**Exp. Chapter 1. Exploring the relationship between visual working memory and attention in neglect.**

As already mentioned, most traditional models of the neglect syndrome suggest that it is a disorder of spatial attention.

[Posner – disengage deficit; Corbetta – attention is sticky on the right (attentional capture)]

A great deal of research over the past few decades has highlighted a range a key deficits in neglect that go beyond spatial attention.

[Robertson – sustained attention; Husain – temporal attention (attentional blink)]

In addition, recent work has highlighted deficits in spatial working memory even for events in central or right, putatively non-neglected, space (refs).

[Feber & Danckert, Malhotra et al; Parton et al; ]

So while attentional deficits clearly represent a cornerstone feature of the neglect syndrome, these deficits can not explain the full range of impairments observed.

Furthermore, recent attempts at rehabilitating neglect (to be discussed in more detail below) have shown that while spatial attention can be improved, a range of perceptual biases remain unaltered (refs). It may be the case then that prisms operate on neural systems important for the deployment of attention, but have little to no effect on those mechanisms needed to form accurate perceptual representations.

[could consider dealing with the RPS results we have – or leaving it to a general discussion section]

One first question to consider in this context is the relationship between spatial attention and working memory (Awh et al.,).

[both are related, but likely to be independent cognitive mechanisms – if they are truly independent, then there should be little relationship between them in patients – Hyp: both attention and WM will be impaired in patients, but these impairments are independent. That’s why prisms will influence one but not the other. WM is not dorsal.]