



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Enabling open access to Birkbeck's published research output

A 2.5-D representation of the human hand

Journal Article

<http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/4529>

Version: Submitted (Refereed)

Citation:

Longo, M.R.; Haggard, P. (2011)
A 2.5-D representation of the human hand –
*Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and
Performance* - September 5th 2011

© 2011 American Psychological Association

[Publisher Version](#)

All articles available through Birkbeck ePrints are protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law. Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

[Deposit Guide](#)

Contact: lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk

RUNNING HEAD: A 2.5-D Representation of the Human Hand

A 2.5-D Representation of the Human Hand

Matthew R. Longo¹ and Patrick Haggard²

¹Department of Psychological Sciences, Birkbeck, University of London

²Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, University College London

Direct correspondence to:

Matthew R. Longo

Department of Psychological Sciences

Birkbeck, University of London

Malet Street

London WC1E 7HX

United Kingdom

m.longo@bbk.ac.uk

Abstract

Primary somatosensory maps in the brain represent the body as a discontinuous, fragmented set of 2-D skin regions. We nevertheless experience our body as a coherent 3-D volumetric object. The links between these different aspects of body representation, however, remain poorly understood. Perceiving the body's location in external space requires that immediate afferent signals from the periphery be combined with stored representations of body size and shape. At least for the back of the hand, this body representation is massively distorted, in a highly stereotyped manner. Here we test whether a common pattern of distortions applies to the entire hand as a 3-D object, or whether each 2-D skin surface has its own characteristic pattern of distortion. Participants judged the location in external space of landmark points on the dorsal and palmar surfaces of the hand. By analyzing the internal configuration of judgments, we produced implicit maps of each skin surface. Qualitatively similar distortions were observed in both cases. The distortions were correlated across participants, suggesting that the two surfaces are bound into a common underlying representation. The magnitude of distortion, however, was substantially smaller on the palmar surface, suggesting that this binding is incomplete. The implicit representation of the human hand may be a hybrid, intermediate between a 2-D representation of individual skin surfaces and a 3-D representation of the hand as a volumetric object.

Information about the size and shape of one's body is critical for many forms of perception. Recent studies investigating body representations underlying position sense have revealed large distortions of body size and shape (Hach & Schütz-Bosbach, 2010; Longo & Haggard, 2010), not found for explicit judgments of body shape. This suggests that somatosensation relies on *implicit* body representations, distinct from the conscious body image. The exact nature of these representations, however, remains unclear. While we experience our body as a coherent, volumetric object, the brain also appears to maintain highly fragmented representations of individual body parts (Kammers et al., 2009) and skin surfaces (Coslett & Lie, 2004; Mancini et al., 2011a). Mancini and colleagues (2011a) found systematic biases in localisation of cutaneous stimuli on the hand, which were highly consistent across individuals and stimulus types (mechanoreceptive vs. thermal), but differed dramatically between palm and dorsum. This surface-specificity suggests that these biases arise from fragmented representations of multiple 2-D skin regions, rather than from coherent 3-D body representations. Here, we investigated the spatial coherence of the implicit body representation underlying a different perceptual process: localisation of one's body in external space ("position sense").

We determined whether distortions of distinct skin surfaces of a single body part (the dorsal and palmar hand surfaces) are consistent, or particular to each. If position sense derives from local sensory features of the skin and organisation of somatosensory cortical maps, distinct patterns of distortion might be found, indicating fragmented, 2-D representations of individual skin surfaces. In contrast, if position sense uses a 3-D model of the hand as a coherent volumetric object, similar spatial distortions should be found on both surfaces, producing correlated distortions across individuals.

We used the ‘psychomorphometric’ technique (Longo & Haggard, 2010) to compare implicit representations of the dorsal and palmar hand surfaces. Participants indicated the perceived location of landmarks on their occluded hand (Figure 1). By having participants localise landmarks by verbal instruction, rather than somatic stimuli, we isolated body representations mediating position sense specifically, rather than processes such as localisation on the skin surface. By comparing the judged locations of landmarks, we constructed implicit maps of represented hand morphology, to compare with true hand morphology and across skin surfaces.

Methods

Participants

Twelve individuals (nine female) between 19 and 30 years participated. All but three were right-handed by the Edinburgh Inventory, M : 43.04, range: -78.95 – 100.

Procedure

Participants sat with their left hand on a table, either the palm or dorsum facing up. Participants rested their hand flat, fingers completely straight. A board (40x40 cm) was placed over the hand, resting on four pillars (6 cm high). A camera suspended above the board captured still images (1,280x960 pixels).

Participants used a baton (35 cm length; 2 mm diameter) to indicate the perceived location of landmarks on the palm or dorsum of their occluded left hand. For the dorsum, the landmarks were the centre of the knuckle at the base of each finger and each fingertip. For the palm, the landmarks were the centre of the skin crease at the base of each finger where it meets

the palm, and each fingertip. On each trial, participants were verbally instructed which landmark to judge. Participants were instructed to take their time, be precise, avoid ballistic pointing, and avoid strategies such as tracing the outline of the hand. Before each trial, participants moved the tip of the baton to a blue dot at the edge of the board.

There were four blocks of 20 trials, dorsum and palm blocks alternating in counterbalanced ABBA sequence. Each block comprised two miniblocks of 10 trials, each landmark in random order. Immediately before and after blocks, a picture was taken without the occluder, showing the hand.

*** FIGURE 1 HERE ***

Analysis

Analysis methods were described in full elsewhere (Longo & Haggard, 2010). Pixel coordinates of landmarks were coded and averaged, resulting in one map for each block. Distances were calculated between the tip of each finger and its base, and between the bases of finger pairs.

Additionally, we compared actual and represented hand shape using generalized Procrustes analysis (GPA). GPA aligns sets of homologous landmarks, removing differences in location, rotation, and scale, isolating differences in shape (Bookstein, 1991). Before GPA, fingers were rotated to a common set of angles to remove postural differences. GPA was conducted using CoordGen, (Integrated Morphometrics Program, H. David Sheets, Canisius College, <http://www.canisius.edu/~sheets/morphsoft.html>). Finally, thin-plate splines, depicting

represented hand shape as a deformation of actual hand shape, were computed using tpsSpln (F. James Rohlf, SUNY Stony Brook, <http://life.bio.sunysb.edu/morph/index.html>).

Results

We previously found several characteristic distortions of the implicit representation of the dorsum (Longo & Haggard, 2010): (1) overestimation of hand width (~60-80%), (2) underestimation of finger length (~20%), and (3) a radial-ulnar gradient of magnification, finger length underestimation increasing from thumb to little finger. All three results were replicated here (Figure 2). As a measure of hand width, we used the distance between the bases of the index and little fingers. There was clear overestimation of the width of the dorsal surface (M : 79.2% overestimation), $t(11) = 6.54$, $p < .0001$. Clear overestimation was also observed on the palmar surface (M : 49.0% overestimation), $t(11) = 5.72$, $p < .0001$, but significantly less than on the dorsum, $t(11) = 4.39$, $p < .005$. The magnitude of overestimation on the two surfaces was strongly correlated, $r(11) = .834$, $p < .0005$.

*** FIGURE 2 HERE ***

Underestimation of finger length was observed for the dorsal (M : 11.9% underestimation), $t(11) = -2.58$, $p < .05$, but not palmar (M : 1.8% overestimation), $t(11) = .36$, *n.s.*, surface. There was a significant difference between surfaces, $t(11) = 4.00$, $p < .005$. Again, under- or overestimation for the two sides was strongly correlated, $r(11) = .751$, $p < .005$.

We found previously that underestimation of finger length on the dorsum increased from thumb to little finger. We quantified this radial-ulnar gradient with least-squares regression,

using digit number (1=thumb to 5=little finger) to predict underestimation. A clear radial-ulnar gradient was observed on the dorsum, mean $\beta = 4.6\%$ / digit, $t(11) = 3.37$, $p < .01$. On the palm, gradients were not significantly different from 0, mean $\beta = -2.5\%$ / digit, $t(11) = -1.83$, $p = .095$, but were reduced from the dorsum, $t(11) = 4.58$, $p < .001$.

*** FIGURE 3 HERE ***

To normalise size, GPA normalizes the *centroid size* (the square root of the sum of squared distances of each point from their centre of mass). Centroid size, thus, quantifies overall map size, independent of shape. Overestimation of size was observed both for the dorsal ($M: 11.8\%$), $t(11) = 2.33$, $p < .05$, and palmar ($M: 17.4\%$), $t(11) = 4.05$, $p < .002$, hand surfaces. Overestimation was significantly larger on the palmar surface, $t(11) = 2.32$, $p < .05$, but strongly correlated across participants, $r(11) = .877$, $p < .0001$.

Discussion

These results replicate the characteristic distortions of hand representation we recently reported (Longo & Haggard, 2010). These distortions are substantially reduced, though qualitatively similar, on the palmar compared to the dorsal hand surface. We experience our body as a coherent volumetric whole, subject to the same physical and geometric laws as other rigid bodies. That different *magnitudes* of distortion are found on the two sides of a single body part, however, suggests that the body model used for position sense is not a fully unified representation of the hand as a coherent, 3-D object. At the same time, however, the strong correlation between the distortions on the two skin surfaces suggests that the body model does

not contain entirely independent 2-D representations of the two skin surfaces either. While our recent findings suggest that localisation of somatic stimuli on the skin relies on a fragmented representation of individual skin surfaces (Mancini et al., 2011a), the present findings suggest that the implicit representation underlying external spatial localisation of the hand is intermediate between a fragmented, 2-D representation of individual skin surfaces and an integrated, 3-D representation of the hand as a volumetric object. We suggest that this representation can be conceived as a 2.5-D body model, a somatosensory analogy to Marr's (1982; Marr & Nishihara, 1978) classic description of the '2½D sketch' in vision.

How might such a 'hybrid' representation emerge? The analogy with vision is potentially instructive. Marr (1982) postulated the 2½-D sketch as a representation intermediate between 2-D retinal images and 3-D representations of objects, describing local surfaces and their orientations, but not integrating them into a fully 3-D representation. The body model revealed here may be similarly intermediate between a purely local representation of individual skin surfaces and a fully volumetric 3-D body. Indeed, there are bidirectional influences between somatosensory maps and the conscious body image. For example, cutaneous anaesthesia leads the anaesthetized body part to feel larger than it really is (Gandevia & Phegan, 1999). Conversely, manipulating the body image, for example by visual distortion, modulates basic somatosensation (Kennett et al., 2001; Mancini et al., 2011b). Such findings suggest that interaction between 2-D and 3-D representations is a general feature of somatosensory hierarchies (cf. Longo, Azañón, & Haggard, 2010), and may underlie the hybrid representation of the body itself. We recently found that the posterior parietal cortex is involved in remapping touch from a skin-centred to an external reference frame (Azañón et al., 2010). The present results suggest there may be an analogous 'remapping' problem in constructing a representation

of the 3-D structure of the body itself from underlying 2-D representations of individual skin surfaces. It is unclear from the present data, however, whether the 2.5-D representation is stored by the brain in some intermediate format, or is built up in real-time from 2-D and 3-D representations, whether it is an ‘online’ or an ‘offline’ representation (cf. Carruthers, 2008).

We previously suggested that differences in cortical magnification, receptive field size, and innervation density were related to distortions in implicit body representation (Longo & Haggard, 2010, 2011). However, at the larger spatial scale of palm vs dorsum, receptor innervation appears not to predict represented size. Although the palm has higher sensitivity and cortical magnification than the dorsum (Pons et al., 1987), the palm was not represented as *larger*, but rather was represented *more accurately*. That is, overestimation of hand width was reduced on the palm, and underestimation of finger length was replaced by a near-accurate representation. Thus, while high cortical magnification may in some cases produce perceptual distortions, such as the ‘Weber illusion’ (Taylor-Clarke et al., 2004; Weber, 1834/1996), it may also enhance accuracy for other perceptual abilities, such as position sense. Higher accuracy on the palm may also relate to the more orderly, somatotopic representation of glabrous skin, compared to hairy skin which is represented irregularly in islands of cortex intermixed with the map of the glabrous skin (Powell & Mountcastle, 1959; Pons et al., 1987).

Interestingly, the perceived distance between tactile stimuli also appears to depend on a body representation featuring overestimation of the dorsum (Longo & Haggard, 2011): stimuli oriented medio-laterally (*across* the hand) are perceived as approximately 40% larger than identical stimuli oriented proximo-distally (*along* the hand). This common distortion suggests that position sense and tactile size perception may use a common implicit body representation. Indeed, overestimation of hand width in both cases mirrors anisotropies both in tactile acuity

(Cody et al., 2008) and RF geometry (Alloway et al., 1989). Intriguingly, no such distortion in tactile size perception was found on the glabrous skin of the palm. Thus, both for tactile size perception (Longo & Haggard, 2011) and position sense (this study), the implicit representation of the palm is less distorted than the dorsum. If the brain used a single, coherent model of the hand as a volumetric object, one might expect the more accurate representation of the palm to be transferred, or extruded, to the dorsum. Our results show that this transfer is partial, at best. The brain's ability to maintain a single, coherent model of the body, capable of integrating diverse somatosensory inputs, may be highly limited.

References

- Alloway, K. D., Rosenthal, P., & Burton, H. (1989). Quantitative measurements of receptive field changes during antagonism of GABAergic transmission in primary somatosensory cortex of cats. *Experimental Brain Research*, *78*, 514-532.
- Azañón, E., Longo, M. R., Soto-Faraco, S., & Haggard, P. (2010). The posterior parietal cortex remaps touch into external space. *Current Biology*, *20*, 1304-1309.
- Bookstein, F. L. (1991). *Morphometric Tools for Landmark Data: Geometry and Biology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Botvinick, M., & Cohen, J. (1998). Rubber hands 'feel' touch that eyes see. *Nature*, *391*, 756.
- Carruthers, G. (2008). Types of body representation and the sense of embodiment. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *17*, 1302-1316.
- Cody, F. W., Garside, R. A., Lloyd, D., & Poliakoff, E. (2008). Tactile spatial acuity varies with site and axis in the human upper limb. *Neuroscience Letters*, *433*, 103-108.
- Coslett, H. B., & Lie, E. (2004). Bare hands and attention: Evidence for a tactile representation of the human body. *Neuropsychologia*, *42*, 1865-1876.
- Hach, S., & Schütz-Bosbach, S. (2010). Sinistrals' upper hand: Evidence for handedness differences in the representation of body space. *Brain and Cognition*, *72*, 408-418.
- Kammers, M. P. M., Longo, M. R., Tsakiris, M., Dijkerman, H. C., & Haggard, P. (2009). Specificity and coherence of body representations. *Perception*, *38*, 1804-1820.
- Kennett, S., Taylor-Clarke, M., & Haggard, P. (2001). Noninformative vision improves the spatial resolution of touch in humans. *Current Biology*, *11*, 1188-1191.
- Longo, M. R., Azañón, E., & Haggard, P. (2010). More than skin deep: Body representation beyond primary somatosensory cortex. *Neuropsychologia*, *48*, 655-668.

- Longo, M. R., & Haggard, P. (2010). An implicit body representation underlying human position sense. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA, 107*, 11727-11732.
- Longo, M. R., & Haggard, P. (2011). Weber's illusion and body shape: Anisotropy of tactile size perception on the hand. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 37*, 720-726.
- Mancini, F., Longo, M. R., Iannetti, G. D., & Haggard, P. (2011a). A supramodal representation of the body surface. *Neuropsychologia, 49*, 1194-1201.
- Mancini, F., Longo, M. R., Kammers, M. P. M., & Haggard, P. (2011b). Visual distortion of body size modulates pain perception. *Psychological Science, 22*, 325-330.
- Marr, D. (1982). *Vision: A computational investigation into the human representation and processing of visual information*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Co.
- Marr, D., & Nishihara, H. K. (1978). Representation and recognition of the spatial organization of three-dimensional shape. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B, 200*, 269-294.
- Pons, T. P., Wall, J. T., Garraghty, P. E., Cusick, C. G., & Kaas, J. H. (1987). Consistent features of the representation of the hand in area 3b of macaque monkeys. *Somatosensory Research, 4*, 309-331.
- Powell, T. P. S., & Mountcastle, V. B. (1959). Some aspects of the functional organization of the cortex of the postcentral gyrus of the monkey: A correlation of findings obtained in a single unit analysis with cytoarchitecture. *Bulletin of the Johns Hopkins Hospital, 105*, 133-162.
- Taylor-Clarke, M., Jacobsen, P., & Haggard, P. (2004). Keeping the world a constant size: Object constancy in human touch. *Nature Neuroscience, 7*, 219-220.

Tsakiris, M., & Haggard, P. (2005). The rubber hand illusion revisited: Visuotactile integration and self-attribution. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *31*, 80-91.

Weber, E. (1834/1996). *E. H. Weber on the Tactile Senses*, 2nd ed. London: Academic.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) grant BB/D009529/1 to PH. PH was additionally supported by a Leverhulme Trust Major Research Fellowship.

Figure Captions

Figure 1: (a-b) Landmarks used in this experiment. On the dorsal surface of the back of the hand (a), the knuckle and tip (i.e., the most distal point) of each finger were judged. On the palmar surface of the hand (b), the centre of the skin crease at the base of each finger where it meets the palm and the tip of each finger were judged. (c-d) Experimental setup and apparatus. Participants placed their hand either dorsum or palm up on a surface (c), which was then occluded with a board. They judged where in space each landmark on their hand was by placing the tip of a long baton on the board directly above the perceived location of each landmark (d) and responses were recorded with a camera.

Figure 2: (a) Percent overestimation [i.e., $(100 \times \text{judged length} - \text{actual length})/\text{actual length}$] of finger lengths. Clear underestimation of finger length was observed on the dorsal, but not on the palmar, surface of the hand. (b) Percent overestimation of spacing between pairs of knuckles. Clear overestimation was observed on both sides of the hand, but was significantly reduced on the palmar, compared to the dorsal surface. (c-d) Scatterplots showing relation between overestimation of finger length (c) and hand width (d) on the two skin surfaces. Clear relations were observed for both measures.

Figure 3: (a-b) Generalized Procrustes analysis (GPA) alignment of maps of actual and represented hand shape on the dorsal (a) and palmar (b) hand surfaces. (c-d) Thin-plate splines depicting represented hand shape as a deformation of actual hand shape on the dorsal (c) and palmar (d) hand surfaces.