



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Decoding of standard and non-standard visuomotor associations from parietal cortex

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Filippini M., Morris A.P., Breveglieri R., Hadjidimitrakis K., Fattori P. (2020). Decoding of standard and non-standard visuomotor associations from parietal cortex. *JOURNAL OF NEURAL ENGINEERING*, 17(4), 1-15 [10.1088/1741-2552/aba87e].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/789028> since: 2021-01-16

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/aba87e>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Decoding of standard and non-standard visuomotor associations from parietal cortex.

To cite this article before publication: Matteo Filippini *et al* 2020 *J. Neural Eng.* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/aba87e>

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2020 IOP Publishing Ltd.

During the embargo period (the 12 month period from the publication of the Version of Record of this article), the Accepted Manuscript is fully protected by copyright and cannot be reused or reposted elsewhere.

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a subscription basis, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 licence after the 12 month embargo period.

After the embargo period, everyone is permitted to use copy and redistribute this article for non-commercial purposes only, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions will likely be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected, unless specifically stated otherwise in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

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

1 **Decoding of standard and non-standard visuomotor associations from parietal cortex.**

2

3

4 M. FILIPPINI^{1,2}, A.P. MORRIS³, R. BREVEGLIERI¹, K. HADJIDIMITRAKIS^{1,3*}, P. FATTORI^{1,2*};

5 ¹University of Bologna, Department of Biomedical and Neuromotor Sciences, Bologna, Italy;

6 ² ALMA-AI: Alma Mater Research Institute for Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence

7 ³Neuroscience Program, Biomedicine Discovery Institute, Department of Physiology, Monash University,

8 Clayton, Australia

9

10

11 * Equal senior authors

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

Correspondence:

Dr. Matteo Filippini, Ph.D,

Department of Biomedical and Neuromotor Sciences,

University of Bologna, Piazza di Porta San Donato 2,

Bologna 40126, Italy E-mail: matteo.filippini7@unibo.it

1
2
3 27
45 28
67 29
89
10 30 **Abstract**11
12 31 Objective

13
14 32 Neural signals can be decoded and used to move neural prostheses with the purpose of restoring motor
15
16 33 function in patients with mobility impairments. Such patients typically have intact eye movement control and
17
18 34 visual function, suggesting that cortical visuospatial signals could be used to guide external devices. Neurons
19
20 35 in parietal cortex mediate sensory-motor transformations, encode the spatial coordinates for reaching goals,
21
22 36 hand position and movements, and other spatial variables. We studied how spatial information is
23
24 37 represented at the population level, and the possibility to decode not only the position of visual targets and
25
26 38 the plans to reach them, but also conditional, non-spatial motor responses.

27
28
29
30 39 Approach

31
32 40 The animals first fixated one of nine targets in 3D space and then, after the target changed color, either
33
34 41 reached toward it, or performed a non-spatial motor response (lift hand from a button). Spiking activity of
35
36 42 parietal neurons was recorded in monkeys during two tasks. We then decoded different task related
37
38 43 parameters.

39
40
41 44 Main results

42
43 45 We first show that a maximum-likelihood estimation (MLE) algorithm trained separately in each task
44
45 46 transformed neural activity into accurate metric predictions of target location. Furthermore, by combining
46
47 47 MLE with a Naïve Bayes classifier, we decoded the monkey's motor intention (reach or hand lift) and the
48
49 48 different phases of the tasks. These results show that, although V6A encodes the spatial location of a target
50
51 49 during a delay period, the signals they carry are updated around the movement execution in an
52
53 50 intention/motor specific way.

54
55 51 Significance
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 52 These findings show the presence of multiple levels of information in parietal cortex that could be decoded
4
5 53 and used in brain machine interfaces to control both goal-directed movements and more cognitive
6
7 54 visuomotor associations.
8
9

10 55

11 56

14 57 **Keywords**

16 58 Reaching, brain computer interfaces, decoding, electrophysiology, posterior parietal cortex, monkey
17
18
19 59

22 60 **1. Introduction**

23
24 61 A large body of evidence shows that motor intentions can be decoded from neural activity and used to control
25
26 62 artificial limbs (1–6). In most of these cases, neural activity was recorded from motor cortex, where signals
27
28 63 are highly correlated with desired movement trajectories (1,3). An alternative approach is to exploit signals
29
30 64 earlier in the sensorimotor pathways, particularly in posterior parietal cortex (PPC), where neurons are
31
32 65 sensitive to movement parameters and more abstract representations of intention and visuospatial attention
33
34 66 (7–13). The spatial target of a reach, for example, can be decoded from a small number of neurons in PPC in
35
36 67 monkeys (14–17), and from fMRI signals (18,19) or intracortical signals (2) in humans.
37
38
39
40 68

41
42 69 A device that relies on signals from PPC, rather than from motor cortex, has the potential advantage that it
43
44 70 could (also) infer the intended outcome of an action rather than the kinematics of a specific movement. This
45
46 71 could provide greater flexibility in its use across a range of assistive technologies. However, PPC signals are
47
48 72 multi-modal and high-dimensional (8,20,21), making difficult to disentangle between these signals.
49
50
51 73

52
53 74 Here, we tested whether multiple task- and intention-related variables could be decoded simultaneously
54
55 75 from population activity in area V6A, located in the posterior parietal cortex (PPC) (22,23). V6A neurons are
56
57 76 involved in both reaching and grasping (24–27), and are tuned for kinematic parameters such as direction
58
59 77 (28,29) and amplitude of hand movement (24). In addition, they encode visual target location in 3D in the
60

1
2
3 78 absence of reaching (27,30–32), thus enabling the use of visuospatial information in task contexts where no
4
5 79 arm movement is planned.
6

7
8 80
9
10 81 To test this hypothesis, we decoded neural activity recorded from area V6A in macaques while they
11
12 82 performed sequentially two sensorimotor tasks (Fig. 1). Both tasks required fixation of a visual target that
13
14 83 varied position in 3D space across trials, but they differed in the type of motor response required: a reach
15
16 84 movement towards the target (fixate-to-reach task), or a non-spatial motor response (fixate-to-hand lift task)
17
18 85 that was instructed by the color code of the target, but not directed towards it. We used a Maximum
19
20
21 86 Likelihood Estimator (MLE) that permits a metric estimation of the target position.
22

23 87 We then compared population codes between the two tasks during the delay period. At the single neuron
24
25 88 level, we recently reported that the most represented type of V6A cells (44%) showed different firing
26
27 89 between these two tasks (33), so we expected that the population signals would be different. In addition, we
28
29
30 90 looked for activity patterns related to distinct task stages and how they gradually evolved to support the
31
32 91 movement. These switches can be useful to trigger prosthesis movement (17,34).
33

34 92 We found that we could reliably decode: target position, type of intended movement and different cognitive
35
36 93 states from the very same population of neurons. At the same time, generalization analysis across tasks
37
38 94 showed that the neural codes were very similar in most task phases and diverged only immediately before
39
40 95 the movement onset. The finding that multiple variables and types of motor responses were coded
41
42 96 dynamically in the same brain area could be exploited for neuroprosthetic applications.
43
44
45

46 97

48 98 **2. Methods**

49 99

50
51
52
53 100 The experimental part of this study was performed in accordance with the guidelines of the EU Directives
54
55 101 (86/609/EEC; 2010/63/EU) and the Italian national law (D.L. 116-92, D.L. 26-2014) on the use of animals in
56
57 102 scientific research. Protocols were approved by the Animal-Welfare Body of the University of Bologna. During
58
59
60

1
2
3 103 training and recording sessions, particular attention was paid to any behavioral and clinical sign of pain or
4
5 104 distress.

6
7 105

8
9 106

10 107 *2.1 Experimental Procedures*

11
12 108

13
14 109 Two male macaque monkeys (*Macaca fascicularis*) weighing 4.4 kg (Monkey 1, M1) and 3.8 kg (Monkey 2,
15
16 110 M2) were used. Single cell activity was recorded extracellularly by means of single electrode from the anterior
17
18 111 bank of the parieto-occipital sulcus (POs). We performed multiple electrode penetrations using a five-channel
19
20 112 multielectrode recording system that permitted to record from up to five single electrodes at once (Thomas
21
22 113 Recording GmbH, Giessen, Germany). We recorded the activity of 162 V6A (36) neurons, 100 cells from M1
23
24 114 and 62 cells from M2. Although five electrodes was the maximum number of our recording system, on
25
26 115 average we were recording from 2-3 neurons at once; in total, the number of sessions distributed between
27
28 116 M1 and M2 was 45 (22 + 23). Action potentials (spikes) in each channel were isolated with a waveform
29
30 117 discriminator (Multi Spike Detector; Alpha Omega Engineering Nazareth, Israel) and were sampled at 100
31
32 118 kHz. Quality of single-unit isolation was determined by the homogeneity of spike wave forms and clear
33
34 119 refractory periods in ISI histograms during spike-sorting. Only well-isolated units not changing across tasks
35
36 120 were considered. The experimental procedures are described in full detail in Breveglieri et al. (2014).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 121

46 122 *2.2 Behavioral Tasks*

47
48 123

49
50 124 Electrophysiological signals were collected while the monkeys were performing two instructed-delay tasks:
51
52 125 a fixate-to-reach task (fix-reach) and a fixate-to-lift hand task (fix-lift), as illustrated in Figure 1. In both tasks,
53
54 126 one of nine targets placed in several locations in 3-D space was switched on and the animal had to fixate it
55
56 127 and, when instructed (target color change), either perform a reach toward the target (fix-reach), or lift the
57
58 128 hand from the home button (fix-lift). Monkeys sat in a primate chair, with the head restrained, and faced a
59
60

1
2
3 129 horizontal panel located at eye level. Nine light-emitting diodes (LEDs) mounted on the panel at different
4
5 130 distances from the eyes were used as fixation and reaching targets (Figure 1A, left). As shown in the right
6
7
8 131 part of Figure 1A, the nine target LEDs were arranged in a radial grid consisting of three directions: version
9
10 132 angles of -15° , 0° , and $+15^\circ$ and three depths i.e., vergence angles of 17.1° , 11.4° , and 6.9° . The two animals
11
12 133 had the same interocular distance (3.0 cm), so we placed the grid at the same distance from the monkeys in
13
14 134 both animals (nearest targets: 10 cm; intermediate targets: 15 cm; far targets: 25 cm). The range of vergence
15
16 135 angles was chosen to be within the limits of peripersonal space, so the monkeys were able to reach all target
17
18
19 136 positions. The animals performed the tasks with the arm contralateral to the recording site. The two tasks
20
21 137 were performed in separate blocks. In case of fix-lift task, a plexiglass barrier prevented the hand movement
22
23 138 toward the target.

24
25 139 In both tasks, the animal initiated a trial by pressing and holding a home button (HB; 2.5 cm in diameter,
26
27
28 140 Figure 2A) placed 5 cm in front of the torso, outside the field of view (FREE epoch). After a delay of 1000 ms,
29
30 141 one of the nine LEDs was turned on in green, cuing the animal to initiate fixation. After a delay of 1700–2500
31
32 142 ms (DELAY epoch), the LED changed to red, cuing the animal to either perform a reach to the target (fix-reach
33
34 143 task) or to simply release the button (fix-lift task) (MOV epoch). In the case of fix-reach task, monkeys had 1
35
36
37 144 sec after the go signal to reach the target, otherwise the trial was aborted. Then, monkeys pressed the target
38
39 145 and held the hand on it for 800–1200 ms. The target offset cued the monkeys to release the LED and return
40
41 146 to the home button, which ended the trial and allowed monkeys to receive reward. In the case of fix-lift task,
42
43 147 monkeys had 1 s to release the button to have the reward.

44
45 148 Only correctly executed trials were used in this analysis. We collected 10 correct trials for each of the 9
46
47
48 149 conditions (targets) and for each tested task.

50 150 51 52 151 *2.3 Data Analysis*

53
54 152
55
56
57 153 2.3.1 Preprocessing. Neurons activities were analyzed as spike counts within single trials. The spike times on
58
59 154 each trial were counted within a 100-ms window that stepped in 100 ms increments. Because these neurons
60

1
2
3 155 were not recorded simultaneously, a “trial” in this context refers to a synthetic dataset in which a single
4
5 156 experimental trial was drawn randomly for each neuron from a common behavioral condition and collated.
6
7
8 157 This is a common and useful way to simulate population codes in the brain from single neuron data (37–40),
9
10 158 It should be noted, however, that this approach ignores potential effects of correlated spike-count variability
11
12 159 on the coding of target position.

13
14 160
15
16 161 2.3.2 Population Decoding. To decode the different parameters which describes the fix-reach or the fix-lift
17
18
19 162 task, two different decoding algorithms were used in our analysis: a Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLE)
20
21 163 and a Naïve Bayes classifier (NB). Metric estimation of target positions (in a 2D grid) relied on MLE decoding
22
23 164 algorithm. This algorithm was used successfully to decode eye position signals from macaque parietal and
24
25 165 temporal cortex (37,38). We adapted this implementation to our motor task using signals from area V6A. In
26
27
28 166 addition to the decoding of the target spatial position, we examined two additional parameters: given a
29
30 167 random bin of activity, whether it was possible to predict the current task type (fix-reach or fix-lift) and the
31
32 168 current task phase (epoch free, or delay, or movement, see below). These latter parameters, together with
33
34 169 metric estimation of target location provide a detailed snapshot of the ongoing action. In particular, we
35
36
37 170 combined the MLE and NB decoders to recognize whether the monkey performed a reach toward the target
38
39 171 or simply lifted his hand off the button. Decoding of task phase was performed using a simple NB
40
41 172 implementation to identify the different epochs of tasks.

42
43 173
44
45 174 2.3.3 Target decoding. MLE decoder estimated the spatial coordinates of targets given the population neural
46
47
48 175 activity. The implementation is described in full detail in Morris et al. (37,38): here are summarized the key
49
50 176 steps. A regression surface (second order polynomial, eq.1 and a real example in Fig.2A) was calculated for
51
52 177 each neuron and it was used to estimate the effect of target position (*direction X, depth Y*) on mean spike
53
54 178 counts (\hat{c}).

55
56
57 179 Eq. 1 $\hat{c}(X, Y) = a_0 + a_1X + a_2Y + a_3X^2 + a_4Y^2 + a_5XY$
58
59
60

1
2
3 180 Assuming Poisson statistics, eq.1 becomes a description of how both the mean and variance (both equal to
4
5 181 λ) of spike counts varied as a function of target position. Thus, conditional probability over spike counts for
6
7
8 182 a given target position (x,y) was:

9
10 183 Eq. 2
$$\hat{p}(C|x, y) = \text{Poisson}[\lambda(x, y)] \text{ where } \lambda(x, y) = \hat{c}(x, y)$$

11
12 184 Equation 2 provides a critical quantitative link between target position and the neural response: the
13
14 185 probability of a neural response given a target position (in statistical terms, a “likelihood function”); but
15
16 186 without additional steps, they do not provide the information needed for decoding. Decoding implements
17
18
19 187 the reverse direction of inference, so it requires an estimate of the probability of each target position given
20
21 188 an observed spike count (i.e. $p(X, Y|c)$), the posterior probability distribution (Fig. 2B). These two types of
22
23 189 conditional probability are related via the Bayes rule. Assuming statistical independence among N neurons,
24
25 190 the optimal way to combine posterior probability density functions across the population is to take their
26
27
28 191 product, which is usually implemented as a sum of their logarithms. As the final step, the eye position
29
30 192 associated with the maximum a posteriori (MAP) log-likelihood (i.e., the MAP estimate) in log
31
32 193 $p(X, Y|C \text{ population})$ was selected as the point estimate for target direction and depth (Fig. 2C). To assess
33
34 194 the ability of our model to predict the correct target positions, we used a R^2 metric, R^2 is the proportion of
35
36
37 195 the variance in the dependent variable (x,y of targets) that is predictable from the independent variable
38
39 196 (decoded spike counts). Accuracy was evaluated as the Euclidean distance from the mean of predictions (over
40
41 197 cross-validation) to the real target position. Similarly, precision was computed as distance from predictions
42
43
44 198 to the mean of predictions for a given target position.

45
46 199
47
48 200 2.3.4. Task type decoding. To identify which task the monkey executed, i.e. fix-reach or fix-lift, we used a
49
50 201 combination of the MLE decoder used for target decoding and a Bayesian classifier. In this case we were not
51
52 202 interested to predict the target position, so the analysis was conducted pooling together spike counts from
53
54
55 203 different positions but keeping separate the data of the two tasks. First, a regression surface for each neuron
56
57 204 was calculated in the same way as the method proposed above. Second, residuals from surface fitting were
58
59 205 used to train a NB classifier to discriminate between tasks. Residuals are a common way to express the
60

1
2
3 206 distance between the model resulting from the fitting and the real data. Deviations from the model can be
4
5 207 used as feature for machine learning algorithms, in the way that they are very informative about the
6
7
8 208 uncommon part between the two datasets. Since we wanted to solve a simple binary classification problem
9
10 209 between two classes (i.e. given the spike count of any bin taken in the interval of one of the two tasks predict
11
12 210 which task it belonged to) we adopted a Naïve Bayesian classifier. Keeping the assumption of independence
13
14 211 between features, Naive Bayesian classifiers are robust, fast and widely used as neural decoders in case the
15
16 212 goal is to classify discrete quantities as neural states can be. Matlab '*ClassificationNaiveBayes*' class
17
18
19 213 implementation was used. Results are given as recognition rate computed from a 50-fold cross-validation.
20
21 214 Such cross-validation was used to keep the analysis fair compared to the others where fewer trials were
22
23 215 available; here 90 trials per class were available and keeping out 3 trials for testing per cross-validation
24
25 216 iteration seemed a good compromise.

26
27
28 217
29
30 218 2.3.5. Task phase decoding. To test whether the spike counts (100ms bin) contained information about the
31
32 219 different task phases, we trained a NB classifier to discriminate between the three FREE, DELAY and
33
34 220 MOVEMENT states (see 2.2 for behavioral epochs). Simple spike counts were used to build-up the population
35
36 221 feature vectors with dimension n neurons by 10 trials x 9 conditions x 3 states (270 vectors). The three states
37
38
39 222 correspond to three classes for the classifier. A leave one out cross-validation over 10 trials was used. A
40
41 223 custom Python script based on *scikit-learn* implementation of Naïve Bayes classifier with a Poisson
42
43 224 assumption was used (41). Results are reported as probability for each state along the time (Fig. 7A) and
44
45 225 confusion matrices (Fig. 7B).

46
47
48 226
49
50 227 2.3.6 Cross-validation. Leave-One-Out (LOO) cross-validation was used to ensure that the results of
51
52 228 population decoding reflected reliable characteristics of the neural code for target position and not effects
53
54 229 of overfitting. For each cross-validation set, the spike counts at each of the 9 target positions and the
55
56
57 230 associated regression coefficients were estimated from 90% of the available trials for each neuron ("training
58
59 231 set"). Decoding was then performed on 100 synthetic trials (see 2.3.1) drawn at random from the remaining
60

1
2
3 232 trial for each neuron. Unless otherwise stated, the population decoding results presented herein were
4
5 233 therefore derived from 900 synthetic trials (100 test trials for each cross-validation sets).
6

7 234
8
9
10 235 2.3.7 Generalization. In order to compare neural activation patterns under different experimental paradigm
11
12 236 we can build models (training the algorithm) on neural data from a specific task, then using data from the
13
14 237 other task to make predictions. Prediction accuracy (expected vs predicted) represents metric for the grade
15
16 238 of similarity between codes. Given the example for training on fix-reach and testing on fix-lift task, we
17
18
19 239 computed the regression surfaces with spike counts from fix-reach task.
20

21 240 22 23 241 **3. Results**

24
25 242 Two monkeys were trained to perform in randomized block sequence the fix-reach and the fix-lift task.
26
27
28 243 Fixation and reach targets were nine touch-sensitive LEDs, placed in the 3-D space at three different
29
30 244 directions (version angles -15° , 0° , $+15^\circ$) and three different distances (vergence angles, 17.1° , 11.4° and 6.9° ;
31
32 245 Fig. 1A). The two tasks were identical except for the motor response (reaches vs. hand lifts; Fig.1B-C). Neurons
33
34 246 were recorded from two macaque monkeys (see 2.1 for more details) and were included in the subsequent
35
36
37 247 analyses, only if ten trials were completed for each target in both tasks. No other selection criteria have been
38
39 248 applied. From the original population of 162 neurons, this procedure yielded 145 neurons for analysis (89 in
40
41 249 monkey 1, M1, 56 in monkey 2, M2).
42

43 250
44
45 251 Single neuron activity was recorded and then quantified into spike counts calculated in 100ms bins that were
46
47
48 252 then used to build up features population vectors to train the MLE and Naïve Bayes (NB) decoders. Thus a
49
50 253 single features vector included, for a given time bin, spike counts calculated for each element (neuron) of the
51
52 254 examined population, that is 89 elements for monkey 1 and 56 for monkey 2. Features space was obtained
53
54 255 concatenating horizontally all 10 trials by 9 possible positions (90 feature vectors). Note that neurons were
55
56
57 256 recorded one at time, therefore feature vectors describe the activity of a pseudo-population (2.3.1).
58
59
60

1
2
3 257 We were interested in studying to what extent signals extracted from V6A could support cognitive neuro
4
5 258 prosthetics. Unlike the traditional approach where the trajectory of movement is decoded, here we used a
6
7
8 259 combinations of MLE and NB decoders to decode: a) target location, b) the intention to perform a reach or a
9
10 260 non-spatial motor response and c) the different phases that follow one another for the realization of the
11
12 261 movement, free, delay and movement.

13
14 262
15
16 263 *3.1 Target decoding.* The first property we decoded was target position in space. We have previously decoded
17
18 264 target position in categorical space (left/right, near/far) using a Bayesian classifier (42). Given that the space
19
20
21 265 is a continuous physical quantity, such method would have insufficient application in real life conditions. To
22
23 266 overcome this limitation, we employed here an MLE decoder which, starting from the x, y coordinates of
24
25 267 target position in space (x, y for direction and depth axis, respectively) and the corresponding spike counts,
26
27
28 268 fitted a polynomial regression surface for each neuron. Using Bayes' rule we calculated continuous maps
29
30 269 which describe the probability of target's x, y location given a spike count. Combining maps across neurons
31
32 270 we obtained the most likely target position given the population spike counts vector.

33
34 271
35
36
37 272 Figure 3 reports the results of this analysis performed on a time interval that spanned from 500ms before,
38
39 273 till the movement onset for M1 and M2 populations. Averaged decoded positions (black dots) were typically
40
41 274 very close to the real position of targets (green crosses). Estimated positions using signals from M1
42
43 275 population ($n=89$) yielded good accuracy and precision: we calculated an overall mean constant error (over
44
45 276 100 cross validations and 9 positions) of 1.1 cm (S.D. 1.1) and a mean dispersion of 1.4 cm (Fig.3 left, S.D.
46
47
48 277 1.2). For M2 population, we found similar results with a mean constant error of 0.9 cm (SD 0.6) and a mean
49
50 278 dispersion of 2.3 cm (Fig.3 right, SD 2.1). Besides a lower accuracy for M2 monkey probably due to a smaller
51
52 279 neural population, results were very comparable between the two monkeys. Similar results were obtained
53
54 280 pooling together neurons from M1 and M2 (compare M1 results with Fig.4 where M1 + M2 population was
55
56
57 281 used) with an even higher precision and accuracy, 1.1cm, SD 0.7, and 1.1cm, SD 0.8, respectively. The analyses
58
59 282 presented below were obtained by pooling together data from M1 and M2.

60

1
2
3 283
4

5 284 First, we analyzed three distinct 300-ms intervals in each task (Fig. 1D). The first interval, termed 'early delay',
6
7
8 285 extended from the beginning of target fixation till 300 ms after it. The second interval, 'late delay', included
9
10 286 the last 300 ms before the 'Go' cue. While in 'early delay' visuospatial signals related to the newly fixated
11
12 287 target were expected to be dominant, in the 'late delay' we assumed that activity would also be influenced
13
14 288 by the preparation of the upcoming movement. The third interval we analyzed started at the 'GO' cue and
15
16 289 lasted for 300 ms, thus encompassing monkey's reaction time, which is variable between trials (285 ms SD
17
18 290 44 ms), and part of movement (409 ms SD 99 ms from the release of the home button to the touch of the
19
20
21 291 target). By examining these three intervals we examined whether decoding accuracy of target's location
22
23 292 changes across distinct task stages.

24
25 293 Overall results of Figure 4 show a high decoding performance in all three intervals. Decoding accuracy
26
27
28 294 increased moving toward the movement onset, with distances (ellipses size) between predicted and real
29
30 295 target position progressively decreasing throughout the task. No remarkable differences were noticeable
31
32 296 between the fix-reach and fix-lift tasks (Mann-Whitney test, $p > 0.05$).

33
34 297
35
36 298 While using wide time intervals (i.e. 300 ms) for the analysis reduces noise increasing overall decoding
37
38
39 299 performance, it provides less information about the dynamics of neural coding. To resolve this issue, we
40
41 300 performed the same decoding analysis using a 100-ms window that moved in steps of 20 ms. A full 100-fold
42
43 301 cross-validation was performed, R^2 values were plotted as function of time (Fig. 5). Blue and red solid lines
44
45 302 of Figure 5 refer to R^2 values for cross-validated models of fix-reach and fix-lift tasks, respectively. Decoding
46
47
48 303 accuracy started to increase as soon as the target was presented (Fig.1, LED ON), was stable during delay and
49
50 304 movement and then decreased at the end of each task. This performance was used as reference for the
51
52 305 generalization analysis. With this analysis we investigated how much the task-specific movements (reach vs
53
54 306 hand lift) affected the population activity. Generalization typically works well in case of similar pattern of
55
56
57 307 neural activity, whereas poor results are obtained when neural codes differ. The generalization analysis was
58
59 308 implemented by training the MLE decoding algorithm on one task and testing it on the other task, with results
60

1
2
3 309 plotted as dashed lines in Figure 5. As shown, the generalization performance during the delay epoch was
4
5 310 comparable with decoding performed within the same task (solid lines), suggesting that activity during delay
6
7 311 reflected mostly an abstract encoding of movement preparation and/or cue anticipation shared between the
8
9
10 312 two tasks. Differently, after GO signal the generalization performance dropped abruptly. This finding most
11
12 313 likely reflects the different motor response (reach vs. hand lift).

13
14 314
15
16 315 *3.2. Task decoding.* The generalization analysis reported in Figure 5 showed that the patterns of population
17
18 316 activity in the two tasks were similar during the delay period and then they diverged immediately before and
19
20
21 317 during the movement. The similarity during the delay makes questionable whether it is feasible to extract
22
23 318 task-specific information from the activity before the movement execution. This information would be useful
24
25 319 for a prosthesis about the real intention of the subject. To maximize the differences in neuronal activity linked
26
27
28 320 to the specific movement plans of the two tasks and to allow a decoder to better discriminate between them,
29
30 321 we performed another analysis. We used the residuals from regressions fits performed for the MLE decoding
31
32 322 described above as feature to train a Naïve Bayes classifier. Residuals describe how much the observed data
33
34 323 (spike counts) deviated from the model; in this case, polynomial fit was calculated pooling together the fix-
35
36 324 reach and fix-lift datasets, thus plausibly the model was halfway between the real data of fix-reach and fix-
37
38
39 325 lift, making the residuals suitable to describe the differences. As shown in Figure 6 the Naïve Bayes decoder
40
41 326 correctly assigned, to fixate-to-reach or fixate-to-lift, residuals coming from the polynomial model.
42
43 327 Recognition rates were above 90% before and after the GO signal, thus confirming the feasibility of extracting
44
45 328 the task-specific motor plan well before movement onset.

46
47
48 329
49
50 330 *3.3. State decoding.* To develop neural prosthetics as autonomous as possible, the algorithm would have to
51
52 331 determine when the subject intend to start the action. Decoding of neural states has been pursued as trigger
53
54 332 for neuroprosthetic control (17,34). Yet identifying the exact temporal sequence of neural states can help to
55
56 333 understand how similar neural activation patterns are reused in different tasks, and how these latent states
57
58
59 334 gradually evolve towards movement execution (43). PPC seems to be the ideal region to extract information
60

1
2
3 335 regarding task phases, as PPC neurons often exhibit activity modulation according to the task phase
4
5 336 (24,29,44,45). To examine this aspect, we trained a Naive Bayes classifier to recognize the correct task phase
6
7 337 between FREE, DELAY and MOV epochs given the spike counts in these epochs. We found that the high
8
9
10 338 probabilities of a certain state matched the behavioral epoch that was source of spike counts. Accordingly, it
11
12 339 was possible to identify the correct task state giving spike counts from a random 100 ms bin (Fig. 7A, top row)
13
14 340 both for fix-reach and fix-lift. Applying the generalization approach (Fig. 7A, bottom row) yielded accurate
15
16 341 epoch recognition during FREE and DELAY (i.e. the fix-reach and fix-lift codes are very similar). As expected,
17
18 342 MOVEMENT epoch is not recognized in the context of generalization because of the very different nature of
19
20
21 343 movement type between the tasks (reaching vs hand lift). Accuracy score for single classes (epochs) reported
22
23 344 in confusion matrices (Fig.7B) are consistent with state probabilities of Fig.7A: codes are very similar during
24
25 345 free and delay epoch, but not during MOV. For the MOV epoch, in particular where the decoder was trained
26
27 346 during the fix-reach and tested during the fix-lift task, the classifier yielded a rather unexpected result. In
28
29 347 fact, state probabilities were unbalanced towards being in the state delay (see green line in the corresponding
30
31 348 box of Fig.7A), this lead to a bias in the confusion matrix where a 33% chance level was expected (here 83%
32
33 349 of MOV bins were attributed to the delay epoch). The result indicates that during the movement epoch of
34
35 350 the fix-lift task visuospatial information that is present also in fix-reach task is preserved. On the contrary,
36
37 351 visuospatial signals in fix-lift task were not strong enough to support decoding generalization in the fix-reach
38
39 352 task. In other words, while in the case of the fix-reach task the information about the spatial position of the
40
41 353 target remained relevant during MOV, this was not the case for the corresponding interval of the fix-lift task
42
43 354 where the simple release of the button did not require spatial information.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 356 **4. Discussion**

52
53 357 We examined whether we could decode from the population activity of PPC area V6A information regarding
54
55 358 the target position, the required movement type and the time interval along the task progress at the same
56
57 359 time. We trained a MLE algorithm to yield a metric estimation of the target positions. Then we used a
58
59 360 combination of MLE and a NB classifier to obtain a classification of task type. Finally, we demonstrated that,
60

1
2
3 361 supplying the algorithm with spike counts from small time intervals of the trial, these were attributed
4
5 362 correctly to the corresponding free, delay or movement epoch.
6
7
8 363 Taken together, these results indicate that neurons in V6A encode, in the same population, several types of
9
10 364 information such as spatial position, intention for a specific motor response and progress of the task. This
11
12 365 finding supports the idea that neurons are not simply tuned to a single feature, but they encode several task-
13
14 366 relevant variables in the same time. Decoding of multiple parameters from the same area could be
15
16 367 advantageous for BCI applications in terms of implant invasiveness and accuracy of the reconstructed
17
18
19 368 information.

20
21 369

22
23 370

24
25 371

26
27
28 372

29
30 373

31
32 374

33
34 375

35
36 376

37
38 377

39
40 378

41
42 379

43
44 380

45
46 381

47
48 382

49
50 383

51
52 384

53
54 385

55
56 386

57
58
59
60

4.1 Decoding of visuospatial, movement planning and motor signals.

374 Monkeys performed both tasks while always looking at the targets, so our task cannot discriminate whether
375 we are solely decoding gaze position or attentional/visuospatial signals useful to guide the motor response.
376 In a previous work where we dissociated gaze from target, the decoding of target position was still possible,
377 though less accurate (42). This suggested that V6A neurons carry both attentional and gaze signals. Signals
378 related to gaze position and visuospatial attention have been shown to be useful for decoding and
379 neuroprosthetic purposes (46–48). Thus, although in the present case it was not possible to separate the two
380 components, this is not a limitation for the proposed method, since often the spatial attention matches the
381 gaze position in naturalistic conditions.

382 Single cell analysis over the population used here showed that about 44% of cells were influenced by both
383 target location and task type. Another fraction of cells (25%) were tuned by target location, but not task type,
384 while a smaller number (17%) encoded task type only (33). Given the tight relationship between the tuning
385 of a neural population to a given parameter and the decoding accuracy of that parameter using population
386 activity(42,49–51), it should be taken for granted that each of the homogeneous sub-populations mentioned

1
2
3 387 above would excel in decoding the variable(s) that is tuned for. For example, the sub-population of cells
4
5 388 sensitive only to the type of task (i.e. their firing rate does not significantly change between different spatial
6
7 389 position), will not contribute to the spatial position decoding of the target, which would rely on signals from
8
9
10 390 the other two subpopulations. At this regard, the reliable decoding of target position from population signals
11
12 391 in both tasks (Fig.5), is in line with the high incidence (44% + 25%) of neurons sensitive to target location as
13
14 392 reported in Breveglieri et al.(32) and was also confirmed by the generalization analysis. Our decoding
15
16 393 analyses put together these subpopulations in order to extract information from the whole population
17
18
19 394 activity and thus achieve the best decoding performance.

20
21 395 Generalization of decoders between tasks can help to examine the nature of encoded information. Different
22
23 396 authors used a generalization approach to test stationarity of temporal code within a neural population (51–
24
25 397 53), or to compare population activation patterns between different, but related tasks (43). Similarly, we
26
27
28 398 wanted to compare codes employed for tasks that shared initial stages, but differed in the subsequent motor
29
30 399 response and its related planning. After the GO signal, the neural population activity changed to encode the
31
32 400 upcoming movement, so the decoder's generalization performance dropped rather abruptly.

33
34 401 Slightly before the Go signal, the generalization performance was still high, thus suggesting that planning
35
36 402 activity was similar between the two tasks. This finding, though surprising, might be attributed to the
37
38
39 403 presence of a default reach plan/intention also when no reach is executed, as some evidence suggests
40
41 404 (54,55). However, given that the two tasks were performed in separate blocks, the animal was always aware
42
43 405 whether it was required to perform a reach movement, or simply lift its hand. Furthermore, given that a
44
45 406 simple hand lift was enough to obtain the reward, we would expect that monkey's intention and commitment
46
47
48 407 to perform a reach was significantly attenuated in the fixation-to-lift task. In line with this view, Breveglieri
49
50 408 et al. (33) found that the majority of V6A cells show different activity between these two tasks. Whether
51
52 409 these neurons were still encoding a default or uncompleted reach plan cannot be answered directly in the
53
54 410 present study. Nevertheless, we could still discriminate task type (Fig.6) despite the fact that the codes were
55
56
57 411 very similar during the delay (code generalization of Fig. 5). Such a result would not have been achieved if
58
59 412 the neural codes in the two tasks were the same. The high levels of generalization obtained in the period
60

1
2
3 413 before the movement could be attributed to the strong visuospatial signals in V6A that, being invariant
4
5 414 between tasks, masked the task-specific signals related to movement planning and preparation.
6
7
8 415 Our decoding method was based on fitting residuals. Residuals represent the distance between actual spike
9
10 416 counts and regression surfaces: thinking at these surfaces as a midline between fixate-to-reach and fixate-
11
12 417 to-lift condition (because of fitting of dispersed data), shifts from this midline are still informative about the
13
14 418 task type. A point of strength of this analysis is the type of feature we used in the classifier. The model was
15
16 419 computed pooling together data from different target positions; this ensures that the present method works
17
18 420 independently from position constraints. The possibility to discriminate in advance if the subject will execute
19
20 421 the reach movement or just lift the hand, could be potentially useful for neuroprosthetic purposes. In case
21
22 422 where a Go signal is spatially dissociated from the target of the action (e.g. clicking a computer mouse while
23
24 423 looking at the screen), decoded information may allow to select the appropriate action: to prepare for
25
26 424 moving or to withhold the robotic limb. In our case the decoding is limited to distinguish two scenarios, but
27
28 425 the system could be trained to recognize different tasks and act accordingly.
29
30
31

32 426

33

34 427

35

36

37 428 *4.2 Metric estimation of target position from PPC.*

38

39 429 In a previous work we used a Bayesian classifier from PPC activity to discriminate between the nine target

40

41 430 positions on the same panel used here (42). This method yielded very high target recognition rates and a

42

43 431 small neuronal population was sufficient to obtain very good results (about 10-20 neurons). The present

44

45 432 method enables a metric estimation of target positions at the cost of a larger number of neurons required to

46

47 433 give an accurate prediction. 56 neurons were found to be barely enough (see very high dispersion in M2 case)

48

49 434 to get a good decoding accuracy, whereas ~90 neurons (see M1 case) were fairly enough. Given that simple

50

51 435 (second-order) polynomials were used to model single neuron tuning, our results suggest that good

52

53 436 performance could also be observed for intermediate target positions never seen by the decoder. This is a

54

55 437 desirable characteristic for a fully implemented neural decoder.

56

57 438

58

59 439

60

1
2
3 439
45 440 *4.3 Encoding of task progress.*
6

7 441 Thus, V6A signals were adequate to obtain a metric estimation of target, both in the fix-reach and fix-lift task,
8
9
10 442 and to decode the intended action. In addition, we provided evidence that a time interval of 100 ms, putting
11
12 443 together contributions of a population of V6A neurons, was sufficient to decode reliably the corresponding
13
14 444 phase in the task progress (Fig.7A-B). Although much effort has been put into decoding intended reaching
15
16 445 goals (2,16,56), deciphering the intended action onset is equally important (17,34,57). Different task phases
17
18 446 have been typically correlated to different neural states, proceeding through the tasks entail moving through
19
20
21 447 neural states. So, in our fix-reach task we expected at least three neural states: a resting state (no task
22
23 448 engagement), a waiting time where the animal waited the go signal and finally the actual reaching
24
25 449 movement. A similar task was studied in premotor areas (34). They used a hidden Markov model (HMM) to
26
27
28 450 detect baseline, preparation and execution states. In addition, they implemented an extended model to
29
30 451 decode multiple states, one for each reaching goal. In another study a four states (additional holding state)
31
32 452 HMM was used to detect hidden neural states and so to develop a task independent decoder (58). Here we
33
34 453 used a simpler, but equally informative, Bayesian decoder to obtain posterior probabilities of free, delay and
35
36
37 454 movement states. Our results demonstrate that also signals from V6A are adequate to detect the switch from
38
39 455 pre-movement to movement neural state that might be useful to trigger neural prosthesis movement.
40

41 456
4243 457
4445 458
4647
48 459 *4.4. Different parameters encoded in the same circuit is advantageous for BCI.*
49

50 460 A large amount of evidence has already reported that single PPC neurons can encode both spatial (sensory)
51
52 461 and non-spatial (cognitive) information (53,58–61). For example, attention toward a specific spatial location
53
54
55 462 or toward non-spatial visual features modulate lateral intraparietal neurons (51,61,62), parietal reach region
56
57 463 encodes both the target location and the movement intention (59,60). Information of spatial location of
58
59 464 target and the intention for performing one action or another are of great interest for neuroprosthetic
60

1
2
3 465 applications, yet few works tried to perform population decoding of both spatial and non-spatial PPC signals
4
5 466 and explore the potential from a neuroprosthetic perspective. In Hauschild et al.(14), monkey brain activity
6
7 467 controlled a cursor in a 3D environment, but the cognitive information that can be decoded from PPC to
8
9
10 468 improve the decoder was not considered. Similarly another study by Shenoy and colleagues (17) decoded
11
12 469 the information about task stage, either free, plan or movement, but they did not attempt to generalize the
13
14 470 decoder over other tasks.
15
16 471 Recent studies have demonstrated that neurons in parietal (24,63–68) and frontal (69,70) areas have mixed
17
18
19 472 selectivity: individual neurons are modulated by multiple task parameters. Rather than having specialized
20
21 473 networks for specific behaviors, mixed selectivity is considered to offer a significant computational advantage
22
23 474 by encoding multiple feature information over a single neural network (69,71,72). In everyday life, we often
24
25
26 475 look at objects that we are going to reach and grasp, but we also look and attend to stimuli in one location
27
28 476 and perform a motor response in another location. Here we provide evidence that both action plans that
29
30 477 involve different sensory-to-motor transformations can be decoded from the same neural population in V6A
31
32 478 and this finding is relevant also as fundamental knowledge.
33

34 479 35 36 37 480 *4.5 Future application in human.*

38
39 481 Functional MRI studies proposed a putative human homologue of area V6A (35), which approximately
40
41 482 corresponds to the anterior part of the superior parieto-occipital cortex (SPOC) (12). SPOC shows enhanced
42
43 483 visual activation to objects presented within the peripersonal space, even when the potential action is not
44
45
46 484 actually executed (73). Decoding of pre-movement activity of SPOC with fMRI pattern analysis allowed
47
48 485 reliable classification of specific actions that were subsequently performed, with a clear distinction between
49
50 486 reaching and grasping movements (19). Although fMRI technique does not allow to study mixed selectivity
51
52 487 due to poor spatial resolution, analogies between monkey and putative human V6A (35,74) give hope to
53
54
55 488 translate findings from monkey to human.
56

57 489 58 59 490 **5. Conclusions**

60

1
2
3 491 In conclusion, these results show that V6A signals can be used to reliably decode visuospatial properties,
4
5 492 information about the type of intended movement (spatial, goal-directed reach, or non-spatial button
6
7 493 release), and task progression. Recently, V6A signals were used to decode up to 5 grip types during a grasping
8
9
10 494 task and 9 different goal locations during reach (41,42). Previous and present results support prostheses that
11
12 495 extract the target of a movement and respond as the intention to move is formed. Furthermore, present
13
14 496 findings show that conditional motor responses like when a visual cue instructs a movement somewhere else
15
16 497 in space could be also decoded and subsequently used to control a prosthesis. Having multiple information
17
18
19 498 coded in a single area is advantageous for neuroprosthetics, allowing a single electrode array to decode
20
21 499 multiple action scenarios.
22

23 500

24 501 **Funding**

25
26 502 This work was supported by European Union (H2020-MSCA-734227 – PLATYPUS), by Ministero
27
28 503 dell'Università e della Ricerca (Italy, PRIN2017-2017KZNZLN), by Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio in Bologna,
29
30 504 Bando Ricerca 2018/0373, by National Health and Medical Research Council (Australia, NHMRC
31
32 505 APP1083898, NHMRC APP1082144).
33

34 506 **Acknowledgements**

35
36 507 We thank Drs. Federica Bertozzi and Giulia Dal Bo' for help in the recordings, Massimo Verdosci and
37
38 508 Francesco Campisi for technical assistance.
39

40 509

41 510 **References**

- 42 511
- 43 512 1. Hochberg LR, Bacher D, Jarosiewicz B, Masse NY, Simeral JD, Vogel J, et al. Reach and grasp by
44 513 people with tetraplegia using a neurally controlled robotic arm. *Nature*. 2012;485(7398):372–5.
 - 45 514 2. Aflalo T, Kellis S, Klaes C, Lee B, Shi Y, Pejsa K, et al. Neurophysiology. Decoding motor imagery from
46 515 the posterior parietal cortex of a tetraplegic human. *Science*. 2015 May 22;348(6237):906–10.
 - 47 516 3. Collinger JL, Wodlinger B, Downey JE, Wang W, Tyler-Kabara EC, Weber DJ, et al. High-performance
48 517 neuroprosthetic control by an individual with tetraplegia. *Lancet*. 2013 Feb;381(9866):557–64.
 - 49 518 4. Velliste M, Perel S, Spalding M, Whitford A, Schwartz A. Cortical control of a robotic arm for self-
50 519 feeding. *Nature*. 2008;453(June):1098–101.
 - 51 520 5. Carmena JM, Lebedev MA, Crist RE, O'Doherty JE, Santucci DM, Dimitrov DF, et al. Learning to
52 521 control a brain-machine interface for reaching and grasping by primates. *PLoS Biol*. 2003;1(2):E42.
 - 53 522 6. Wessberg J, Stambaugh CR, Kralik JD, Beck PD, Laubach M, Chapin JK, et al. Real-time prediction of
54 523 hand trajectory by ensembles of cortical neurons in primates. *Nature*. 2000;408(6810):361–5.
 - 55 524 7. Mountcastle VB, Lynch JC, Georgopoulos A, Sakata H, Acuna C. Posterior parietal association cortex
56 525 of the monkey: command functions for operations within extrapersonal space. *J Neurophysiol*. 1975
57 526 Jul 1;38(4):871–908.
 - 58 527 8. Andersen RA, Snyder LH, Bradley DC, Xing J. MULTIMODAL REPRESENTATION OF SPACE IN THE

- 1
2
3 528 POSTERIOR PARIETAL CORTEX AND ITS USE IN PLANNING MOVEMENTS. *Annu Rev Neurosci.* 1997;
4 529 9. Andersen RA, Burdick JW, Musallam S, Pesaran B, Cham JG. Cognitive neural prosthetics. Vol. 8,
5 530 Trends in Cognitive Sciences. 2004. p. 486–93.
6 531 10. Kalaska JF, Scott SH, Cisek P, Sergio LE. Cortical control of reaching movements. *Curr Opin Neurobiol.*
7 532 1997 Dec;7(6):849–59.
8 533 11. Culham JC, Cavina-Pratesi C, Singhal A. The role of parietal cortex in visuomotor control: What have
9 534 we learned from neuroimaging? *Neuropsychologia.* 2006 Jan;44(13):2668–84.
10 535 12. Gallivan JP, Culham JC. Neural coding within human brain areas involved in actions. *Curr Opin*
11 536 *Neurobiol.* 2015 Aug;33:141–9.
12 537 13. Gallivan JP, Goodale MA. The dorsal “action” pathway. In: *Handbook of clinical neurology.* 2018. p.
13 538 449–66.
14 539 14. Hauschild M, Mulliken GH, Fineman I, Loeb GE, Andersen RA. Cognitive signals for brain-machine
15 540 interfaces in posterior parietal cortex include continuous 3D trajectory commands. *Proc Natl Acad*
16 541 *Sci U S A.* 2012 Oct;109(42):17075–80.
17 542 15. Mulliken GH, Musallam S, Andersen RA. Decoding trajectories from posterior parietal cortex
18 543 ensembles. *J Neurosci.* 2008;28(48):12913–26.
19 544 16. Musallam S, Corneil BD, Greger B, Scherberger H, Andersen R. Cognitive control signals for neural
20 545 prosthetics. *Science.* 2004;305(5681):258–62.
21 546 17. Shenoy K V., Kureshi SA, Pesaran B, Buneo CA, Andersen RA, Meeker D, et al. Neural prosthetic
22 547 control signals from plan activity. *Neuroreport.* 2003 Mar 24;14(4):591–6.
23 548 18. Gertz H, Lingnau A, Fiehler K. Decoding Movement Goals from the Fronto-Parietal Reach Network.
24 549 *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2017 Feb 24;11.
25 550 19. Gallivan JP, McLean DA, Valyear KF, Pettypiece CE, Culham JC. Decoding action intentions from
26 551 preparatory brain activity in human parieto-frontal networks. *J Neurosci.* 2011 Jun 29;31(26):9599–
27 552 610.
28 553 20. Andersen RA, Cui H. Intention, Action Planning, and Decision Making in Parietal-Frontal Circuits.
29 554 *Neuron.* 2009 Sep;63(5):568–83.
30 555 21. Hadjidimitrakis K, Bakola S, Wong YT, Hagan MA. Mixed Spatial and Movement Representations in
31 556 the Primate Posterior Parietal Cortex. *Front Neural Circuits.* 2019 Mar 11;13:15.
32 557 22. Galletti C, Fattori P, Kutz DF, Gamberini M. Brain location and visual topography of cortical area V6A
33 558 in the macaque monkey. *Eur J Neurosci.* 1999 Feb;11(2):575–82.
34 559 23. Galletti C, Kutz DF, Gamberini M, Breveglieri R, Fattori P. Role of the medial parieto-occipital cortex
35 560 in the control of reaching and grasping movements. In: *Experimental brain research.* 2003. p. 158–
36 561 70.
37 562 24. Hadjidimitrakis K, Bertozzi F, Breveglieri R, Bosco A, Galletti C, Fattori P. Common neural substrate
38 563 for processing depth and direction signals for reaching in the monkey medial posterior parietal
39 564 cortex. *Cereb Cortex.* 2014;24(6):1645–57.
40 565 25. Fattori P, Raos V, Breveglieri R, Bosco A, Marzocchi N, Galletti C. The dorsomedial pathway is not
41 566 just for reaching: grasping neurons in the medial parieto-occipital cortex of the macaque monkey. *J*
42 567 *Neurosci.* 2010;30(1):342–9.
43 568 26. Fattori P, Breveglieri R, Bosco A, Gamberini M, Galletti C. Vision for Prehension in the Medial Parietal
44 569 Cortex. *Cereb Cortex.* 2017 Dec 1;27(2):1149–63.
45 570 27. Hadjidimitrakis K, Breveglieri R, Bosco A, Fattori P. Three-dimensional eye position signals shape
46 571 both peripersonal space and arm movement activity in the medial posterior parietal cortex. *Front*
47 572 *Integr Neurosci.* 2012;6:37.
48 573 28. Fattori P, Gamberini M, Kutz DF, Galletti C. “Arm-reaching” neurons in the parietal area V6A of the
49 574 macaque monkey. *Eur J Neurosci.* 2001 Jun;13(12):2309–13.
50 575 29. Fattori P, Kutz DF, Breveglieri R, Marzocchi N, Galletti C. Spatial tuning of reaching activity in the
51 576 medial parieto-occipital cortex (area V6A) of macaque monkey. *Eur J Neurosci.* 2005 Aug;22(4):956–
52 577 72.
53 578 30. Hadjidimitrakis K, Breveglieri R, Placenti G, Bosco A, Sabatini SP, Fattori P. Fix your eyes in the space
54 579 you could reach: neurons in the macaque medial parietal cortex prefer gaze positions in

1

2

3 580

peripersonal space. Gribble PL, editor. PLoS One. 2011 Aug 17;6(8):e23335.

4 581

31. Breveglieri R, Hadjidimitrakis K, Bosco A, Sabatini SP, Galletti C, Fattori P. Eye position encoding in three-dimensional space: integration of version and vergence signals in the medial posterior parietal cortex. *J Neurosci*. 2012 Jan 4;32(1):159–69.

6 583

7 584

32. Hadjidimitrakis K, Ghodrati M, Breveglieri R, Rosa MGP, Fattori P. Neural coding of action in three dimensions: Task- and time-invariant reference frames for visuospatial and motor-related activity in parietal area V6A. *J Comp Neurol*. 2020;

10 586

11 587

33. Breveglieri R, Galletti C, Dal Bò G, Hadjidimitrakis K, Fattori P. Multiple aspects of neural activity during reaching preparation in the medial posterior parietal area V6A. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2014 Apr;26(4):878–95.

13 589

14 590

34. Kemere C, Santhanam G, Yu BM, Afshar A, Ryu SI, Meng TH, et al. Detecting Neural-State Transitions Using Hidden Markov Models for Motor Cortical Prostheses. *J Neurophysiol*. 2008;100(4):2441–52.

16 591

17 592

35. Pitzalis S, Sereno MI, Committeri G, Fattori P, Galati G, Tsoni A, et al. The human homologue of macaque area V6A. *Neuroimage*. 2013 Nov 15;82:517–30.

18 593

19 594

36. Galletti C, Fattori P, Gamberini M, Kutz DF. The cortical visual area V6: brain location and visual topography. *Eur J Neurosci*. 1999 Nov;11(11):3922–36.

20 595

21 596

37. Morris AP, Krekelberg B. A Stable Visual World in Primate Primary Visual Cortex. *Curr Biol*. 2019 May 6;29(9):1471-1480.e6.

22 597

23 598

38. Morris AP, Bremmer F, Krekelberg B. Eye-position signals in the dorsal visual system are accurate and precise on short timescales. *J Neurosci*. 2013 Jul 24;33(30):12395–406.

24 599

25 600

39. Morris AP, Kubischik M, Hoffmann K-P, Krekelberg B, Bremmer F. Dynamics of Eye-Position Signals in the Dorsal Visual System. *Curr Biol*. 2012 Feb 7;22(3):173–9.

27 601

28 602

40. Morris AP, Bremmer F, Krekelberg B. The Dorsal Visual System Predicts Future and Remembers Past Eye Position. *Front Syst Neurosci*. 2016 Feb 24;10:9.

29 603

30 604

41. Filippini M, Breveglieri R, Akhras MA, Bosco A, Chinellato E, Fattori P. Decoding Information for Grasping from the Macaque Dorsomedial Visual Stream. *J Neurosci*. 2017 Apr;37(16):4311–22.

31 605

32 606

42. Filippini M, Breveglieri R, Hadjidimitrakis K, Bosco A, Fattori P. Prediction of Reach Goals in Depth and Direction from the Parietal Cortex. *Cell Rep*. 2018;23(3):725–32.

33 607

34 608

43. Mazurek KA, Rouse AG, Schieber MH. Mirror Neuron Populations Represent Sequences of Behavioral Epochs During Both Execution and Observation. *J Neurosci*. 2018 May 2;38(18):4441–55.

36 609

37 610

44. Cui H, Andersen RA. Posterior Parietal Cortex Encodes Autonomously Selected Motor Plans. *Neuron*. 2007;56(3):552–9.

38 611

39 612

45. Stetson C, Andersen RA. Early planning activity in frontal and parietal cortex in a simplified task. *J Neurophysiol*. 2015 Jun;113(10):3915–22.

40 613

41 614

46. Astrand E, Wardak C, Ben Hamed S. Selective visual attention to drive cognitive brain machine interfaces: from concepts to neurofeedback and rehabilitation applications. *Front Syst Neurosci*. 2014 Aug 12;8.

43 616

44 617

47. Andersen RA, Hwang EJ, Mulliken GH. Cognitive neural prosthetics. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2010 Jan;61:169–90, C1-3.

46 618

47 619

48. Batista AP, Yu BM, Santhanam G, Ryu SI, Afshar A, Shenoy KV. Cortical Neural Prosthesis Performance Improves When Eye Position Is Monitored. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng*. 2008 Feb;16(1):24–31.

48 620

49 621

49. Bremmer F, Kaminiarz A, Klingenhoefer S, Churan J. Decoding target distance and saccade amplitude from population activity in the macaque lateral intraparietal area (LIP). *Front Integr Neurosci*. 2016;

51 623

52 624

50. Lehmann SJ, Scherberger H. Reach and gaze representations in macaque parietal and premotor grasp areas. *J Neurosci*. 2013 Apr 17;33(16):7038–49.

54 625

55 626

51. Astrand E, Ibos G, Duhamel J-R, Ben Hamed S. Differential Dynamics of Spatial Attention, Position, and Color Coding within the Parietofrontal Network. *J Neurosci*. 2015 Feb 18;35(7):3174–89.

56 627

57 628

52. Crowe DA, Averbeck BB, Chafee M V. Rapid Sequences of Population Activity Patterns Dynamically Encode Task-Critical Spatial Information in Parietal Cortex. *J Neurosci*. 2010 Sep 1;30(35):11640–53.

58 629

59 630

53. Meyers EM, Freedman DJ, Kreiman G, Miller EK, Poggio T. Dynamic Population Coding of Category Information in Inferior Temporal and Prefrontal Cortex. *J Neurophysiol*. 2008 Sep;100(3):1407–19.

60 631

- 1
2
3 632 54. Suminski AJ, Tkach DC, Hatsopoulos NG. Exploiting multiple sensory modalities in brain-machine
4 633 interfaces. *Neural Networks*. 2009 Nov;22(9):1224–34.
5 634 55. Bremner LR, Andersen RA. Temporal Analysis of Reference Frames in Parietal Cortex Area 5d during
6 635 Reach Planning. *J Neurosci*. 2014 Apr 9;34(15):5273–84.
7 636 56. Shanechi MM, Williams ZM, Wornell GW, Hu RC, Powers M, Brown EN. A Real-Time Brain-Machine
8 637 Interface Combining Motor Target and Trajectory Intent Using an Optimal Feedback Control Design.
9 638 Zhan W, editor. *PLoS One*. 2013 Apr 10;8(4):e59049.
10 639 57. Kao JC, Nuyujukian P, Ryu SI, Shenoy K V. A High-Performance Neural Prosthesis Incorporating
11 640 Discrete State Selection with Hidden Markov Models. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*. 2017;
12 641 58. Sumsby SL, Schieber MH, Thakor N V., Sarma S V., Santaniello S. Decoding kinematics using task-
13 642 independent movement-phase-specific encoding models. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng*. 2017;
14 643 59. Andersen RA, Buneo CA. Intentional Maps in Posterior Parietal Cortex. *Annu Rev Neurosci*. 2002;
15 644 60. Snyder LH, Batista a P, Andersen R a. Coding of intention in the posterior parietal cortex. Vol. 386,
16 645 *Nature*. 1997. p. 167–70.
17 646 61. Bisley JW, Goldberg ME. Attention, Intention, and Priority in the Parietal Lobe. *Annu Rev Neurosci*.
18 647 2010 Jun;33(1):1–21.
19 648 62. Ibos G, Freedman DJ. Interaction between Spatial and Feature Attention in Posterior Parietal Cortex.
20 649 *Neuron*. 2016 Aug 17;91(4):931–43.
21 650 63. Rishel CA, Huang G, Freedman DJ. Independent Category and Spatial Encoding in Parietal Cortex.
22 651 *Neuron*. 2013 Mar;77(5):969–79.
23 652 64. Meister MLR, Hennig JA, Huk AC. Signal Multiplexing and Single-Neuron Computations in Lateral
24 653 Intraparietal Area During Decision-Making. *J Neurosci*. 2013;
25 654 65. Park IM, Meister MLR, Huk AC, Pillow JW. Encoding and decoding in parietal cortex during
26 655 sensorimotor decision-making. *Nat Neurosci*. 2014 Oct 31;17(10):1395–403.
27 656 66. Hadjidimitrakis K, Bertozzi F, Breveglieri R, Galletti C, Fattori P. Temporal stability of reference
28 657 frames in monkey area V6A during a reaching task in 3D space. *Brain Struct Funct*. 2017 May
29 658 1;222(4):1959–70.
30 659 67. Bosco A, Breveglieri R, Hadjidimitrakis K, Galletti C, Fattori P. Reference frames for reaching when
31 660 decoupling eye and target position in depth and direction. *Sci Rep*. 2016 Apr 15;6(1):21646.
32 661 68. Bosco A, Breveglieri R, Filippini M, Galletti C, Fattori P. Reduced neural representation of arm/hand
33 662 actions in the medial posterior parietal cortex. *Sci Rep*. 2019 Dec 30;9(1):936.
34 663 69. Rigotti M, Barak O, Warden MR, Wang X-J, Daw ND, Miller EK, et al. The importance of mixed
35 664 selectivity in complex cognitive tasks. *Nature*. 2013 May 19;497(7451):585–90.
36 665 70. Mante V, Sussillo D, Shenoy K V., Newsome WT. Context-dependent computation by recurrent
37 666 dynamics in prefrontal cortex. *Nature*. 2013 Nov 6;503(7474):78–84.
38 667 71. Fusi S, Miller EK, Rigotti M. Why neurons mix: high dimensionality for higher cognition. *Curr Opin*
39 668 *Neurobiol*. 2016 Apr;37:66–74.
40 669 72. Zhang CY, Aflalo T, Revechikis B, Rosario ER, Ouellette D, Pouratian N, et al. Partially Mixed Selectivity
41 670 in Human Posterior Parietal Association Cortex. *Neuron*. 2017;
42 671 73. Gallivan JP, McLean A, Culham JC. Neuroimaging reveals enhanced activation in a reach-selective
43 672 brain area for objects located within participants' typical hand workspaces. *Neuropsychologia*. 2011
44 673 Nov;49(13):3710–21.
45 674 74. Tsoni A, Pitzalis S, Committeri G, Fattori P, Galletti C, Galati G. Resting-state connectivity and
46 675 functional specialization in human medial parieto-occipital cortex. *Brain Struct Funct*. 2015
47 676 Nov;220(6):3307–21.
48 677
49 678
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


679 **Figures:**

Figure 1. Experimental setup and schematic representation of the tasks. (A) Scheme of the setup used for the fix-reach and fix-lift tasks. Exact distances are indicated in the lateral (left) and top (right) views. Nine LEDs are used as targets, embedded in a panel located at eye level. HB = home button. (B, C) Time courses and behavioral epochs in the fix-reach (B) and fix-lift (C) tasks. The two tasks shared the first part, holding of home button, start of fixation, waiting for the GO signal. Then, in the fix-reach task the reaching movement is performed cued by the GO signal (target color changed from green to red), whereas in the fix-lift task the GO signal was the cue to lift the hand from the home button, and no reaching movement was performed. Black arrows indicate hand actions performed in the two tasks. (D) Schematic of the time intervals used in the analysis, with every interval lasting 300 ms. EARLY DELAY, from the start of the target fixation till 300 ms after it; LATE DELAY, the last 300 ms before the GO signal; PRE-/MOV, from the GO signal to 300 ms after it, this encompassed the reaction time plus the very first part of movement.




Figure 2. MLE decoder. (A) Activity of an exemplary V6A neuron and regression surface. In a first step a GLM was used to fit a regression surface over spike counts in the training set. Black vertical solid lines depict mean spike counts over the 9 panel positions with their standard deviation (red spheres). This neuron discharged for far positions, especially for the far-left position and was downregulated for intermediate positions. The regression surface was interpreted probabilistically, such that it specified the conditional probability of spike count given x,y target positions ($p(\text{count} | X,Y)$), assuming spike counts were Poisson-distributed. Using Bayes' rule, this could be converted to the probability of all target positions, X,Y , given a spike count ($p(X,Y | \text{count})$) in the test set. In (B) left, the probability map of neuron (A) given a low spike count (high probability in intermediate area) and (B) right, the probability maps given a high spike count (high probability for far and near area). (C) Given a vector of spike counts (c) for all neurons in a sample, (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n), and corresponding probability maps, a population probability map was obtained by

summing the (log) probabilities. As the final step, the target position associated with the maximum a posteriori (MAP) log-likelihood (i.e., the MAP estimate) in $\log p(X, Y | \text{CountPopulation})$ was selected as the point estimate.




Figure 3. Metric estimation of target positions. The array of the 9 targets is illustrated in a two-dimensional view from above, green crosses show the real position of each targets, black dots are target estimated positions with their error distribution (light grey ellipses). Distances are reported in cartesian x,y (cm) coordinates, with x being the distance from the monkey's midsagittal level and y being the distance from the frontal eye level. Left panel, monkey 1 (89 neurons), right panel monkey 2 (56 neurons). Time analyzed was an interval of 500 ms before movement onset.




Figure 4. Metric estimation of targets position for different time intervals and tasks. Analysis was performed extracting spike counts from 100 ms time intervals and pooled together in 300 ms time windows corresponding to EARLY DELAY, LATE DELAY and PRE-/MOV epochs. These time intervals were analyzed for fix-reach task (top) where target position signals were transformed into arm action, and fix-lift task where no reaching movement was required (bottom). Neural population used in the analysis included both neurons from monkey 1 and monkey 2. Other conventions same as Figure 3.




Figure 5. Decoding time course. R^2 values are reported for each of 100ms time intervals analyzed. The time window slid over the trial time with a 20ms step. Cross validated results are reported for fix-lift (solid red line) and fix-reach (solid blue line) tasks. A code generalization approach was used to obtain target estimations using the decoder trained with the opposite task dataset, that is, the algorithm was trained on fix-lift task and the code was generalized to decode fix-reach neural activity (blue dashed line), as opposed to training on fix-reach and estimation on fix-lift task (red dashed line). The plot required a double alignment (target LED ON and HB RELEASE, i.e. movement onset), as delay was randomized between trials. During the initial fixation and delay epochs across-task decoder performance was comparable to its within-task performance. This suggests that visuospatial and motor preparation codes were similar during the delay period. The two codes diverged shortly after the cue to execute the required motor response (reach/hand lift).




Figure 6. Decoding of task type. Binary classification of task type obtained feeding a naïve Bayes classifier with residuals from polynomial fits. Data from different targets were pooled together. A 50 folds' cross

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

validation was used. Residuals were good predictors for task type discriminations as evidenced by the recognition rate being always well above chance levels.



8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
2223
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
5152
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
754

Figure 7. Decoding of task state. Spike counts were used as predictor of different task phases, free, delay or movement epochs. (A) Probability of each state, blue, green or red, respectively free, delay and movement states, were plotted over the time. Solid bold lines correspond to averages calculated over single trial probabilities (light lines). Due to different durations of delay between trials, two separate time intervals were artificially merged: 1 second before target led on (free epoch) and from -1.5s to 0.5s centered on movement onset. On the top row within-task decoding for reaching (left) and fixation (right) task are

1
2
3 755 shown, “leave one out” cross validation was used. Bottom row reports task generalization performance, i.e.
4 756 training on fix-reach and testing on fix-lift task (left), and vice versa (right). During free and delay epochs
5 757 the decoder can generalize across tasks; this gives an accurate epoch recognition, whereas movement
6 758 epoch is correctly recognized only in the context of the same task. (B) The probabilities obtained for the
7 759 states in Figure 7A were processed with an argmax function in order to calculate the classification results
8 760 plotted in confusion matrices. The rows correspond to the real labels (epochs free, delay and movement),
9 761 the columns to predicted labels.
10 762
11
12
13 763
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60