




**Figure 1. Ventral stream lesions in patient D.F. shown in comparison with the expected location of the lateral occipital complex in healthy subjects, taken from MRI scan data. (A) D.F.'s brain has been rendered at the pial surface (outer grey matter boundary). Lesions were traced on slices that indicated tissue damage, and rendered on the pial surface in pale blue. Lateral views of the left and right hemispheres are shown, as is a ventral view of the underside of the brain. The rightmost image shows a slice through the lesions ( $z = \pm 8$ ). (B) The expected location of LOC based on group data from seven neurologically intact participants is shown on one individual's pial surface and on a slice through the  $z = \pm 8$  plane. The activation in the slice is outlined in orange in panel A for comparison with the lesions in D.F.'s brain. (Reproduced with permission from James et al. 2003).**




**Figure 2. The experimental arrangement used in Experiment 1. The start position is shown as a filled black circle, the target as a filled rectangle, and the six possible obstacle locations as empty rectangles.**




**Figure 3. Experiment 1: Graphs depicting the reach trajectories (normalized for start position) taken by D.F. (top 3 graphs) and controls (bottom 3 graphs) for each of the 3 obstacle locations. The solid line represents reach trajectories when the obstacle was present on the left and the broken line represents reach trajectories when the obstacle was on the right.**



**Figure 4.** The lesion sites in patient S.B., as reconstructed from MRI scan data. (Reproduced with permission from Lé et al. 2002).




**Figure 5. The experimental arrangement used in Experiment 2. The start button is shown as a filled black circle, and the possible locations of the two cylindrical non-target objects are shown as open circles. The target zone is shown in grey at the far edge of the board. A strip of white card was placed between the two cylinders on every trial to cover the unused holes.**



**Figure 6. The 'weightings' (dPL and dPR) given to each cylinder by D.F. and S.B. and the controls in the reaching task. These values indicate the extent to which each subject takes the left or right cylinder's location into account when performing the task.**


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




**Figure 8. The weightings given to the two cylinders by our two visual form agnosic patients (D.F. and S.B.) and by optic ataxic patients A.T. and I.G. (Schindler et al. 2004) in the reaching task.**

Review



**Figure 9. The weightings given to the two cylinders by our two visual form agnosic patients (D.F. and S.B.) and by patients A.T. and I.G. (Schindler et al. 2004) in the bisection task.**

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



**Figure 7. The 'weightings' given to each cylinder by D.F. and S.B. and the controls in the bisection task.**

Review

Revised submission February 2006.

**Intact automatic avoidance of obstacles in patients with visual form agnosia**

Nichola J. Rice<sup>1,6</sup>, Robert D. McIntosh<sup>2</sup>, Igor Schindler<sup>3</sup>, Mark Mon-Williams<sup>4</sup>, Jean-François Démonet<sup>5</sup>, and A. David Milner<sup>1</sup>.

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

<sup>2</sup>School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences  
University of Edinburgh  
7 George Square  
Edinburgh, EH8 9JZ, UK.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Psychology  
University of Hull  
Cottingham Road  
Hull, HU6 7RX, UK.

<sup>4</sup>School of Psychology  
William Guild Building  
University of Aberdeen  
Aberdeen, AB24 2UB, UK

<sup>5</sup>INSERM U455  
Federation of Neurology  
CHU Purpan  
F-31059 Toulouse Cedex, France.

<sup>6</sup>The first author is now at:  
Center for Cognitive Neuroscience  
Dartmouth College  
Hanover NH 03755, USA

**Number of text pages, including figures and tables: 40**

**Number of figures and tables: 9**

**Corresponding author:**

Professor A.D. Milner  
Phone: (44-) 191-334-0433  
Fax: (44-) 191-334-0452  
Email: [a.d.milner@durham.ac.uk](mailto:a.d.milner@durham.ac.uk)

**Abstract**

In everyday life our reaching behaviour has to be guided not only by the location and properties of the target object, but also by the presence of potential obstacles in the workspace. Recent evidence from neglect and optic ataxia patients has suggested that this automatic obstacle avoidance is mediated by the dorsal, rather than the ventral, stream of visual processing. We tested this idea in two studies involving patients with visual form agnosia resulting from bilateral ventral-stream damage. In the first study, we asked patient D.F. to reach out and pick up a target object in the presence of obstacles placed at varying distances to the left or right of the target. We found that both D.F. and controls shifted their trajectories away from the potential obstacles and adjusted their grip aperture in such a way as to minimize risk of collision. In a second study, we asked D.F. and a second patient, S.B., to either reach between, or to bisect the space between, two cylinders presented at varying locations. We found that both patients adjusted their reach trajectories to account for shifts in cylinder location in the reaching task, yet showed significantly worse performance than control subjects when asked to make a bisection judgement. Taken together, these data indicate that automatic obstacle avoidance behaviour is spared in our patients with visual form agnosia. We attribute their ability to the functional intactness of the dorsal stream of visual processing, and argue that the ventral stream plays no important role in automatic obstacle avoidance.

## 1. Introduction

In everyday life we automatically tailor our movements so as to prevent collisions with potential obstacles in our workspace. In the laboratory similar behaviours have been observed. For example, Jackson and colleagues [12] found that the placement of non-target objects in the workspace caused changes in both the transport and grasp components of a reach, especially when performed in visual open loop conditions (i.e. when visual feedback is denied). In other studies, it was reported that even a non-target LED would cause reaching movements to veer away from the LED [11, 29]. Although the authors conceptualized this effect as a kind of attentional repulsion, in functional terms it may reflect a failsafe mechanism to maintain sight of potential obstacles in order to minimize the likelihood of colliding with them. This failsafe mechanism may be automatically recruited even when there is no actual physical risk of collision. Tresilian [32] presented data in support of this interpretation, arguing that both the grasp and transport components of prehension movements are adjusted to avoid potential obstacles. Tresilian proposed that people move so as to avoid the hand coming within a minimum preferred distance from non-target objects within the workspace.

More recently, Mon-Williams and McIntosh [26] have shown that as the distance between two flanking obstacles gets smaller, movement time to grasp a target object increases, according to a quasi-Fitts' Law function [7]. In a further investigation, Mon-Williams, Tresilian and colleagues [27] found that the presence of obstacles during a reach to grasp task caused both increases in movement time and decreases in maximum grip aperture, but in varying proportions depending on the layout of the workspace. They suggested that their findings indicate a flexible control

1  
2  
3 strategy in which movements are adjusted to avoid collision with obstacles in a subtle  
4  
5 and precise manner.  
6

7  
8 Until very recently, there have been no investigations directed at  
9  
10 understanding the neural underpinnings of these various aspects of non-target  
11  
12 processing in goal directed reaching. In contrast, a host of neurobehavioural and  
13  
14 neurophysiological studies are in agreement that the visual control of target-directed  
15  
16 reaching and grasping depends upon systems in the dorsal stream of cortical  
17  
18 processing [8, 14, 22]. Nevertheless, non-target processing clearly plays an important  
19  
20 role in determining the parameters of reaching and grasping movements. One of the  
21  
22 first studies of non-target processing following brain damage was performed by  
23  
24 McIntosh and colleagues [18]. They tested 12 neglect patients and 12 healthy control  
25  
26 subjects on a bisection task and a reaching task, in both cases using the same spatial  
27  
28 layout. Subjects were presented with two cylinders, one on the left and one on the  
29  
30 right, each of which could be located in one of two positions. In the bisection task  
31  
32 they were required to judge the midpoint between the two cylinders by making a  
33  
34 pointing response, while in the reaching task they were required to touch a wide target  
35  
36 zone located beyond the two cylinders, by reaching between them. The former can be  
37  
38 regarded as an explicit bisection task, while the latter is an implicit one. The results  
39  
40 showed that 10 out of the 12 neglect patients performed similarly to controls on the  
41  
42 reaching task, taking full account of both cylinder locations as they carried out the  
43  
44 movements. This result contrasted with their behaviour in the bisection task, where  
45  
46 the patients took little account of the varying locations of the left cylinder when  
47  
48 making their spatial judgements. McIntosh et al [18] argued that this preservation of  
49  
50 non-target processing during reaching in most neglect patients might be due to the  
51  
52 sparing of dorsal-stream cortex in and around the intraparietal cortex [6]. The  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 implication of their argument was that the two patients who did not show such a  
4  
5 preservation must have had lesions that included concomitant damage to dorsal stream  
6  
7 areas.  
8  
9

10 These results suggest that the adjustments made to reaching movements with  
11  
12 respect to potential obstacles are not subject to the same neglect of leftward objects to  
13  
14 which conscious bisection judgements are prone. They do not, of course, show that  
15  
16 the patients were taking the left cylinder into account without being visually *aware* of  
17  
18 it. The patients were free to move their eyes and no attempt was made to discover  
19  
20 what they saw or did not see. Therefore in a separate study [19], a patient with visual  
21  
22 extinction was tested in a comparable reaching task. Instead of 2-cm wide cylinders,  
23  
24 thin poles were used, and they were visible only briefly: by this means it was possible  
25  
26 to induce extinction of the left pole on about half of the test trials. On different trials,  
27  
28 either the left pole alone, the right pole alone, both, or neither of the poles was  
29  
30 present. The results showed that the patient took significantly different reaching  
31  
32 routes according to whether the left, right, or both poles were present, much as healthy  
33  
34 control subjects did. Moreover, his reach trajectories when both poles were present  
35  
36 were identical on trials where he reported seeing the left pole and on those when he  
37  
38 reported not seeing it.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Taken together, the results of these two studies are consistent with the  
46  
47 hypothesis that obstacle avoidance is subserved by the same superior parietal  
48  
49 networks as the *target-directed* aspects of reaching, and that this processing does not  
50  
51 require conscious awareness of the potential obstacles [24]. More direct evidence for  
52  
53 this hypothesis was obtained in a third study in which two patients with optic ataxia,  
54  
55 resulting from bilateral lesions of the dorsal stream, were tested on essentially the  
56  
57 same two tasks used by McIntosh et al. [18]. In this study [28], the optic ataxic  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 patients failed completely to shift their trajectories with respect to any changes in  
4  
5 cylinder location in the reaching task, while taking full account of shifts of both  
6  
7 cylinders when required to bisect the space between them. These patients thus  
8  
9 exhibited the opposite pattern to that typically seen in neglect patients.  
10  
11

12  
13 The results of these studies fit well within the framework of our current  
14  
15 functional understanding of the ventral and dorsal processing streams [8, 22]. That is,  
16  
17 like target-directed reaching and grasping movements, it can be proposed that  
18  
19 automatic obstacle avoidance is a dorsal stream function (abolished when superior  
20  
21 parietal cortex is damaged, as in optic ataxia, but typically preserved in neglect, where  
22  
23 the damage is predominantly temporo-parietal). Bisection, on the other hand, depends  
24  
25 on a conscious strategy which optic ataxic patients can implement using perceptual  
26  
27 information processed within their ventral stream and its right temporo-parietal  
28  
29 elaboration; both of which may remain largely intact. A prediction from this  
30  
31 interpretation is that while damage to the ventral stream itself might be expected to  
32  
33 impair gap bisection to some degree (assuming that it provides an important input  
34  
35 route to the temporo-parietal region damaged in neglect), it should entirely spare  
36  
37 obstacle avoidance.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 In contrast to optic ataxia, visual form agnosia is associated with damage to  
45  
46 the ventral stream of processing. Benson and Greenberg [1] first introduced the term  
47  
48 *visual form agnosia* when describing a patient (Mr S.) whose recognition deficits they  
49  
50 believed could be attributed to a primary defect in form discrimination. They  
51  
52 suggested that the disorder was associated with an intact ability to deal with the  
53  
54 simple features of an object, but a specific inability to put such features together to  
55  
56 permit form discrimination and perception. This loss resulted in the patient having a  
57  
58 severe inability to recognize everyday objects, and particularly drawings of objects,  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 by virtue of their shape (see review by Heider [10]). In the present paper we have  
4  
5 tested a patient with a very similar pattern of visual impairment to Mr S (D.F. [25]),  
6  
7 who has been extensively studied [see 8, 21]. Recently, James and colleagues [13]  
8  
9 have shown that D.F. has bilateral posterior cortical damage remarkably coincident  
10  
11 with the lateral occipital area (area LO: [15, 20]). Indeed, when functional MRI was  
12  
13 used to examine her brain activation in response to complete versus fragmented line  
14  
15 drawings of objects, the subtraction of which defines area LO in healthy subjects, no  
16  
17 net activation was found [13]. It was inferred from these results that it was D.F.'s  
18  
19 bilateral damage to area LO that was the direct cause of her visual form agnosia, and  
20  
21 by extension that similar damage is the cause of this impairment in other patients as  
22  
23 well. In contrast, D.F., as demonstrated in a number of studies [9, 25], has rather well-  
24  
25 preserved visuomotor control in simple reaching and grasping tasks, which has been  
26  
27 attributed to a functionally-intact dorsal stream of visual processing [21, 22]. This  
28  
29 conjecture has now been confirmed using fMRI [5, 13].  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 The aim of the present experiments was to examine obstacle avoidance  
37  
38 behaviour in visual form agnosia in order to assess the relative contributions of the  
39  
40 dorsal and ventral streams to automatic obstacle avoidance. We define obstacle  
41  
42 avoidance as behaviour in which a participant moves a body part over, away from or  
43  
44 around non-targets, in order to avoid potential collision. (Nonetheless empirical  
45  
46 evidence suggests that the brain mechanisms controlling such behaviour may also  
47  
48 sometimes treat stimuli that present no real risk of collision (e.g. LEDs) in a  
49  
50 qualitatively similar way [33]). Such behaviour should be inversely related to the  
51  
52 distance between target and obstacle (i.e. the closer the obstacle to the target, the  
53  
54 greater the effect on performance). In the first experiment D.F. was asked to reach out  
55  
56 and grasp an object in the presence of a secondary object, placed either to the left or  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the right of the target, at varying distances. In the second experiment D.F. and a  
4  
5 second visual form agnostic patient, S.B., were asked to either reach between or bisect  
6  
7 the space between two cylinders in a manner similar to the previous studies of  
8  
9 McIntosh et al [18] and Schindler et al. [28]. If automatic obstacle avoidance is  
10  
11 subserved by the dorsal stream of processing alone, it would be predicted that in the  
12  
13 first experiment, D.F. would take full account of the obstacle locations relative to the  
14  
15 target, by systematically shifting her reach trajectories and modifying her grip  
16  
17 aperture, in the same manner as controls. In the second experiment it was predicted  
18  
19 that although both patients might show somewhat impaired performance on the  
20  
21 bisection task due to their damaged ventral streams, they should perform in a similar  
22  
23 way to normals when required to reach between the two cylinders, given their  
24  
25 functionally intact dorsal streams. In other words, a partial double dissociation  
26  
27 between optic ataxic and visual form agnostic patients was predicted on these  
28  
29 respective perceptual and visuomotor tasks.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

## 39 **2. Experiment 1**

### 40 *2.1. Method*

#### 41 *2.1.1. Participants*

42  
43 Patient D.F. and six controls took part in the study: three females (average 27.3 years  
44  
45 old, SD 4.6 years) and three males (average 25.7 years old, SD 2.1 years)<sup>1</sup>. All  
46  
47 participants were right-handed by self-report, had normal or corrected to normal  
48  
49 vision, and no history of neurological disorders.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

---

59 <sup>1</sup> In Experiment 2 two groups of control participants were tested; one group age-matched to D.F. and  
60 one group age-matched to S.B. A comparison between the results of the two control groups reveals no  
difference, suggesting that the age difference between them did not affect performance.

1  
2  
3 D.F. was 43 years old at the time of testing, and had developed visual form  
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

D.F. was 43 years old at the time of testing, and had developed visual form agnosia as a result of carbon monoxide poisoning nine years earlier. She was extensively tested by Milner and colleagues [25], her deficits including a failure to recognize objects visually, and difficulties in discriminating shape, lightness (see also [23]), orientation, symmetry and texture differences. She was also unable to copy drawings or letters, had impoverished reading abilities, and experienced difficulty estimating the speed of objects. Despite these deficits she had preserved visual acuity, colour vision, tactile recognition and verbal intelligence. She could partially describe objects, particularly their surface properties, and could then make reasonable guesses as to what they were. Though finding it difficult to describe her visual experience, she said that objects appeared “blurred” and tended “to run into each other”. EEG showed bilateral abnormalities, most prominent posteriorly and in temporal regions. Early MRI scans showed abnormalities in occipital cortex bilaterally, with the damage extending laterally in the ventral part of the occipital lobe (area 18) and dorsally in the posterior occipitoparietal region, her primary visual cortex remaining intact [25]. A recent study [13] has shown that D.F.’s principal lesions correspond bilaterally with the location of the lateral occipital area (LO) in the ventral stream in healthy subjects (see Figure 1), along with damage to the left posterior parietal cortex.

Figure 1 about here

### 2.1.2. Apparatus

The equipment used in the present experiment is depicted in Figure 2. Participants placed their index finger and thumb on a start position located directly in front of them. They were presented with a green target object, which was located 25 cm away from the start point, and aligned with their body midline. There were six

1  
2  
3 possible obstacle locations, either 3, 6 or 9 cm away from the inside edge of the target.  
4  
5 Both target and obstacle were 3 cm wide, 2 cm deep, 5 cm high. The target was green  
6  
7 in colour, while the obstacle was always black. Hand movements were recorded using  
8  
9 *Minibird* (Ascension Technology Ltd), which sampled the positions of two markers  
10  
11 attached to the index finger and thumb at a frequency of 86.1 Hz. Movements were  
12  
13 recorded in full (i.e. from initial start position to end of each movement). Recordings  
14  
15 were filtered at 10 Hz, and the start and end of each movement were defined by a 5  
16  
17 cm/s threshold, maintained for 10 frames at the start.  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 Figure 2 about here  
23  
24  
25

### 26 27 *2.1.3. Procedure*

28  
29 The experiment consisted of a simple grasping task performed in free vision.  
30  
31 Subjects were asked to reach out and grasp the target object as quickly as possible  
32  
33 using the right hand. There were seven different conditions. In one, the target was  
34  
35 presented alone, while in each of the other 6 conditions, the obstacle was present  
36  
37 alongside the target object. On each trial, the subject was cued to respond by a verbal  
38  
39 “go” signal given by the experimenter. Each subject performed a block of 56 trials,  
40  
41 with eight trials per condition presented in a fixed pseudo-random order. The data  
42  
43 were processed using custom written Labview programs (National Instruments Inc.).  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 51 *2.2. Results*

### 52 53 *2.2.1 Analysis*

54  
55 The average x-y trajectory of the index finger and thumb was computed for  
56  
57 each condition in which there was an obstacle present for both D.F. and controls. The  
58  
59 x trajectory refers to the left / right movement with respect to the observer, and the y  
60

1  
2  
3 trajectory refers to the forward / backward movement. These trajectories were  
4  
5 normalized to the start position (which varied slightly from trial to trial) and then  
6  
7 modified t-tests, recommended by Crawford and Garthwaite [4] were used to compare  
8  
9 D.F. to the controls at 1 cm intervals throughout the movement in each of the  
10  
11 conditions.  
12  
13

14  
15 In addition, the following kinematic variables were computed and used for  
16  
17 analysis: maximum grip aperture, movement time, peak velocity, time to maximum  
18  
19 grip aperture, time to peak velocity, percentage time to maximum grip aperture  
20  
21 (expressed as a percentage of total movement time) and percentage time to peak  
22  
23 velocity (expressed as a percentage of total movement). Maximum grip aperture was  
24  
25 defined as the maximum 3-dimensional separation of the markers attached to the  
26  
27 index finger and the thumb. Movement time was defined as end time (defined as the  
28  
29 time at which the velocity of the marker attached to the thumb fell below 50 mm/s)  
30  
31 minus start time (defined as the time at which the velocity of the marker attached to  
32  
33 the thumb exceeded 50 mm/s for at least 100ms). Peak velocity was defined as the  
34  
35 maximum velocity of the marker attached to the thumb. Time to peak velocity was the  
36  
37 time at which peak velocity occurred minus the start time. Percentage time to  
38  
39 maximum grip aperture was time to maximum grip aperture expressed as a percentage  
40  
41 of total movement time. Percentage time to peak velocity was the time to peak  
42  
43 velocity expressed as a percentage of total movement time. For each of these seven  
44  
45 variables an individual ANOVA was carried out for D.F. and each of the control  
46  
47 subjects, with two factors (1) Obstacle position (left / right) (2) Obstacle distance  
48  
49 (3cm / 6cm / 9cm) (target only trials were excluded from the analysis).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### 2.2.2. Trajectory

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

Figure 3 shows the average trajectory of the index finger and thumb for each condition for D.F. and controls, normalized for the start position. These graphs clearly show that both D.F. and the controls shift their trajectory to the right in the presence of a left obstacle, and shift their trajectory to the left in the presence of a right obstacle, the largest shift occurring when the obstacle is close to the target. A modified t-test was conducted comparing the trajectory for D.F. and controls every 1 cm of the movement; this revealed no significant differences between D.F. and the controls.

Figure 3 about here

### 2.2.3. Kinematics

Table 1 shows the kinematic data for D.F. and the controls in each condition. An individual ANOVA was used to assess the effect of obstacle position (left / right) and obstacle distance (3cm / 6cm / 9cm) for D.F. and each of the controls. The results for the control subjects were considered to be consistent if significant effects were observed in four or more of the six controls. For D.F. a significant effect of obstacle *position* was observed for peak velocity ( $p < 0.05$ ), in that D.F. achieved a higher peak velocity when the obstacle was present on the left. No other effects of obstacle position were observed in D.F. and no consistent effects of obstacle position were observed in the control subjects. A significant effect of obstacle *distance* on maximum grip aperture was observed for D.F. ( $p < 0.01$ ), with an increase in maximum grip aperture as distance between the target and obstacle increased. Similar effects and patterns were consistently observed in the control subjects ( $p < 0.01$ ). A significant effect of obstacle distance on movement time was present for D.F. ( $p < 0.05$ ), in that D.F. shows an increase in movement time when there is an increase in distance between the target and obstacle. A significant effect of obstacle distance on movement

1  
2  
3 time was also consistently observed in the control subjects ( $p < 0.05$ ), but the pattern  
4  
5 of results goes in the opposite direction, with a decrease in movement time as distance  
6  
7 between obstacle and target increases. A significant effect of obstacle distance on  
8  
9 percentage time to maximum grip aperture was also observed for D.F. ( $p < 0.05$ ), in  
10  
11 that D.F. showed an earlier time to maximum grip aperture as distance between the  
12  
13 target and obstacle increased, while no such pattern was observed consistently for  
14  
15 control subjects. Finally a significant effect of obstacle distance on percentage time to  
16  
17 peak velocity was observed for D.F. ( $p < 0.001$ ), reflecting an earlier time to peak  
18  
19 velocity for the far obstacle location compared to the other conditions. Such an effect  
20  
21 was also consistently observed in control subjects ( $p < 0.05$ ), but this was due to the  
22  
23 peak velocity being reached at later times as the distance between target and obstacle  
24  
25 increased. No other significant effects of obstacle distance were observed for DF or  
26  
27 consistently for control subjects.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Table 1 about here  
35  
36  
37

### 38 2.3. Discussion 39

40  
41 The aim of Experiment 1 was to assess patient D.F.'s performance (in  
42  
43 comparison with controls) when asked to reach out and grasp a target object in the  
44  
45 presence of potential obstacles placed at different locations. The results demonstrate  
46  
47 that the average trajectory taken by the hand was similar in both D.F. and controls for  
48  
49 each obstacle condition. In other words, D.F. shifts her overall trajectory to the left in  
50  
51 the presence of a rightward obstacle and to the right in the presence of a leftward  
52  
53 obstacle, in a manner comparable to healthy subjects. We suggest that this intact  
54  
55 obstacle avoidance behaviour is achieved by virtue of her functioning dorsal stream of  
56  
57 visual processing [13].  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The kinematic results confirm the observations by Mon-Williams et al [27]  
4 that the presence of obstacles during a reach-to-grasp task leads to an increase in  
5 movement time and a decrease in maximum grip aperture in healthy subjects. They  
6 further confirm that these effects are highly dependent on the distance of the obstacle  
7 from the target [26], with a decrease in maximum grip aperture and an increase in  
8 movement time being seen as the target-obstacle separation decreases. In addition we  
9 have found that time to peak velocity (expressed as a percentage of movement time)  
10 occurs later as distance between the target and obstacle increases in healthy  
11 individuals. All of this suggests that the extent to which subjects adjust the transport  
12 and grasp components of the reach in the presence of a potential obstacle is inversely  
13 related to the target-obstacle separation, and thereby directly related to the risk of  
14 collision with the obstacle. D.F.'s kinematic results similarly showed a decrease in  
15 maximum grip aperture as distance between the target and obstacle became smaller,  
16 strengthening the finding that she exhibits intact obstacle avoidance behaviour. One  
17 surprising difference between D.F. and the controls, however, is that as the target-  
18 obstacle separation increased she showed a *slower* movement time. In other words,  
19 the closer the obstacle was to the target, the faster were D.F.'s reaches. It is possible  
20 that this is due to the fact that the presence of the non-target obstacles in the  
21 workspace enriched D.F.'s spatial representation of the scene, giving her more  
22 confidence to move faster. In addition, DF also showed an atypical pattern of results  
23 when time to maximum grip aperture and time to peak velocity were expressed as a  
24 percentage of movement time. It should be noted, however, that in this study no  
25 constraints were placed on the subjects regarding speed of movement, and D.F.'s  
26 movement time was approximately twice as long as control subjects in all conditions.  
27 This makes comparisons of her kinematic data difficult.  
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

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

There has been much debate in the literature between the respective merits of ‘distractor’ accounts and ‘obstacle avoidance’ accounts of the effects of non-target objects on motor behaviour [2, 31]. It has been argued that effects such as those observed in the present experiment cannot be explained by obstacle avoidance alone and may be due to the fact that the non-target objects serve as distractors and cause competition for attention [2]. For example, studies have shown that non-target objects in the form of an LED (which would cause no risk of collision) can cause reaching movements to veer away. Although the authors interpret their findings as a kind of attentional repulsion [11, 31], Tresilian [33] argues that this additional postulate is unnecessary for explaining the data. Since participants were instructed to attend to the LED, their behaviour could have been an avoidance response to ensure unrestricted viewing to comply with task instructions. Such an explanation is supported by the observation that participants only veered away from the LED when it was possible for their reaching limb to obscure a clear view of it. If the non-target objects used in the present experiment were treated as distractors rather than obstacles, it is difficult to explain why participants not only moved their hand trajectories consistently away from them, differentially according to the distance of the non-target object from the target, but also opened their grip less widely for the closest non-target objects. Given this pattern of findings, it seems more appropriate to discuss the results of the present experiment within the framework of obstacle avoidance (i.e. that participants move away from the non-target objects in the work space and adjust the kinematics of their movements in order to minimize risk of collision). Of course, this *functional* interpretation does not exclude the possibility that the actual neural *mechanism* whereby the trajectories change could involve some kind of inhibitory process between the neuronal correlates of the target and non-target locations, thereby causing

1  
2  
3 a kind of 'repulsion' effect. But then of course a different interpretation would have to  
4  
5 be sought for the changes observed in grip size.  
6

7  
8 In summary, the results of Experiment 1 show that the presence of obstacles in  
9  
10 the workspace causes both D.F. and healthy subjects to adjust their reaching  
11  
12 trajectory, and decrease their maximum grip aperture, ostensibly in order to avoid the  
13  
14 possibility of collision. The effects observed are dependent on the distance of the non-  
15  
16 target object from the target, with those closest to the target having the greatest effect.  
17  
18 The data thus confirm our prediction that D.F. should have intact obstacle avoidance  
19  
20 behaviour, and they thereby provide convergent support for the idea that such  
21  
22 behaviour is mediated by the dorsal stream of visual processing.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 One weakness of the present experiment, however, is that we do not have a  
28  
29 control task that would enable us to demonstrate a dissociation between D.F.'s intact  
30  
31 visuomotor behaviour and impaired perceptual processing. Such a task (i.e. one that is  
32  
33 formally similar to the visuomotor task but which demands an element of perceptual  
34  
35 processing) would enable us to make a stronger claim regarding D.F.'s intact obstacle  
36  
37 avoidance behaviour. In addition, the present study had no constraints placed on the  
38  
39 subjects regarding speed of movement. Finally, although D.F. is the most extensively  
40  
41 studied patient with visual form agnosia, a second patient would enable us to make  
42  
43 stronger claims for preserved obstacle avoidance behaviour in patients of this kind.  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 In Experiment 2, we sought to examine whether we could extend the results of  
49  
50 Experiment 1 to demonstrate a partial double dissociation between visual form  
51  
52 agnosia and optic ataxia, using tasks similar to those of Schindler et al [28]. In that  
53  
54 study, two patients with bilateral optic ataxia showed a complete failure to heed the  
55  
56 changing obstacle locations during a reaching task, while both showed a full  
57  
58 appreciation of the same two objects when making a bisection judgement of the space  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 between them. In the present experiment we were able to test both D.F. and also a  
4  
5 second patient with visual form agnosia, S.B. The experimental paradigm extends the  
6  
7 previous experiment, not only by including a perceptual control task, but also in that  
8  
9 subjects are given instructions regarding speed of movement.  
10  
11

### 12 13 14 15 **3. Experiment 2**

#### 16 17 *3.1. Method*

##### 18 19 20 *3.1.1. Participants*

21  
22 Two patients with visual form agnosia (D.F. and S.B.) and sixteen age-  
23  
24 matched controls took part in the study. Eight of the controls were females age-  
25  
26 matched to D.F. (average 46.3 years, SD 7.4 years), while the others were males age-  
27  
28 matched to S.B. (average 34.4 years, SD 3.5 years). All participants were right-  
29  
30 handed by self-report, had normal or corrected to normal vision and no history of  
31  
32 neurological disorders.  
33  
34

35  
36 D.F. was 48 years old at the time of testing, while S.B. was 34 years old.  
37  
38 Patient S.B. had developed visual form agnosia following meningoencephalitis at 3  
39  
40 years old. As shown in the extensive studies of Lê and her colleagues [16], his deficits  
41  
42 include achromatopsia, prosopagnosia, alexia and object agnosia. Like D.F., S.B.  
43  
44 typically focuses on parts of objects rather than the objects themselves, and can  
45  
46 process local aspects of shapes while failing to link and integrate them as a global  
47  
48 whole. S.B. also shares D.F.'s ability to generate and manipulate visual images. S.B  
49  
50 performs better than D.F. in matching meaningful and meaningless objects, as well as  
51  
52 in copying drawings (relying on feature by feature analysis of the objects), and in  
53  
54 being able to navigate his way confidently in both familiar and non-familiar  
55  
56 environments. He also has a striking ability to use motion information to help him  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 identify objects. MRI scans show lesions of the occipitoparietal and occipitotemporal  
4  
5 regions in the right hemisphere and the occipitotemporal junction of the left  
6  
7 hemisphere. The right hemisphere lesion is reported to include complete or partial  
8  
9 damage to areas V2, V3, V4, V5 and LO, and there is limited damage to the right  
10  
11 supramarginal gyrus. There is a spared region in the right occipital pole including the  
12  
13 calcarine fissure (V1), in its rostral and superior aspects. In the left hemisphere, the  
14  
15 lesion involves mainly the ventrolateral visual cortex, including the fusiform gyrus  
16  
17 and area LO [16] (see Figure 4).  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 The study was carried out according to the principles of the Declaration of  
23  
24 Helsinki, on the basis of informed consent, and was approved by the local research  
25  
26 ethics committee.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 Figure 4 about here  
33

### 34 3.1.2. Apparatus

35  
36 The experimental set-up is depicted in Figure 5. Participants faced a 60 cm<sup>2</sup>  
37  
38 white stimulus board laid horizontally on a table. This board consisted of a start  
39  
40 button located 10 cm from the edge of the board and a 5-cm grey target zone, which  
41  
42 spanned the far edge of the board. Two grey cylinders (24.5 cm tall and 3.5 cm in  
43  
44 diameter) could be fixed to the board one on either side of the midline at a distance of  
45  
46 25 cm from the start position and 20 cm in front of the grey target zone. Each of the  
47  
48 cylinders could occupy one of two locations, with its inside edge either 8 cm or 12 cm  
49  
50 from the midline. The factorial combination of these locations created four possible  
51  
52 stimulus configurations. A strip of white card was placed between the two cylinders in  
53  
54 every trial to prevent participants using the visible holes to guide them.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Figure 5 about here

1  
2  
3 Liquid-crystal shutter glasses (*Plato*, Translucent Technologies Inc., Toronto)  
4  
5 were worn by participants and were programmed to open for 2 s at the onset of each  
6  
7 trial. Hand movements were recorded using *Optotrak* (Northern Digital Inc.,  
8  
9 Waterloo, Ontario), sampling the position of a marker attached to the nail of the right  
10  
11 index finger, at a frequency of 100 Hz. In both the reaching and bisection tasks, the  
12  
13 entire movement was recorded (i.e. from the initial start position to the movement  
14  
15 endpoint). The start position and end position were defined by the frame at which  
16  
17 hand velocity rose or fell below a threshold of 50 mm/s respectively. The data were  
18  
19 processed using custom written Labview programs (National Instruments Inc).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 27 3.1.3. Procedure

28  
29 Participants were required to perform both a reaching task and a bisection task,  
30  
31 in separate blocks. They were instructed to place their right index finger on the start  
32  
33 button when they were ready to begin each trial, and to initiate their response when  
34  
35 they heard a tone signal, which was presented immediately on the closure of the  
36  
37 shutter glasses. In the reaching task participants were instructed to reach out and touch  
38  
39 a target zone located beyond the two cylinders, and were told that the emphasis was  
40  
41 on speed of movement. They were instructed that whenever a cylinder was present  
42  
43 there would be one on the left and one on the right and they should pass their hand  
44  
45 between the two cylinders rather than around the outside edge of the board. Each  
46  
47 participant made 60 reaches in a fixed pseudo-random order, with 12 trials for each of  
48  
49 the four cylinder configurations and 12 in which no cylinders were present (these  
50  
51 trials were included to check for any systematic bias when the reaching response was  
52  
53 not constrained by any potential obstacles; they were not included in the main  
54  
55 analysis). In the bisection task, participants were informed that the position of the  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 cylinders would vary from trial to trial, and that there would always be one on the left  
4  
5 and one on the right. They were instructed to point to the midpoint between the two  
6  
7 cylinders, and told that the emphasis in this task was on accuracy of judgement. Each  
8  
9 participant made 48 bisection responses, including 12 trials for each of the stimulus  
10  
11 configurations, presented in a fixed pseudo-random order.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 3.2. Results

#### 18 3.2.1 Analysis

19  
20  
21 The dependent measure taken for each trial in the bisection task was the final  
22  
23 lateral position (P) of the marker on the index finger with respect to the midline of the  
24  
25 stimulus board. Similarly, the dependent measure for the reaching task was the lateral  
26  
27 position of the marker as it crossed the virtual line joining the two cylinder locations  
28  
29 (here the exact value of P was estimated by linear interpolation).  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 The main analyses were of the weightings given to the two cylinders during  
35  
36 each task by each subject ( $dP_L$  and  $dP_R$ : [18, 28]). These indices measure the mean  
37  
38 change in P that is associated with a shift of either cylinder between its two locations,  
39  
40 while the other remains in the same location (i.e. how much the response shifts in  
41  
42 relation to a 40 mm shift of one or the other cylinder). If we denote the four different  
43  
44 cylinder locations as  $a$  = outer left,  $b$  = inner left,  $c$  = inner right, and  $d$  = outer right,  
45  
46 we can refer to the four possible stimulus configurations as:  $ac$ ,  $ad$ ,  $bc$ , and  $bd$ . The  
47  
48 weighting indices are then given by the following equations:  
49  
50  
51

$$52 \quad dP_L = \text{mean } P(bc, bd) - \text{mean } P(ac, ad) \quad \text{[reflecting changes caused by } a \leftrightarrow b \text{ shifts]}$$

$$53 \quad dP_R = \text{mean } P(bd, ad) - \text{mean } P(bc, ac) \quad \text{[reflecting changes caused by } c \leftrightarrow d \text{ shifts].}$$

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Since there were no significant differences between the two control groups,  
4 they were combined in the analyses in order to improve statistical power. The  
5 modified t-test recommended by Crawford and Garthwaite [4] was used to make a  
6 statistical comparison between each patient and the combined control group on each  
7 of the two indices in each test condition. An independent-samples t-test was also used  
8 to compare the group of patients ( $n = 2$ ) to controls ( $n = 16$ ). In a second set of  
9 analyses the variability of reaches was assessed by calculating the variance of P. All  
10 of the t-tests reported are one-tailed, since they are directional in nature.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Finally the kinematics of the movements were analysed, including reaction  
23 time, movement time, peak velocity and time to peak velocity. Reaction time was  
24 defined as the time elapsing after the tone signal at which the velocity of the marker  
25 attached to index finger rose above 50 mm/s (the start time). Movement time was  
26 defined as end time (defined as the time at which the velocity of the marker attached  
27 to the index finger fell below 50 mm/s) minus the start time. Peak velocity was  
28 defined as the maximum velocity of the marker attached to index finger. Time to peak  
29 velocity was the time at which peak velocity occurred, minus the start time. The  
30 kinematic data of 11 of the 16 controls were included in the analysis. For the other 5  
31 control subjects the kinematic data had to be excluded due to technical problems with  
32 the trigger sent from the shutter glasses to the *Optotrak* at the time of testing, which  
33 caused the timing of the start of the recording to be unreliable. There is no reason to  
34 think that the analysed data are unrepresentative of the whole group.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

### 55 3.2.2. Reaching task

56  
57 Figure 6 shows the  $dP_L$  and  $dP_R$  values for each subject in the experiment, that  
58 is, the mean changes in reach trajectory (measured as P) that were associated with a  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 40 mm shift of either the left or right cylinder. It is clear that while a great deal of  
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

variability in performance exists among the control subjects, both D.F. and S.B. perform within the normal range. The two patients took account of both the left and the right cylinder when making their reaches. Modified t-test comparisons revealed no significant differences between D.F. and the controls on either  $dP_L$  ( $t = 1.39$ ,  $p = 0.092$ ) or  $dP_R$  ( $t = 0.59$ ,  $p = 0.282$ ). Likewise, there were no significant differences between S.B. and the controls on either  $dP_L$  ( $t = 0.58$ ,  $p = 0.285$ ) or  $dP_R$  ( $t = 1.05$ ,  $p = 0.155$ ). In addition, an independent-samples t-test carried out on the full data set also failed to reveal any significant difference between the patients ( $n = 2$ ) and the controls ( $n = 16$ ) on either  $dP_L$  ( $t = 1.38$ ,  $p = 0.186$ ) or  $dP_R$  ( $t = 1.16$ ,  $p = 0.263$ ).

Figure 6 about here

The variance of both patient's P values was higher (D.F. = 165.8) and (S.B. = 544.0) than the controls (mean = 131.7). Modified t-tests showed that this difference was significant for S.B. ( $t = 3.35$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ), but not for D.F. ( $t = 0.28$ ,  $p = 0.393$ ).

Table 2 shows kinematic reaching-task data for D.F. and S.B. compared with those of controls. A modified t-test revealed that D.F. was significantly slower than controls in movement time ( $p = 0.037$ ), and that S.B. differed from controls in the percentage time to peak velocity ( $p = 0.02$ ). All other comparisons were non-significant.

Table 2 about here

### 3.2.3. Bisection task

Figure 7 shows the mean change in bisection response (P) that was associated with a 40 mm shift of either the left or right cylinder in the bisection task. It can be seen that D.F. lies outside the control range on both  $dP_L$  and  $dP_R$ , and that S.B. lies

1  
2  
3 outside the control range for  $dP_R$ , and only just within the lower range of control  
4  
5 values for  $dP_L$ . Modified t-tests revealed a significant difference between D.F. and  
6  
7 controls on both  $dP_L$  ( $t = 2.51$ ,  $p = 0.012$ ) and  $dP_R$  ( $t = 2.29$ ,  $p = 0.019$ ), and a  
8  
9 significant difference between S.B. and controls on  $dP_R$  ( $t = 1.78$ ,  $p = 0.048$ ). The  
10  
11 difference between S.B. and controls on  $dP_L$  failed to reach significance ( $t = 1.25$ ,  $p =$   
12  
13  $0.116$ ). Overall independent t-tests revealed significantly lower values in the patients  
14  
15 ( $n = 2$ ) than in the controls ( $n = 16$ ) on both  $dP_L$  ( $t = 2.59$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ) and  $dP_R$  ( $t = 2.87$ ,  
16  
17  $p = 0.011$ ).

21  
22 Figure 7 about here

23  
24 The variance of the both patients' bisection points (P-values) was higher than  
25  
26 controls (D.F. = 133.53; S.B. = 63.67; control mean = 61.39). A modified t-test shows  
27  
28 that this was significant for D.F. ( $t = 3.55$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), though not for S.B. ( $t = 0.11$ ,  $p$   
29  
30  $= 0.456$ ).

31  
32  
33 Table 3 shows the kinematic data for the patients and controls on the bisection  
34  
35 task. Modified t-tests revealed significantly lengthened movement times in both D.F.  
36  
37 ( $p = 0.027$ ) and S.B. ( $p = 0.033$ ). Both D.F. ( $p = 0.04$ ) and S.B. ( $p = 0.004$ ) also  
38  
39 differed from the controls in time to peak velocity, but this was due to their longer  
40  
41 movement durations, and the differences disappeared when time to peak velocity was  
42  
43 taken as a percentage of movement time. All other comparisons were non-significant.  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Table 3 about here

### 51 52 53 3.3. Discussion

54  
55 The aim of Experiment 2 was to examine obstacle avoidance behaviour in two  
56  
57 patients with bilateral ventral stream damage resulting in visual form agnosia, when  
58  
59 they were asked to reach between two cylinders varying in location from trial to trial.  
60

1  
2  
3 The results show that our patients shifted their reaching trajectories in response to  
4 shifts in obstacle position to an extent that fell within the normal range. Nevertheless,  
5 the patients both failed to shift their bisections of the space between the same two  
6 objects from trial to trial to the same extent as control subjects. As shown in Figures 8  
7 and 9, these results provide a partial double dissociation when taken in combination  
8 with those from the two optic ataxic patients tested by Schindler et al [28]. We believe  
9 that this contrast provides strong evidence to support the role of the dorsal stream in  
10 automatic obstacle avoidance. It should be noted however that there are differences in  
11 the way the two groups of patients were tested – the optic ataxia patients were  
12 required to maintain central fixation during the tasks whereas the visual form agnostic  
13 patients were allowed free vision. This difference in testing conditions was due to the  
14 fact that S.B. suffers from hemianopia in his left visual field, and we wanted to ensure  
15 that he could see both of the obstacles.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Figures 8 and 9 about here

35  
36 In the bisection task there was no significant difference between S.B. and  
37 controls in the weightings attached to the left pole. This may perhaps be explained by  
38 the fact that S.B. has acquired, as a result of his left hemianopia, a compensatory  
39 strategy of habitually paying more attention to the left than the right side of space. He  
40 could have done this easily in the present task through overt scanning, since there was  
41 no requirement to fixate centrally while initially viewing the array. Indirect evidence  
42 for this possibility is that S.B. tended to take long reaction times prior to lifting his  
43 finger from the start switch (at which point the LC glasses closed). Also, it is notable  
44 that despite his left visual hemifield being ‘blind’, S.B.’s responses are more heavily  
45 influenced by the left cylinder than the right in both the reaching and bisection tasks.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 [In contrast, in a separate reaching experiment in which S.B. was required to fixate on

1  
2  
3 a central target during the viewing period, his responses showed little influence of  
4  
5 shifts in the left cylinder, his  $dP_L$  value dropping from the present 12.86 mm to a non-  
6  
7 significant 3.83 mm.]  
8  
9

10 The major prediction of this study was that their functionally intact dorsal  
11  
12 streams should allow both D.F. and S.B. to perform normally in the reaching task,  
13  
14 where no perceptual judgements were required. The prediction as to how they would  
15  
16 perform in the bisection task, however, was less strong, since neither has a totally  
17  
18 destroyed ventral stream. James et al [13] demonstrated that the ventral stream lesions  
19  
20 in D.F. are largely restricted to area LO, though the damage is larger in the right  
21  
22 hemisphere than the left. The primary visual cortex as well as lingual and fusiform  
23  
24 gyrus are largely spared. Studies by Steeves and colleagues have shown that there is  
25  
26 sparing of D.F.'s fusiform face area [30] as well as of her parahippocampal place area  
27  
28 [29]. Such spared ventral stream areas could be implicated in spatial perception in  
29  
30 healthy individuals, and this could explain some of D.F.'s preserved abilities in the  
31  
32 bisection task. A close look at S.B.'s lesion reveals a similar sparing of ventral stream  
33  
34 areas, particularly in the left hemisphere, which may account for some of his  
35  
36 preserved abilities in the bisection task. In sum, it is clear that neither patient has a  
37  
38 completely destroyed ventral stream, and therefore it would be unlikely that either  
39  
40 patient would be totally unable to perform the bisection task. In practice, both of them  
41  
42 did perform at above-chance levels.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 While the variability of the patients' responses was higher than that of controls  
51  
52 in both tasks, this cannot explain the absence of a statistically significant deficit in the  
53  
54 reaching task, for several reasons. Firstly, the calculation of the weightings attached to  
55  
56 the change in position of the left and the right cylinder was based only on mean reach  
57  
58 trajectories, and as such would not have been affected by the variability of responses.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Secondly, while both patients tended to have higher variability of responses than  
4 controls in both tasks, the difference was small and non-significant for D.F. in the  
5 reaching task (and for S.B. in the bisection task). Finally, if variability of responses  
6 could explain the data it is unlikely that a dissociation between the two tasks would  
7 have emerged, since it was present in both tasks.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 The results of the kinematic analyses are consistent with our conclusions, in  
16 that overall the patients showed greater deficits on the bisection task than the reaching  
17 task. Both moved significantly more slowly than controls on the bisection task,  
18 whereas D.F. only did so during the reaching task. Of course the slower movement  
19 times in the bisection task cannot themselves explain the deficits seen in that task: if  
20 anything one would expect a speed-accuracy trade-off. In general the control subjects  
21 showed greater  $dP_L$  and  $dP_R$  values on the bisection than the reaching task, which is in  
22 agreement with previous work [18, 28]. In part this may have been due to the  
23 differential instructions given to participants, which were also reflected in the longer  
24 reaction times and movement times, and lower peak velocities, on the bisection task  
25 than the reaching. Presumably the kinematics of the patients' behaviour too reflected  
26 these different task demands.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 It is important to note that while D.F. and S.B. both show visual form agnosia,  
44 that there are distinct differences between them in their pathology and associated  
45 deficits. For example, D.F. detects high spatial frequencies well, whereas S.B.  
46 performs better at low spatial frequencies; and D.F. has relatively preserved colour  
47 vision, whereas S.B. is achromatopsic [16]. S.B.'s right ventral stream damage is  
48 more extensive than D.F.'s, and his right parietal lesion is more extensive than D.F.'s  
49 left parietal lesion. On the other hand D.F. has associated sulcal widening that is less  
50 apparent in S.B., and she sustained her brain damage in adulthood rather than  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 childhood. Finally, S.B.'s extensive right hemisphere (including white matter) damage  
4  
5 has resulted in a hemianopia in his left visual field, whereas D.F. has a smaller lower  
6  
7 visual-field scotoma. The remarkable thing is that despite all of these differences, the  
8  
9 two patients behaved in a comparable fashion in our two tasks.  
10  
11

#### 12 13 14 15 **4. Conclusions**

16  
17 In Experiment 1, D.F. shifted her trajectory and adjusted her grip aperture in  
18  
19 the same manner as controls when asked to reach and grasp a target object in the  
20  
21 presence of non-target objects. In Experiment 2, both D.F. and S.B. shifted their  
22  
23 trajectories with respect to shifts in cylinder location when asked to reach between  
24  
25 two non-target objects in the same way as the controls, while showing a reduced  
26  
27 influence of the same two objects when required to make an explicit bisection  
28  
29 judgement between them. We interpret these results in terms of automatic obstacle  
30  
31 avoidance, and conclude that this implicit skill, whereby movement programming is  
32  
33 modified as a function of non-target objects, is preserved in patients with ventral  
34  
35 stream damage.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 In line with our previous findings with neglect patients [18] and optic ataxic  
42  
43 patients [28], we believe that the present data provide further convergent support for  
44  
45 the view that automatic obstacle avoidance is a function of the dorsal stream of visual  
46  
47 processing. When this system is damaged, the automatic motor adjustments that we  
48  
49 have been measuring are absent; whereas when either the ventral stream or the  
50  
51 temporo-parietal systems associated with spatial neglect are damaged, these  
52  
53 adjustments remain intact. Our results extend the functional description of the ventral  
54  
55 and dorsal streams that has been developing over recent years [8, 22]. Not only is the  
56  
57 dorsal stream intimately involved in the transformation of target properties such as  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 size and location into motor coordinates for programming and controlling reaching  
4  
5 and grasping movements, it also automatically takes into account the location of *non*-  
6  
7 target stimuli while carrying out these computations.  
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

For Peer Review

**Acknowledgements:**

This study was supported by research grants from the Wellcome Trust (grant 052443) and the Leverhulme Trust (grants F/268/T and F/00128/C). We are grateful to both D.F. and S.B. for their time, patience, and good-humoured cooperation.

For Peer Review

## References

1. D.F. Benson, J.P. Greenberg, Visual form agnosia: a specific deficit in visual discrimination, *Archives of Neurology* 20 (1969) 82-89.
2. U. Castiello, Mechanisms of selection for the control of hand action, *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 3 (1999) 264-271.
3. S. Chieffi, M. Gentilucci, A. Allport, E. Sasso, G. Rizzolatti, Study of selective reaching and grasping in a patient with unilateral parietal lesion, *Brain* 116 (1993) 1119-1137.
4. J.R. Crawford, P.H. Garthwaite, Investigation of the single case in neuropsychology: confidence limits on the abnormality of test scores and test score differences, *Neuropsychologia* 40 (2002) 1196-1208.
5. J. Culham, Neuroimaging investigations of visually-guided grasping. In: *Attention and Performance XX: Functional Brain Imaging of Human Cognition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004, pp. 415-436.
6. J.C. Culham, N.G. Kanwisher, Neuroimaging of cognitive functions in human parietal cortex, *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* 11 (2001) 157-163.
7. P.M. Fitts, The information capacity of the human motor system in controlling the amplitude of movement, *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 47 (1954) 381-391.
8. M.A. Goodale, A.D. Milner, *Sight Unseen: An Exploration of Conscious and Unconscious Vision*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.
9. M.A. Goodale, A.D. Milner, L.S. Jakobson, D.P. Carey, A neurological dissociation between perceiving objects and grasping them, *Nature* 349 (1991) 154-156.
10. B. Heider, Visual form agnosia: neural mechanisms and anatomical foundations, *Neurocase* 6 (2000) 1-12.
11. L.A. Howard, S.P. Tipper, Hand deviations away from visual cues: indirect evidence for inhibition, *Experimental Brain Research* 113 (1997) 144-152.
12. S.R. Jackson, G.M. Jackson, J. Rosicky, Are non-relevant objects represented in working memory? The effects of non-target objects on reach and grasp kinematics, *Experimental Brain Research* 102 (1995) 519-530.
13. T.W. James, J. Culham, G.K. Humphrey, A.D. Milner, M.A. Goodale, Ventral occipital lesions impair object recognition but not object-directed grasping: a fMRI study, *Brain* 126 (2003) 2463-2475.

14. M. Jeannerod, *The Cognitive Neuroscience of Action*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1997.
15. N. Kanwisher, R.P. Woods, M. Iacoboni, J.C. Mazziotta, A locus in human extrastriate cortex for visual shape analysis, *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 9 (1997) 133-142.
16. S. Lê, D. Cardebat, K. Boulanouar, M.-A. Hénaff, F. Michel, A.D. Milner, H.C. Dijkerman, M. Puel, J.-F. Démonet, Seeing, since childhood, without ventral stream: a behavioural study, *Brain* 125 (2002) 58-74.
17. R.D. McIntosh, H.C. Dijkerman, M. Mon-Williams, A.D. Milner, Visuomotor processing of spatial layout in visual form agnosia. Presentation to the Experimental Psychology Society, Cambridge, July 2000, 2000.
18. R.D. McIntosh, K.I. McClements, H.C. Dijkerman, D. Birchall, A.D. Milner, Preserved obstacle avoidance during reaching in patients with left visual neglect, *Neuropsychologia* 42 (2004a) 1107-1117.
19. R.D. McIntosh, K.I. McClements, I. Schindler, T.P. Cassidy, D. Birchall, A.D. Milner, Avoidance of obstacles in the absence of visual awareness, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* 271 (2004b) 15-20.
20. R. Malach, J.B. Reppas, R.B. Benson, K.K. Kwong, H. Jiang, W.A. Kennedy, P.J. Ledden, T.J. Brady, B.R. Rosen, R.B.H. Tootell, Object-related activity revealed by functional magnetic resonance imaging in human occipital cortex, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, USA* 92 (1995) 8135-8138.
21. A.D. Milner, Vision without knowledge, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, B* 352 (1997) 1249-1256.
22. A.D. Milner, M.A. Goodale, *The Visual Brain in Action*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995.
23. A.D. Milner, C.A. Heywood, A disorder of lightness discrimination in a case of visual form agnosia, *Cortex* 25 (1989) 489-494.
24. A.D. Milner, R.D. McIntosh, Reaching between obstacles in spatial neglect and visual extinction, *Progress in Brain Research* 144 (2004) 213-226.
25. A.D. Milner, D.I. Perrett, R.S. Johnston, P.J. Benson, T.R. Jordan, D.W. Heeley, D. Bettucci, F. Mortara, R. Mutani, E. Terazzi, D.L.W. Davidson, Perception and action in 'visual form agnosia', *Brain* 114 (1991) 405-428.
26. M. Mon-Williams, R.D. McIntosh, A test between two hypotheses and a possible third way for the control of prehension, *Experimental Brain Research* 134 (2000) 268-273.

- 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
27. M. Mon-Williams, J.R. Tresilian, V.L. Coppard, R.G. Carson, The effect of obstacle position on reach-to-grasp movements, *Experimental Brain Research* 137 (2001) 497-501.
  28. I. Schindler, N.J. Rice, R.D. McIntosh, Y. Rossetti, A. Vighetto, A.D. Milner, Automatic avoidance of obstacles is a dorsal stream function: evidence from optic ataxia, *Nature Neuroscience* 7 (2004) 779-784.
  29. J.K.E. Steeves, G.K. Humphrey, J.C. Culham, R.S. Menon, A.D. Milner, M.A. Goodale, Behavioral and neuroimaging evidence for a contribution of color and texture information to scene classification in a patient with visual form agnosia, *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 16 (2004) 955-965.
  30. J.K.E. Steeves, J.C. Culham, B.C. Duchaine, C. Cavina Pratesi, K.F. Valyear, I. Schindler, G.K. Humphrey, A.D. Milner, M.A. Goodale, The fusiform face area is not sufficient for face recognition: evidence from a patient with dense prosopagnosia and no occipital face area, *Neuropsychologia*, published online 25 August (2005).
  31. S.P. Tipper, L.A. Howard, S.R. Jackson, Selective reaching to grasp: evidence for distractor interference effects, *Visual Cognition* 4 (1997) 1-38.
  32. J.R. Tresilian, Attention in action or obstruction of movement? A kinematic analysis of avoidance behaviour in prehension, *Experimental Brain Research* 120 (1998) 352-368.
  33. J.R. Tresilian, Selective attention in reaching: when is an object not a distractor? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 3 (1999) 407-408.

## Figure legends

### Figure 1

Ventral stream lesions in patient D.F. shown in comparison with the expected location of the lateral occipital complex in healthy subjects, taken from MRI scan data.

(A) D.F.'s brain has been rendered at the pial surface (outer grey matter boundary).

Lesions were traced on slices that indicated tissue damage, and rendered on the pial surface in pale blue. Lateral views of the left and right hemispheres are shown, as is a ventral view of the underside of the brain. The rightmost image shows a slice through the lesions ( $z = \pm 8$ ).

(B) The expected location of LOC based on group data from seven neurologically intact participants is shown on one individual's pial surface and on a slice through the  $z = \pm 8$  plane. The activation in the slice is outlined in orange in panel A for comparison with the lesions in D.F.'s brain. (Reproduced with permission from James et al. [13]).

### Figure 2

The experimental arrangement used in Experiment 1. The start position is shown as a filled black circle, the target as a filled rectangle, and the six possible obstacle locations as empty rectangles.

### Figure 3

Experiment 1: Graphs depicting the reach trajectories (normalized for start position) taken by D.F. (top 3 graphs) and controls (bottom 3 graphs) for each of the 3 obstacle locations. The solid line represents reach trajectories when the obstacle was present on the left and the broken line represents reach trajectories when the obstacle was on the right.

### Figure 4

The lesion sites in patient S.B., as reconstructed from MRI scan data. (Reproduced with permission from Lé et al. [16]).

### Figure 5

1  
2  
3 The experimental arrangement used in Experiment 2. The start button is shown as a  
4 filled black circle, and the possible locations of the two cylindrical non-target objects  
5 are shown as open circles. The target zone is shown in grey at the far edge of the  
6 board. A strip of white card was placed between the two cylinders on every trial to  
7 cover the unused holes.  
8  
9

#### 10 11 12 13 Figure 6

14 The 'weightings' ( $dP_L$  and  $dP_R$ ) given to each cylinder by D.F. and S.B. and the  
15 controls in the reaching task. These values indicate the extent to which each subject  
16 takes the left or right cylinder's location into account when performing the task.  
17  
18  
19

#### 20 21 22 Figure 7

23 The 'weightings' given to each cylinder by D.F. and S.B. and the controls in the  
24 bisection task.  
25  
26  
27

#### 28 29 Figure 8

30 The weightings given to the two cylinders by our two visual form agnosic patients  
31 (D.F. and S.B.) and by optic ataxic patients A.T. and I.G. [28] in the reaching task.  
32  
33  
34

#### 35 36 Figure 9

37 The weightings given to the two cylinders by our two visual form agnosic patients  
38 (D.F. and S.B.) and by optic ataxic patients A.T. and I.G. [28] in the bisection task.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1

		Far left	Middle left	Near left	Target only	Near right	Middle right	Far right
MGA	DF	68.17	67.29	65.32	67.44	64.1	68.83	70.29
	Controls	81.66	80.86	71.56	80.19	70.32	79.29	82.66
MT	DF	1058.54	951.58	949.46	1042.78	956.21	991.03	1027.03
	Controls	524.92	553.83	586.44	517.02	608.2	565.44	525.18
PV	DF	816.66	814.7	823.08	793.6	784.05	792.92	794.56
	Controls	1294.91	1251.43	1269.48	1274.23	1130.2	1211.11	1293.34
TMGA	DF	591.3	591.15	599.74	587.68	539.94	603.89	576.79
	Controls	303.61	317.86	319.89	303.25	319.84	332.9	315.41
TPV	DF	312.18	329.01	321.83	318.26	304.51	334.47	285.53
	Controls	202.81	206.64	198.99	197.76	196.1	222.59	201.3
%TMGA	DF	56.11	62.5	63.79	56.59	57.06	61.49	56.26
	Controls	59.17	57.72	55.6	59.47	52.62	58.66	60.22
%TPVEL	DF	29.62	34.84	34.11	30.54	32.15	34.06	27.95
	Controls	40.89	38.12	34.79	39.31	32.85	39.56	40.09

Experiment 1: Kinematic data for D.F. and healthy controls for each of the test conditions, including maximum grip aperture (MGA), movement time (MT), peak velocity (PV), time to maximum grip aperture (TMGA), time to peak velocity (TPV), % time to maximum grip aperture (%TMGA) and % time to peak velocity (%TPVEL).

Table 2

Subject	RT (ms)	MT (ms)	PV (mm/s)	TPV (ms)	%TPV
DF	448.75	932.46*	1203.43	351.46	37.56
SB	351.25	439.17	2926.58	220.74	50.26*
Mean C	206.85	603.45	1742.98	238.56	39.46

Experiment 2: Kinematic data for D.F., S.B. and 11 healthy control subjects in the reaching task.

Table 3

Subject	RT (ms)	MT (ms)	PV (mm/s)	TPV (ms)	%TPV
DF	431.46	948.44*	564.1	425.42*	44.85
SB	580.21	930.63*	682.86	538.57**	57.87
Mean C	349.2636	602.71	907.6009	267.7645	45.47

Experiment 2: Kinematic data for D.F., S.B. and 11 healthy control subjects in the bisection task.