



## Author's Proof

Carefully read the entire proof and mark all corrections in the appropriate place, using the Adobe Reader editing tools ([Adobe Help](#)), alternatively provide them in the Discussion Forum indicating the line number of the proof. Do not forget to reply to the queries.

We do not accept corrections in the form of edited manuscripts.

In order to ensure the timely publication of your article, please submit the corrections within 48 hours.

If you have any questions, please contact [science.production.office@frontiersin.org](mailto:science.production.office@frontiersin.org).

## Author Queries Form

<b>Q1</b>	Confirm that the first name and surname of all the authors have been identified correctly in the front page and citation text.	
<b>Q2</b>	Verify that all the equations and special characters are displayed correctly.	
<b>Q3</b>	Ensure to add all grant numbers and funding information, as after publication this is no longer possible.	
<b>Q4</b>	Please provide the name of the department for the following affiliations. "Georgia State University, Atlanta, USA" "Université Laval, Québec, Canada" "Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium."	
<b>Q5</b>	Please reduce short running title to maximum of five words.	
<b>Q6</b>	Please add "Milner, 1986" to the reference list.	
<b>Q7</b>	We have changed "Schack et al., 2013" to "Schack et al., 2014" as per the reference list. Please confirm if this is fine.	
<b>Q8</b>	Please cite "Causer et al., 2013" inside the text.	
<b>Q9</b>	Please confirm whether the edits made in the sentence "There are a lot of things that we do not know about the mechanisms of mental practice of action. What does each part of the brain engaged in mental practice actually doing; how do processes relate to one another; what happens when different areas in the network are damaged?" is fine.	



# Editorial: Mental practice: clinical and experimental research in imagery and action observation

Magdalena Ietswaart<sup>1\*</sup>, Andrew J. Butler<sup>2</sup>, Philip L. Jackson<sup>3</sup> and Martin G. Edwards<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Psychology, University of Stirling, Stirling, UK, <sup>2</sup> Georgia State University, Atlanta, USA, <sup>3</sup> Université Laval, Québec, Canada, <sup>4</sup> Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

**Keywords:** mental practice, action simulation, action observation, imagery, cognitive neuroscience

This editorial accompanies 18 articles as part of a *Frontiers* research topic. The aim of this research topic was to clarify the underlying mechanisms involved in mental practice of action, bringing together evidence from a range of disciplines including cognitive neuroscience, experimental neuropsychology, sport and movement science, clinical neuropsychology and clinical neurology. The need to clarify the underlying mechanisms of mental practice is a pressing one. Mental practice of action has been explored in sport psychology for several decades, with the aim to use mental practice to improve sport performance. However, following the discovery of the mirror neuron system (see for example, Rizzolatti and Craighero, 2004), the perspective of mental practice has changed to a rationale based on neuroscience and to research focussed on understanding the neural processes of mental practice. Evidence that the brain simulates action has resulted in a common understanding of “functional equivalence” (Jeannerod, 1994): the idea that the *mental* representation of an action or percept in the person’s mind is the neural “equivalent” to the *physical* action or *actual* percept. This ability to mentally represent action using the motor system allows for action simulation, providing conscious mental rehearsal of movement (imagery), but also allows for a common percept when observing the movements of others. Finally, in recent years, the disciplines of clinical neuropsychology and neurology have begun to use mental rehearsal of action, or *mental practice*, to produce improvements normally attributed to practicing actual movements with the aim to improve impaired actions following brain-damage.

At the heart of all of the research is the idea that mental practice of action uses equivalent neural processes to those used in action execution. Of course, there is debate on what one understands to be “equivalent,” but the common reasoning seems to be that because mental practice (motor imagery and action observation) is functionally or neurally equivalent to actual practice, the efficacy principle of mental practice is that the motor areas are “trained,” perhaps through Hebbian learning “firing-rewiring.” Although the scientific foundation of this idea of action simulation is very sound in neuroimaging research (e.g., Sharma and Baron, 2013, this issue), the link to behavioral evidence or efficacy is currently weak. The neural correlates of mental practice are just that: correlates and do not justify inference about function, efficacy, or critical causality. There nevertheless seems to be reluctance in the field to address the underlying mechanisms of mental practice efficacy. This comes maybe as no surprise. A functional equivalence rationale for mental practice is intuitive and appealing and will therefore attract interest and funding. It is hardly in the researchers’ interest to potentially undermine the idea by getting to the bottom of the matter.

We are now 15 or maybe 20 years into mental practice efficacy research based on the neural equivalence premise (Jackson et al., 2001). What is apparent is that the above simple interpretation of equivalence is not reflected in emerging data. It seems that mental practice efficacy is much more complex than simple Hebbian learning. There may be an analogy with the development of our understanding of the supplementary motor area (SMA) over that same time period. Initially SMA was thought of as a simple planning neural strip, but we have since understood the operation

## OPEN ACCESS

### Edited and reviewed by:

Hauke R. Heekeren,  
Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

### \*Correspondence:

Magdalena Ietswaart  
magdalena.ietswaart@stir.ac.uk

**Received:** 22 June 2015

**Accepted:** 01 October 2015

**Published:** xx October 2015

### Citation:

Ietswaart M, Butler AJ, Jackson PL  
and Edwards MG (2015) Editorial:  
Mental practice: clinical and  
experimental research in imagery and  
action observation.  
*Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 9:573.  
doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2015.00573

of SMA to be highly complex in the way it is involved in inhibition. For example, in studies using fMRI, motor imagery and action observation often do not activate the primary motor cortex (M1) because the SMA is thought to suppresses the M1 activity (presumably preventing the individual from actually executing actions). The inherent role of inhibition in mental practice and the complexity of efficacy mechanisms still require further research. The popular notion that anything to do with the mirror neuron system is a simple matter of equivalence, or similarly that in applied contexts of mental practice equivalence is the end of the conversation, needs to change. We now need to go beyond what we are comfortable with and challenge what we know, even if we risk undermining the last decades of research.

There are a lot of things that we do not know about the mechanisms of mental practice of action. What does each part of the brain engaged in mental practice actually doing; how do processes relate to one another; what happens when different areas in the network are damaged? There are indications that insufficient drive to address the fundamentals of mental practice is starting to become a real issue of concern. The systematic review in this issue by Braun et al. (2013) concludes that the clinical evidence for mental practice efficacy in neurorehabilitation is weakening. The reasons for this seems to be the lack of theory-driven interventions, conceptual confusion (what does mental practice actually entail in practice?) and general methodological malaise including feasibility, dose, responders/non-responders, and adherence issues in larger scale trials that are more representative of clinical practice. Alternatively, when neuroscience evidence is carefully implemented in theory-driven clinical evaluation of mental practice, this may not translate to earlier reported clinical benefit (Ietswaart et al., 2011). Indeed, Malouin et al. (2013) in this issue highlight significant issues with the translation of experimental findings into clinical practice. Malouin et al.'s critical review is constructive, however, by suggesting ways in which the value of mental practice can be redeemed by addressing underlying mechanisms of mental practice efficacy. They conclude that the field must now truly put the use of mental practice to the test. Mental practice may indeed benefit the large number of stroke patients in neuro-rehabilitation, but unless mental practice is truly put to the test, this application may be superseded by other clinical innovations, for example, robotic assisted therapy. The field needs to deliver the necessary clarity on what exactly are the "active ingredients" of mental practice; what are the things that do not work and are mere distractions; which complexities play a role. Only then can we formulate effective guidance on what mental practice should actually entail in clinical practice. In the meantime, mental practice therapy in neuro-rehabilitation is already currently recommended treatment in many clinical guidelines. This current position means that we need to act fast in order to understand the processes and benefits of mental practice for clinical use. However, the current questionable guidance, range of possible uses, lack of efficacy etc. . . will likely undermine clinicians' willingness to adopt the treatment in the forthcoming years unless some clarity emerges.

Currently, much of the research effort goes to further documenting the correlates of mental practice, i.e., the fact

that imagery and observation resonate with other motoric processes. In that respect, a number of the studies reported in this issue are exceptions to this rule in the way these studies ambitiously delineate the mental practice process by for example comparing the quasi-visual and the verbal-cognitive element of mental practice efficacy (Saimpont et al., 2013, this issue), or by contrasting the efficacy of different visual perspectives in mental practice (Callow et al., 2013, this issue; Yao et al., 2013, this issue), or by separating the impact of active imagery and passive observation (Eaves et al., 2014, this issue). It is an issue of concern, however, that such experimental approaches are generally not pursued (nor funded) as part of clinical evaluations, when now is the time to establish the finer details of mental practice efficacy in clinical contexts. We therefore advocate more high risk, high gain evaluations of mental practice that can establish the real impact of mental practice on the lives of real people in the clinic.

Further to bringing clarity with regards to the underlying mechanisms of mental practice, there is a real need to establish the modes of delivery and dosage. Clinicians furthermore need tools to make predictions of which patients will benefit and from what types of mental practice treatment. Lack of clarity on patient characteristics such as motor imagery ability can easily lead to miss-use of current findings exposing a risk of clinicians dismissing patients who they believe would not stand to benefit from mental practice-based rehabilitation. It would be great if we could say with some level of certainty whether a brain-damaged patient has an intact ability to use and benefit from mental practice therapies. Some authors would claim this can be done either through subjective methods such as vividness questionnaires, or through more objective methods such as mental chronometry (Milner, 1986), or monitoring automatic covert action simulation such as the cognitive hand mental rotation task established by Parsons (1987), or the response of the autonomic nervous system in mental practice as proposed by Collet et al. (2013, this issue). There is pressure on the research community to provide reliable measures of motor imagery ability on which clinicians can base a decision whether to provide a patient with mental practice rehabilitation. But quite possibly we do not (yet) have reliable tools on which such important decisions can be based. A study by de Vries et al. (2013, this issue) documenting motor imagery ability in stroke patients, showed that poor motor imagery ability as measured by subjective vividness questionnaires was not associated with poor performance also on *objective* imagery ability assessment. So although vividness scores suggested the patients had poor motor imagery, objective task performance in these stroke patients suggested that motor imagery was in fact intact. This situation could lead to the risk that clinicians when using only vividness scores could dismiss patients as poor imagers and therefore unable to benefit from mental practice-based rehabilitation, while the patients' imagery ability would be deemed intact if measured in other ways. Although Lawrence et al. (2013, this issue) report that high motor imagery vividness is associated with an increased benefit of mental practice in novice gymnasts compared to the lower performance gains in those with low motor imagery

vividness, this relationship may not be a simple one suitable for rehabilitation treatment decisions.

This research topic aimed to address confusion regarding the concepts of imagery and observation which has hampered the progression of mental practice research both scientifically and in translation to clinical practice. Wondrusch and Schuster-Amft (2013, this issue) remarkably point to the need to address any confusion regarding mental practice even at a therapeutic level. They advocate a good understanding of theory and practice in recipients using mental practice rehabilitation techniques by describing ways to teach stroke patients mental practice. Other contributions in this issue broaden the concept of mental practice in a number of ways, such as Howatson et al.'s rationale for including the observation of one's own movements within the mental practice concept (Howatson et al., 2013, this issue), Smith and Wakefield's considerations with regards to the timing rate of mental practice (Smith and Wakefield, 2013, this issue), Kirsch et al.'s link between action simulation and aesthetic experience (Kirsch et al., 2013, this issue), Schack et al.'s novel theory of how mental practice develops cognitive mental representation structures (Schack et al., 2014, this issue), and importantly Vogt et al.'s meticulous review of the evidence of why mental practice should encompass both motor imagery and action observation (Vogt et al., 2013, this issue).

Because neuroimaging studies provide strong evidence for action simulation, but the link to behavioral change is perhaps weak, we invited contributions to show that mental practice efficacy might be driven by neuroplasticity processes evoked

by action simulation. The preliminary work by Olsson and Lundstrom (2013, this issue) shows that successful action anticipation, as a precursor of mental practice, appeared associated with motor and temporal regions of the brain. Future research needs to investigate evidence of the associations between mental practice performance benefits and brain plasticity in the motor network. It is possible that combination of techniques is needed, including functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), diffusion tensor imaging (DTI), MEG, and EEG.

In conclusion, in an attempt to build on interdisciplinary consensus on the nature and application of mental practice, this research topic integrated perspectives from the full range of the disciplines involved in mental practice research. It furthermore intentionally did not seek to limit mental practice to a narrow interpretation of conscious mental rehearsal of movement or motor imagery, but instead advocates to include imitation and action observation of self or others as an interpretation of mental practice as Action Simulation Therapy (AST). Such an interpretation of AST mental practice is justified in light of the evidence for neural equivalence. What the neuroscience of neural equivalence means for our understanding of behavior, mechanisms, and applied efficacy of mental practice, however, needs a much more sustained research effort devoid of complacency and supported by high-risk-high-gain research funding. With this shared and funded research drive it will be possible to accelerate our understanding and agreement on the core processes of mental practice, and therefore speed up the translation of evidence-based benefit of applied use of mental practice in sport and clinical practice.

## REFERENCES

- Braun, S., Kleynen, M., van Heel, T., Kruithof, N., Wade, D., and Beurskens, A. (2013). The effects of mental practice in neurological rehabilitation; a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:390. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00390
- Callow, N., Roberts, R., Hardy, L., Jiang, D., and Edwards, M. G. (2013). Performance improvements from imagery: evidence that internal visual imagery is superior to external visual imagery for slalom performance. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:697. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00697
- Causer, J., McCormick, S. A., and Holmes, P. S. (2013). Congruency of gaze metrics in action, imagery and action observation. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:604. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00604
- Collet, C., Di Rienzo, F., El Hoyek, N., and Guillot, A. (2013). Autonomic nervous system correlates in movement observation and motor imagery. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:415. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00415
- de Vries, S., Tepper, M., Feenstra, W., Oosterveld, H., Boonstra, A. M., and Otten, B. (2013). Motor imagery ability in stroke patients: the relationship between implicit and explicit motor imagery measures. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:790. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00790
- Eaves, D. L., Haythornthwaite, L., and Vogt, S. (2014). Motor imagery during action observation modulates automatic imitation effects in rhythmical actions. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 8:28. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2014.00028
- Howatson, G., Zult, T., Farthing, J. P., Zijdwind, I., and Hortobagyi, T. (2013). Mirror training to augment cross-education during resistance training: a hypothesis. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:396. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00396
- Ietswaart, M., Johnston, M., Dijkerman, H. C., Joice, S., Scott, C. L., MacWalter, R. S., et al. (2011). Mental practice with motor imagery in stroke recovery: randomized controlled trial of efficacy. *Brain* 134, 1373–1386. doi: 10.1093/brain/awr077
- Jackson, P. L., Lafleur, A. F., Malouin, F., Richards, C., and Doyon, J. (2001). Potential role of mental practice using motor imagery in neurologic rehabilitation. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* 82, 1133–1141. doi: 10.1053/apmr.2001.24286
- Jeannerod, M. (1994). The representing brain - neural correlates of motor intention and imagery. *Behav. Brain Sci.* 17, 187–202. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X00034026
- Kirsch, L. P., Drommelschmidt, K. A., and Cross, E. S. (2013). The impact of sensorimotor experience on affective evaluation of dance. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:521. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00521
- Lawrence, G., Callow, N., and Roberts, R. (2013). Watch me if you can: imagery ability moderates observational learning effectiveness. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:522. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00522
- Malouin, F., Jackson, P. L., and Richards, C. L. (2013). Towards the integration of mental practice in rehabilitation programs. A critical review. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:576. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00576
- Olsson, C., and Lundstrom, P. (2013). Using action observation to study superior motor performance: a pilot fMRI study. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:819. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00819
- Parsons, L. M. (1987). Imagined spatial transformations of one's hands and feet. *Cogn. Psychol.* 19, 178–241. doi: 10.1016/0010-0285(87)90011-9
- Rizzolatti, G., and Craighero, L. (2004). The mirror-neuron system. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* 27, 169–192. doi: 10.1146/annurev.neuro.27.070203.144230
- Saimpont, A., Lafleur, M. F., Malouin, F., Richards, C. L., Doyon, J., and Jackson, P. L. (2013). The comparison between motor imagery and verbal rehearsal on the learning of sequential movements. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:773. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00773
- Schack, T., Essig, K., Frank, C., and Koester, D. (2014). Mental representation and motor imagery training. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 8:328. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2014.00328

343	Sharma, N., and Baron, J. (2013). Does motor imagery share neural networks with	forceful muscle contractions increases brain signal and muscle	400
344	executed movement: a multivariate fMRI analysis. <i>Front. Hum. Neurosci.</i> 7:564.	strength. <i>Front. Hum. Neurosci.</i> 7:561. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.	401
345	doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00564	00561	402
346	Smith, D., and Wakefield, C. (2013). A timely review of a key aspect of motor	<b>Conflict of Interest Statement:</b> The authors declare that the research was	403
347	imagery: a commentary on Guillot et al.(2012). <i>Front. Hum. Neurosci.</i> 7:761.	conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could	404
348	doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00761	be construed as a potential conflict of interest.	405
349	Vogt, S., Di Rienzo, F., Collet, C., Collins, A., and Guillot, A. (2013). Multiple roles		406
350	of motor imagery during action observation. <i>Front. Hum. Neurosci.</i> 7:807. doi:	<i>Copyright © 2015 Ietswaart, Butler, Jackson and Edwards. This is an open-access</i>	407
351	10.3389/fnhum.2013.00807	<i>article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC</i>	408
352	Wondrusch, C., and Schuster-Amft, C. (2013). A standardized motor imagery	<i>BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the</i>	409
353	introduction program (MIIP) for neuro-rehabilitation: development and	<i>original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this</i>	410
354	evaluation. <i>Front. Hum. Neurosci.</i> 7:477. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00477	<i>journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution</i>	411
355	Yao, W. X., Ranganathan, V. K., Allexandre, D., Siemionow,	<i>or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.</i>	412
356	V., and Yue, G. H. (2013). Kinesthetic imagery training of		413
357			414
358			415
359			416
360			417
361			418
362			419
363			420
364			421
365			422
366			423
367			424
368			425
369			426
370			427
371			428
372			429
373			430
374			431
375			432
376			433
377			434
378			435
379			436
380			437
381			438
382			439
383			440
384			441
385			442
386			443
387			444
388			445
389			446
390			447
391			448
392			449
393			450
394			451
395			452
396			453
397			454
398			455
399			456