A. Farné, L. Li, D. Boisson, and M. T.
580 Perenin. Prism adaptation to a rightward optical deviation rehabilitates
581 left hemispatial neglect. *Nature*, 395(6698):166–169, Sept. 1998.
- 582 M. Rousseaux, T. Bernati, A. Saj, and O. Kozlowski. Ineffectiveness of prism
583 adaptation on spatial neglect signs. *Stroke*, 37(2):542–543, Feb. 2006.
- 584 A. Saj, Y. Cojan, R. Vocat, J. Luauté, and P. Vuilleumier. Prism adaptation
585 enhances activity of intact fronto-parietal areas in both hemispheres in
586 neglect patients. *Cortex*, 49(1):107–119, Jan. 2013.
- 587 A. Saj, Y. Cojan, F. Assal, and P. Vuilleumier. Prism adaptation effect on
588 neural activity and spatial neglect depend on brain lesion site. *Cortex*, 119:
589 301–311, May 2019.
- 590 A. Serino, V. Angeli, F. Frassinetti, and E. Làdavas. Mechanisms underlying
591 neglect recovery after prism adaptation. *Neuropsychologia*, 44(7):1068–
592 1078, 2006.
- 593 M. A. Smith, A. Ghazizadeh, and R. Shadmehr. Interacting adaptive pro-
594 cesses with different timescales underlie short-term motor learning. *PLoS*
595 *Biol.*, 4(6):e179, June 2006.
- 596 S. P. Stone, P. W. Halligan, and R. J. Greenwood. The incidence of neglect
597 phenomena and related disorders in patients with an acute right or left
598 hemisphere stroke. *Age Ageing*, 22(1):46–52, Jan. 1993.
- 599 M. W. Woolrich, B. D. Ripley, M. Brady, and S. M. Smith. Temporal au-
600 tocorrelation in univariate linear modeling of fMRI data. *Neuroimage*, 14
601 (6):1370–1386, Dec. 2001.
- 602 M. W. Woolrich, T. E. J. Behrens, C. F. Beckmann, M. Jenkinson, and S. M.
603 Smith. Multilevel linear modelling for fMRI group analysis using bayesian
604 inference. *Neuroimage*, 21(4):1732–1747, Apr. 2004.

605 K. Yamamoto, D. S. Hoffman, and P. L. Strick. Rapid and long-lasting
606 plasticity of input-output mapping. *J. Neurophysiol.*, 96(5):2797–2801,
607 Nov. 2006.

608 *Appendix .1. Stroke patient lesion overlay image*

Figure .4: **Stroke patient lesion overlay image.** This figure shows lesion overlay maps for all stroke patients. Bright colour indicates greater overlap.

609 *Appendix .2. Comparing out-of-scanner prism adaptation dynamics between*
610 *healthy controls and neglect patients*

611 We employed two approaches to ensure the validity of applying the weighted
612 two-state model parameters based on healthy control dynamics to stroke
613 patients: a) we compared the dynamics of prism adaptation both visually
614 (observed pointing dynamics) and, b) quantitatively (i.e. statistically com-
615 paring individual computational model parameter estimates) of historical be-
616 havioural data collected outside the scanner. We used data from 34 healthy
617 controls (mean age = 66.68, SD = 8.44) and 15 neglect patients (mean age =
618 59.24, SD = 7.78). From a qualitative perspective, Figure .5 indicates similar
619 pointing dynamics between healthy older adults and neglect patients.

Figure 5: **Pointing dynamics for healthy older adults and stroke patients collected out-of-scanner.** This figure shows the pointing dynamics from a prism adaptation protocol collected in a non-MRI environment, where measurement noise is significantly reduced. It can be seen that healthy older adults (green) and neglect patients (orange-brown), in general, display similar pointing dynamics for AE (white columns) and error-correction (grey shaded columns) trials.

620 In contrast to inside the scanner, the precise timing of each trial was un-
621 known. Thus, similar to previous studies (Inoue et al., 2015, Joiner and
622 Smith, 2008, Smith et al., 2006), retention factors were defined as a function
623 of trial rather than time. The model was therefore defined as follows on

624 error-correction trials:

$$\begin{aligned}
 p(n) &= d - X(n) \\
 X(n) &= x_f(n) + x_s(n) \\
 x_f(n) &= A_f x_f(n-1) + B_f p(n-1) \\
 x_s(n) &= A_s x_s(n-1) + B_s p(n-1) \\
 0 < A_f < A_s < 1; 0 < B_s < B_f < 1
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{.1}$$

625 And as follows on AE trials:

$$\begin{aligned}
 e(n) &= -X(n) \\
 X(n) &= w_f x_f(n) + w_s x_s(n) \\
 x_f(n) &= A_f x_f(n-1) \\
 x_s(n) &= A_s x_s(n-1) \\
 0 < A_f < A_s < 1; 0 < B_s < B_f < 1 \\
 0 < w_f < 5; 0 < w_s < 5
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{.2}$$

626 The model differs in four ways between the two pointing types. First, a
 627 different bias term is used, reflecting the fact that, at baseline, individuals
 628 show different biases depending on visual feedback availability. This bias
 629 was computed as the average endpoint error for each type of trial during
 630 the pre-exposure phase. Second, the prism effect d is set to zero on AE

631 trials (no prism deviation). On error-correction trials, d is set to the group-
 632 averaged normalised pointing error obtained on the first exposure trial (i.e.
 633 when no adaptation has occurred yet). This corresponded to $d = 3.33cm$
 634 for the neglect group, and $d = 6.07cm$ for the control group. Third, the
 635 learning rates of the fast and slow systems are set to zero on OLP trials in
 636 order to reflect the absence of visual feedback. Fourth, weighting factors are
 637 introduced on OLP trials to allow for a dissociation between the state of a
 638 system on CLP and its contribution to the after-effect on OLP.

639 After optimising the model to individual datasets (6 free parameters), the
 640 quality of the fit was comparable across the two groups (r-square; $t(39.6) =$
 641 $2.01, p = .051, two - tailed$). We found no evidence of a difference in learn-
 642 ing (fast system: $t(30.3) = -1.08, p = .290, two - tailed$; slow system:
 643 $t(22.8) = -.35, p = .727, two - tailed$) or forgetting (fast system: $t(34.8) =$
 644 $.24, p = .814, two - tailed$; slow system: $t(17.4) = -.76, p = .458, two - tailed$)
 645 between patients and controls. This suggested that similar learning and for-
 646 getting dynamics were driving overt behaviour during prism adaptation in
 647 patients and controls.

Figure 6: **Model parameter comparison.** This figure shows comparisons of model computational parameters between healthy older adults and neglect patients. p-values following two-tailed independent samples t-test are presented as well as Bayes factor values. Bayes factor presents the strength of evidence for a particular hypothesis. A Bayes factor between 1/3.2 and 3.2 indicate no evidence for the hypothesis.

648 However, the two groups differed in terms of the weight attributed to the
649 slow system during OLP trials ($t(16.8) = 2.56, p = .020, two - tailed$), with
650 patients showing greater transfer. The contribution of the fast system to the
651 after-effect on the other hand was not significantly different between the two
652 groups ($t(17.60) = 1.34, p = .20, two - tailed$). The apparent over-weighting
653 of the slow system reflected the fact that patients showed after-effects that
654 were overall comparable to controls, despite making smaller pointing errors
655 during exposure trials. In our experience, smaller endpoint errors during
656 prism exposure result from the fact that stroke patients tend to move slower,
657 which allows them to correct their movement in-flight to a greater extent
658 than controls. Thus, it might be the case that overt pointing behaviour

659 better reflects the error signal driving adaptation in controls, whereas it is
660 contaminated by online corrections in stroke patients.

661 In order to test this idea and investigate whether it accounted for the appar-
662 ent over-weighting of the slow system in stroke patients, we introduced an
663 *overt expression* parameter on CLP trials as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p_o(n) &= o.p(n) \\ p(n) &= d - X(n) \\ X(n) &= x_f(n) + x_s(n) \\ x_f(n) &= A_f x_f(n-1) + B_f p(n-1) \\ x_s(n) &= A_s x_s(n-1) + B_s p(n-1) \\ 0 &< o < 1 \\ 0 &< A_f < A_s < 1; 0 < B_s < B_f < 1 \end{aligned} \tag{.3}$$

664 where o expresses the fraction of error signal that is expressed in overt be-
665 haviour after online correction. A value of zero means perfect online control
666 (none of the prism-induced error is expressed in the endpoint error), while
667 a value of one means no online control (all of the prism-induced error is ex-
668 pressed in the endpoint error). Crucially, the systems learn based on the
669 covert error, i.e. the error before online correction. This modification also
670 allowed us to use the same prism effect d for the two groups, which guaranties
671 a better comparison of the dynamics obtained.

672 As expected, this parameterisation of the model captured a difference of
673 online control between the two groups. However, none of the other free
674 parameters were significantly different. This reinforced the idea that the
675 fast and slow adaptation dynamics were comparable across the two group,

despite patients displaying smaller CLP errors overall, potentially due to larger online control.

Appendix .3. fMRI modelling materials

Figure .7: **FMRI explanatory variables.** The seven explanatory variables entered into the fmri general linear model.

Figure .8: **Task relevant mask for healthy controls.** The 'task-relevant' mask used for control participants prior to statistical thresholding.

Figure .9: **Task relevant mask for stroke patients.** The 'task-relevant' mask used for control participants prior to statistical thresholding.