



**Manchester
Metropolitan
University**

Marshall, Ben and Wright, David J and Holmes, Paul S and Wood, Greg (2019) Combining Action Observation and Motor Imagery Improves Eye–Hand Coordination during Novel Visuomotor Task Performance. *Journal of Motor Behavior*. pp. 1-9. ISSN 0022-2895

Downloaded from: <http://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/623095/>

Version: Accepted Version

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222895.2019.1626337>

Please cite the published version

<https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk>

1 **Combining action observation and motor imagery improves eye-hand coordination**
2 **during novel visuomotor task performance**

3

4 **Author details**

5 Ben Marshall¹ (b.marshall@mmu.ac.uk) (corresponding author)

6 David J. Wright¹ (d.j.wright@mmu.ac.uk)

7 Paul S. Holmes¹ (p.s.holmes@mmu.ac.uk)

8 Greg Wood¹ (greg.wood@mmu.ac.uk)

9

10

- 11 1. Research Centre for Musculoskeletal Science and Sports Medicine
12 Department of Sport and Exercise Science
13 Faculty of Science & Engineering
14 Manchester Metropolitan University
15 Manchester, UK

16

17

1 **Abstract**

2 In the present study we compared the effectiveness of concurrent action observation and
3 motor imagery (AO+MI), observing with the intent to imitate (active observation; AO) and
4 passive observation (PO) training interventions for improving eye-hand coordination. Fifty
5 participants were assigned to five groups (AO+MI, AO, PO, physical practice (PP); control)
6 and performed a visuomotor rotation task, whilst eye movements were recorded. Each
7 participant then performed 20 task trials in a training intervention before repeating the
8 visuomotor rotation task in a post-test. As expected, physical practice produced the greatest
9 improvement in task performance and eye-hand coordination. However, in comparison to the
10 control group, AO+MI training produced a statistically significant increase in both task
11 performance and eye-hand coordination, but no such improvements were found following
12 AO or PO.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Introduction

1
2 The observation of an action is widely accepted to activate similar, but not identical, neural
3 structures to those active during the physical execution of the same movement (Hardwick,
4 Caspers, Eickhoff, & Swinnen, 2018). This has led to suggestions that during the observation
5 of actions, a motor representation of that movement is activated in the observer's motor
6 system (Rizzolatti, Fogassi, & Gallese, 2001). Action observation (AO) has, therefore, been
7 proposed as a simulation technique that has utility for motor (re)learning by facilitating
8 neuroplastic changes in motor pathways (Buccino, 2014). Consequently, researchers have
9 tested the efficacy of AO interventions in a variety of motor (re)learning settings, and this
10 research indicates that it may offer clinical benefits for movement in stroke patients (Ertelt,
11 2007), upper limb amputees training with prosthetics (Cusack et al., 2016) and Parkinson's
12 disease patients (Pelosin et al., 2010).

13 While previous research has used passive observation (e.g., watch the action) and
14 active observation (e.g., watch the action with the intention to imitate) instructions (Wright,
15 McCormick, Williams, & Holmes, 2016), recent research has suggested that the most
16 effective method for delivering AO interventions is by combining the technique with
17 concurrent motor imagery (AO+MI: Eaves, Riach, Holmes & Wright, 2016). MI involves the
18 covert mental rehearsal of action execution (AE), typically in the absence of physical
19 movement (Mulder, 2007). The rationale provided for combining both motor simulation
20 techniques would seem intuitive. First, AO+MI produces increased cortico-motor activity
21 compared to when AO or MI are performed in isolation (Eaves et al., 2016). Second, in
22 contrast to MI, AO allows experimental control of the clarity, vividness and perspective of
23 the image (Holmes & Calmels, 2008), and as AO does not require the participant to generate
24 or maintain the visual aspects of an image, it allows them to focus their resources exclusively
25 on generating kinesthetic imagery alongside the observation (Eaves et al., 2016). Finally,

1 AO+MI has been shown to produce a positive effect on performance across a variety of
2 motor activities, including the imitation of hand movements (Bek, Poliakoff, Marshall,
3 Trueman, & Gowen, 2016), the recovery of upper limb function following stroke (Sun, Wei,
4 Luo, Gan, & Hu, 2016) and strength (Scott, Taylor, Chesterton, Vogt, & Eaves, 2017),
5 balance (Taube, Lorch, Zeiter, & Keller, 2014) and sports tasks (Romano-Smith, Wood,
6 Wright & Wakefield, 2018).

7 Despite these positive findings, little is understood about how AO+MI facilitates
8 skillful movement in such tasks. Although research has indicated increased activity in motor
9 regions of the brain associated with AO+MI relative to independent AO or MI (Eaves et al.,
10 2016), it is currently unclear how this would serve to facilitate motor skill learning. One
11 possible explanation is offered by Jeannerod's (2001) simulation theory. In this theory,
12 Jeannerod proposed that a functional equivalence exists between AO, MI and AE, whereby
13 all three action states are associated with activity in similar neural structures. Research using
14 neuroimaging techniques has provided support for this theory by demonstrating that several
15 areas known to be active during action execution, such as the dorsal pre-motor cortex,
16 supplementary motor area, superior parietal lobe and intraparietal sulcus, are indeed active
17 during both AO and MI (Grezes & Decety, 2001; Filimon, Nelson, Hagler, & Sereno, 2007,
18 Munzert, Zentgraf, Stark, & Vaitl, 2008). However, more recent evidence indicates that there
19 are differences in how the two simulation states of AO and MI activate the motor system. For
20 example, using multi-voxel pattern analysis, Filimon, Rieth, Sereno, & Cottrell (2015)
21 demonstrated that lateral and posterior regions of the dorsal premotor cortex and anterior
22 regions of the ventral premotor cortex are more active during AO, whilst anterior regions of
23 the dorsal premotor cortex and posterior regions of the ventral premotor cortex are more
24 active during MI. Similarly, in a meta-analysis of neuroimaging experiments, Hardwick, et
25 al., (2018) reported that MI was associated with increased activity in the premotor cortex and

1 supplementary motor area than AO. They also reported that AO was not associated with
2 activity in any sub-cortical structures, whilst MI was associated with activity in the bilateral
3 putamen and cerebellum. Consequently, the inclusion of motor imagery instructions in
4 AO+MI interventions may promote increased and more widespread activity throughout the
5 motor regions of the brain than which occurs through either passive or active observation
6 interventions. This increased neural activity may facilitate the development of internal motor
7 representations for specific actions, contributing to improved performance following AO+MI
8 interventions.

9 Given the similar, but not identical, neural activity during AO, MI and AE, similar
10 eye movements to those produced during AE should be recordable during simulation
11 conditions. Indeed, evidence suggests that eye movements are similar during AE and MI
12 (Heremans et al., 2008), AE and AO (Flanagan & Johansson, 2003) and MI and AO
13 (McCormick, Causer & Holmes, 2012). Taken together, this suggests that these similar eye
14 movement patterns may be indicative of a shared neural network that is used to plan and
15 control visually guided actions. As AO+MI allows for the provision and control of the visual
16 elements of simulation, attentional resources are able to be devoted to the kinesthetic aspects
17 of a movement, which may serve to develop sensorimotor mapping rules that include the
18 encoding of associated visuomotor programs.

19 However, little is currently known as to *how* AO+MI may be used to facilitate the
20 development of effective eye-hand coordination. During the skilled performance of daily
21 activities, gaze is directed towards objects of intended interaction as vision precedes action in
22 a feedforward, proactive, manner (Land, 2009). Such coordination between eye and effector
23 movement develops during the learning of a new skill. For example, Sailer, Flanagan and
24 Johansson (2005) investigated this development as participants learned a challenging and
25 novel visuomotor adaptation task. In this task, participants were required to move a cursor to

1 targets displayed on a computer screen. Participants manipulated the cursor by applying
2 isometric forces and torques to the tool held freely between the two hands. Results
3 demonstrated that in the early stages of learning, eye movements tended to fixate the cursor,
4 visually monitoring it as it approached the target. When the skill had been mastered, cursor
5 movement was not attended to, and eye movements tended to be target focused in nature,
6 enhancing performance. Therefore individuals learn to program spatially congruent eye and
7 motor commands, so that fixations on objects precede motor actions and provide visually
8 acquired goal related information to the motor systems (Land, 2009; Neggers and Bekkering,
9 2000; Sailer, et al, 2005). Task-specific (goal-directed) eye movements of this nature support
10 the planning and control of manual action and are therefore indicative of top-down attentional
11 control and task expertise (Land, 2009). Similar development of effective eye-hand
12 coordination have been reported during real-world tasks like the learning of surgical skills
13 (Wilson et al., 2010) and when learning to use a prosthetic hand (Parr, Vine, Harrison, &
14 Wood, 2018).

15 Despite this proactive gaze behavior being shown to manifest during action
16 observation (Sciutti et al., 2011), no studies have examined if/how AO+MI can be used to
17 facilitate the development of eye-hand coordination and improve task performance.
18 Therefore, in this study, we examined the effect of AO+MI for the development of eye-hand
19 coordination during the performance of a novel visuomotor adaptation task. Given the more
20 widespread neural activity associated with AO+MI, we hypothesized that this would lead to
21 significantly faster adaptation compared to the other simulation conditions. Secondly, we
22 expected that this improvement in performance would be reflected in the development of a
23 proactive gaze strategy with the AO+MI group displaying significantly more target-focused
24 gaze strategies after training, compared to the other simulation conditions (Sailer et al.,
25 2005).

Method

Participants

Fifty right-handed participants (28 male and 22 female; age $M = 24.8$, $SD = 4.73$ years) with normal or corrected-to-normal vision, volunteered to take part in the experiment. Participants gave their written informed consent prior to taking part and the experimental procedures were granted ethical approval by the local university ethics committee.

Task

Participants performed an experimental task that was an adaptation of the virtual radial Fitts' task (Heremans et al., 2011). The goal of the task was to use a stylus to guide sequentially a cursor to a series of target squares whilst under the constraints of an 180° visuomotor x-axis reversal (see Figure 1). The reversal resulted in any leftward movements of the stylus on the screen producing an equal rightward movement of the cursor, and vice-versa. Each sequence consisted of three squares (7 mm x 7 mm) that were presented in a radial pattern on the screen (132 mm apart). This gave an index of difficulty of 4.3 bits based on the Shannon formulation. Participants started at the 'home' target square located in the bottom center of the screen (right panel, Figure 1) and then moved to the next target square in each sequence highlighted in yellow. An auditory chime played each time the cursor was successfully guided onto the appropriate target to indicate it had been hit. Once all three onscreen squares were hit and the cursor returned the home square, a new three-square pattern was presented. In total, eight sequences were presented and successfully hitting all 25 targets represented one full trial.




Figure 1. The left-side image shows a participant using the stylus and touchscreen to perform the experimental task. Each participant wore eye-tracking glasses during each phase of the experiment. The right-side image shows a screenshot of the action observation video used in the AOMI, AO and PO training interventions.

1

2 *Apparatus*

3 Testing was performed on a vertically oriented Dell ST2220T touchscreen monitor
4 (Dell, Round Rock, TX) with a 480 mm x 270 mm visual display, situated 210 mm from the
5 edge of the table where the participant was seated (see Figure 1). This monitor had been
6 modified to report input along the x-axis as reversed thereby providing participants with an
7 180° visuomotor reversal on only one plane of movement that had to be negotiated in order to
8 complete the task successfully. This was introduced in order to present participants with a
9 novel task that would disrupt eye-hand coordination (Sailer et al., 2005). The adapted virtual
10 radial Fitts' task was produced using DMDX software (Forster & Forster, 2003) which
11 allowed the automatic presentation of the next target in the sequence once the previous target
12 had been hit. The equipment had a temporal resolution of 15ms and a spatial resolution of
13 one pixel on a 1280 x 720 resolution monitor.

14 Participants' gaze behavior was monitored using SMI ETG 2w eye tracking glasses
15 and iView ETG 2.7 software (SensoMotoric Instruments, Teltow, Germany). The system
16 comprises a pair of lightweight glasses that track participants' binocular eye movements at a
17 sampling rate of 60 Hz with a gaze position accuracy of 0.5°. This was calibrated for each
18 participant prior to the pre-test using a 3-point calibration procedure and accuracy of this
19 calibration was monitored prior to each trial by instructing participants to fixate on points on

1 a calibration grid that represented the spatial arrangement of the target sequences. If, during
2 the session, the quality of the calibration was deemed to have deteriorated then the calibration
3 procedure was repeated before testing continued.

4 ***Procedure***

5 *Pre-test*

6 All participants performed a familiarization trial that consisted of guiding the cursor
7 to hit three targets under the constraints of the visuomotor reversal in order to establish the
8 goal of the task and the presentation of the target sequence. Only three targets were used to
9 minimize the level of adaptation to the x-axis reversal. Prior to the start of the trial
10 participants were instructed to guide the cursor to the targets using the stylus and to attempt
11 to complete the sequence as quickly and accurately as possible (Rentsch & Rand, 2014).
12 Following this participants were then fitted with eye-tracking glasses and performed a pre-
13 test consisting of one 25-target trial. Following completion of the trial participants
14 immediately began the training intervention to which they had been randomly assigned.

15 *Training Interventions*

16 ***Physical practice group.*** Participants in this group completed 20 trials of physical practice of
17 the same 25-target task completed at pre-test (a total of 500 target hits; Sailer et al., 2005).
18 This number of trials was deemed appropriate as most participants may adapt to small
19 visuomotor rotations within 240 attempts (Krakauer, Ghilardi, & Ghez, 1999) but adaptation
20 to 180° visuomotor reversal has been shown to take longer (Werner & Bock, 2010).
21 Participants were given a 30 second rest after completion of each trial. Completing this
22 training phase took approximately 20 minutes.

23 ***Intervention Groups.*** In each of the intervention conditions participants watched a video of
24 an expert model completing four trials of the pre-test 25-target task, filmed from a first

1 person visual perspective using a static camera in which only the model's hand and arm were
2 visible (right panel, Figure 1). This perspective was selected in order to increase the visual
3 congruence between the observed action and physical performance (Holmes & Collins, 2001)
4 and has been used in similar task protocols (Lim, Larssen, & Hodges, 2014; Ong and Hodges,
5 2010; Ong, Larssen, & Hodges, 2012). The expert model had previously performed the task
6 over 100 times and consistently completed the task within 40 seconds. An expert model was
7 selected to show repeated trials of successful task execution in order to minimize variability
8 (Blandin & Proteau, 2000) and previous visuomotor adaptation research has shown both
9 novice and expert models to produce almost identical outcomes (Ong and Hodges, 2010; Ong
10 et al., 2012). The video was shown five times for 20 observed task completions totaling 500
11 target hits. Prior to watching each video participants were given specific instructions
12 depending on the experimental condition to which they had been assigned. Participants in the
13 AO+MI group were instructed to "actively imagine that you are performing the movement as
14 you observe it. Specifically, try to imagine the feelings in your muscles associated with
15 gripping the stylus and moving your arm across the screen". Participants in the AO group
16 were instructed to "observe the movement closely as you will be asked to imitate the
17 movement sequence later in the experiment", whilst participants in the PO group were
18 instructed to "observe the movement sequence shown on screen" and given no further
19 explicit instructions. In all three intervention groups, participants were asked to remain still
20 whilst they engaged with their intervention videos. Following each video, participants were
21 given a 30 second rest. Completion of each training intervention took approximately 20
22 minutes.

23 ***Control Group.*** Participants in this group watched a 20-minute video of a nature
24 documentary that contained no human motor content (Buccino, 2014).

25 *Post-test*

1 Participants then performed a post-test that was identical to that completed at the pre-
2 test.

3 *Measures*

4 *Performance*

5 Performance was measured as the time (in seconds) taken to complete one trial of 25
6 target hits. Previously, researchers (e.g., Chan & Hoffman, 2016) have used task completion
7 time as an indicator of improvement in motor performance in similar goal-directed aiming
8 tasks.

9 *Gaze control*

10 Eye tracking videos of each pre-test and post-test trial were analyzed using BeGaze
11 3.7 software (SMI, Teltow, Germany). Areas of interest (AOI) were assigned to each target
12 and the cursor. Targets were defined as the yellow highlighted square in each sequence.
13 Analysis was performed manually on a fixation-by-fixation basis allowing each fixation to be
14 assigned to the appropriate AOI. Fixations were defined as gaze dispersed over less than 3° of
15 visual angle for a minimum of 80 ms. The total duration of all target and cursor fixations at
16 pre-test and post-test was determined and a target locking measure was then calculated by
17 subtracting the percentage of cursor fixation time from the percentage of target fixation time.
18 A more positive score reflects more time fixating on targets whereas a negative score reflects
19 more time spent fixating the cursor. A score of '0' reflects equal time spent fixating the
20 cursor and targets and represents a 'switching strategy'. This has been shown to be a reliable
21 measure of eye-hand coordination in studies (1) examining expertise in prosthetic hand
22 control (Parr et al., 2018) and surgery (Wilson et al., 2010); (2) in studies that have examined
23 the development of eye-hand coordination (Parr, Vine, Wilson, Harrison & Wood, 2019;
24 Wilson et al., 2011); and (3) in studies examining the effect of pressurized performance

1 environments on eye-hand coordination (Vine, Freeman, Moore, Chandra-Ramanan, &
2 Wilson, 2013).

3 ***Data analysis***

4 Separate one-way ANOVAs were used to analyze the percentage of change in
5 completion time and target locking score. Greenhouse-Geisser corrections were used where
6 the assumption of sphericity was violated. Post hoc analyses were conducted using pairwise
7 comparisons with the Bonferroni adjustment. Effect sizes are reported as partial eta squared
8 (η_p^2). A linear regression was also performed to assess if any improvements in target locking
9 score predicted improvements in task completion time.

10 **Results**

11 ***Preliminary analysis***

12 One way ANOVAs performed on the pre-test performance and eye gaze data revealed
13 no significant differences between groups for task completion time ($p = .975$) or target
14 locking score ($p = .691$) (Table 1).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 **Table 1.** Mean scores for completion time and target locking score.

2

Group	Completion time (s)			Target locking score (%)		
	Pre-test	Post-test	Percentage of improvement from pre-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Percentage of improvement from pre-test
AO+MI	95.62 (11.89)	50.77 (3.65)	42.79 (4.60)	-25.23 (14.57)	22.42 (11.72)	47.65 (9.03)
AO	93.36 (9.95)	57.54 (4.14)	35.47 (4.16)	-26.93 (10.66)	2.91 (12.07)	29.84 (8.12)
PO	92.66 (16.07)	54.00 (4.67)	35.07 (4.84)	-31.63 (12.38)	-2.23 (14.01)	29.40 (6.58)
PP	89.51 (6.06)	30.57 (3.65)	64.40 (4.62)	-45.48 (7.54)	30.33 (14.95)	75.81 (11.48)
Control	100.58 (13.32)	75.96 (9.91)	24.27 (1.69)	-31.62 (5.18)	-20.07 (4.98)	11.55 (4.35)


3

4

5 ***Performance***

6 A significant difference between groups ($F_{(4, 49)} = 12.99, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.54$) was
7 found for the percentage change in task completion time (Table 1). Pairwise comparisons
8 with the Bonferroni adjustment revealed that the PP group reduced their completion time
9 significantly more than all the other groups (AO+MI, $p = .006$; AO, $p < .001$; PO, $p < .001$;
10 control, $p < .001$). In addition, whilst the AO+MI group showed significantly greater
11 reductions in completion time compared to the control group ($p = .03$), no such changes were
12 found in the AO or PO groups (see Figure 2a).

13



1

Figure 2. Mean scores for (A) percent reduction in completion time and (B) percent increase in target locking score. Error bars represent standard error of the mean. * indicates a significant difference from control ($p = .03$), ** indicates a significant difference to all groups ($p \leq .006$), *** indicates a significant difference to AO, PO, and control ($p \leq .003$)

2

3 ***Gaze control***

4

A significant difference was found between groups in target locking score ($F_{(4, 49)} =$

5

8.64, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.43$). Pairwise comparisons with the Bonferroni adjustment indicated

6

that participants in the PP group acquired a significantly higher target locking score than the

7

AO ($p = .003$), PO ($p = .003$), and control ($p < .001$) groups (Table 1). However, there was no

8

significant difference between the PP and AO+MI groups ($p = .20$). Furthermore, whilst the


9

AO+MI group increased their target locking score to a significantly greater extent than the

1 control group ($p = .03$), no such improvement was found in the AO and PO groups (see
2 Figure 2b).

3 **Regression**

4 This analysis indicated that the percentage of increase in target locking score was a
5 significant predictor of the percentage of decrease in completion time ($F_{(1, 49)} = 61.47$, $R^2 =$
6 $.56$, $b = .41$, $p < .001$) (see Figure 3).



7

8 Figure 3. Relationship between percent reduction in completion time and percent increase in target locking
9 score.

8

9

10 **Discussion**

10 In the present study we compared the effects of three types of action observation
11 viewing instructions (AO+MI; AO; PO) and PP on the development of eye-hand coordination
12 and performance of a novel visuomotor task. It was predicted that AO+MI instructions would
13 lead to greater improvements in performance (i.e., reductions in completion time) and
14 facilitate an earlier shift to a proactive gaze strategy than AO or PO instructions. The results
15 of this experiment partially support our hypotheses. The AO+MI group improved their

1 performance to a significantly greater extent than the control group, and these improvements
2 were underpinned by changes in proactive gaze behavior. Specifically, after training, the
3 AO+MI group exhibited higher target locking scores that were not significantly different to
4 the PP group but significantly higher than the control group. A positive shift in target locking
5 score indicates that more time is spent fixating targets than the cursor and is representative of
6 increased top-down attentional control and superior eye-hand coordination (Sailer et al.,
7 2005). Finally, the importance of the improvement in target locking score for the AO+MI
8 group was reflected in the regression analysis that revealed a significant positive relationship
9 between target locking score and task performance. This evidence suggests that the AO+MI
10 intervention helped participants to develop more proactive, feedforward, gaze behavior and
11 that this helped to improve their rate of visuomotor adaptation, compared to a control group.

12 These results can provide some support for Jeannerod's (2001) simulation theory.
13 Although no central measures of brain activity were taken in this experiment, it is possible
14 that by engaging in dual action simulation, the participants in the AO+MI group would have
15 experienced increased activity in the motor regions of the brain during their training, than
16 participants in the AO or PO groups, where no deliberate imagery was instructed. Based on
17 the findings of Hardwick et al. (2018), the addition of motor imagery for participants in the
18 AO+MI group would likely have evoked increased activity in the premotor cortex and
19 supplementary motor area, as well as sub-cortically in the bilateral putamen and cerebellum.
20 The AO+MI training may, therefore, have provided a closer behavioral match to action
21 execution than occurred through either passive or active observation. This may have
22 contributed to participants in the AO+MI group developing a task-specific motor
23 representation that was more analogous to physical practice than the other simulation
24 conditions, and is reflected in the achievement of a more proactive gaze strategy and
25 improved performance of the AO+MI group.

1 Another possible explanation is that the inclusion of kinesthetic imagery alongside the
2 AO stimulus may have facilitated the development of sensorimotor mapping rules that
3 improved proprioceptive modes of action control. Specifically, while the AO component is
4 thought to develop the sequencing and timing of basic action concepts (Wright et al., 2018),
5 kinesthetic imagery has been shown to update the proprioceptive components of the forward
6 model that subsequently improves movement planning and control (Kilteni, Andersson,
7 Houborg, & Ehrsson, 2018). The development of more elaborate proprioceptive control is
8 indicative of more expert-like motor control that ‘frees-up’ vision to be allocated as a feed-
9 forward resource to guide action ahead of time (Sailer et al., 2005). In this explanation, due to
10 the inclusion of kinesthetic imagery, the AO+MI group may have developed this
11 proprioceptive ability to control the cursor skillfully without having to monitor it visually
12 (compared to AO and PO groups) allowing them to locate and fixate targets ahead of time,
13 thereby improving performance.

14 Finally, kinesthetic imagery has previously been shown to facilitate corticospinal
15 excitability to a greater extent than visual imagery (Stinear, Byblow, Steyvers, Levin, &
16 Swinnen, 2006). Subsequently the AO+MI training may have produced stronger activity in
17 the premotor and motor regions of the brain than active or passive observation (Wright et al.,
18 2016), which is widely believed to be advantageous for promoting neuroplastic changes that
19 facilitate motor processes and behavioral outcomes (see Eaves et al., 2016). Future research
20 may wish to explore the effects of AO+MI upon motor representations further by including
21 explicit measures related to their generation and maintenance (Frank, Land & Schack, 2016).

22 From an applied perspective, whilst it is clear that physical practice offers superior
23 performance benefits to all simulation conditions, AO+MI seems to facilitate significant
24 improvements in performance and gaze behavior compared to no intervention. Conversely,
25 active or passive observation strategies seem to offer no significant benefits for this type of

1 task, compared to doing no intervention at all. These results provide interesting avenues for
2 further research in clinical populations where individuals are unable to carry out physical
3 practice due to illness, injury or disease. For example, while AO+MI interventions have been
4 shown to increase corticospinal excitability (e.g., Wright, Williams, & Holmes, 2014), which
5 may be linked to improvement in neural pathways supporting improved functional strength
6 (Scott et al., 2017), they may also serve to facilitate the development of effective eye-hand
7 coordination critical for activities of daily living (e.g., reaching and grasping). This would
8 have significant clinical benefit for recovering stroke patients suffering hemiparesis or with
9 patients after upper limb amputation. Future studies should aim to explore the use of AO+MI
10 within these populations to support more traditional physical neurorehabilitation techniques.

11 While these findings are informative, some limitations need to be acknowledged.
12 First, it is possible that if participants had been exposed to a longer training period, or had
13 completed their action observation training alongside physical practice then greater
14 improvements in performance or gaze control may have been revealed. However, AO+MI
15 interventions of similar duration have been shown to improve performance in previous
16 research (Bek et al., 2016). Finally, the MI ability of participants was not assessed in this
17 study due to the current lack of a suitable measure for AO+MI imagery ability characteristics.

18 In conclusion, these findings suggest that AO+MI training can be used to facilitate an
19 earlier shift to a proactive pattern of eye-hand coordination, similar to that observed in
20 physical practice, during performance of a novel visuomotor task. Therefore, AO+MI may be
21 an effective technique for restoring optimal eye-hand coordination in populations where
22 physical practice is painful or impossible, such as in stroke or upper limb amputation, and
23 future research should endeavor to explore the effects of AO+MI training on eye-hand
24 coordination in these clinical groups.

References

- 1
- 2 Bek, J., Poliakoff, E., Marshall, H., Trueman, S., & Gowen, E. (2016). Enhancing voluntary
3 imitation through attention and motor imagery. *Experimental Brain Research*, 234(7),
4 1819-1828.
- 5 Blandin, Y., & Proteau, L. (2000). On the cognitive basis of observational learning:
6 Development of mechanisms for the detection and correction of errors. *The Quarterly*
7 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Section A*, 53(3), 846-867.
- 8 Buccino, G. (2014). Action observation treatment: a novel tool in
9 neurorehabilitation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 369(1644),
10 20130185.
- 11 Chan, A. H., & Hoffmann, E. R. (2017). Subjective estimation of task time and task difficulty
12 of simple movement tasks. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 49(2), 185-199.
- 13 Cusack, W. F., Thach, S., Patterson, R., Acker, D., Kistenberg, R. S., & Wheaton, L. A.
14 (2016). Enhanced neurobehavioral outcomes of action observation prosthesis
15 training. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, 30(6), 573-582.
- 16 Eaves, D. L., Riach, M., Holmes, P. S., & Wright, D. J. (2016). Motor imagery during action
17 observation: a brief review of evidence, theory and future research
18 opportunities. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 10.
- 19 Ertelt, D., Small, S., Solodkin, A., Dettmers, C., McNamara, A., Binkofski, F., & Buccino, G.
20 (2007). Action observation has a positive impact on rehabilitation of motor deficits
21 after stroke. *Neuroimage*, 36, T164-T173.

- 1 Filimon, F., Nelson, J. D., Hagler, D. J., & Sereno, M. I. (2007). ‘Human cortical
2 representations for reaching: mirror neurons for execution, observation and imagery.’
3 *Neuroimage*, 37(4), pp. 1315-1328.
- 4 Filimon, F., Rieth, C. A., Sereno, M. I., & Cottrell, G. W. (2015). Observed, executed, and
5 imagined action representations can be decoded from ventral and dorsal areas.
6 *Cerebral Cortex*, 25(9), 3144-3158.
- 7 Flanagan, J. R., & Johansson, R. S. (2003). Action plans used in action observation.
8 *Nature*, 424 (6950), 769.
- 9 Forster, K. I., & Forster, J. C. (2003). DMDX: A Windows display program with millisecond
10 accuracy. *Behavior Research Methods*, 35(1), 116-124.
- 11 Frank, C., Land, W. M., & Schack, T. (2016). Perceptual-cognitive changes during motor
12 learning: The influence of mental and physical practice on mental representation, gaze
13 behavior, and performance of a complex action. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1981.
- 14 Grezes, J., & Decety, J. (2001). Functional anatomy of execution, mental simulation,
15 observation, and verb generation of actions: a meta-analysis. *Human Brain Mapping*,
16 12(1), 1-19.
- 17 Hardwick, R. M., Caspers, S., Eickhoff, S. B., & Swinnen, S. P. (2018). Neural correlates of
18 action: Comparing meta-analyses of imagery, observation, and execution.
19 *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 94, 31-44.
- 20 Heremans, E., Helsen, W. F., & Feys, P. (2008). The eyes as a mirror of our thoughts:
21 quantification of motor imagery of goal-directed movements through eye movement
22 registration. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 187(2), 351-360.

- 1 Heremans, E., Smits-Engelsman, B., Caeyenberghs, K., Vercruyssen, S., Nieuwboer, A., Feys,
2 P., & Helsen, W. F. (2011). Keeping an eye on imagery: the role of eye movements
3 during motor imagery training. *Neuroscience*, *195*, 37-44.
- 4 Holmes, P., & Calmels, C. (2008). A neuroscientific review of imagery and observation use
5 in sport. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, *40*(5), 433-445.
- 6 Jeannerod, M. (2001). Neural simulation of action: a unifying mechanism for motor
7 cognition. *Neuroimage*, *14*(1), S103-S109.
- 8 Kilteni, K., Andersson, B. J., Houborg, C., & Ehrsson, H. H. (2018) Motor imagery involves
9 predicting the sensory consequences of the imagined movement. *Nature*
10 *Communications*, *9*(1617)
- 11 Krakauer, J. W., Ghilardi, M. F., & Ghez, C. (1999). Independent learning of internal models
12 for kinematic and dynamic control of reaching. *Nature Neuroscience*, *2*(11).
- 13 McCormick, S. A., Causer, J., & Holmes, P. S. (2012). Eye gaze metrics reflect a shared
14 motor representation for action observation and movement imagery. *Brain and*
15 *Cognition*, *80*(1), 83-88.
- 16 Mulder, T. (2007). Motor imagery and action observation: cognitive tools for
17 rehabilitation. *Journal of Neural Transmission*, *114*(10), 1265-1278.
- 18 Munzert, J., Zentgraf, K., Stark, R., & Vaitl, D. (2008). Neural activation in cognitive motor
19 processes: comparing motor imagery and observation of gymnastic movements.
20 *Experimental Brain Research*, *188*(3), 437-444.
- 21 Parr, J. V. V., Vine, S. J., Harrison, N. R., & Wood, G. (2018). Examining the spatiotemporal
22 disruption to gaze when using a myoelectric prosthetic hand. *Journal of motor*
23 *behavior*, *50*(4), 416-425.

- 1 Parr, J. V. V., Vine, S. J., Wilson, M. R., Harrison, N. R., & Wood, G. (2019). Visual
2 attention, EEG alpha power and T7-Fz connectivity are implicated in prosthetic hand
3 control and can be optimized through gaze training. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and*
4 *Rehabilitation*, 16(1), 52.
- 5 Pelosin, E., Avanzino, L., Bove, M., Stramesi, P., Nieuwboer, A., & Abbruzzese, G. (2010).
6 Action observation improves freezing of gait in patients with Parkinson's disease.
7 *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, 24(8), 746-752.
- 8 Rentsch, S., & Rand, M. K. (2014). Eye-hand coordination during visuomotor adaptation
9 with different rotation angles. *PLoS One*, 9(10), e109819.
- 10 Rizzolatti, G., Fogassi, L., & Gallese, V. (2001). Opinion: Neurophysiological mechanisms
11 underlying the understanding and imitation of action. *Nature reviews*.
12 *Neuroscience*, 2(9), 661.
- 13 Romano-Smith, S., Wood, G., Wright, D. J., & Wakefield, C. J. (2018). Simultaneous and
14 alternate action observation and motor imagery combinations improve aiming
15 performance. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 38, 100-106.
- 16 Sailer, U., Flanagan, J. R., & Johansson, R. S. (2005). Eye-hand coordination during learning
17 of a novel visuomotor task. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 25(39), 8833-8842.
- 18 Scott, M., Taylor, S., Chesterton, P., Vogt, S., & Eaves, D. L. (2017). Motor imagery during
19 action observation increases eccentric hamstring force: an acute non-physical
20 intervention. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 1-9.
- 21 Stinear, C. M., Byblow, W. D., Steyvers, M., Levin, O., & Swinnen, S. P. (2006).
22 Kinesthetic, but not visual, motor imagery modulates corticomotor
23 excitability. *Experimental Brain Research*, 168(1-2), 157-164.

- 1 Sun, Y., Wei, W., Luo, Z., Gan, H., & Hu, X. (2016). Improving motor imagery practice with
2 synchronous action observation in stroke patients. *Topics in Stroke*
3 *Rehabilitation, 23*(4), 245-253.
- 4 Taube, W., Lorch, M., Zeiter, S., & Keller, M. (2014). Non-physical practice improves task
5 performance in an unstable, perturbed environment: motor imagery and observational
6 balance training. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8*, 972.
- 7 Vine, S. J., Freeman, P., Moore, L. J., Chandra-Ramanan, R., & Wilson, M. R. (2013).
8 Evaluating stress as a challenge is associated with superior attentional control and
9 motor skill performance: Testing the predictions of the biopsychosocial model of
10 challenge and threat. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 19*(3), 185.
- 11 Werner, S., & Bock, O. (2010). Mechanisms for visuomotor adaptation to left–right reversed
12 vision. *Human Movement Science, 29*(2), 172-178.
- 13 Wilson, M. R., Vine, S. J., Bright, E., Masters, R. S., Defriend, D., & McGrath, J. S. (2011).
14 Gaze training enhances laparoscopic technical skill acquisition and multi-tasking
15 performance: a randomized, controlled study. *Surgical endoscopy, 25*(12), 3731-3739.
- 16 Wilson, M., McGrath, J., Vine, S., Brewer, J., Defriend, D., & Masters, R. (2010).
17 Psychomotor control in a virtual laparoscopic surgery training environment: gaze
18 control parameters differentiate novices from experts. *Surgical Endoscopy, 24*(10),
19 2458-2464.
- 20 Wright, D. J., McCormick, S. A., Williams, J., & Holmes, P. S. (2016). Viewing instructions
21 accompanying action observation modulate corticospinal excitability. *Frontiers in*
22 *Human Neuroscience, 10*, 17.

- 1 Wright, D. J., Williams, J., & Holmes, P. S. (2014). Combined action observation and
- 2 imagery facilitates corticospinal excitability. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8.
- 3 Wright, D. J., Wood, G., Eaves, D. L., Bruton, A. M., Frank, C., & Franklin, Z. C. (2018).
- 4 Corticospinal excitability is facilitated by combined action observation and motor
- 5 imagery of a basketball free throw. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 39, 114-121.