Bond University

Research Repository

The role of frontoparietal cortex across the functional stages of visual search

Remington, Roger W.; Vromen, Joyce M.G. ; Becker, Stefanie I.; Baumann, Oliver; Mattingley, Jason B.

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Bond University research repository.](#)

The role of frontoparietal cortex across the functional stages of visual search

Roger W. Remington[1,2], Joyce M. G. Vromen[3], Stefanie I. Becker[1], Oliver Baumann[6], &

Jason B. Mattingley[1,4,5]

[1] School of Psychology, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia 4072, Queensland, Australia
[2] Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, 75 East River Road, S204 Elliott Hall Minneapolis, MN 55455
[3] Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, The University of Oxford, Oxford OX39DU, UK,
[4] Queensland Brain Institute, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia 4072, Queensland, Australia
[5] Canadian Institute for Advanced Research (CIFAR)
[6] Interdisciplinary Centre for the Artificial Mind & School of Psychology, Bond University, Robina 4226, Queensland, Australia

Corresponding author: Roger W. Remington, Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, 75 East River Road, Minneapolis, MN 55455
Email: remin085@umn.edu

Number of pages: 42 | figures: 7 | tables: 1

Number of words in Abstract: 193 | Introduction: 1422 | Discussion: 2412

Abstract

Areas in frontoparietal cortex have been shown to be active in a range of cognitive tasks and have been proposed to play a key role in goal-driven activities (Dosenbach et al., 2007; Duncan, 2001). Here we examine the role this frontoparietal system plays in visual search. Visual search, like many complex tasks, consists of a sequence of operations: target selection, stimulus-response (SR) mapping, and response execution. We independently manipulated the difficulty of target selection and SR mapping in a novel visual search task that involved identical stimulus displays. Enhanced activity was observed in areas of frontal and parietal cortex during both difficult target selection and SR mapping. Additionally, anterior insula and anterior cingulate cortex showed preferential representation of SR-stage information, whereas the medial frontal gyrus, precuneus, and inferior parietal sulcus showed preferential representation of target selection-stage information. A connectivity analysis revealed dissociable neural circuits underlying visual search. We hypothesize that these circuits regulate distinct mental operations associated with the allocation of spatial attention, stimulus decisions, shifts of task set from selection to SR mapping, and SR mapping. Taken together, the results show frontoparietal involvement in all stages of visual search and a specialization with respect to cognitive operations.

Significance Statement

Goal-directed cognition is critical to key life outcomes including longevity and academic performance. Regions in frontoparietal cortex associated with goal-directed behavior show cross-domain and cross-task overlap, supporting the idea of flexible representation of goal-critical information. Our study demonstrates that flexible frontoparietal processing applies across the functional stages of processing common to all tasks: target selection, SR mapping, and response execution.

Flexible information coding in frontoparietal cortex across the functional stages of

visual search

One of the striking properties of the human brain is its ability to flexibly implement goals that fit a specific context, irrespective of the exact stimuli. For example, we can judge the size of an object or its color depending on instructions or need. Alternatively, we can search among a set of items for our keys, or a folder, or a favorite pen, again depending on our needs. We can even set abstract rules, such as picking out the largest object, or the object different from the rest, and do this regardless of the exact objects. The same flexibility and context specificity apply to our actions. On finding our keys, we might just grab them with our dominant hand, but we might use our non-dominant hand, or simply tell a friend where they are depending on the circumstances.

The brain mechanisms that underlie this flexibility have been associated with a network of regions in frontal and parietal cortex variously labeled as the multiple demand (MD) region (Crittenden et al., 2016; Duncan, 2010), flexible cognitive hub (Cole et al., 2013; Cole & Schneider, 2007), task-set system (Dosenbach et al., 2007; Dosenbach et al., 2006; Nelson et al., 2010) and task-activation cortex (Hampshire & Sharp, 2015; Seeley et al., 2007). We will concentrate principally on MD and potentially larger activation across frontoparietal cortex. MD encompasses frontal regions, including mid-dorsolateral, ventrolateral, and dorsal anterior cingulate regions, as well as regions in parietal cortex, notably the inferior parietal sulcus. MD has been shown to play a central role in goal attainment across a range of domains (Fedorenko, Duncan, & Kanwisher, 2013; Cole et al., 2013; Cole & Schneider, 2007; Crittenden, Mitchell, & Duncan, 2016; Duncan, 2010; Hampshire & Sharp, 2015; Seeley et al., 2007). Current evidence is somewhat conflicting as to whether MD is functionally homogeneous. Some studies find widespread activation throughout this region regardless of specific cognitive demands (e.g., Woolgar et al., 2015).

In the main, though, evidence favors a functional specialization within MD, such that regions respond more to some manipulations than others (Shenhav et al., 2013). For example, Crittenden et al. (2016) manipulated the complexity of response rules that had to be learned and found that one subset of MD, including regions in dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC), inferior frontal sulcus (IFS), and inferior parietal sulcus (IPS), showed strong representations of task rules. Another subset of MD regions including the anterior insula (AI), anterior PFC, and dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), showed weaker rule representation. The results of Crittenden et al. (2016) suggest that patterns of activity within MD reflect a highly interconnected network of functionally separate brain areas whose activity depends on the exchange of information specific to the demands of a given task (see also, Molinari et al., 2012). Moreover, localized regions of frontal cortex have been shown to be preferentially active in manipulations of response complexity, notably bilateral activity in dlPFC, dorsolateral premotor cortex (dlPMC), anterior cingulate (AC), superior parietal (SP) and inferior parietal (IP) cortex, and precuneus (e.g., Schumacher, Cole, & D'Esposito, 2007; Schumacher, Elston, & D'Esposito, 2003; Jiang & Kanwisher, 2003).

Our interest here is in the role of MD, and more broadly frontoparietal cortex in visual search. Visual search is the process of finding a pre-defined target embedded in a set of irrelevant distractor items. In daily life it could be looking for one's keys among papers, phones, folders, and loose change on the desk, spotting threats in airport baggage screening, or locating tumors in medical images. Visual search can be functionally decomposed into a target selection stage, followed by a stimulus-response (SR) mapping stage. Each stage can be further decomposed into more elementary cognitive operations. During target selection, objects are attended to in sequence and compared with the properties that define the target, such as a particular feature (e.g., red), a conjunction of features (e.g., red circles), or a semantic attribute (e.g., animals). Thus, in the target selection stage, shifts of spatial attention

alternate with stimulus decision making until an item matching the target specification is found. Once found, the task rules that define the target must be replaced by those that dictate the response, so that the SR mapping stage can be completed. Such switching requires mental operations associated with executive control. In addition, the SR stage itself requires executive control in the application of response rules along with preparation and execution of the motor response. Visual search then has potential for the involvement of frontoparietal cortex in the application of two separate sets of task rules to complete the task; rules that specify what distinguishes targets from distractors, along with a second set that defines the response (e.g., find the blue diagonal line then press the left button if it is angled left, the right button otherwise). Since both stages share a common dependency on task-specific rules, stimulus decisions in target selection may share neural resources with response decisions in SR mapping. However, the application of task rules differ in the two stages. A stimulus decision involves matching target specification against an internal representation of an attended object, while SR mapping rules specify a motor response. Object representation and response planning likely invoke separate neural systems. Thus, it may be possible to observe localized activity in MD, and frontoparietal cortex more broadly, attributable to only one of these stages, both stages, or localized preferences for some operations over others. Here we investigate this issue by independently varying the difficulty of target detection and SR mapping.

As noted above, the target selection stage consists of repeated comparisons of attended objects to target specifications followed by voluntary shifts of attention for non-matches. Consistent with shifts of spatial attention, imaging studies of visual search (Makino et al., 2004; Müller et al., 2003; Nobre et al., 2003) typically find activity in frontoparietal areas associated with the dorsal attention network (DAN), which underlies the endogenous orienting of spatial attention (Corbetta & Shulman, 2003). For example, Nobre, Coull, Walsh,

& Frith (2003) compared brain activity when subjects searched for targets that differed by a single feature or a feature conjunction, both during efficient and inefficient search. Search is efficient when search times are constant with increasing number of distractors, inefficient when times increase. The main effect of search efficiency revealed activity in the right and left intraparietal sulci (R IP, L IP), the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (R dlPFC), and right and left ventrolateral prefrontal cortex (R vlPFC, L vlPFC). Similar results have been found in studies using cues to direct spatial attention in advance to better isolate activity associated with spatial attention (Müller et al., 2003; Makino, Yokosawa, Takeda, and Kumada, 2004). While a relatively consistent pattern of activity in portions of the DAN has been observed for attention shifts during visual search, the existing literature is less clear about brain activity underlying other mental operations in target selection, such as stimulus comparison, or response processing. Activity in portions of frontal cortex not associated with response mapping, especially L PFC, has been attributed to target identification (Müller et al., 2003). A firm association between regions within MD and specific control actions in visual search has yet to be established owing, in part, to the difficulty of inference from different paradigms and manipulations. The present study independently manipulates target selection and SR mapping difficulty using the exact same stimulus displays within the same paradigm to provide a clearer picture of how task rules operate at two functional levels of visual search. This should enable a clearer picture of specialization within the Multiple Demand System and the role of frontoparietal cortex in visual search.

Participants in the present experiment were presented with search arrays and had to select two targets (easy or difficult), apply an SR mapping rule (easy or difficult), and execute a response. Easy target detection consisted of a 'pop-out' search, in which targets were two uniquely colored items against distractor items in a different, uniform color (see Figure 1). The difficult detection required selection of one of the uniquely colored items

along with an item in the background color, ignoring the more salient but irrelevant uniquely

colored item. Easy SR mapping consisted of a single-component mapping rule, whereas

difficult mapping consisted of two components. We used multi-voxel pattern analysis

(MVPA) because of its sensitivity in discriminating between experimental conditions (K. A.

Norman et al., 2006), and employed a well-established functional connectivity analysis to

assess MD connectivity changes (Friston et al., 1997; O'Reilly et al., 2012). We also

employed a whole-brain univariate analysis to assess directional amplitude involvement of

non-MD regions in selection and SR mapping. Because the search task we developed allowed

for independently varying demands on target selection and SR mapping under identical visual

input, differences in brain activity could arise only from differences in the complexity of

target selection or SR mapping, and not from differences in the visual displays themselves.

Materials & Methods

Participants

Twenty-three right-handed participants (16 females, mean $\pm$ SD age, 24 $\pm$ 3.2 years)

were recruited for the study. They provided informed written consent and were reimbursed

for their time ($20/1.5h). Of these twenty-three individuals, data from 2 participants were

excluded due to excessive head movement (>10 mm translation and/or 6° rotation), and data

from another 3 participants were excluded because their accuracy in the behavioral task was

below our a-priori criterion of 70% correct. The study was approved by The University of

Queensland Human Research Ethics Committee.

Experimental task and procedure

Participants were scanned while performing a visual search task that included three

operations: target selection, SR mapping, and response execution (Figure 1A). On each trial,

participants were required to: (1) select two target stimuli from a visual search array; (2)

apply the correct SR rule to map the targets onto the correct response, and; (3) execute a motor response via an appropriate key press. The task was organized in mini blocks of four trials. At the start of each mini-block, target selection and SR instructions were displayed on the screen for 6s, followed by a sequence of 4 trials consisting of fixation for 1s, search display for 1.5s, and a blank screen for 1.5s. Responses were recorded from the onset of the search display until the offset of the blank screen (3s). Critically, difficulty of target selection and SR mapping were independently manipulated whilst visual input was identical across conditions.

Apparatus and Stimuli

The task was created using the Psychophysics Toolbox (version 3.0.8) (Brainard, 1997; Pelli, 1997) for MATLAB (MathWorks, release 2012b). Responses were recorded with an MR-compatible fiber-optic 2-button response box and stimuli were projected onto a screen at the top-end of the scanner bore that was viewed through a mirror mounted to the head coil.

We created 96 search displays that consisted of 9 bars arranged in a 3 x 3 grid and subtended a visual angle of ~3° (see Figure 1A and 1B). Six bars in each display were tilted at a 45° angle (three leftward and rightward each) and all colored green or blue with equal probability (distractors). The remaining three bars in each display were oriented horizontally or vertically (equiprobably[1]) and colored red (RGB values = 247,0,0), green (24,145,0), and blue (0,50,254). Across search displays, color, orientation, and location were controlled. Stimuli were rendered on a light gray background.

Experimental conditions

Task-difficulty was manipulated independently for target selection and SR mapping, resulting in easy vs. difficult conditions. Targets in the easy target selection conditions were two uniquely colored items that popped-out of the display because of their distinct color (e.g.

---

[1] With the restriction that they could not all three be of the same orientation.

red and blue amongst green distractors; see Figure 1A and 1B, top row). Targets in the difficult selection condition consisted of one of the pop-out items (red) along with a distractor-colored item of the specified orientation. Conditions of difficult search, thus, required effortful search and suppression of the salient distractor (see red and green target in Figure 1B, middle row). For SR mapping, the easy conditions required only that participants press the "Yes" key if the two uniquely colored bars had the same orientation, or the "No" key if they were oriented differently. In the difficult SR mapping condition, responses were contingent on both color and orientation; participants pressed the "Yes" key if the display contained either a red, horizontal pop-out colored bar and a green vertical pop-out bar OR a red, vertical pop-out colored bar and a blue, horizontal pop-out colored bar (and otherwise the "No" key). We included a control condition in which participants had to determine whether a central bar was tilted leftward or rightward (in identical displays). Participants were tested in 4 conditions: (1) **Control**; (2) **Easy** (Easy Selection / Easy SR); (3) **Selection** (Difficult Selection / Easy SR); (4) **SR** (Easy Selection / Difficult SR). We did not test the Difficult Selection / Difficult SR, as MD activity would likely be similar to that of the SR condition, and we were not interested in how the difficulty manipulations combined (additively or otherwise). Instead, our analyses focused on activations in the Selection and SR conditions. For similar reasons, the MVPA analysis assessed the regions of frontoparietal cortex by contrasting SR and Selection against the Control condition, not the Easy condition. As noted above MD activity is widespread across tasks. The Easy conditions would, therefore, likely provide a noisy background against which to detect unique contributions of frontoparietal locations that distinguish SR and Selection.

Procedure

The four conditions were interleaved using mini blocks (of 22s duration each). Sixteen blocks (four of each condition) were interleaved according to a Latin-square

procedure in each run for a total of six runs (Figure 1 panel C). Each visual search display

was shown once per condition and display order was determined by a random permutation of

all displays. The total number of trials was 384 and the scanning session lasted about 50

minutes. Before transferring into the scanner participants completed a training block of 96

trials (24 of each condition; 15minutes).[2]

Figure 1. The visual search task was conducted using a block design with four main

conditions: *Control, Easy, SR,* and *Selection.* **A**. A mini block consisted of task instructions

and four search trials. Displayed are instructions for the Easy condition ('do the two pop-out

colored targets have the same orientation?'). **B**. The shortened instructions for the SR ('are

there a red, horizontal pop-out colored and a green vertical pop-out colored bar OR are there

a red, vertical pop-out colored and a blue, horizontal pop-out colored bar?'), Selection ('are

there a red pop-out colored and a green or blue background-colored bar of the same

orientation?'), and Control ('is the central bar tilted rightward?'). The correct answer in each

---

[2] At the end of each trial, accuracy feedback was provided. If a participant's accuracy rate
was below 70% in any of the four conditions, participants had to complete the training block
a second time. The only other divergence in procedure from the scanner block was that
instructions were displayed for 12 seconds.

condition for the example search display is presented rightmost. Colored instruction borders are added to the figure for clarity but were not present in the experiment. **C**. The experimental time course is depicted as an alternating block design with each run consisting of 16 interleaved blocks (4 of each condition; blue = Control, yellow = Easy, red = SR, green = Selection) according to a Latin-square procedure.

fMRI acquisition

Anatomical and functional images were acquired using a 3T Siemens Trio MRI scanner (Erlangen, Germany) and a 32-channel head coil. Functional T2*-weighted images were acquired parallel to the AC–PC plane using a GRE (gradient recalled echo) EPI (echo planar imaging) sequence (TR = 1.8s, TE = 30ms, FA = 80°, FOV = 192 × 192, matrix = 64 × 64, in-plane resolution = 3 × 3 mm). Each volume consisted of 29 slices with a thickness of 3 mm and a 0.3-mm inter-slice gap. At the start of the session, we collected a T1-weighted anatomical image using an MP-RAGE sequence (TR = 1.9s, TE = 2.32ms, FA = 9°, FOV = 230 × 230 × 230, resolution = 0.9mm^3). Each run consisted of 196 volumes. The first 3 images of each run were discarded to account for T1 equilibration effects.

fMRI preprocessing

Images were preprocessed and analyzed with Brain Voyager (version 20.2; Brain Innovation, Maastricht, The Netherlands) and custom-written MATLAB code using the BVQX Toolbox v08d (Weber, 2014). Images were slice-scan time corrected, re-aligned to the first image, and coregistered with the structural images. Finally, data were normalized to the standard Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) template. For the univariate analyses and connectivity (PPI) analyses, data were smoothed with an 8mm full-width-half-maximum Gaussian kernel. For the MVPA, unsmoothed data were used.

ROI selection

To minimize any theory-driven bias in ROI selection, a single run from each participant's data was selected (equiprobably from runs 1-6) to compute a functional localizer

contrast (this run was excluded from subsequent MVPA and connectivity analyses). The localizer contrast showed voxel clusters (minimum size of 10 voxels) where BOLD activity averaged over the SR, selection, and intermediate conditions exceeded that in the control condition (FDR q: .01). The contrast yielded twelve activation clusters, all in frontal and parietal cortex. We computed the centre of gravity coordinates for each cluster (see Table 1, grey highlighted regions/ coordinates) and created a spherical ROI with a radius of 6mm around each.[3]

The majority of identified ROIs were similar to those identified in previous studies (Dosenbach et al., 2007; Duncan, 2010; Jiang & Kanwisher, 2003; Wen et al., 2018).s Table 1 lists the coordinates of ROIs, with those marked ++ corresponding to ROIs from Duncan (2010) and Dosenbach, et al. (2007).   We included an additional 4 ROIs based on MD coordinates reported previously (Duncan, 2010) that were not covered by the twelve ROIs we identified with the functional localizer. Together these sixteen ROIs covered the MD regions that were studied in previous research, and our procedure ensured that other regions with significant task-activation were not excluded on a-priori theoretical grounds.

---

[3] Peak voxel coordinates for the single run localizer were representative of all six runs with the distance between the peak coordinates observed for a single run and those observed when using all six runs being less than 3 voxels (x mean: 1.8, y mean: 2.6, z mean: 1.8).

Table 1. Regions of interest selected for analysis of fMRI data.

ROI name	ROI coordinates			t-value (FDR-corrected)	Duncan (2010)			Dosenbach (2007)		
	x	y	z		x	y	z	x	y	z
L AI / FO [++]	-32	21	3	6.158	-35	18	2	-35	14	5
R AI / FO [++]	32	23	0	7.158	35	18	2	36	16	4
ACC [+]	0	31	24	_	0	31	22	_	_	_
L MFG	-24	4	52	7.303	_	_	_	_	_	_
R MFG	24	4	52	5.843	_	_	_	_	_	_
L IPS [++]	-31	-50	48	10.686	-37	-56	41	-31	-59	42
R IPS [++]	31	-49	48	9.176	37	56	41	30	-61	39
L lFOG [+]	-21	43	-10	_	-21	43	-10	-25	-44	-12
R lFOG [+]	21	43	-10	_	21	43	-10	25	-44	-12
L IFS (dlPFC) [++]	-46	32	29	4.474	-41	23	29	-43	22	34
R IFS (dlPFC) [++]	42	39	22	4.595	41	23	29	43	22	34
L PrG [++]	-43	5	30	3.891	_	_	_	-41	3	36
R PrG [++]	48	9	28	6.720	_	_	_	41	3	36
Pre SMA [+]	0	18	50	_	0	18	50	_	_	_
L precuneus	-29	-71	34	10.686	_	_	_	-9	-72	37
R precuneus	30	-65	35	9.176	_	_	_	10	69	39

Abbreviations: AI/FO = anterior insula and adjacent frontal operculum; ACC = anterior cingulate; MFG = medial frontal gyrus; IPS = intraparietal sulcus; lFOG = Lateral Frontal-Orbital Gyrus; IFS = inferior frontal sulcus; dlPFC = dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; PrG = Precentral Gyrus; pre SMA = presupplementary motor area. ++ ROIs identified in our functional localizer that were similar to ROIs identified in Duncan, 2010 or Dosenbach,

2007. + ROIs that were identified in Duncan, 2010, but that failed to reach significance in our functional localizer.

Analyses

In line with previous studies (Woolgar et al., 2015) we used MVPA to assess condition differences in the pattern of activity across voxels because of its sensitivity in discriminating between experimental conditions (K. A. Norman et al., 2006). Subsequently, we employed a well-established functional connectivity analysis (Friston et al., 1997; O'Reilly et al., 2012) to assess whether multi-voxel activity pattern differences across the Selection and SR manipulations were accompanied by a differential pattern of connectivity between MD regions. Finally, we conducted a whole-brain univariate analysis to assess the directional amplitude of the effects and involvement of non-MD regions in Selection and SR mapping.

MVPA analyses. MVPA was performed using BrainVoyager (version 20.2; Brain Innovation, Maastricht, The Netherlands) to assess whether voxel activity patterns for different levels of complexity in the target selection and SR mapping stages were distinguishable. In a first step, GLM analyses were performed on each individual's data (5 runs), with separate regressors for each condition. Each regressor was modeled as a rectangular function from the onset of the first search display in each block to the end of the fourth trial and convolved with the canonical HRF. We derived t-values for each voxel in each ROI per mini-block. Values were z-scored across all voxels to reduce any impact of small differences in univariate activity between selection and SR conditions on MVPA results.

The pattern discrimination between tasks was then estimated using pairwise classification between SR and Control, and Selection and Control, for each participant. We used a support vector machine (SVM) with a linear kernel and optimized cost parameter C in

a level-split procedure. The classifier was trained on 4 runs and tested on a different run. This procedure was repeated five times on a leave-one-out basis (fivefold cross-validation) such that each run was used for testing once. Classification accuracies for each ROI were averaged across splits and participants to yield a single classification accuracy.

To assess whether classification accuracy was significantly higher than chance, we ran 200 permutation tests per split with condition labels randomly shuffled and identified the 95th percentile of this distribution. We then assessed whether pattern discrimination with intact labels exceeded the observed 95th percentile of this distribution. Finally, classification accuracy for SR and selection conditions were compared using paired, two-sided t-tests.

Connectivity analyses. Connectivity analyses were performed using a standard psychophysiological interaction analysis (PPI; Friston et al., 1997) for the contrast SR versus Selection to compare the patterns of activity in MD to SR and selection difficulty manipulations (using the PPI plug-in for BrainVoyager). The source regions in the preprocessed and smoothed data were assessed for ROIs that showed a difference in classification accuracy in the MVPA analysis for SR and Selection. The potential receiving voxels were restricted to the ROIs introduced in Table 1. Connectivity strength was calculated across mini blocks.

The unique explanatory power of the PPI was assessed by first extracting the time series from the first-level GLM for each source ROI and convolving it with the vector representing the contrast of SR versus selection. Subsequently we ran a second-level GLM with all three of the task difficulty variables testing the unique explanatory power of the PPI. Changes in connectivity between SR and Selection are indicated when PPI regressor values differ significantly from zero (FDR q: .01, minimum cluster size 20 voxels).

Whole-brain univariate analyses. Finally, to test for activations uniquely associated with either target selection or SR mapping in other brain areas, we also conducted a standard whole-brain analysis with the contrasts SR minus Easy and Selection minus Easy (threshold of p-FDR < 0.01; minimum cluster size: 15 continuous voxels).

Results

Behavioral results

Mean response times (RTs) in the visual search task differed significantly across conditions, $F(3,17) = 152.02$, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .96$ (see Figure 2). Paired, two-tailed *t*-tests showed that RTs in all conditions differed significantly from one another: RTs in the Control condition were faster than those in the Easy condition (Easy Selection/ Easy SR) ($t(19) = 10.89$, $p < .001$), which in turn were faster than those in the SR condition (Easy Selection/Difficult SR) ($t(19) = 9.78$, $p < .001$), which in turn were faster than those in the Selection condition (Difficult Selection/Easy SR) ($t(19) = 3.10$, $p < .001$). Mean error percentages are also shown in Figure 2 (black circles). There was no evidence of a speed-accuracy trade-off.

Figure 2. Mean RTs (bars) differed significantly between all conditions (Control < Easy < SR < Selection). Mean error percentages (right-sided vertical axis) are plotted as black circles. Error bars represent the standard errors of the means and may be smaller than the plotting symbol. ** $p < 0.001$.

MVPA results

       Most of the ROIs showed significant decoding of task difficulty (for SR vs. Control as well as Selection vs. Control) with the average classification accuracy of increased task difficulty over all ROIs being 75%. Figure 3 depicts the mean classification accuracy for SR vs. Control (red bars) and Selection vs. Control (green bars), and the 95th percentile of the null distribution (grey line) that was used as the criterion for significance. All regions decoded both difficulty of target selection and difficulty of SR mapping, although some regions showed significantly better decoding for one condition or the other.

       To compare classification accuracy for Selection and SR, we conducted a repeated-measures ANOVA with search stage (Selection vs. SR) and ROI as within-groups factors. There was a significant effect of ROI ($F(8,9) = 4.642$, $p = 0.017$) and a significant interaction between stage of processing and ROI ($F(8,9) = 4.199$, $p = 0.016$). A series of follow-up t-tests showed that one set of ROIs – specifically the AI/FO and ACC – showed comparatively better decoding for the task pair that differed in the SR dimension (see Figure 3, left cluster: AI/FO = 77% (SR) vs. 70% (Selection), $p = .009$; ACC = 74% (SR) vs, 67% (Selection), $p = 0.013$. MFG, IPF, and the precuneus showed comparatively stronger decoding for Selection (Figure 3, central cluster): MFG region = 71% (SR) vs. 77% (Selection), $p = .010$; IPS = 74% (SR) vs 81% (Selection), $p = 0.007$. For the precuneus, classification accuracy was lower for SR than Selection, 76% (SR) vs 81% (Selection), $p = 0.038$. The remaining ROIs (IFS, FC, pre-SMA) did not show a significant difference in decoding strength for SR and Selection (see Figure 3, right cluster; IFS: $p = .595$; FC: $p = 0.184$; pre-SMA: $p = .667$; rPFC: $p = .470$). The only frontoparietal ROI that did not show significant decoding for either task pair was the lFOG.

Figure 3. Task decoding in selected frontal and parietal ROIs. Classification accuracy for task decoding is plotted for difficult SR (red bars) and difficult Selection (green bars) versus the Control. ROIs with reliably better decoding of SR-related information are shown on the left; ROIs with significantly better decoding of selection-related information are shown in the middle; and ROIs that showed comparable decoding for SR and Selection are displayed on the right. The dark grey line running horizontally through the plot denotes the 95th percentile of the chance distribution. ⌐¯¯⌐ denotes a significant difference (corrected p < .05) in the pairwise comparison between SR and Selection classification accuracy.

To assess whether RT differences between conditions influenced the MVPA results, we regressed classification accuracy on RT for each participant and extracted the slopes (β) and intercepts (α). Critically, classification accuracy at intercept – i.e. in the absence of any RT differences between conditions – was above chance level for SR and Selection (Figure 4A). Specifically, for the SR-Control and Selection-Control pairs, the classification accuracy at intercept was 64% and 63% respectively. Two-tailed, Wilcoxon signed rank tests showed

that these percentages were significantly greater than chance (ps < 0.05), thus confirming reliable task decoding across conditions in the absence of RT differences.

The regression slopes provided evidence that RT moderately, but significantly, modulated classification accuracy for target selection (Figure 4B). Specifically, for the SR-Control and Selection-Control pairs, the regression slopes were 0.014 and 0.013, respectively. The former did not differ significantly from zero ($p = 0.103$), whereas the latter did ($p = 0.024$). Since the mean RT difference between the two conditions of interest was around 100ms, this suggests that RT differences might have inflated the difference in classification accuracy by ~1.3%. Thus, RT differences between conditions cannot account for the large and reliable effects observed in our MVPA analyses.

Figure 4. Mean parameter estimates of α and β after regression of classification accuracy differences (SR minus Control and Selection minus Control) on absolute reaction time differences. **A**. At the intercept (i.e. in the absence of RT differences) the mean value of α for SR (red) and Selection (green) was significantly greater than chance (50%). **B**. Mean value of β for SR and Selection; only the latter was significantly greater than zero. * p < 0.05.

PPI results

The PPI analysis showed a change in functional connectivity between several ROIs for the SR and Selection conditions (see Figure 5). Specifically, connectivity between the ACC and right MFG (1167 voxels significant, $t(17)= 2.783$, corrected $p = 0.015$) was stronger during SR and weaker during Selection. Similarly, connectivity between the ACC and PrG (left PrG: 1309 voxels significant, $t(17)= 3.075$, corrected $p = 0.008$; right PrG: 1309 voxels significant, $t(17)= 2.632$, corrected $p = 0.019$) was stronger during SR and reduced during Selection. The opposite pattern, with relatively stronger functional connectivity during Selection and reduced connectivity during SR, was observed between the PrG and the right precuneus (1238 voxels, $t(17)= -2.786$, corrected $p = 0.016$).

Figure 5. Increased functional connectivity between ROIs during Selection (green lines) and SR (red lines). For Selection, increased connectivity was observed bilaterally between PrG and the right precuneus. For SR, increased connectivity was observed bilaterally between ACC and PrG, as well as ACC and right MFG. ACC and MFG are depicted in red to denote their preferential role in SR, precuneus in green to denote its preferential role in Selection, and left and right PrG are rendered in green with red lines to denote their roles in both SR and Selection.

Whole-brain univariate analyses

For Selection (difficult target selection > easy), the whole-brain univariate analysis revealed four regions of gray matter activation (see Fig. 6), centered bilaterally on the

precuneus (left: -21, -55, 52; 522 voxels; right: 18, -55, 52; 1906 voxels; Brodmann area 7)

and the middle occipital gyri (left: -33, -88, 4; 3788 voxels; right: 30, -91, 10; 7179 voxels;

Brodmann area 19).

Figure 6. For Selection (difficult target selection > easy), the whole-brain univariate analysis

revealed four regions of gray matter activation, centered bilaterally on the precuneus (left: -

21, -55, 52; right: 18, -55, 52) and the middle occipital gyri (left: -33, -88, 4; right: 30, -91,

10). The rendered image shows the brain from a posterior viewpoint.

For SR (difficult SR > easy), the whole-brain univariate analysis revealed eight

regions of gray matter activation (see Fig. 7) in frontal, parietal and occipital cortex. Frontal

activation included the bilateral anterior MFG (left: -37, 59, -11; 12850 voxels; right: 48, 50,

-20; 12665 voxels; Brodmann areas 10/11), a more posterior portion of the left MFG (-36, 23,

31; 2340 voxels; Brodmann area 9), the middle frontal gyrus (6, 35, 43; 19952 voxels;

Brodmann area 8), and the right claustrum (30, 23, -5; 1376 voxels). Parietal and occipital

activation included the bilateral inferior parietal lobule (left: -37, 64, 46; 2021 voxels; right:

48, -55, 43; 9986 voxels; Brodmann areas 7/40), and the cuneus (-6, -70, 31; 6187 voxels;

Brodmann area 7). Overall, the whole-brain analysis confirmed the pattern of results

observed in previous studies, implicating parietal and occipital cortex in target selection, and

frontal and parietal regions in SR.

Figure 7. For SR (difficult SR > easy), the whole-brain univariate analysis revealed eight

regions of gray matter activation in frontal, parietal and occipital cortex. Frontal activation

included the bilateral anterior medial frontal gyri (left: -37, 59, -11; right: 48, 50, -20), the left

posterior medial frontal gyrus (-36, 23, 31), the middle frontal gyrus (6, 35, 43), and the right

claustrum (30, 23, -5). Parietal and occipital activation included the bilateral inferior parietal

lobule (left: -37, 64, 46; right: 48, -55, 43), and the cuneus (-6, -70, 31). The rendered image

shows the brain from an anterior viewpoint.

Discussion

Here we have shown that during visual search, areas in frontal cortex lying within the region associated with MD flexibly represent information not only relevant to SR decisions, but also to target selection. The results of the MVPA analysis suggest that all MD regions represented Selection-related information when target selection was demanding, and SR-mapping information when the SR stage of processing was demanding. Moreover, some MD regions showed relatively stronger representations for target selection, others for SR mapping. The systems underlying target selection appear to involve circuits that span frontal and parietal areas, while preferential activity for difficult SR mappings involved primarily frontal cortical areas. A demanding target selection stage was associated more strongly with activity within a cluster of regions consisting of the MFG and IPS, whereas a demanding SR mapping stage showed strong activity within a more ventral cluster consisting of the AI/FO and ACC. Additionally, our connectivity analysis identified two separate circuits, one consisting of correlated activity between left and right PrG and the right precuneus, the other between left and right PrG, ACC, and right MFG. Importantly, our activation patterns cannot be attributed to changes in display characteristics as we held the visual search stimuli constant across conditions. Instead, they reflect differences in the nature of the demands imposed by selection difficulty and SR difficulty.

Overall, the patterns of activity observed in response to SR and selection difficulty correspond to the functional task analysis of visual search we presented in the Introduction, and are broadly consistent with existing literature. To relate active regions to possible cognitive operations in visual search we input coordinates of our ROIs into NeuroSynth (Yarkoni et al., 2011) to identify studies finding activity within 6 mm of the centroid of each ROI. For target selection difficulty, the univariate analysis in Figure 6 showed heightened

activity in precuneus and occipital sites when targets were less salient. Occipital and parietal activity has previously been observed with shifts of spatial attention in visual search (Nobre, Coull, Walsh, & Frith, 2003; Müller et al., 2003; Makino, Yokosawa, Takeda, and Kumada, 2004) and forms part of the DAN (dorsal attention network), a neural orienting network underlying voluntary shifts of attention (e.g., Corbetta & Shulman, 2001). Heightened activity in precuneus has been found with shifts of attention between object features (Becker et al., 2014; Nagahama et al., 1999, 2001), consistent with the cognitive operations needed to iteratively match attended items to target finding features. Activity in the precuneus has also been found in tasks requiring mental imagery or episodic memory retrieval (Becker et al., 2014; Bray et al., 2015; for a review see, Cavanna, 2007; Cavanna & Trimble, 2006; Giesbrecht et al., 2003; Makino et al., 2004). In the MVPA analysis, activation in MFG and IPS led to better classification rates for target selection than SR mapping. Our MFG coordinates put it close to the frontal eye fields (FEF), which are also part of the DAN (Corbetta & Shulman, 2001), just outside the confidence intervals given by Paus (1996), but well within the range of locations active during shifts of spatial attention (Giesbrecht et al., 2003; Jiang, 2004; Makino et al., 2004; Müller et al., 2003; Nobre et al., 2003; Woldorff et al., 2004). In summary, the function associated with active locations in the univariate, MVPA, and connectivity analyses correspond to the cognitive operations associated with repeated shifts of attention and comparison of attended items to target specifications.

For SR mapping difficulty, the univariate analysis revealed a more anterior pattern of activation involving prefrontal sites and activity in supplementary motor cortex, regions associated with response processing (Boettiger, 2005; Cavina-Pratesi, 2006; Jiang, 2004; Jiang & Kanwisher, 2003; Johnson-Frey et al., 2003; Molinari et al., 2013). The MVPA analysis classification accuracy was higher for SR mapping than target selection in ACC and

AI/FO. Regions in ACC and AI/FO have been strongly linked to executive and task control (Dosenbach et al., 2007; Dosenbach et al., 2006; Nelson et al., 2010).

Perhaps the most novel outcome of the experiment is the identification of dissociable circuits underlying SR mapping and target selection difficulty seen in the connectivity analysis. Although the majority of ROIs within MD were active in decoding both selection and SR difficulty, the connectivity analysis tells a slightly more nuanced story by examining correlated patterns of firing between regions. Difficult target selection revealed highly correlated activity patterns between the precuneus and bilateral Precentral Gyrus (PrG). Difficult SR mapping revealed correlations involving bilateral PrG, this time with anterior cingulate (ACC). The ACC also showed correlated activity with the left medial frontal gyrus (L MFG). It is premature to draw strong conclusions about the role of these circuits in visual search, especially since each location has been associated with multiple functions in studies with varying results, stimulus material, and paradigms. Nonetheless, when examined in light of previous studies the connectivity does suggest that we are dealing with two separate control circuits, one for attention and stimulus decisions, the other for response planning, in which task rules are applied separately in the two stages of visual search.

Evidence for two separate control circuits involved in manipulating and applying task rules comes from studies showing that regions in close proximity to our PrG coordinates are active in tasks that require manipulation of task goals, especially the instantiation and shifting of task set. Bilateral PrG activity has been observed in studies that require a shift in task set, as for example transitioning from one stimulus to another in dual-task paradigms (Jiang, 2004), learning SR mapping rules (Boettiger, 2005), and task-switching (Nagahama et al., 2001). These regions are also active when observing objects being manipulated (Johnson-Frey et al., 2003), suggesting that they participate in planning upcoming actions.

Although both L PrG and R PrG activity has been observed, the two appear to deal with different aspects of goal-driven behavior. Unilateral activity in R PrG has been observed in difficult working memory conditions (Bray et al., 2015) and shifts of attention (Dosenbach et al., 2007; Dosenbach et al., 2006; Müller et al., 2003). Müller et al. (2003), for example, cued target location using circles around one, two, or four items in a search array. Participants were instructed to shift attention to the indicated region. The authors found transient activity in coordinates near our R PrG (x, y, z = 36, -3, 33) shortly after the cue was presented, as well as immediately on presentation of the search array. No activity of L PrG was reported. Dosenbach et al. (2006) analyzed fMRI data from 10 tasks to identify activity within the Default Mode Network (for a review see, Raichle, 2015) associated with the start of a trial, sustained throughout a trial, and in response to error feedback. They observed increased activity in a region close to the coordinates of our R PrG (x, y, z = 42, 2, 37) only in the start-cue condition. They argue that regions active in the start-cue condition reflect the instantiation of attentional goals. Activation in R PrG has also been shown to increase in the incongruent condition of the Stroop task (Pardo et al., 1990; x, y, z = 46, 7, 21), reinforcing the idea that the R PrG is closely involved in goal-directed attention. Given this, it is reasonable to hypothesize that the connection between the precuneus and R PrG mediates attention shifts in target selection.

Unilateral activity in regions corresponding to our L PrG suggests a role in task set, but specifically verbal working memory. Hanakawa et al. (2002), for example, had participants engage in a verbal, numeric, or spatial incrementing task. They observed activity in an area corresponding to our L PrG for numeric (x, y, z = -56, 8, 46) and verbal (x, y, z = -56, 4, 42) addition tasks, as well as a verbal rehearsal task (x, y, z = -64, 0, 40), but not for a spatial task. Giesbrecht et al. (2003) used letters to cue either location or color and found activity in areas corresponding to our L PrG (x, y, z = -49, -4, 30; -34, 8, 50; -45, 8, 35; -45, 4, 30), but

not right PrG. Molinari et al. (2013) found activity in areas corresponding to L PrG (x, y, z = -48, 6, 28; -49, 6, 30) when participants were instructed to actively monitor functional hand movements. Similar results were observed by Dinstein et al. (2007) when participants were instructed to either imitate (x, y, z = -39, -2, 29) or simply observe motor actions (x, y, z = -45, -3, 32). Interestingly, they also found that repetition of a motor response led to reduced L PrG activity (x, y, z = -43, 0, 26), leading them to argue that activity in this area was related to motor memory, which would also be consistent with planning upcoming task-appropriate actions. One possibility is that the connection between the precuneus and L PrG mediates matching between an attended stimulus against a set of task rules specifying target properties. The match may even involve a verbal (phonetic) representation of task rules.

In the SR mapping condition, the connection of the ACC with both L PrG and R PrG appears to be part of an executive control circuit, involved in the transition from target detection to response mapping. The ACC has long been associated with cognitive control (see, Bush et al., 2000 for a review; Fellows & Farah, 2005) in Stroop (Pardo et al., 1990) and task switching (Johnston et al., 2007; Liston et al., 2006). Evidence suggests that ACC represents and maintains current goals at an abstract, task-independent level (Lopez-Garcia et al., 2015; Munakata et al., 2011), consistent with the proposal that the PrG and ACC together monitor progress toward an active goal (Benn et al., 2014). Other accounts, however, posit that control is not achieved through such strategic monitoring, but through conflict monitoring (Botvinick et al., 2004; Carter et al., 2000; Shenhav et al., 2013, 2016). In either case, it is reasonable to posit that the ACC-PrG connection represents a cognitive control circuit that supports the transition from target selection to response planning.

It could be argued that related to its executive control function the ACC activity in our study reflects error monitoring. We cannot completely rule out this account. Our mini-block

design does not allow us to eliminate error trials without eliminating the entire 4-item mini-block, which would result in an underpowered analysis. Nonetheless, aspects of the data strongly suggest that error monitoring cannot be the primary driver of ACC activity in the MVPA. Although the ACC does provide weak predictive value in the Selection condition it shows substantial preference for SR. Despite this, error rates in Selection, though a little less than in SR (black dots in Figure 2), are 10-15% higher than in Control. If error rate differences were the primary drive than we should have expected to see a roughly equivalent role for ACC in SR and Selection. In the univariate analysis, which is less sensitive than MVPA to error asymmetries, we see the same pattern: ACC activation in the SR, but not Selection condition. The pattern suggests that both the MVPA and univariate analyses reflect functional specialization within ACC that goes beyond error monitoring. The functional specialization we find, moreover, is consistent with existing literature on the role of ACC in executive control more broadly, not simply error monitoring.

The connection between the ACC and R MFG may at first glance seem odd in the context of the SR mapping circuit, given its position within accepted bounds for FEF (e.g., Giesbrecht et al., 2003; Jiang & Kanwisher, 2003). However, our R MFG is in the region of supplementary motor cortex shown to be active in conditions requiring incompatible or unusual response mapping (Bray et al., 2015; Jiang, 2004; Jiang & Kanwisher, 2003; Schumacher & Jiang, 2003), as well as spatial (but not verbal) working memory (Giesbrecht et al., 2003; Hanakawa, 2002; Majerus et al., 2016; Nagahama et al., 2001). Hanakawa et al. (2002), for example, found R MFG (x, y, z = 20, 0, 66) involvement only when subjects mentally transitioned from one cell in a matrix to another, not for a numeric or verbal incrementing task. Similarly, Giesbrecht et al. (2003) presented a numeric cue that indicated either the location or color of a target. Activity in R MFG (x, y, z = 23, 0, 50) was observed only with the location cue. Although we cannot definitively rule out a role for the R MFG –

ACC connectivity in shifts of spatial attention, in the context of our SR mapping difficulty it is more likely to be associated with response processing.

Our target selection manipulation increased the perceptual difficulty involved in finding the target by keeping the color of one of the target elements identical to the surrounding items, effectively reducing its salience. In keeping with this, the univariate analysis found increased activity in occipital and parietal areas, but we also noted that this perceptual manipulation led to activity within MD regions in frontal cortex. What role, then, does the region in frontoparietal cortex identified as MD play in perceptual processing? Our view is that MD and other frontal sites are active only when the perceptual difficulty triggers task-level processing. By task-level processing we refer to cognitive operations that can only be carried out in reference to the state of ongoing goal-directed processing, such as decisions about where to fixate next, whether a stimulus matches target specifications, or which response should be made. This is in line with claims that MD is associated with resource-limited processing, not data-limited processing (Han & Marois, 2013; Wen et al, 2018). In the dual-task literature resource-limited processing refers to cognitive operations that benefit from the application of limited-capacity resources. In contrast, data-limited processing is associated with perceptual manipulations that affect stimulus quality and are insensitive to the application of additional resources (D. A. Norman & Bobrow, 1975; Pashler, 1984; Welford, 1952). Data-limited processing engages sensory processing, but not the integration of the sensory signal with task goals. A key feature of resource-limited processing is its serial nature; resource limitations make difficult any parallel processing of multiple stimuli even for simple tasks (Pashler, 1984, 1994; Pashler & Johnston, 1989). Such limitations are consistent with widespread activity seen in MD, and frontoparietal cortex in general, in response to our difficulty manipulation. Despite the specialization within MD, communication between multiple regions was evidently needed in our task.

Investigations of the role of MD in perceptual discrimination support the idea that it is

associated with task-level operations. Wen, Mitchell, and Duncan (2018) had participants

judge brief periods of coherent random motion in random dot kinematograms. No MD

activity was detected in conditions of reduced contrast or variations in motion coherence,

even though performance was poorer. In seeming contradiction to this finding, Jiang and

Kanwisher (2003, Experiment 1) observed MD activity in a perceptually more demanding

discrimination task, in which participants had to judge whether a discrepant line was shorter

or longer than the other line segments. While these two perceptual discriminations may seem

at first glance similar, one could argue that the line discrimination task in Jiang and

Kanwisher (2003) did not make it more difficult to perceptually resolve the stimuli, but more

difficult to judge whether the line was longer or shorter. Similarly, our salience manipulation

in target selection not only made it more difficult to detect the target stimulus against the

background, but also increased the difficulty of target decision-making, involving task-level

operations. Clearly, more examples are required before making strong generalizations about

the kinds of manipulations that drive MD responses and those that do not.

The link between MD and resource-limited processing (Wen et al., 2018; Han & Marois,

2013) brings up the larger issue of whether MD may be the principal brain region associated

with resource-demanding portions of task processing – what has been called *central*

processing in the dual-task literature (Welford, 1952; Pashler, 1984). The central processor is

assumed to flexibly apply task rules to incoming stimuli that describe what decisions are to

be made and to map arbitrary responses to task-relevant aspects of the stimulus. The observed

pattern of MD activity across a wide range of tasks is consistent with the kind of task- and

stimulus-independence required of a central processor.

Conclusions

We have identified two separate circuits underlying target selection and stimulus-response mapping in visual search. These circuits interact with neural centers previously shown to be important for the manipulation and application of task-specific rules. The observation that both circuits communicate with the same regions of frontal cortex suggests that task rules for target selection and stimulus-response mapping are not represented in widely separate brain regions but draw on the same neural resources.

References

Becker, S. I., Grubert, A., & Dux, P. E. (2014). Distinct neural networks for target feature versus dimension changes in visual search, as revealed by EEG and fMRI. *NeuroImage*, *102*, 798–808. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.08.058

Benn, Y., Webb, T. L., Chang, B. P. I., Sun, Y.-H., Wilkinson, I. D., & Farrow, T. F. D. (2014). The neural basis of monitoring goal progress. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *8*(September), 688. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00688

Boettiger, C. A. (2005). Frontal Networks for Learning and Executing Arbitrary Stimulus-Response Associations. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *25*(10), 2723–2732. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3697-04.2005

Botvinick, M. M., Cohen, J. D., & Carter, C. S. (2004). Conflict monitoring and anterior cingulate cortex: An update. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *8*(12), 539–546. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2004.10.003

Brainard, D. H. (1997). The Psychophysics Toolbox. *Spatial Vision*, *10*(4), 433–436. https://doi.org/10.1163/156856897X00357

Bray, S., Almas, R., Arnold, A. E. G. F., Iaria, G., & MacQueen, G. (2015). Intraparietal Sulcus Activity and Functional Connectivity Supporting Spatial Working Memory Manipulation. *Cerebral Cortex*, *25*(5), 1252–1264. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bht320

Bush, G., Luu, P., & Posner, M. I. (2000). Cognitive and emotional influences in anterior cingulate cortex. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *4*, 215–222.

Carter, C. S., Macdonald, A. M., Botvinick, M., Ross, L. L., Stenger, V. A., Noll, D., & Cohen, J. D. (2000). Parsing executive processes: Strategic vs. evaluative functions of the anterior cingulate cortex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *97*(4), 1944–1948. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.97.4.1944

Cavanna, A. E. (2007). The Precuneus and Consciousness. *CNS Spectrums*, *12*(7), 545–552. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1092852900021295

Cavanna, A. E., & Trimble, M. R. (2006). The precuneus: A review of its functional anatomy and behavioural correlates. *Brain*, *129*(3), 564–583. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awl004

Cavina-Pratesi, C. (2006). Dissociating Arbitrary Stimulus-Response Mapping from Movement Planning during Preparatory Period: Evidence from Event-Related Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *26*(10), 2704–2713. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3176-05.2006

Cole, M. W., Reynolds, J. R., Power, J. D., Repovs, G., Anticevic, A., & Braver, T. S. (2013). Multi-task connectivity reveals flexible hubs for adaptive task control. *Nature Neuroscience*, *16*(9), 1348–1355. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3470

Cole, M. W., & Schneider, W. (2007). The cognitive control network: Integrated cortical regions with dissociable functions. *NeuroImage*, *37*(1), 343–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.03.071

Corbetta, M., & Shulman, G. L. (2001). Imaging expectations and attentional modulations in the human brain. *Visual Attention and Cortical Circuits*, 1-24 313.

Crittenden, B. M., Mitchell, D. J., & Duncan, J. (2016). Task Encoding across the Multiple Demand Cortex Is Consistent with a Frontoparietal and Cingulo-Opercular Dual Networks Distinction. *The Journal of Neuroscience : The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, *36*(23), 6147–6155. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4590-15.2016

Dinstein, I., Hasson, U., Rubin, N., & Heeger, D. J. (2007). Brain areas selective for both observed and executed movements. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *98*(3), 1415–1427. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00238.2007

Dosenbach, N. U. F., Fair, D. A., Miezin, F. M., Cohen, A. L., Wenger, K. K., Dosenbach, R. A. T., Fox, M. D., Snyder, A. Z., Vincent, J. L., Raichle, M. E., Schlaggar, B. L., & Petersen, S. E. (2007). Distinct brain networks for adaptive and stable task control in humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *104*(26), 11073–11078. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0704320104

Dosenbach, N.U.F., Visscher, K. M., Palmer, E. D., Miezin, F. M., Wenger, K. K., Kang, H. C., Burgund, E. D., Grimes, A. L., Schlaggar, B. L., & Petersen, S. E. (2006). A Core System for the Implementation of Task Sets. *Neuron*, *50*(5), 799–812. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2006.04.031

Duncan, J. (2010). The multiple-demand (MD) system of the primate brain: Mental programs for intelligent behaviour. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *14*(4), 172–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.01.004

Fellows, L. K., & Farah, M. J. (2005). Is anterior cingulate cortex necessary for cognitive control? *Brain*, *128*(4), 788–796. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awh405

Friston, K. J., Buechel, C., Fink, G. R., Morris, J., Rolls, E., & Dolan, R. J. (1997). Psychophysiological and modulatory interactions in neuroimaging. *NeuroImage*, *6*(3), 218–229. https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.1997.0291

Giesbrecht, B., Woldorff, M. G., Song, A. W., & Mangun, G. R. (2003). Neural mechanisms of top-down control during spatial and feature attention. *NeuroImage*, *19*(3), 496–512. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-8119(03)00162-9

Hampshire, A., & Sharp, D. J. (2015). Contrasting network and modular perspectives on inhibitory control. In *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* (Vol. 19, Issue 8, pp. 445–452). Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.06.006

Hanakawa, T. (2002). The Role of Rostral Brodmann Area 6 in Mental-operation Tasks: An Integrative Neuroimaging Approach. *Cerebral Cortex*, *12*(11), 1157–1170. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/12.11.1157

Jiang, Y. (2004). Resolving dual-task interference: An fMRI study. *NeuroImage*, *22*(2), 748–754. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.01.043

Jiang, Y., & Kanwisher, N. (2003). Common Neural Substrates for Response Selection across Modalities and Mapping Paradigms. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *15*(8), 1080–1094. https://doi.org/10.1162/089892903322598067

Johnson-Frey, S. H., Maloof, F. R., Newman-Norlund, R., Farrer, C., Inati, S., & Grafton, S. T. (2003). Actions or Hand-Object Interactions? Human Inferior Frontal Cortex and Action Observation. *Neuron*, *39*(6), 1053–1058. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(03)00524-5

Johnston, K., Levin, H. M., Koval, M. J., & Everling, S. (2007). Top-Down Control-Signal Dynamics in Anterior Cingulate and Prefrontal Cortex Neurons following Task Switching. *Neuron*, *53*(3), 453–462. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2006.12.023

Liston, C., Matalon, S., Hare, T. A., Davidson, M. C., & Casey, B. J. (2006). Anterior Cingulate and Posterior Parietal Cortices Are Sensitive to Dissociable Forms of Conflict in a Task-Switching Paradigm. *Neuron*, *50*(4), 643–653. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2006.04.015

Lopez-Garcia, P., Lesh, T. A., Salo, T., Barch, D. M., MacDonald, A. W., Gold, J. M., Ragland, J. D., Strauss, M., Silverstein, S. M., & Carter, C. S. (2015). The neural circuitry supporting goal maintenance during cognitive control: A comparison of expectancy AX-CPT and dot probe expectancy paradigms. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-015-0384-1

Majerus, S., Cowan, N., Péters, F., Van Calster, L., Phillips, C., & Schrouff, J. (2016). Cross-Modal Decoding of Neural Patterns Associated with Working Memory: Evidence for Attention-Based Accounts of Working Memory. *Cerebral Cortex (New York, N.Y.: 1991)*, *26*(1), 166–179. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhu189

Makino, Y., Yokosawa, K., Takeda, Y., & Kumada, T. (2004). Visual search and memory search engage extensive overlapping cerebral cortices: An fMRI study. *NeuroImage*, *23*(2), 525–533. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.06.026

Molinari, E., Baraldi, P., Campanella, M., Duzzi, D., Nocetti, L., Pagnoni, G., & Porro, C. A. (2013). Human Parietofrontal Networks Related to Action Observation Detected at Rest. *Cerebral Cortex*, *23*(1), 178–186. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhr393

Müller, N. G., Donner, T. H., Bartelt, O. A., Brandt, S. A., Villringer, A., & Kleinschmidt, A. (2003). The functional neuroanatomy of visual conjunction search: A parametric fMRI study. *NeuroImage*, *20*(3), 1578–1590. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-8119(03)00416-6

Munakata, Y., Herd, S. a., Chatham, C. H., Depue, B. E., Banich, M. T., & O'Reilly, R. C. (2011). A unified framework for inhibitory control. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *15*(10), 453–459. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2011.07.011

Nagahama, Y., Okada, T., Katsumi, Y., Hayashi, T., Yamauchi, H., Oyanagi, C., Konishi, J., Fukuyama, H., & Shibasaki, H. (2001). Dissociable Mechanisms of Attentional Control within the Human Prefrontal Cortex. *Cerebral Cortex*, *11*(1), 85–92. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/11.1.85

Nagahama, Y., Okada, T., Katsumi, Y., Hayashi, T., Yamauchi, H., Sawamoto, N., Toma, K., Nakamura, K., Hanakawa, T., Konishi, J., Fukuyama, H., & Shibasaki, H. (1999). Transient Neural Activity in the Medial Superior Frontal Gyrus and Precuneus Time

Locked with Attention Shift between Object Features. *NeuroImage*, *10*(2), 193–199.

https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.1999.0451

Nelson, S. M., Dosenbach, N. U. F., Cohen, A. L., Wheeler, M. E., Schlaggar, B. L., &

Petersen, S. E. (2010). Role of the anterior insula in task-level control and focal

attention. *Brain Structure and Function*, *214*(5–6), 669–680.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-010-0260-2

Nobre, A. C., Coull, J. T., Walsh, V., & Frith, C. D. (2003). Brain Activations during Visual

Search: Contributions of Search Efficiency versus Feature Binding. *NeuroImage*,

18(1), 91–103. https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2002.1329

Norman, D. A., & Bobrow, D. G. (1975). On data-limited and resource-limited processes.

Cognitive Psychology, *7*(1), 44–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(75)90004-3

Norman, K. A., Polyn, S. M., Detre, G. J., & Haxby, J. V. (2006). Beyond mind-reading:

Multi-voxel pattern analysis of fMRI data. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *10*(9), 424–

430. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.07.005

O'Reilly, J. X., Woolrich, M. W., Behrens, T. E. J., Smith, S. M., & Johansen-Berg, H.

(2012). Tools of the trade: Psychophysiological interactions and functional

connectivity. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *7*(5), 604–609.

https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nss055

Pardo, J. V., Pardo, P. J., Janer, K. W., & Raichle, M. E. (1990). The anterior cingulate cortex

mediates processing selection in the Stroop attentional conflict paradigm.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, *87*(1), 256–259.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.87.1.256

Pashler, H. (1984). Processing Stages in Overlapping Tasks—Evidence for a Central

Bottleneck. *Journal of Experimental Psychology-Human Perception and*

Performance, *10*, 358–377.

Pashler, H. (1994). Dual-Task Interference in Simple Tasks—Data and Theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *116*, 220–244.

Pashler, H., & Johnston, J. C. (1989). Chronometric Evidence for Central Postponement in Temporally Overlapping Tasks. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A-Human Experimental Psychology*, *41*, 19–45.

Paus, T. (1996). Location and function of the human frontal eye-field: A selective review. *Neuropsychologia*, *34*(6), 475–483. https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932(95)00134-4

Pelli, D. G. (1997). The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: Transforming numbers into movies. *Spatial Vision*, *10*(4), 437–442. https://doi.org/10.1163/156856897X00366

Raichle, M. E. (2015). The Brain's Default Mode Network. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *38*(1), 433–447. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-071013-014030

Schumacher, E. H., & Jiang, Y. (2003). Neural Mechanisms for Response Selection: Representation Specific or Modality Independent? *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *15*(8), 1077–1079. https://doi.org/10.1162/089892903322598058

Seeley, W. W., Menon, V., Schatzberg, A. F., Keller, J., Gary, H., Kenna, H., Reiss, A. L., & Greicius, M. D. (2007). Dissociable Intrinsic Connectivity Networks for Salience Processing and Executive Control. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *27*(9), 2349–2356. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5587-06.2007.Dissociable

Shenhav, A., Botvinick, M., & Cohen, J. (2013). The expected value of control: An integrative theory of anterior cingulate cortex function. *Neuron*, *79*(2), 217–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2013.07.007

Shenhav, A., Cohen, J. D., & Botvinick, M. M. (2016). Dorsal anterior cingulate cortex and the value of control. *Nature Neuroscience*, *19*(10), 1286–1291. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4384

Welford, A. T. (1952). The "psychological refractory period" and the timing of high-speed

performance—A review and a theory. *British Journal of Psychology*, *43*, 2–19.

Wen, T., Mitchell, D. J., & Duncan, J. (2018). Response of the multiple-demand network

during simple stimulus discriminations. *NeuroImage*, *177*, 79–87.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.05.019

Woldorff, M. G., Hazlett, C. J., Fichtenholtz, H. M., Weissman, D. H., Dale, A. M., & Song,

A. W. (2004). Functional Parcellation of Attentional Control Regions of the Brain.

Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, *16*(1), 149–165.

https://doi.org/10.1162/089892904322755638

Woolgar, A., Afshar, S., Williams, M. A., & Rich, A. N. (2015). Flexible Coding of Task

Rules in Frontoparietal Cortex: An Adaptive System for Flexible Cognitive Control.

Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, *27*(10), 1895–1911.

https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00827

Yarkoni, T., Poldrack, R. A., Nichols, T. E., Van Essen, D. C., & Wager, T. D. (2011).

Large-scale automated synthesis of human functional neuroimaging data. *Nature

Methods*, *8*(8), 665–670. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.1635