

Submitted to *Experimental Brain Research* for the special issue in honour of
Professor G Berlucchi

The disengage deficit in hemispatial neglect is restricted to between-object shifts and
is abolished by prism adaptation

I. Schindler^{1,2}, R.D. McIntosh^{1,3}, T.P. Cassidy⁴, D. Birchall⁵ V Benson^{1,6}, M
Ietswaart^{1,7}, and A.D. Milner¹

¹Cognitive Neuroscience Research Unit, Wolfson Research Institute, Durham
University, Queen's Campus, Stockton-on-Tees TS17 6BH, UK.

²Department of Psychology, University of Hull, Hull HU6 7RX, UK.

³Human Cognitive Neuroscience, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH8 9JZ, UK.

⁴Stroke Medicine Department, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Gateshead, Tyne and Wear
NE9 6SX, UK

⁵Division of Neuroradiology, Regional Neurosciences Centre, Newcastle General
Hospital, Westgate Road, Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE4 6BE

⁶School of Psychology, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ

⁷School of Psychology and Sport Sciences, Northumbria University, Newcastle-upon-
Tyne NE1 8ST.

Corresponding author:

Professor A D Milner

Wolfson Research Institute

Durham University Queen's Campus

Stockton-on-Tees TS17 6BH, UK.

a.d.milner@durham.ac.uk; phone +44-191-334-9148; fax +44-191-334-3241.

Keywords: neglect, prism adaptation, attention, within-object, Posner.

Abstract

We sought to determine the effects of prism adaptation on peripherally-cued visual attention shifting in patients with spatial neglect, using a task devised by Egly and colleagues (1994) based on the classic Posner paradigm. This task allowed a comparison of “within-object” versus “between-object” attention shifts. A display was presented containing two parallel outline rectangles, and subjects were asked to make rapid responses to a target, which would appear at one end of one of the rectangles. The target location was pre-cued with 75% validity: on invalid trials attention was directed either to the other end of the same rectangle, or to the other rectangle. Healthy subjects and right-hemisphere patients without neglect showed a left-right symmetrical pattern, with a larger validity effect when required to shift attention between rectangles, thus indicating a greater difficulty of attention-shifting between than within the respective shapes. The neglect patients showed the typical leftward ‘disengage deficit’ previously observed in neglect, but only for attention shifts *between* objects, indicating that the effect is object-based rather than purely spatial. A comparison of vertical and horizontal shift costs showed that this attention-shifting deficit for left-hemifield target stimuli was directional rather than hemifield-based: it was absent for vertical shifts of attention within the left hemifield. Finally, we found that prism adaptation abolished the disengage deficit. We found no effects of prism adaptation in the control subjects. We argue that prism adaptation has a powerful effect on one of the fundamental manifestations of the neglect syndrome.

Introduction

A powerful and simple technique for temporarily modifying the symptoms of unilateral spatial neglect was reported by Rossetti and colleagues (1998). They found that a session of a few minutes in which the patient repeatedly made pointing responses to a simple target while wearing 10° rightward-displacing prismatic goggles was sufficient to cause quite major improvements across a wide range of symptoms. The tasks showing improvement included standard clinical tests such as cancellation, copying and bisection. Moreover subsequent studies have demonstrated that the effects may generalize to wheelchair navigation (Rossetti et al. 1999), postural control (Tilikete et al. 2001), neglect of mental imagery (Rode et al. 1999, 2001) and haptic spatial judgements (McIntosh et al. 2002). The observations indicate that visuomotor adaptation causes a temporary reorganization of the neural representation of space that persists for hours or days following removal of the prisms (Milner and McIntosh 2005). The way in which this change occurs, however, remains obscure (see Redding and Wallace 2006, for a discussion of possible mechanisms).

One plausible hypothesis would be that visuomotor prism adaptation causes a short-term redistribution of attentional resources across visual space. The evidence for such a proposal, however, is mixed. In favour of it is the finding by Berberovic et al. (2004) that the ipsilesional attentional bias of neglect patients on a left/right visual temporal order judgement task was significantly reduced following adaptation. In a second study by the same research group, however, Morris and colleagues (2004) reported no effect of adaptation on the steep lateral gradients of visual search performance that are typical of, and arguably a more central feature of, neglect.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
A more direct test of the attention-redistribution hypothesis would be to use the well-known attentional cueing procedure devised by Posner (1980). Several previous studies have shown that neglect patients experience an exaggerated cost for shifts of attention toward the contralesional side when given an invalid ipsilesional cue (Morrow and Ratcliff 1988; Ladavas et al. 1994; Losier and Klein 2001). The initial studies selected patients on an anatomical rather than a diagnostic basis (e.g. Posner et al. 1982, 1984, 1987; Friedrich et al. 1998) and found this so-called 'disengage deficit' in both left and right parietal-lesioned patients. In a meta-analysis, however, Losier and Klein (2001) found a much bigger deficit in parietal patients with neglect than in those without.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
Two recent small-scale studies have used the Posner paradigm specifically to examine the effects of prism adaptation in neglect patients. First, Striemer and Danckert (2007) tested four right-brain damaged patients, two of them with neglect, on an exogenous version of the Posner task (i.e. using non-informative, peripheral cues). They reported that prism adaptation reduced both the rightward attentional bias and the disengage deficit, irrespective of the presence of neglect, especially at a short SOA between cue and target (50 ms). In the other study, however, Nijboer et al. (2008) reported data on two neglect patients suggesting a contrary conclusion, namely that voluntary (i.e. endogenous) shifts of attention benefit from prism adaptation while exogenous shifts do not.

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
In the present paper we report a much more extensive study of the effects of prism adaptation on attentional orienting, testing groups of both neglect patients and right-brain damaged controls, as well as a group of healthy controls. We were interested in determining whether there is an object-based component to the disengage deficit in neglect, or whether it depends simply on spatial factors. To this end, we

1
2
3 adopted a task from Egly and colleagues (1994), designed to contrast the shifting of
4 attention between two objects as opposed to two locations within a single objects.
5
6 These investigators presented subjects with a visual array containing two parallel
7
8 outline rectangles, and asked them to make rapid responses to a target, which would
9
10 appear at one end of one of the rectangles. The target location was pre-cued with 75%
11
12 validity, and invalid trials either directed attention to the 'wrong' end of the correct
13
14 rectangle, or to the 'right' end of the incorrect rectangle. Normal subjects showed a
15
16 larger validity effect for attention shifts between rectangles, indicating an object-
17
18 based component of attention. The authors also tested patients with left or right
19
20 parietal lesions, and reported, as expected, that both groups showed elevated costs of
21
22 invalid cueing for contralesional compared with ipsilesional targets in the between-
23
24 object paradigm. This high cost for attention shifts toward objects on the
25
26 contralesional side was significantly greater in the left-hemisphere patients than for
27
28 shifts made within objects. However, the right-hemisphere patients showed no such
29
30 differential cost for between versus within-object shifts to the contralesional side,
31
32 suggesting that their disengage deficit was purely spatial. In agreement with Egly et
33
34 al.'s (1994) data, there is accumulating evidence that object-based neglect is more
35
36 common in patients whose neglect results from left- rather than right-hemisphere
37
38 damage (Kleinman et al. 2007).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 We adopted an essentially identical experimental procedure in the present
49
50 study, but used it specifically to compare groups of right-hemisphere patients either
51
52 with or without left visuospatial neglect. Our aim was to discover whether between-
53
54 object shifts toward left-side stimuli would be subject to greater reaction-time costs
55
56 than within-object shifts in our patients with neglect, and thus whether there is an
57
58 object-based component to the disengage deficit in neglect. Our second aim was to
59
60

1
2
3 assess the extent to which performance in these two versions of the Posner paradigm
4
5 would be amenable to modification by prism adaptation.
6
7
8
9

10 **Methods**

11 *Subjects*

12
13
14
15
16
17 In total, 32 right-handed subjects participated in the experiment (see Table 1 for
18 clinical and demographic details). The neglect group (NEG) consisted of 10 right
19 brain-damaged patients with a mean age of 68.3 years (SD = 10.9 years), all of them
20 diagnosed clinically as having spatial neglect. Ten right brain-damaged patients
21 without neglect served as neurological controls (RBD: mean age = 66.2 years, SD =
22 10.8 years). None of the patients suffered from visual field defects as assessed by
23 finger perimetry, general mental deterioration as clinically assessed, or psychiatric
24 disorder. In addition, the study included 12 healthy, age matched controls (HC)
25 without any history of neurological damage (mean age = 68.7 years, SD = 7.3 years).
26 All subjects were right-handed and gave their informed consent prior to their
27 inclusion in the study. The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical
28 standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki, and was approved by the
29 NHS regional ethics committee (MREC).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 *Neglect tests*

51
52 The presence of neglect was determined by impaired performance on at least two of
53 the following five standard neglect screening tests: two visual search tasks – star
54 cancellation from the Behavioural Inattention Test (BIT: Wilson et al. 1987), and the
55 Balloons Test version-B (Edgworth et al. 1998); line bisection (BIT); scene copying
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Gainotti et al. 1972); and drawing from memory. For star cancellation, the number
4 of targets omitted on each side was counted, and neglect was defined by a cut-off
5 score of ≤ 51 and at least 10% more omissions of targets on the left than on the right.
6
7 For the Balloons test an index of left sided inattention was calculated based on the
8 proportion of targets found on the left side relative to the total number of found
9 targets $[(\text{Left}/\text{Total}) * 100]$. The cut off value was an index of $< 45\%$. Performance in
10 the line bisection task was measured by calculating the average deviation of the
11 bisection marks from the objective centre of each line in mm, with leftward deviations
12 scored as negative and rightward deviations scored as positive. The cut off score for a
13 significant rightward bias was $> +12.5$ mm, corresponding to $> 5\%$ of the total line
14 length. Scene copying was scored according to the number of objects copied (total $n =$
15 5) and the number of objects symmetrically depicted, with neglect diagnosed by the
16 omission or transposition of any objects at the left of the picture and/or omission of
17 left-sided details from any of the attempted items. In the drawing task each patient
18 was asked to draw a daisy, a clock face, and a person. The quality of the drawings was
19 scored based on symmetry with a maximum score of 3 for all three items depicted
20 symmetrically and a minimum score of 0 for no item depicted symmetrically. Neglect
21 was inferred if left-sided details were omitted or transposed from one or more of the
22 drawings.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Table 1 about here
52
53
54

55 *Prism adaptation*

56
57 For the prism adaptation procedure subjects wore a pair of goggles fitted with wide-
58 field prismatic lenses inducing a rightward optical shift of 10° . Exposure consisted of
59
60

1
2
3 200 fast pointing movements made to visual targets (dots) presented either 10° to the
4 left or right of the body midline, at a distance of 65 cm, with 100 responses made to
5 each in pseudo-random order. A board was positioned horizontally under the subject's
6 chin to conceal the hand from view at its starting position but allowing an
7 unobstructed view of the targets and terminal pointing errors. The sham adaptation
8 procedure was identical except that plain, uncorrected lenses were used. After
9 removal of the goggles (whether prism or sham), subjects made four fast open-loop
10 pointing movements to a central target dot on the table to verify the presence of a
11 prismatic after-effect. Open-loop pointing was re-tested at the end of each trial block
12 to confirm that the after-effects were still present. These pointing errors were formally
13 recorded (manually, in cm from the target) only for the prism condition, immediately
14 after the adaptation trials (before the attention task) and at the end of the session (after
15 the last block of trials).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 35 36 *Attentional Paradigm* 37

38
39 Subjects were seated in a darkened room in front of a 17-inch computer monitor
40 (resolution 1027 x 768 pixels). The viewing distance was 57 cm, with the centre of
41 the screen at eye level. The subject's head position was controlled by a chin-rest. At
42 the beginning of each trial, four white, solid squares ($0.4^\circ \times 0.4^\circ$) would converge,
43 over 1000 ms, from the corners of a virtual square (40 mm) at the centre of a black
44 screen (see Fig. 1) to draw gaze to this location. At the point of convergence, the
45 square was replaced by a white central fixation cross ($0.4^\circ \times 0.4^\circ$) along with two grey
46 rectangles, either horizontally or vertically aligned. Each rectangle subtended $2.2^\circ \times$
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
15.2° with a line thickness of 0.1° , and was centred 4.5° from fixation.

1
2
3
4 After 1000 ms a peripheral pre-cue was presented in the form of a brightening
5 (grey to white) of three sides of an imaginary outline square (2.2°), which overlapped
6 one end of the rectangle. After 100 ms the cued end returned to its original grey
7 colour and the fixation display remained on-screen for another 100 ms. This was
8 followed by the target, a solid grey square ($0.2 \times 0.2^\circ$). The target could appear at
9 either the cued end of the rectangle (valid trial), the opposite end of the same
10 rectangle (invalid within-object trial), or at the homologous end of the other rectangle
11 (invalid between-object trial). As shown in Figure 1, the experimental design was
12 fully balanced, such that invalid cueing could require attention to be redirected either
13 between (or within) rectangles equally frequently between or within visual hemifields.
14 The cue position relative to the fixation point was equidistant at 6° horizontal/vertical,
15 in all presentation conditions. The target remained on-screen for 3000 ms or until
16 response (pressing of the space bar), whichever was sooner. This terminated the trial;
17 the next one started after a 500 ms inter-trial interval during which the screen was
18 blank (see Fig. 1).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 There were 352 trials in total, comprising 256 valid trials, 64 invalid trials, and
40 32 catch trials with no target present. For each array type (i.e. horizontal or vertical
41 rectangles) there were 176 trials, in 160 of which the target was present. This resulted
42 in 40 (32 valid and 8 invalid) target-present trials for each end of a given (horizontal
43 or vertical) rectangle. Thus, for each rectangle there were 8 invalid targets at the
44 opposite end of the same rectangle and 8 invalid targets at the homologous end of the
45 opposite rectangle. Not taking into account the catch trials, the cue validity was 75%
46 for each end of a cued rectangle.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1 about here

Experimental design

A crossover design was used whereby each subject took part in two testing sessions. Half of the subjects in each group performed the attentional task after sham adaptation followed by prism adaptation. The other half received the same conditions in reverse order. The order of conditions was counterbalanced within each group and each condition was performed with a one-week interval between them to minimize carry-over effects. In addition, each experimental session was split into two blocks of trials each preceded by an adaptation period in order to ensure a lasting prismatic after-effect for the duration of the session (Fig. 2).

Figure 2 about here

Results

The analyses were carried out on group means based on each individual's median reaction times. Before calculating the medians, however, the raw RT data were trimmed to remove outliers more than 3 SDs above each subject's overall mean. Overall, between 0.6 % and 2.5% of all trials were omitted from the analyses. All difference calculations (invalid-valid) were carried out on individual median RTs.

Main analyses

Figure 3 summarizes the RT performance for each group (HC, RBD, NEG), broken down by adaptation condition (sham, prism), cue validity (valid, invalid within-object, invalid between-object) and target side (left, right). An initial ANOVA found a highly significant four-way interaction between these four factors [$F(4, 58) = 9.34, p <$

1
2
3 0.0001]. This was followed up by a series of repeated measures ANOVAs within each
4 subject group, with adaptation condition, cue validity and target side as factors, and
5
6 Huyn-Feldt adjustments to the degrees of freedom for violations of sphericity.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Figure 3 about here
13
14
15
16

17 For the HC group (Fig. 3, left column), significant main effects of validity
18 condition [$F(1,09,11.95) = 55.04, p < 0.0005$] and side [$F(1,11) = 6.25, p < 0.05$]
19 were found. Notably, adaptation condition had no influence on performance in this
20 group. The 'side' effect reflected slightly longer RTs to left-side targets overall (mean
21 RT 510 ms left, 503 ms right). The validity effect reflected the expected cost for
22 invalidly cued relative to validly cued targets, with an additional cost when the
23 invalidly cued target required a between-object attention shift (mean valid RT 415 ms;
24 invalid within-object RT 533 ms; invalid between-object RT 571 ms). Bonferroni t-
25 tests confirmed significant differences between all pairings of validity conditions
26 (adjusted $p < 0.0005$ in all cases).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The RBD group (Fig. 3, middle column) similarly showed significant main
42 effects of validity [$F(2,18) = 42.08, p < 0.0001$] and side [$F(1,9) = 7.12, p < 0.05$],
43 with no significant effects involving adaptation condition. As before, the 'side' effect
44 reflected longer RTs to left-side targets (mean RT 698 ms left, 652 ms right), this
45 larger difference no doubt arising as a generalized effect of the right-hemisphere
46 damage in these patients. The validity effect again reflected the cost of invalid cueing
47 and an additional cost for a between-object attention shift (mean RT 552 ms valid,
48 713 ms invalid within-object, 761 ms invalid between-object). Bonferroni t-tests
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 confirmed significant differences between all pairings of validity conditions (adjusted
4
5
6 $p < 0.05$ in all cases).
7

8 As in the two control groups, the analysis for the NEG group (Fig. 3, right
9 column) also found significant main effects of target side [$F(1,9) = 19.29, p < 0.005$]
10 and validity [$F(1.21,10.86) = 55.97, p < 0.0005$]. The neglect patients were
11 considerably slower to respond to targets on the left than on the right, slower to
12 respond to invalidly-cued than to validly-cued targets, and slower to make between-
13 object than within-object shifts of attention. In contrast to the other two groups,
14 however, all effects involving the factor of adaptation were also highly significant,
15 including the three-way interaction between adaptation condition, validity, and target
16 side [$F(1.44,12.95) = 17.54, p < 0.0005$].
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 This result was followed up by separate repeated-measures ANOVAs for
30 each adaptation condition separately. In the sham condition (Fig. 3, upper right plot),
31 the main finding was a pronounced interaction of validity by side [$F(1.31,11.83) =$
32 $11.29, p < 0.005$], with a greatly elevated RT cost (657 ms) when attention had to be
33 reoriented between objects to an invalidly-cued target on the left side. The NEG group
34 thus showed the classic disengage deficit for invalidly-cued targets on the left side.
35 This deficit, however, was specific to between-object shifts of attention, and did not
36 affect within-object shifts. Table 2 presents these data in the form of difference scores
37 between within and between-object invalid RTs in the three groups of subjects. The
38 selectivity of the disengage deficit in the neglect group following sham adaptation,
39 and its disappearance following real prism adaptation, are clearly apparent.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2 about here

1
2
3 In the prism adaptation condition, however, performance in the NEG group
4 conformed to the patterns observed in the two control groups, with significant effects
5 of validity [$F(2,18) = 50.38, p < 0.0005$] and side [$F(1,9) = 9.72, p < 0.05$]. RTs were
6 longer for left-sided targets (mean RT 814 ms left, 692 ms right). The validity effect
7 again reflected the cost of invalid cueing and an additional cost for between-object
8 attention shifts (mean RT 582 ms valid, 803 ms invalid within-object, 879 ms invalid
9 between-object). Bonferroni t-tests confirmed significant differences between all
10 pairings of validity conditions (adjusted $p < 0.05$ in all cases). In other words, prism
11 adaptation restored performance in the NEG group to a remarkably normal pattern,
12 abolishing the disengage deficit entirely.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 *Analysis of valid trials*

30
31 The difference between the NEG patients and the control groups is readily evident in
32 terms of the disengage deficit, as is the effect of prism adaptation on this aspect of the
33 NEG group's performance. However, we were also interested in the patients' more
34 fundamental ability to detect validly-cued targets. For this purpose, we performed an
35 additional analysis of reaction times to valid targets with group, adaptation condition
36 and target side as factors. This revealed no significant effects involving adaptation
37 condition, but found a highly significant interaction of group by side [$F(2,29) =$
38 11.20, $p < 0.0005$]. The source of this interaction was investigated in a series of
39 independent t-tests between pairs of groups conducted on difference scores (left
40 minus right RTs to validly-cued targets). Only the difference between the NEG and
41 HC group survived Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons [$t(9.20)$ with
42 unequal variances = 4.46, adjusted $p < 0.01$]. Thus the tendency for longer RTs to
43 left-sided targets was more pronounced in the NEG group than in healthy controls, but
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 not reliably more pronounced than in RBD controls. In all cases, however, it is clear
4
5 that right prism adaptation did not induce any differential speeding of responses to
6
7 validly-cued targets on the left side.
8
9

10 11 12 *Horizontal vs vertical attention shifts*

13
14
15 In order to evaluate whether the observed attentional asymmetries were hemispatial or
16
17 directional in nature we reanalysed the raw data by calculating for each subject their
18
19 median invalidly-cued RTs according to whether attention had to be shifted
20
21 horizontally (between-hemifield) or vertically (within-hemifield). The valid RTs for
22
23 the relevant hemifield were subtracted to provide RT costs for the two kinds of shift
24
25 separately, as shown in Fig. 4.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Figure 4 about here
33
34
35

36
37 An ANOVA on these costs with the between-subjects factor 'group' (HC,
38
39 RBD, NEG) and within-subject factors 'adaptation' (sham, prism), 'attention shift'
40
41 (within-, between-hemifield) and 'target side' (left, right) revealed a highly significant
42
43 main effect for 'shift' [$F(1,29) = 24.35, p < 0.0001$], reflecting the generally higher
44
45 within-hemifield than between-hemifield costs. More interestingly, there was also a
46
47 significant 3-way interaction of shift x side x group [$F(2,29) = 5.61, p < 0.05$], and a 4-
48
49 way interaction of adaptation x shift x side x group [$F(2,29) = 6.74, p < 0.005$].
50
51

52
53 To explore these interactions, separate ANOVAs were carried out for each
54
55 group separately. In the NEG group only, these analyses revealed a significant 2-way
56
57 (shift x side) interaction [$F(1,9) = 17.64, p < 0.005$], and a significant 3-way
58
59 (adaptation x shift x side) interaction [$F(1,9) = 22.78, p < 0.005$]. No significant
60

1
2
3 interactions were found in either of the two control groups. The shift x side
4 interaction in the NEG group, as Fig. 4 (top right) illustrates, reflects a much more
5 prominent disengage deficit in the NEG group for between-hemifield than for within-
6 hemifield trials after sham adaptation. The 3-way interaction reflects the fact that this
7 selective disengage deficit was abolished by prism adaptation.
8
9

10
11 We confirmed these interpretations of the NEG group data by performing 2 x
12 2 ANOVAs on the horizontal and vertical shifts separately. These showed that the
13 main effect of side was significant only for horizontal shifts [$F(1,9) = 6.06, p < 0.05$],
14 and not for vertical shifts considered alone. In other words, the disengage deficit was
15 specifically a *directional* deficit: there was no deficit for vertical attention shifts
16 executed within the left hemifield alone. Similarly, the condition x side interaction
17 was significant only for horizontal shifts [$F(1,9) = 14.17, p < 0.05$], reflecting the
18 disappearance of the disengage deficit after prism adaptation.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

Figure 5 about here

41 *Extent of prismatic after-effects*

42
43 As shown in Figure 5 (top), the NEG patients showed a substantially larger
44 visuomotor deviation following prism adaptation than either of the two control
45 groups. This difference between groups was significant on a two-way ANOVA
46 [$F(2,29) = 7.82, p < 0.01$]. The ANOVA also revealed that unlike either control
47 group, the neglect patients maintained this strong after-effect between the beginning
48 and the end of the testing session [interaction group x occasion: $F(2,29) = 6.76, p <$
49 0.01]. We also examined the relationship between this reaching bias after prismatic
50 adaptation and the extent of improvement in the disengage deficit that followed it. As
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 illustrated in Figure 5 (bottom), the neglect patients showed a strong correlation
4 between the visuomotor bias and the reduction in between-object disengage deficit
5
6 between sham and prism sessions [$r(9) = 0.76$; $p < 0.01$, using an averaged reaching
7
8 bias across initial and final scores]. This correlation did not reach significance in
9
10 either of the other two groups ($r \leq 0.33$, $p > 0.05$). Finally, there was no significant
11
12 correlation between the initial (sham) disengage deficit and its improvement
13
14 following prism adaptation across the neglect patient group, indicating that the
15
16 prismatic benefit was not influenced by the severity of a patient's deficit.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Discussion

26
27 The task used in the present study elicited attention shift costs somewhat larger than
28 those reported by Egly et al. (1994): our healthy subjects responded to invalidly cued
29 stimuli 137 ms slower than their responses to validly cued stimuli. Nonetheless, just
30 as in that previous study, significantly greater costs were observed (156 ms) for shifts
31 of attention *between* objects than for shifts *within* objects (119 ms). These costs in
32 our healthy control group were unaffected by prism adaptation. This normal pattern
33 was replicated in the control group of right-hemisphere patients without neglect: they
34 showed between-object shift costs of 209 ms, as compared with their within-object
35 costs of 161 ms. There was no significant difference in the costs for responding to
36 target stimuli presented in the left versus right visual field. Although numerically
37 these shifting costs in non-neglect patients were higher than those observed in our
38 healthy controls, their reaction times were longer. Proportionately, their shift costs
39 were almost identical to those of the healthy subjects. Following prism adaptation,
40 they too showed no significant change in attention-shifting costs on either task.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our neglect patients showed a completely different pattern of results from the
4 other two groups. At baseline, that is following sham adaptation only, they exhibited
5 an extremely large RT cost for leftward attention shifts between objects. Yet their
6 costs for rightward between-object shifts, and for within-object shifts, whether
7 leftward or rightward, remained proportionately comparable to those seen in the
8 lesion controls (given that their mean RTs were even longer). Furthermore, there was
9 no difference between the within- and between-object conditions for rightward shifts
10 of attention.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Following prism adaptation, the pattern of RT costs in the neglect patients
23 came close to the normal pattern seen in the two control groups. That is, there was
24 now a completely symmetrical pattern in which between-object shifts had higher costs
25 (301 ms) than within-object shifts (225 ms). Allowing for the longer RTs made by
26 our neglect patients, this pattern thus became relatively normal in percentage terms,
27 i.e. the costs observed were now comparable to the baseline (sham-adaptation) results
28 from our two control groups.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Our experimental design, following that of Egly et al. (1994), included vertical
40 as well as horizontal shifts of attention, balanced across both types of invalid-cue
41 condition. It was therefore possible to compare the effects of shifting attention within
42 one visual hemifield with those of shifting attention between hemifields (averaging
43 across both between- and within-object cueing). Our data show that such vertical
44 attention shifts were overall somewhat more costly (by, on average, 47 ms) in both of
45 our control groups, in both hemifields. This was true also in our neglect patients
46 when the target stimulus appeared in the right hemifield. Only when the target
47 stimulus appeared in the left field was a different pattern obtained. Prior to prism
48 adaptation, the neglect patients now showed the opposite result: a significantly *higher*
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 cost for right-to-left attention shifts than for upward or downward shifts. In other
4
5 words, their disengage deficit was clearly restricted to lateral attention shifts from the
6
7 right to left hemifield. Following prism adaptation, this pattern reversed dramatically
8
9 to the 'normal' pattern of a higher cost for vertical than for horizontal shifts to left-
10
11 hemifield targets.
12
13

14
15 In our sample of neglect patients, the disengage deficit was observed only for
16
17 between-object attention shifts. This seems to indicate that the disengage deficit is
18
19 strongly object-based, and not purely spatial: if the disengage deficit were space-
20
21 based only, then we it should be equally apparent in the within- and between-object
22
23 conditions, because the spatial factors are the same in both cases. In fact, the
24
25 perceptual chunking of the scene into objects had a huge influence on the disengage
26
27 deficit. This is consistent with a recent report by Rastelli et al. (2008), who observed
28
29 that the disengage deficit in neglect was abolished by the use of a peripheral offset
30
31 cue, as opposed to an onset cue. These authors concluded that the disengage deficit
32
33 depends critically upon the presence of an object from which attention must be
34
35 disengaged, and does not apply to locations in space *per se*. To this conclusion, we
36
37 may now add that the presence of an object on which attention is engaged may
38
39 impede the reorienting of attention to contralesional locations away from that object,
40
41 but it does not does impede reorienting within the same object.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 At face value, our findings seems to conflict with the previous data of Egly
50
51 and colleagues (1994), who concluded in favour of an object-based component to the
52
53 disengage deficit in left-hemisphere but not right-hemisphere patients with parietal
54
55 involvement. However, it may not be possible to make such direct comparisons
56
57 between Egly et al's data and our own, because they used unselected groups of left
58
59 and right-hemisphere patients with some degree of parietal involvement, not all of
60

1
2
3 whom had neglect. In contrast, not all of our patients had parietal involvement, even
4
5 among the neglect group. In other words, the baseline data for our patients
6
7 complement, and do not necessarily contradict, those of Egly et al. More specifically,
8
9 our data speak to the nature of spatial neglect, but not directly to the nature of parietal
10
11 lobe function *per se*. Indeed recent evidence suggests that the superior temporal
12
13 region may have at least as much to do with the attentional functions we are
14
15 addressing in this study (Karnath et al. 2001, 2004; Ellison et al. 2004; Schindler et al.
16
17 2008) as does the parietal lobe (Mort et al. 2003; Rorden et al. 2006). Finally of
18
19 course, all of our patients, unlike those of Egly et al, had right-hemisphere infarcts,
20
21 and therefore our data cannot contribute to the question of hemispheric asymmetries
22
23 in attentional control.
24
25
26
27
28

29 The experimental task that we adopted was designed by Egly et al. (1994) to
30
31 contrast object-based and space-based components of reorienting; it was not designed
32
33 explicitly to test for 'within-object' forms of neglect. Nonetheless, the task should be
34
35 sensitive to such symptoms, in that a hypothetical patient who has a within-object but
36
37 not a between-object attentional bias should show greater RT costs when an invalidly
38
39 cued target appears within the cued object, rather than the other object. In reality, we
40
41 found that within-object biases made little if any contribution to neglect performance.
42
43 First, at a group level, within-object reorienting of attention to invalidly cued
44
45 contralesional targets was remarkably efficient. Second, none of our neglect patients
46
47 had a greater RT cost for within-object than for between-object reorienting to left-
48
49 sided targets, as would be expected for any patient with a within-object form of
50
51 neglect. This apparent absence of within-object biases in the attentional task occurred
52
53 despite clear neglect on clinical tasks, such as figure copying and drawing (see Table
54
55 1), that are sometimes held to be diagnostic of within-object forms of neglect. This
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 adds weight to earlier warnings that caution is required in inferring within-object
4
5 neglect from uncontrolled clinical tests such as these, since more parsimonious
6
7 accounts may explain within-object patterns of errors (e.g. Driver and Pouget 2000).
8
9

10
11 Indeed, whilst there is no doubt that object-based effects can powerfully shape
12
13 the symptoms of neglect (e.g. Driver and Halligan, 1991; Behrmann and Tipper,
14
15 1994; Walker, 1996), evidence for a truly dissociable within-object form of neglect is
16
17 limited to a pair of single-case studies (e.g. Humphreys and Riddoch 1994). No
18
19 previous study has assessed the incidence of within-object effects in unselected
20
21 patients with neglect, so we really do not know how common such effects may be, or
22
23 to what extent they contribute to the clinical presentation of neglect. The lack of
24
25 evidence for ‘within-object’ neglect in the present study suggests that such effects
26
27 may be rare at best. On the other hand, the absence of within-object effects may
28
29 reflect something specific about our attentional task, thus not ruling out the possibility
30
31 that some of our patients might have shown within-object neglect in other tests.
32
33 However, at least with regard to the disengage deficit, our data establish a vastly
34
35 greater impairment when making attention shifts between objects than within them.
36
37
38
39

40
41 Analysis of the extent of the visuomotor after-effect of prism adaptation
42
43 within the neglect group provided some potentially useful information for
44
45 understanding the effects of adaptation in these patients. First, the initial amplitude of
46
47 post-adaptation bias was 35 % greater in the neglect group than in the other two
48
49 groups; and this larger effect was maintained throughout the test session, whereas the
50
51 bias fell by 14% in the controls. These results confirm previous reports that neglect
52
53 patients show abnormally large prismatic after-effects which also decay more slowly
54
55 than normal (Rossetti et al. 1998; Serino et al. 2006). Given that no similar effects
56
57 were seen in our RBD controls, it appears that these large and persistent after-effects
58
59
60

1
2
3 are truly specific to neglect. Secondly, our analyses also uncovered a strong
4
5 relationship between the extent of post-prismatic visuomotor bias and the
6
7 improvement in disengage deficit observed among our neglect patients. This finding
8
9 contrasts with a previous report (Serino et al. 2006) that there is no such relationship
10
11 between prismatic after-effect and the degree of recovery from neglect. It may be that
12
13 the reason for this apparent disagreement lies in the selection of neglect tests used: in
14
15 order to detect the relationship it may be necessary to use a very pure and specific
16
17 measure of attentional bias. It should be cautioned that the visuomotor biases we
18
19 were able to analyse do not provide a pure measure of the visuomotor after-effects,
20
21 given that we did not have a pre-adaptation baseline measure of pointing error. This
22
23 may mean that we have tended to underestimate the adaptation effects in our analyses.
24
25 However we do not believe that this would have affected our conclusions. In
26
27 particular the lack of such a baseline does not compromise our demonstration of the
28
29 stability of the after-effect in the neglect patients.
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 As mentioned in the Introduction, there have been two recent reports on the
37
38 effects of prism adaptation on the performance of neglect patients in attentional tasks
39
40 using the Posner paradigm. In particular, Nijboer et al. (2008) have argued from data
41
42 based on two patients that voluntary attention shifts benefit from adaptation while
43
44 automatic shifts do not. This was based on the finding of an effect with central
45
46 symbolic predictive cueing, and long SOAs, but no effect with peripheral non-
47
48 predictive cueing and short SOAs. The present study, however, establishes that it
49
50 cannot be the difference between central and peripheral cues *per se* that is critical,
51
52 because we have reported here a massive effect of prism adaptation in a task with
53
54 peripheral cues. The difference may instead be that, in the present task, the peripheral
55
56 cues were informative, and therefore would have encouraged voluntary as well as
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 engaging automatic orienting processes. It is notable that a neuroimaging study by
4 Kincade et al. (2005) indicates that the “ventral attention network” including the
5 temporoparietal junction (TPJ), may be especially involved in stimulus-driven shifts
6 of attention to *task-relevant* stimuli at unattended locations (i.e. attentional
7 reorienting). Moreover, they found that the ventral network (especially TPJ) is much
8 more strongly activated when attention has initially been directed endogenously.
9 These data suggest that the TPJ, an area frequently damaged in neglect patients, may
10 be a critical centre for stimulus-driven reorienting following endogenous orienting. It
11 may be that such reorienting is the aspect of attention that benefits most directly from
12 prism adaptation in neglect patients.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The effects of prism adaptation on our neglect patients in this study were
28 every bit as dramatic as previous reports have led one to expect (Rossetti et al. 1998;
29 Rossetti and Rode 2002). They were also apparently rather selective, in that they
30 affected only *leftward shifts of attention between objects*. This conclusion, however,
31 has to be tempered by the fact that it was only such leftward between-object shifts that
32 were significantly impaired in our neglect patients in the first place. In other words, it
33 could be argued that in our sample there was no deficit in within-object attention-
34 shifting to be corrected. There is thus an ambiguity in the present data. Is it that
35 prism adaptation benefits are truly restricted to between-object shifts of attention in
36 neglect patients, such that a within-object task that showed an impairment would also
37 remain unaffected? Or would any task that showed a leftward reorienting impairment
38 in neglect show a comparable improvement following prism adaptation? On the basis
39 of the present data, we wish to argue that within this type of Posner cueing paradigm,
40 there is an attentional impairment (disengage deficit) commensurate with the severity
41 of the patients’ clinical neglect symptoms *only for attention shifts between objects*.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 That is, even if another task might uncover a within-object deficit of leftward
4
5
6 attention shifting in neglect patients, it could hardly be regarded as a major causal
7
8
9 determinant of neglect symptomatology.

10
11 In conclusion, our data demonstrate that the huge cost of shifting visuospatial
12
13 attention from an invalidly cued location to a more leftwardly located target in neglect
14
15 patients (Posner et al. 1982, 1984, 1987) is dramatically normalized as a result of
16
17 prism adaptation. The data also indicate that this improvement is specific to neglect:
18
19 no change was observed in our right-hemisphere damaged patients without neglect.
20
21 Finally, our data lead us to propose that the attentional deficit central to the neglect
22
23 syndrome is one restricted to shifts *between* objects. If so, it would follow that prism
24
25 adaptation has a powerful effect on one of the most fundamental manifestations of the
26
27 syndrome.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Acknowledgements**

39 The authors are grateful to the Medical Research Council (grants G0000003 and
40
41 G0000680) and the Leverhulme Trust (grant F/00128/O) for their support.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Behrmann M, Tipper SP (1994) Object-based attentional mechanisms: Evidence from patients with unilateral neglect. In: Umiltà C, Moscovitch M (eds) *Attention and Performance XV. Conscious and Nonconscious Information Processing*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA., pp 351-375
- Berberovic NN, Pisella L, Morris AP, Mattingley JB (2004) Prismatic adaptation reduces biased temporal order judgements in spatial neglect. (2004) Prismatic adaptation reduces biased temporal order judgements in spatial neglect. *Neuroreport* 15: 1199-1204
- Driver J, Halligan PW (1991) Can visual neglect operate in object-centred coordinates? An affirmative single case study. *Cogn Neuropsychol* 8: 475-496
- Edgworth J, Robertson IH, MacMillan T (1998) *The Balloons Test: A Screening Test for Visual Inattention*. Thames Valley Test Company, Bury St Edmunds, UK
- Egley R, Driver J, Rafal RD (1994) Shifting visual attention between objects and locations: evidence from normal and parietal lesion subjects. *J Exp Psychol Gen* 123: 161-177
- Ellison A, Schindler I, Pattison LL, Milner AD (2004) An exploration of the role of the superior temporal gyrus in visual search and spatial perception using TMS. *Brain* 127: 2307-2315
- Frassinetti F, Angeli V, Meneghello F, Avanzi S, Ladavas E (2002) Long-lasting amelioration of visuospatial neglect by prism adaptation. *Brain* 125: 608-623.
- Friedrich FJ, Egley R, Rafal RD, Beck D (1998) Spatial attention deficits in humans: a comparison of superior parietal and temporal-parietal junction lesions. *Neuropsychology* 12: 193-207

- 1
2
3 Gainotti G, Messerli P, Tissot, R (1972) Qualitative analysis of unilateral spatial
4 neglect in relation to laterality of cerebral lesions. *J Neurol Neurosurg*
5
6 *Psychiat* 35: 545-550.
7
8
9
10 Humphreys GW, Riddoch MJ (1994) Attention to within-object and between-object
11 spatial representations – multiple sites for visual selection. *Cogn*
12
13 *Neuropsychol* 11: 207-241
14
15
16
17 Karnath H-O, Ferber S, Himmelbach M (2001) Spatial awareness is a function of the
18 temporal not the posterior parietal lobe. *Nature* 411: 950-953
19
20
21
22 Karnath H-O, Fruhmann Berger M, Kuker W, Rorden C (2004) The anatomy of
23 spatial neglect based on voxelwise statistical analysis: a study of 140 patients.
24
25 *Cereb Cortex* 14: 1164-1172
26
27
28
29 Kincade JM, Abrams RA, Astafiev SV, Shulman GL, Corbetta M (2005) An event-
30 related functional magnetic resonance imaging study of voluntary and
31
32 stimulus-driven orienting of attention. *J Neurosci* 25: 4593-4604
33
34
35
36 Kleinman JT, Newhart M, Davis C, Heidler-Gary J, Gottesman RF, Hillis AE. (2007)
37 Right hemispatial neglect: frequency and characterization following acute left
38
39 hemisphere stroke. *Brain & Cognition* 64: 50-59.
40
41
42
43 Ladavas E, Carletti M, Gori G (1994) Automatic and voluntary orienting of attention
44 in patients with visual neglect: horizontal and vertical dimensions.
45
46 *Neuropsychologia* 32: 1195-1208
47
48
49
50
51 Losier BJ, Klein RM (2001) A review of the evidence for a disengage deficit
52 following parietal lobe damage. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 25: 1-13
53
54
55
56 McIntosh RD, Rossetti Y, Milner AD (2002) Prism adaptation improves chronic
57 visual and haptic neglect: a single-case study. *Cortex* 38: 309-320
58
59
60 Milner AD, McIntosh RD (2005) The neurological basis of visual neglect. *Current*

- 1
2
3 Opin Neurol 18: 748-753
4
5
6 Morris AP, Kritikos A, Berberovic N, Pisella L, Chambers CD, Mattingley JB (2004)
7
8 Prism adaptation and spatial attention: a study of visual search in normals and
9
10 patients with unilateral neglect. Cortex 40: 703-721
11
12
13 Morrow LA, Ratcliff G (1988) The disengagement of covert attention and the neglect
14
15 syndrome. Psychobiol 3: 261-269
16
17
18 Mort DJ, Molhotra P, Mannan SK, Rorden C, Pambakian A, Kennard C, Husain M
19
20 (2003) The anatomy of visual neglect. Brain 126: 1986-1997
21
22
23 Nijboer, TCW, McIntosh RD, Nys GMS, Dijkerman HC, Milner AD (2008) Prism
24
25 adaptation improves voluntary but not automatic orienting in neglect.
26
27 Neuroreport 19: 293-298
28
29
30 Posner MI (1980) Orienting of attention. Quart J Exp Psychol 32: 3-25
31
32
33 Posner MI, Cohen Y, Rafal RD (1982) Neural systems control of spatial orienting.
34
35 Phil Trans R Soc Lond, B 298: 187-198
36
37
38 Posner MI, Walker JA, Friedrich FJ, Rafal RD (1984) Effects of parietal lobe injury
39
40 on covert orienting of attention. J Neurosci 4: 1863-1874
41
42
43 Posner MI, Walker JA, Friedrich FA, Rafal RD (1987) How do the parietal lobes
44
45 direct covert attention? Neuropsychologia 25: 135-145
46
47
48 Rastelli F, Funes M-J, Lupiáñez J, Duret C, Bartolomeo P (2008) Left visual neglect:
49
50 is the disengage deficit space- or object-based? Exp Brain Res 187: 439-446.
51
52
53 Redding GM, Wallace B (2006) Prism adaptation and unilateral neglect: review and
54
55 analysis. Neuropsychologia 44: 1-20
56
57
58 Rode G, Rossetti Y, Boisson D (2001) Prism adaptation improves representational
59
60 neglect. Neuropsychologia 39: 1250-1254
Rode G, Rossetti Y, Li L, Boisson D (1999) Improvement of mental imagery after

- 1
2
3 prism exposure in neglect: a case study. *Behav Neurol* 11: 251-258
4
5
6 Rorden C, Fruhmann Berger M, Karnath H-O (2006) Disturbed line bisection is
7
8 associated with posterior brain lesions. *Brain Res* 1080: 17-25
9
10 Rossetti Y, Rode G (2002) Reducing spatial neglect by visual and other sensory
11
12 manipulations: noncognitive (psychological) routes to the rehabilitation of a
13
14 cognitive disorder. In: Karnath H-O, Milner AD, Vallar G (eds) *Cognitive and*
15
16 *Neural Bases of Spatial Neglect*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 375-396
17
18
19 Rossetti Y, Rode G, Pisella L, Farnè A, Li L, Boisson D, Perenin MT (1998) Prism
20
21 adaptation to a rightward optical deviation rehabilitates left hemispatial
22
23 neglect. *Nature* 395: 166-169
24
25
26
27 Rossetti Y, Rode G, Pisella L, Farne A, Ling L, Boisson D (1999) Sensorimotor
28
29 plasticity and cognition: prism adaptation can affect various levels of space
30
31 representation. In: Grealy M, Thomson JA (eds) *Studies in Perception and*
32
33 *Action*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hove, UK, pp 265-269
34
35
36 Schindler I, Ellison A, Milner AD (2008) Contralateral visual search deficits
37
38 following TMS. *J Neuropsychol*: published online 2 Feb 2008
39
40
41 Striemer C, Danckert J (2007) Prism adaptation reduces the disengagement deficit in right
42
43 brain damage patients. *Neuroreport* 18: 99-103
44
45
46 Tilikete C, Rode G, Rossetti Y, Pichon J, Li L, Boisson D (2001) Prism adaptation to
47
48 a rightward optical deviation improves postural imbalance in left-hemiparetic
49
50 patients. *Curr Biol* 11: 1-5
51
52
53 Walker R (1996) Spatial and object-based neglect. *Neurocase* 1: 371-383
54
55
56 Wilson B, Cockburn J, Halligan PW (1987) *The Behavioural Inattention Test*.
57
58 Thames Valley Test Company, Titchfield, Hampshire, UK
59
60

Table 1: Clinical and demographic data of the neglect (NEG) and control (RBD) patients.

Patient	Age/sex	Months post onset	Aetiology	Lesion site (CT scan)	Star cancellation Omissions (%)		Balloons B Laterality index (%)	BIT line bisection Mean deviation (mm)	Scene copying† Symmetry/Items	Drawing‡
					L	R				
NEG1	75/m	33	Ischaemia	TP, WM, SC	7.4	3.7	37.5	15.5	2/4	3
NEG2	75/f	15	Haemorrhage	P	3.7	3.7	37.5	14.6	4/5	3
NEG3	75/m	36	Ischaemia	FPO	29.6	25.9	12.5	15.3	1/1	1
NEG4	59/f	12	Ischaemia	n. a.	11.1	3.7	33.3	16.2	5/5	3
NEG5	58/m	2	Ischaemia	TP	14.8	3.7	37.5	12.4	5/5	3
NEG6	83/m	27	Ischaemia	P	100	22.2	0	7.3	2/5	0
NEG7	75/f	4	Ischaemia	FT, BG	3.7	0	33.3	16.5	4/5	3
NEG8	74/m	3	Ischaemia	FP	55.6	33.3	18.2	19.1	0/5	0
NEG9	50/m	2	Ischaemia	FP, BG	14.8	3.7	20.0	3.9	4/5	2
NEG10	59/m	13	Ischaemia	FT	100	3.7	33.3	-2.1	5/5	2
RBD1	68/f	3	Ischaemia	WM	0	0	50.0	1.7	5/5	3
RBD2	62/f	2	Ischaemia	SC, WM	0	0	53.9	-4.7	5/5	3
RBD3	78/m	25	Ischaemia	BG	0	0	50.0	1.2	5/5	3
RBD4	57/m	2	Ischaemia	FT	0	3.7	47.1	-9.4	5/5	3
RBD5	41/m	3	Haemorrhage	F	0	0	50.0	-1.3	5/5	3
RBD6	69/m	7	Ischaemia	T, P	3.7	3.7	52.9	8.9	5/5	3
RBD7	79/m	18	Ischaemia	FP	0	0	53.3	4.0	5/5	3
RBD8	69/m	2	Ischaemia	T	0	0	50.0	1.7	5/5	3
RBD9	76/f	4	Ischaemia	FT	3.7	3.7	50.0	0.8	5/5	3
RBD10	69/m	6	Ischaemia	SC	0	0	50.0	0.7	5/5	3

†Symmetry: total number of attempted items copied symmetrically; Items: total number of items copied (from 5)

‡ Drawing from memory of 3 objects (person, clock, daisy): number of items (0-3) drawn symmetrically.

F: frontal, T: temporal, P: parietal, O: occipital, BG: basal ganglia, WM: white matter, SC: subcortical

n.a.: not available.

Test scores that meet the criteria for neglect are shown in bold print.

Table 2: Mean reaction time cost in ms (SD) for healthy controls (HC), lesion control patients (RBD) and neglect patients (NEG), as a function of adaptation condition, target position (Left, Right) and type of attention shift (within/between object).

Sham adaptation				
Group	Within object		Between object	
	Left	Right	Left	Right
HC	124.50 (53.98)	115.75 (67.94)	169.63 (70.31)	149.08 (76.04)
RBD	110.80 (78.08)	187.70 (94.54)	240.35 (134.38)	207.20 (112.89)
NEG	240.00 (158.67)	251.80 (195.34)	656.80 (362.69)	246.10 (160.23)
Prism adaptation				
HC	122.92 (54.60)	111.00 (69.75)	154.67 (80.34)	150.50 (76.40)
RBD	164.50 (149.26)	179.60 (99.20)	184.50 (111.58)	202.70 (120.91)
NEG	223.70 (145.82)	226.60 (89.59)	299.60 (165.60)	302.40 (153.21)




Fig. 1 Timeline for the experimental task. Trials were either validly cued, or invalidly cued either to the same or the other rectangle. Subjects responded to the target as rapidly as possible and reaction times were measured. The two example trials shown illustrate the fact that the two rectangles were presented either vertically or horizontally, in a balanced design. This allowed within vs between-object attention shifts to be distinguished from vertical vs horizontal shifts. See text for more details.
275x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Fig. 2 The experimental design of the study. Within each group of subjects, the sequence of sham adaptation and prism adaptation sessions were balanced. See text for more details.
254x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Review




Fig. 3 The reaction time data for three age-matched groups of subjects: neglect patients, right brain damaged controls, and healthy controls. Data are presented separately for the conditions of sham adaptation (top) and real prism adaptation (bottom). In each of the 6 plots, RTs are presented separately for left and right target location and for different cueing conditions (valid, between-object invalid, and within-object invalid).
296x209mm (150 x 150 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Fig. 4 RT costs plotted according to whether they required a horizontal shift between left and right hemifields or only a vertical shift within one hemifield, for the three groups of subjects. Again the data are presented separately for sham adaptation (top) and real prism adaptation (bottom). In each plot, RT costs are presented separately for left and right target locations.
296x209mm (150 x 150 DPI)

review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Fig. 5 The extent of the prismatic after-effect and its relationship with the resulting improvements in leftward attention switching. A: Mean pointing error (deg) induced by prism adaptation prior to and following attentional testing in the three groups of subjects. Pointing error was highest and also most stable within the neglect group. B: Scattergram showing the strong relationship between the mean post-prism pointing error in neglect patients and the difference in leftward shift cost between prism and sham test conditions.
 839x1187mm (150 x 150 DPI)