

## **Cortical masking and action learning**

THIRKETTLE, Martin <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6200-3130>>, REDGRAVE, P., GURNEY, K., WALTON, T., SHAH, A. and STAFFORD, T.

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/22973/>

---

This document is the Supplemental Material

### **Citation:**

THIRKETTLE, Martin, REDGRAVE, P., GURNEY, K., WALTON, T., SHAH, A. and STAFFORD, T. (2012). Cortical masking and action learning. *PERCEPTION*, 41, p. 100. [Article]

---

### **Copyright and re-use policy**


See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>





The  
University  
Of  
Sheffield.



Martin Thirkettle, Peter Redgrave, Kevin Gurney,  
Tom Walton, Ashvin Shah and Tom Stafford



Department of Psychology, University of Sheffield, Western Bank, Sheffield, S10 2TN  
m.thirkettle@sheffield.ac.uk

## Introduction

- Action outcome learning requires the pairing of an external event with behavioural output.
- The basal ganglia (BG) are thought to be crucial for the pairing of recent motor output with an unexpected visual stimulus (Redgrave & Gurney 2006).
- Previous work (Thirkettle et al 2011) has shown that subcortical visual input is preferred to information which must arrive at the BG via the cortex.
- However, it remains to be seen if subcortical processing is sufficient for action-outcome learning, and what, if any, contribution the results of cortical processing make.



## The Task


- Participants freely move a joystick within a search space until they encounter a target area. They receive no online feedback on their current location or the target position (Stafford et al. 2012).
- Hitting the target results in an on screen reinforcing signal which participants then use to guide their behaviour, homing in on and then holding the joystick on the target.
- Constant Flash Suppression (Tsuchiya, & Koch, 2005) masking was used to prevent cortical processing of an immediate reinforcing signal. This was then followed by an unmasked, but delayed, signal.
- If cortical processing contributes to action outcome learning, then performance should be better with an unmasked immediate signal (condition D) than with a masked immediate signal (condition C).

## Methods

- Participants wore prism glasses and viewed a dichoptic display with a mask presented to their dominant eye (Mondrians changing at 10Hz).
- Reinforcing signals were presented
  - to the masked eye only ('masked') or binocularly ('unmasked')
  - immediately upon hit and/or after a 375ms delay (delayed always unmasked).
- Performance was measured as the average time between first target encounter and settling on the target location (the homing period).

## Results / Conclusions

- Action outcome learning is significantly impaired by delaying reinforcing signal presentation.
- Performance with both an immediate and a delayed signal (Conditions C & D) is between that found with each independently (A & B), suggesting that the two signals are used in combination.
- No significant difference found between performance with cortically masked (C) and cortically available (D) immediate signals
- Lack of significant difference between masked immediate signal and delayed only (B & C) may suggest the mask is too effective, future experiments will investigate this.
- Current results show no evidence that cortical processing has any role in action outcome learning when subcortical input is



## References

- Redgrave, P. & Gurney, K. (2006). The short-latency dopamine signal: a role in discovering novel actions? , Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 7:967-975.
- Tsuchiya, N., and Koch, C. (2005). Continuous flash suppression reduces negative afterimages. Nature neuroscience 8, 1096-101.
- Thirkettle M, Walton T, Gurney K, Redgrave P, Stafford T, 2011. "Learning the long way round: Action learning based on visual signals unavailable to the superior colliculus is impaired" Perception 40 ECVP Abstract Supplement, page 33
- Stafford T, Thirkettle M, Walton T, Vautrelle N, Hetherington L, et al. (2012) A Novel Task for the Investigation of Action Acquisition. PLoS ONE 7(6): e37749. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0037749