## ARTICLE IN PRESS

#### NeuroImage xxx (2014) xxx-xxx



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

### NeuroImage



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ynimg

### 1 Full Length Articles

# Dissociable neural representations of wrist motor coordinate frames in human motor cortices

Natsue Yoshimura <sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Koji Jimura <sup>a,b,c</sup>, Charles Sayo DaSalla <sup>c</sup>, Duk Shin <sup>a,c</sup>, Hiroyuki Kambara <sup>a,c</sup>,
 Takashi Hanakawa <sup>b,d,e</sup>, Yasuharu Koike <sup>a,c,f</sup>

6 <sup>a</sup> Precision and Intelligence Laboratory, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Yokohama 226-8503, Japan

- 7 b Department of Functional Brain Research, National Institute of Neuroscience, National Center of Neurology and Psychiatry, Tokyo 187-8502, Japan
- 8 <sup>c</sup> CREST, Japan Science and Technology Agency, Tokyo 102-0076, Japan
- 9 <sup>d</sup> Department of Advanced Neuroimaging, Integrative Brain Imaging Center, National Center of Neurology and Psychiatry, Tokyo 187-8551, Japan
- <sup>e</sup> PRESTO, Japan Science and Technology Agency, Tokyo 102-0076, Japan
- 11 <sup>f</sup> Solution Science Research Laboratory, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Yokohama 226-8503, Japan

### 12 ARTICLE INFO

13 Article history:

14 Accepted 13 April 2014

- 15 Available online xxxx
- 16 Keywords:

34 36 37

- 17 Motor areas
- 18 Motor coordinate frames
- 19 Functional magnetic resonance imaging
- 20 Multivariate pattern analysis
- 21 Voluntary movement

ABSTRACT

There is a growing interest in how the brain transforms body part positioning in the extrinsic environment into 22 an intrinsic coordinate frame during motor control. To explore the human brain areas representing intrinsic and 23 extrinsic coordinate frames, this fMRI study examined neural representation of motor cortices while human par-24 ticipants performed isometric wrist flexions and extensions in different forearm postures, thereby applying the 25 same wrist actions (representing the intrinsic coordinate frame) to different movement directions (representing 26 the extrinsic coordinate frame). Using sparse logistic regression, critical voxels involving pattern information that 27 specifically discriminates wrist action (flexion vs. extension) and movement direction (upward vs. downward) 28 were identified within the primary motor and premotor cortices. Analyses of classifier weights further identified 29 contributions of the primary motor area proper to the extrinsic coordinate frame and the ventral and dorsal premotor 30 cortex and supplementary motor area proper to the extrinsic coordinate frame. These results are consistent with 31 existing findings using non-human primates and demonstrate the distributed representations of independent 32 coordinate frames in the human brain. 33

© 2014 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

### 39 Introduction

The brain allows for skillful manipulation of the body to interact 40 with the external environment. This sophisticated and flexible opera-41 tion involves transformations between coordinate frames of the internal 42body and external environment, possibly computed in distributed brain 4344regions. The intrinsic coordinate frame is body- and/or musclecentered, whereas the extrinsic coordinate frame refers to points out-45 side the body. However, it is still unclear how these two coordinate 46 47 frames are represented in the brain.

Extensive studies using monkeys have shown that the primary
 motor cortex (M1) and the premotor cortex (PM) are important in cod ing coordinate frames. M1 has been found to represent not only the in trinsic coordinate frame, through parameters such as muscle tension
 (Cheney et al., 1985; Donoghue et al., 1992; Evarts, 1968; Kakei et al.,

E-mail address: yoshimura@cns.pi.titech.ac.jp (N. Yoshimura).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.04.046 1053-8119/© 2014 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1999) and joint angle (Scott and Kalaska, 1995), but also the extrinsic 53 coordinate frame in the form of movement direction (Georgopoulos 54 et al., 1986; Kakei et al., 1999). The ventral and dorsal regions of PM 55 (PMv and PMd) have been found to be associated with the extrinsic co- 56 ordinate frame. PMv codes the direction of action (Kakei et al., 2001), 57 whereas PMd codes motor preparation (Kurata, 1993) and the relative 58 position of targets for reaching (Pesaran et al., 2006). The supplementa- 59 ry motor area (SMA) is also included in the medial portion of PM. To our 60 knowledge, no previous studies have examined the neural representa- 61 tion of distinct coordinate frames in SMA. However, the roles of the an- 62 atomically subdivided areas, pre-SMA and SMA proper, seem to be 63 relatively different. Evidence for these areas suggests that pre-SMA acti- 64 vates in relation to visual cues (Matsuzaka et al., 1992) or new motor 65 plans (Shima et al., 1991), whereas SMA proper activates in relation to 66 somatosensory stimuli (Matsuzaka et al., 1992). 67

These observations are further extended by human functional mag- 68 netic resonance imaging (fMRI), transcranial magnetic stimulation 69 (TMS), and positron emission tomography (PET) studies. M1 has been 70 found to be involved in both the intrinsic and extrinsic coordinate 71 frames (Alaerts et al., 2009; Eisenberg et al., 2010; Toxopeus et al., 72

Please cite this article as: Yoshimura, N., et al., Dissociable neural representations of wrist motor coordinate frames in human motor cortices, NeuroImage (2014), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroImage.2014.04.046

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author at: 4259-J3-10, Nagatsuta-cho, Midori-ku, Yokohama 226-8503, Japan. Fax: + 81 45 924 5085.

2

## **ARTICLE IN PRESS**

N. Yoshimura et al. / NeuroImage xxx (2014) xxx-xxx

2011). A TMS study showed that movement observation leads to highly 73 74 muscle-specific resonating activity in M1, indicating representation of the intrinsic coordinate (Alaerts et al., 2009). Conversely, fMRI studies 7576 using a "center-out task" showed that M1 encodes direction of movement, i.e., the extrinsic coordinate frame (Eisenberg et al., 2010; 77 78Toxopeus et al., 2011). TMS studies have shown the involvement of 79PMd in motor preparation (Davare et al., 2006) and action prediction 80 (Duque et al., 2012; Stadler et al., 2012), and TMS and PET studies 81 have indicated a role for PMv in motor imagery, motor preparation, 82 and grip force prediction (Dafotakis et al., 2008; Davare et al., 2009; Stephan et al., 1995). Although evidence of non-primary motor areas 83 in the human cortex have not shown complete homology with those 84 in monkeys, findings from both species suggest that PMd and PMv 85 may be involved primarily in the extrinsic coordinate frame, because 86 motor preparation and action prediction likely require position infor-87 mation of the body parts in external space. 88

Studies using PET or regional cerebral blood flow measurement
found activation in pre-SMA for externally cued or unfamiliar movement tasks and in SMA proper for self-paced or familiar tasks (Deiber
et al., 1991; Grafton et al., 1992; Jenkins et al., 1994; Jenkins et al.,
2000; Playford et al., 1992). These findings may suggest that SMA proper
is more strongly associated with direct motor control than pre-SMA.

Though electrophysiological studies have been performed to examine the neural representations of motor coordinate frames in monkeys (Kakei et al., 1999, 2001), performing similar studies in humans poses practical challenges. fMRI offers an attractive solution because it is a non-invasive approach and can be used to examine M1 and PM regions in their entirety, a capability impossible for electrophysiological methods focusing on microscopic areas. In order to extract such mutually transformed coordinate representations using fMRI data, increased analysis power is likely needed to detect experimental manipulations. Multivariate pattern analysis (MVPA) is a machine learning technique that can be applied to fMRI data, and its utility has become increasingly apparent due to its high sensitivity to experimental manipulation and areal dissociations (Kriegeskorte, 2011; Mourao-Miranda et al., 2005). Notably, it detects fine-grained pattern differences not found in regional-average activation by conventional univariate analyses and discovers novel neural mechanisms (Kamitani and Tong, 2005; Kriegeskorte, 2011; 110 Miyawaki et al., 2008; Mur et al., 2009). MVPA may, thus, be suitable to dissociate neural representations of the intrinsic and extrinsic coordinate frames.

In this fMRI study, we directly addressed these issues by applying a 114 novel approach to the representation of wrist action (intrinsic) and 115 movement direction (extrinsic). During fMRI acquisition, healthy 116 human participants performed isometric wrist flexion and extension 117 tasks (Fig. 1) in different forearm postures, allowing independent ma- 118 nipulation of the intrinsic and extrinsic coordinate frames. In order to 119 identify brain areas associated with the respective coordinate frames, 120 two binary classifiers were trained based on sparse logistic regression 121 (SLR) (Yamashita et al., 2008), a type of MVPA, for discriminating 122 voxel pattern information for flexion vs. extension (FvE) movements 123 and upward vs. downward (UvD) movements. Taking advantage of 124 SLR, which can train high-dimensional classifiers without prior dimen- 125 sion reduction, binary classifier weight values for M1 and PM regions 126 were examined to identify brain areas associated with the intrinsic 127 and extrinsic coordinate frames. 128



Fig. 1. (A) Schematic of participant postures and relation between movement directions and tasks according to visual instructions in three different wrist postures. The MRI-compatible fixation apparatus consists of splints, Velcro tape, titanium screws, and a plastic platform. [*Left panel*] Pronated posture (Pro). An upward force exertion was equivalent to an extension task and cued with an up arrow (ExtUp), whereas a downward force exertion was equivalent to a flexion task and cued with a down arrow (FlexDown). [*Middle panel*] Supinated posture (Sup). An upward force exertion was equivalent to a flexion task and cued with a up arrow (FlexDUp), whereas a downward force exertion was equivalent to a flexion task and cued with a down arrow (FlexDown). [*Middle panel*] Supinated posture (Sup). An upward force exertion was equivalent to a flexion task and cued with a up arrow (FlexUp), whereas a downward force exertion was equivalent to a flexion task and cued with a down arrow (ExtDown). [*Right panel*] Midway posture between Pro and Sup (Mid). A left or right arrow was used for visual instruction in this posture. A leftward force exertion was equivalent to a flexion task and cued with a left arrow (FlexLeft), whereas a rightward force exertion was equivalent to an extension task and cued with a right arrow (ExtRight). (B) Block design for the fINRI experiment. Execution tasks (Flex and Ext) were instructed with up and down arrows (in Pro and Sup) or left and right arrows (in Mid) inside a gray box, and a no-force task (Still) was instructed with a vertical bar (in Pro and Sup) or a horizontal bar (in Mid).

Please cite this article as: Yoshimura, N., et al., Dissociable neural representations of wrist motor coordinate frames in human motor cortices, NeuroImage (2014), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.04.046

Download English Version:

## https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6027237

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/6027237

Daneshyari.com