

When Far Becomes Near: Remapping of Space by Tool Use

Anna Berti

Università di Torino, Italy

Francesca Frassinetti

Università di Bologna, Italy

Abstract

■ Far (extrapersonal) and near (peripersonal) spaces are behaviorally defined as the space outside the hand-reaching distance and the space within the hand-reaching distance. Animal and human studies have confirmed this distinction, showing that space is not homogeneously represented in the brain. In this paper we demonstrate that the coding of space as “far” and “near” is not only determined by the hand-reaching distance, but it is also dependent on how the brain represents the extension of the body space. We will show that when the cerebral representation of body space is extended to include objects or tools used by the subject, space previously mapped

as far can be remapped as near. Patient P.P., after a right hemisphere stroke, showed a dissociation between near and far spaces in the manifestation of neglect. Indeed, in a line bisection task, neglect was apparent in near space, but not in far space when bisection in the far space was performed with a projection lightpen. However, when in the far space bisection was performed with a stick, used by the patient to reach the line, neglect appeared and was as severe as neglect in the near space. An artificial extension of the patient's body (the stick) caused a remapping of far space as near space. ■

INTRODUCTION

One of the more central issue in cognitive neuroscience is how the brain constructs a map of the external world and how this map interacts with the representation of our body, in order to be able to deal with objects placed in the surrounding space.

We can detect, locate, orient to, and reach for an object. All these operations can be distinguished according to the sector of space in which they occur and to the action needed for accomplishing the task (Colby & Duhamel, 1996; Rizzolatti, Riggio, & Sheliga, 1994; Brouchon, Joannette, & Samso, 1986). For instance, if the object of interest is located in the immediate surroundings of the body (peripersonal space), manual reaching and grasping can be achieved without locomotion. On the contrary, if the object of interest is placed outside a direct manual reaching (extrapersonal space) locomotion is needed for subsequent action to the object. Alternatively, the subject can use a tool to reach and grasp for far objects. In any case, we need to encode the position of the objects with respect to the position of the body and body parts. How is the location of objects placed in different sectors of space coded by the brain?

In animal studies there are reports that show that far and near space are separately represented in the brain. Area 8 of the monkey frontal lobe has different kinds of

neurons related, among other things, to the coding of saccades (e.g., Bruce & Goldberg, 1985; Goldberg & Bushnell, 1981). Although the simple coding of saccades may not be equivalent to the analysis of far space, some authors have pointed to the possibility that an area involved in eye movement programming might contribute to far space representation. Therefore, based on the physiological properties of area 8 neurons and on ablation studies showing that lesions of monkeys' frontal eye-fields causes inattention for stimuli presented contralateral to the brain damage (Latto & Cowey, 1971) especially in the far space (Rizzolatti, Gentilucci, & Matelli, 1985), Rizzolatti and Gallese (1988) proposed that area 8 is involved in far space representation. Furthermore, Colby, Duhamel, and Goldberg (1996) showed that neurons in area LIP (that is richly connected with, and physiologically similar to, area 8) might be another neural substrate for the representation of far space in monkeys. Area LIP neurons have independent sensory and motor responses and saccade-related burst. Interestingly, they discharge before a saccade even when there has been no recent visual stimulus and they are strongly responsive in a task in which the saccades are expressively forbidden. Moreover, attention to spatial location modulates the sensory response to the onset of the stimulus. Altogether, the physiological properties of

Table 1. Means of the Absolute Displacement Errors and of Percentages of Neglect Displacement for Each Condition of the Experiment

<i>Space</i>	<i>Modality</i>	<i>Short lines</i>	<i>Long lines</i>
Near	reaching	24.8 (24.8%)	66.7 (33.3%)
Near	pointing	22.1 (22.1%)	51.6 (25.8%)
Far	reaching	58.5 (29.2%)	96.4 (24.1%)
Far	pointing	17.1 (8.5%)	39.1 (9.7%)

these neurons suggest that they cannot be regarded exclusively as analyzing visual stimuli or as exclusively planning saccades. Because the common factor underlying the activation of these neurons appeared to be the location of an event in space, they have been considered the ideal candidates for far space representation.

On the contrary, near space seems to be represented in frontal area 6 and in the rostral part of the inferior parietal lobe, e.g., in area 7b (Leinonen, Hyvarinen, Nymani, & Linnankoski, 1979) and in area VIP (Duhamel, Bremmer, BenHamed, & Graf, 1997; Colby, Duhamel, & Goldberg, 1993). Some VIP neurons seem to code an ultra-near space, centered around the mouth. These neurons are most sensitive when a static stimulus is presented very close (5 cm) to the animal head. In these areas, peripersonal space is coded in strict relation to the body. Some neurons code for the position of a tactile stimulus delivered to the animal skin and for a visual stimulus presented in the space near the part of the body where the tactile field is located (bimodal neurons, Fogassi et al., 1996; Graziano, Yap, & Gross, 1994; Graziano & Gross, 1995; Gentilucci et al., 1988). Monkeys with lesions in these areas show inattention for stimuli located near the body whereas far stimuli are detected (Rizzolatti, Matelli, & Pavesi, 1983). Following these studies, area 8 and parietal area LIP (Thier & Andersen, 1997) have been considered as the anatomical correlate for far space coding, whereas area 6 and the rostral part of the inferior parietal lobe have been considered as the anatomical correlate for near space coding (Rizzolatti & Gallese, 1988).

Recent neuropsychological investigations seem to suggest that in humans, space is coded in a way similar to monkeys. For instance, evidence in favor of the existence of a visuo-tactile peripersonal space has been recently offered by studies on cross-modal extinction. These studies showed that visual stimuli delivered in the near-peripersonal (but not in the far extrapersonal) space can extinguish tactile stimuli delivered contralaterally, on the corresponding sector of the body, e.g., the hand or the face (hand: Làdavas, di Pellegrino, Fernè, & Zeloni, 1998; di Pellegrino, Làdavas, & Farnè, 1997; face: Làdavas, Zeloni, & Farnè, 1999).

A single case study by Halligan and Marshall (1991) showed that a dissociation between near and far space

coding could also be suggested for humans. Their patient, following a right-hemisphere stroke, showed marked left visual-spatial neglect on a line-bisection task in near space that was reduced when the task was carried out in far space. Cowey, Small, and Ellis (1994) and Vuilleumier, Valenza, Mayer, Reverdin, and Landis (1998) reported the opposite dissociation: more severe neglect in far space than in near space. Thus, based on these studies, one may conclude that the distinction between near and far space is not simply descriptive, but that the brain has different ways for coding the position of objects placed in different location with respect to body coordinates (see Shelton, Bowers, & Heilman, 1990 for further dissociations within the near space). If the brain constructs different maps according to far and near space, a question we can ask is whether “far” and “near” are derived simply referring to the reaching distance or whether coding of spatial positions is a more dynamic operation that can be influenced by using tools that modify the spatial relation between the body and the object. Iriki, Tanaka, and Iwamura (1996) found in the monkey parietal lobe bimodal neurons that coded the schema of the hand, similar to those studied by Rizzolatti et al. (Fogassi et al., 1996; Gentilucci et al., 1988) and by Graziano et al. (1994). These neurons fired when a tactile stimulus was delivered to the monkey’s hand and when visual objects were presented near the hand tactile receptive field. The most striking characteristic of these neurons was that their visual receptive field was modified, during a reaching movement performed with a rake, to include the entire length of the rake and to cover the expanded accessible space. In other words, in that experiment, the body schema was altered using the tool (Head & Holmes, 1911): The tool was assimilated to the hand, becoming part of the hand representation (Aglioti, Smania, Manfredi, & Berlucchi, 1996; Paillard, 1993).

A possible consequence of the modification of the spatial relations between the body and the object caused by using a tool that extends the reaching space might be that far is remapped as near.

In the present study, we explored this possibility in a patient, P.P., who, after damage to the right hemisphere, was affected by visual neglect, a disturbance that impairs the processing and the exploration of the space contralateral to the brain lesion. P.P. showed neglect in a line-bisection test in near space, but not in far space (see

Table 2. Means of the Percentages of Rightward Displacement in Near and Far Space in the Reaching and Pointing Modality, Irrespective of Line Length (Interaction Space × Modality)

	<i>Reaching</i>	<i>Pointing</i>
Near	29.1	24
Far	26.7	9.2

Methods). Our prediction stated that if the bisection of lines in far space was executed with a tool (a stick) that extended the representation of the body to include the space reachable by the tool, then far space should have been treated as near space, and therefore should have become affected by neglect. Based on these assumptions, the patient was asked to bisect short and long lines, in near and far space, by pointing to the lines with a projection lightpen or by reaching them with the index finger or with a stick.

RESULTS

Displacement errors were calculated in millimeters. Displacement of the subjective midpoint to the right of the objective midpoint of the line is indicated with the sign “+” whereas the sign “-” indicates leftward displacement. The absolute displacement errors and the means of the percentages of the displacement errors for each condition are reported in Table 1.

A repeated $2 \times 2 \times 2$ measure ANOVA was performed on the arcsine transformed percentages of displacement. We set the significant level at $p = .01$. Space (Near and Far), Line Length (Short and Long), and Bisection Modality (Reaching and Pointing) were the main factors. The analysis showed that Space [$F(1,19) = 43.27, p < .00001$], Bisection Modality [$F(1,19) = 55.98, p < .000001$] and the interaction Space \times Modality [$F(1,19) = 29.11, p < .0001$] were significant sources of variance. Indeed, rightward displacement was greater in near than in far space (26.5% vs. 18%). Moreover, the main effect of Modality showed that the rightward displacement was greater in the reaching (27.8%) than in the pointing modality (16.6%). However, the interaction Space \times Modality (see Table 2) showed that this was only true in the far space, where the patient's displacement to the right was 26.7% when she was reaching with the stick, and

only 9% when she was using the lightpen (Neuman-Keuls post hoc comparison: $p < .000001$). On the contrary, as shown in Figure 1, in near space no difference related to bisection modality was found (reaching with the stick = 29.1%, pointing = 24%).

The interaction Space \times Length was also significant [$F(1,19) = 20.58, p < .001$]. Post hoc comparison showed that rightward displacement in near space was greater for long (29.6%) than for short lines (23.5%), $p < .001$, whereas in far space this difference was not observed. Within far space, the difference between long (24.1%) and short (29%) lines in the reaching modality, was not statistically significant.

DISCUSSION

This data firstly shows that patient P.P. had neglect in near space, but not in far space, when she had to bisect a line using a lightpen. Therefore, our study provides a confirmation that impaired coding of near space can coexist with good coding of far space, as was first described by Halligan and Marshall (1991). Vuilleumier et al. (1998), and Cowey et al. (1994) described the opposite dissociation, i.e., neglect for far, but not for near, space. These double dissociations have been considered an indirect demonstration that the neural representation of the space outside the hand reaching and of the space within the hand reaching involves different brain mechanisms and, possibly different brain areas that are alternatively activated on the basis of the hand-reaching distance. Recently, Cowey, Small, and Ellis (1999), studying line bisection at different distances from the body, have shown that in patients with neglect for far, but not for near space, there was no sudden change in the patient's performance going from near to far distances. This might suggest that coding of far and near space does not depend on the switch between different neural maps, coding different space sectors. However, Cowey et al. have pointed out that their results are not incompatible with the existence of discrete brain mechanisms for space representation. They argue that the gradient effect, when observed, may be related to the great number of frontal and parietal cortical visual areas whose neurons are sensitive to the distance of the visual stimuli. As a result, if a lesion affects a region chiefly or exclusively concerned with near or far space, there will be ample opportunities for compensation (Cowey et al., 1999). Therefore, on the basis of these arguments, we may advance the hypothesis that also in our patient a discrete mechanism for far space coding was still working, whereas a separated mechanism of near space coding was damaged by the lesion.

Interestingly, although Halligan and Marshall (1991) did not present a reconstruction of the patient's cerebral damage, the lesion they described seems to be very similar to that of patient P.P. Both patients




Figure 1. Percentages of rightward displacement as a function of space and modality.

had a large infarct of the lateral aspect of the right hemisphere with some sparing of the frontal cortex. Therefore, one can advance the hypothesis that the antero-medial aspect of the right frontal lobe (e.g., the supplementary eye field) can be sufficient for far space coding. This hypothesis is based on the assumption that brain areas involved in motor programming are also involved in spatial representation, as discussed in the Introduction. In any case, it is important to remember that the lesions, both in Halligan and Marshall's case and in our case, were so large that drawing firm conclusions from the available anatomical data is difficult.

In our experiment we only used a line bisection task, so we cannot say whether the dissociation found in neglect between near and far space would be found also with other kind of stimuli. The only study that examined neglect in different sectors of space, using different tasks, is the study by Vuilleumier et al. (1998). They found a patient that showed neglect for far, but not for near, space in all the tests used (line bisection, reading, cancellation task). However, this does not mean that once a representation is compromised by brain damage, then all tasks performed within that space are affected and, vice versa, once a particular space sector is spared, then all tasks are possible in that sector. The performance of a task depends not only on where stimuli are presented in space, but also on the specific cognitive system underlying the task that, if intact, may overcome the spatial problem. Moreover, as suggested by Cowey et al. (1999) and by Vuilleumier et al. (1998), the different motor programs used for performing the tasks may also influence different performances in different tasks. The lesion could affect specific motor programs differently, therefore causing different pattern of results.

The remarkable result of the present experiment is that the use of a stick, by extending the body schema to include the space accessible by the stick, influenced the patient's computation of space. Indeed, when in the far space the patient had to indicate the midpoint of the line by pointing to it, the left part of the line was normally perceived, whereas when the patient had to reach the line by means of the stick, the left part of the line was misperceived, as was in near space. The capacity of using tools is, evolutionary, one of the most important achievement for monkeys and man. By holding a stick, we can reach for objects that are beyond the limit of our arm without using the locomotion. Consequently, the relation between our body and the external objects is modified. A far object can become near if we can reach it, no matter what means we use, the hand or a tool. Iriki et al. (1996) suggested that the bimodal neurons that modify their visual receptive field when the monkey reaches for an object with a stick, the neural correlate of an expanded image of the hand. Based on this hypothesis, and on the

assumption that the human brain is equipped in a similar way as the monkey brain, our data can be explained as follows. When the patient used the stick to reach for the object of interest in far space, the tool was coded as part of the patient's hand, as in monkeys, causing an expansion of the representation of the body schema. This affected the spatial relation between far space and the body. The structure of peripersonal space was then altered and peripersonal space was expanded to include the far space reachable by the tool. The reaching of "far" space with a tool determined a switch between spatial representations, so that the representation of near space was now activated. Because near space representation was affected by the brain damaged, the remapping of far space as near affected patient performance in line bisection and neglect reappeared. We did not predict an influence of the use of the projection lightpen in near space, because although the projection lightpen might be incorporated in the representation of the body (like the stick), its dimension is such that it would not alter the relation between personal, peripersonal, and extrapersonal space.

An alternative explanation of our results could be that the kind of action we were going to perform selects the representation of space compatible with that action. According to this alternative hypothesis, our results might be explained as follows: In the space outside the hand-reaching distance, a pointing action activates the representation of far space (intact), whereas a reaching action activates the representation of near space (impaired). This would imply that the simple use of the projection lightpen (pointing action) activates the representation of far space. If so, we should have found a significant amelioration of neglect also in "near" space, when the patient used the projection lightpen. However, we did not find a significant difference between bisection by the index finger (reaching) and bisection by the lightpen (pointing) in near space. Therefore, we are keen to favor the hypothesis stating that the effect that we found in far space, for the reaching modality, is more related to a switch in space representations induced by the artificial extension of body space, than to an activation of different space representations induced by the programming of a specific action. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that both in our patient and in the patient described by Halligan and Marshall (1991) there was a nonsignificant tendency to have a less severe neglect in the pointing modality, also in near space, as if action programming may interact with space mapping.

In conclusion, what affected our patient's performance was the use of a tool that extended the space accessible by the subject influencing the representation of different sectors of space. Both studies on monkeys and neuropsychological studies seem to show that peripersonal and extrapersonal space coding is a dy-




Figure 2. Reconstruction of the patient's brain damage following Damasio and Damasio (1989).

namic process, not only related to the absolute coding of a distance, but also dependent on how body extension is computed in the brain.

METHODS

P.P. was a 77-year-old, right-handed woman who suffered a right CVA on May 2, 1997. On admission, she showed severe left hemiparesis, left body anesthesia, and left homonymous hemianopia. She was anosognosic for her hemiplegia and her hemianopia, but her general reasoning capacities were within the normal range. A CT scan, performed a month after the stroke, showed an ischemic lesion affecting the lateral aspect of the right frontal, temporal and occipital lobe and the inferior and superior parietal lobe. The right basal ganglia and the insula were also damaged (see Figure 2).

We tested P.P. a month after the stroke (after she had given informed consent to participate in the study) on two different days, with an interval of a week between the two experimental sessions. In both occasions, she showed a severe neglect in the Albert test (Albert, 1973), which requires the patient to cross out 40 lines drawn at various angles and widely dispersed on a sheet of paper. In this test, she cancelled only the rightmost stimuli. Moreover, in reading single words, she omitted the leftmost letters and, in reading a paragraph, she omitted the leftmost

words of each line. Therefore, when examined in the near space, P.P. showed neglect for left-side stimuli.

The patient was then tested on line bisection. Lines were drawn in black, on A3 sheets of paper, horizontally oriented, mounted on a wooden board. The board could be placed at a distance of approximately 50 cm (near space) or at a distance of approximately 100 cm (far space). The midpoint of each line was positioned at eye-level and aligned with the patient's midline. Line length in the near space could be either 10 cm (short lines) or 20 cm (long lines). Line length in the far space was corrected for the visual angle and could be either 20 cm (short lines) or 40 cm (long lines). In this way, short lines in near and far space and long lines in near and far space covered the same angle at the retinal level. In the near space the patient had to bisect the line either by touching the midpoint of the line with the index finger of the right hand (reaching modality) or indicating the midpoint of the line by means of a projection lightpen (pointing modality). In the far space, the patient had to bisect the lines either by using a 100-cm stick (reaching modality) or by means of a projection lightpen (pointing modality). Both in the pointing modality and in the reaching modality with the stick, the patient was instructed to keep her right hand close to the body midline. Altogether there were eight conditions: Short and long lines had to be bisected in far or near space, both in the pointing and reaching modality. There were 10 trials for each condition for a total of 80 trials per session.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Giacomo Rizzolatti and Paolo Nichelli for their suggestions and comments on the first draft of the manuscript. We also thank Marzia Minelli for her help in collecting the data and Katie Wright who kindly reviewed the English. This study was supported by a 60% MURST grant to A.B.

Reprint request should be sent to: Anna Berti, Dipartimento di Psicologia, Università di Torino, Via Lagrange 3, 10123 Turin, Italy.

REFERENCES

- Aglioti, S., Smania, N., Manfredi, M., & Berlucchi, G. (1996). Disownership of left hand and of objects related to it in a patient with right brain damage. *NeuroReport*, 8, 293–296.
- Albert, M. L. (1973). A simple test for visual neglect. *Neurology*, 23, 658–664.
- Brouchon, N., Joannette, Y., & Samsø, M. (1986). From movement to gesture: "here" and "where" of visually guided pointing. In J. L. Nespoulos, P. Perron, & A. R. Lecours (Eds.), *The biological foundation of gestures: Motor and semiotic aspects* (pp. 95–107). London: Erlbaum.
- Bruce, C. J., & Goldberg, M. E. (1985). Primate frontal eye fields. I. Single neurons discharging before saccades. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 53, 603–635.
- Colby, C. L., & Duhamel, J. R. (1996). Spatial representation for action in parietal cortex. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 5, 105.

- Colby, C. L., Duhamel, J. R., & Goldberg, M. E. (1993). Ventral intraparietal area of the macaque: Anatomic location and visual response properties. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 69, 902–914.
- Colby, C. L., Duhamel, J. R., & Goldberg, M. E. (1996). Visual, presaccadic, and cognitive activation of single neurons in monkey lateral intraparietal area. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 76, 2841–2852.
- Cowey, A., Small, M., & Ellis, S. (1994). Left visuo-spatial neglect can be worse in far than in near space. *Neuropsychologia*, 32, 1059–1066.
- Cowey, A., Small, M., & Ellis, S. (1999). No abrupt change in visual hemineglect from near to far space. *Neuropsychologia*, 37, 1–6.
- Damasio, H., & Damasio, A. (1989). *Lesion analysis in neuropsychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- di Pellegrino, G., Làdavas, E., & Farnè, A. (1997). Seeing where your hands are. *Nature*, 338, 730.
- Duhamel, J. R., Bremmer, F., BenHamed, S., & Graf, W. (1997). Spatial invariance of visual receptive field in parietal cortex neurons. *Nature*, 389, 845–848.
- Fogassi, L., Gallese, V., Fadiga, L., Luppino, G., Matelli, M., & Rizzolatti, G. (1996). Coding of peripersonal space in inferior premotor cortex (area F4). *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 76, 141–157.
- Gentilucci, M., Fogassi, L., Luppino, G., Matelli, M., Camarda, R., Rizzolatti, G. (1988). Functional organization of inferior area 6 in the macaque monkey. I. Somatotopy and the control of proximal movements. *Experimental Brain Research*, 71, 475–490.
- Goldberg, M. E., & Bushnell, M. C. (1981). Behavioral enhancement of visual responses in monkey cerebral cortex. II. Modulation in frontal eye field specifically related to saccades. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 46, 773–787.
- Graziano, M. S. A., & Gross, C. G. (1995). The representation of extrapersonal space: Possible role for bimodal, visual-tactile neurons. In M. Gazzaniga (Ed.), *The cognitive neuroscience* (pp. 1021–1033). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Graziano, M. S. A., Yap, G. S., & Gross, C. G. (1994). Coding of visual space by premotor neurons. *Science*, 266, 1054.
- Halligan, P., & Marshall, J. M. (1991). Left neglect for near but not for far space in man. *Nature*, 350, 498–500.
- Head, H., & Holmes, G. (1911). Sensory disturbances from cerebral lesion. *Brain*, 34, 102–254.
- Iriki, A., Tanaka, M., & Iwamura, Y. (1996). Coding of modified body schema during tool use by macaque postcentral neurons. *NeuroReport*, 7, 2325–2330.
- Làdavas, E., di Pellegrino, G., Fernè, A., & Zeloni, G. (1998). Neuropsychological evidence of an integrated visuotactile representation of peripersonal space in humans. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 10, 1–24.
- Làdavas, E., Zeloni, G., Farnè, A. (1999). Visual peripersonal space centered on the face in humans. *Brain*, 122, 2317–2329.
- Latto, R., & Cowey, A. (1971). Visual field defects after frontal eye-field lesions in monkeys. *Brain Research*, 30, 1–24.
- Leinonen, L., Hyvarinen, G., Nymani, G., Linnankoski, I. (1979). I. Functional properties of neurons in lateral part of associative area 7 in awake monkeys. *Experimental Brain Research*, 34, 299.
- Paillard, J. (1993). In A. Berthelot, & J. Chavallan (Eds.), *The use of tools by human and non-human primates* (pp. 36–46). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rizzolatti, G., & Gallese, V. (1988). Mechanisms and theories of spatial neglect. In F. Boller, & J. Grafman (Eds.), *Handbook of neuropsychology*, Vol. 1 (pp. 223–249). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Rizzolatti, G., Gentilucci, M., & Matelli, M. (1985). Selective spatial attention: One center, one circuit or many circuits? In M. I. Posner, & O. M. Marin (Eds.), *Attention and performance*, Vol. XI (pp. 251–265). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rizzolatti, G., Matelli, M., & Pavesi, G. (1983). Deficits in attention and movement following the removal of postarcuate (area 6) cortex in macaque monkeys. *Brain*, 106, 655–673.
- Rizzolatti, G., Riggio, L., & Sheliga, B. M. (1994). Space and selective attention. In C. Umiltà, & M. Moscovitch (Eds.), *Attention and performance* (pp. 231–265). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Shelton, P. A., Bowers, D., & Heilman, K. M. (1990). Peripersonal and vertical neglect. *Brain*, 113, 191–205.
- Thier, P., & Andersen, R. A. (1997). Multiple parietal 'eye field': Insight from electrical microstimulation. In P. Thier, & H. O. Karnath (Eds.), *Parietal lobe contributions to orientation in 3D space* (pp. 95–108). Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.
- Vuilleumier, P., Valenza, N., Mayer, E., Reverdin, A., & Landis, T. (1998). Near and far visual space in unilateral neglect. *Annals of Neurology*, 43, 406–410.

This article has been cited by:

1. Michael Berger, Peter Neumann, Alexander Gail. 2019. Peri-hand space expands beyond reach in the context of walk-and-reach movements. *Scientific Reports* **9**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
2. M. Martel, L. Cardinali, G. Bertonati, C. Jouffrais, L. Finos, A. Farnè, A. C. Roy. 2019. Somatosensory-guided tool use modifies arm representation for action. *Scientific Reports* **9**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
3. Alicia Forsberg, Alan O'Dowd, Elena Gherri. 2019. Tool use modulates early stages of visuo-tactile integration in far space: Evidence from event-related potentials. *Biological Psychology* **145**, 42-54. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Laura Piccardi, Massimiliano Palmiero, Alessia Bocchi, Maddalena Boccia, Cecilia Guariglia. 2019. How does environmental knowledge allow us to come back home?. *Experimental Brain Research* **12**. . [[Crossref](#)]
5. Nicolas X. Leclere, Fabrice R. Sarlegna, Yann Coello, Christophe Bourdin. 2019. Sensori-motor adaptation to novel limb dynamics influences the representation of peripersonal space. *Neuropsychologia* . [[Crossref](#)]
6. Chiara Fini, Anna M. Borghi. 2019. Sociality to Reach Objects and to Catch Meaning. *Frontiers in Psychology* **10**. . [[Crossref](#)]
7. Viviana Versace, Stefania Campostrini, Luca Sebastianelli, Leopold Saltuari, Markus Kofler. 2019. Modulation of exteroceptive electromyographic responses in defensive peripersonal space. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **121**:4, 1111-1124. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Keaton Proud, James B. Heald, James N. Ingram, Jason P. Gallivan, Daniel M. Wolpert, J. Randall Flanagan. 2019. Separate motor memories are formed when controlling different implicitly specified locations on a tool. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **121**:4, 1342-1351. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Alessandro Salice, Simon Høffding, Shaun Gallagher. 2019. Putting Plural Self-Awareness into Practice: The Phenomenology of Expert Musicianship. *Topoi* **38**:1, 197-209. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Dagmar Sternad, Neville Hogan. 2019. Control of goal-directed movements within (or beyond) reach?. *Physics of Life Reviews* . [[Crossref](#)]
11. Siyun Liu, Mali Zhou, Ye Li. 2019. Internet use experience influence individuals' lexical decision performance by changing their body representation. *Computers in Human Behavior* **91**, 157-166. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Daniele Romano, Elena Uberti, Pietro Caggiano, Gianna Cocchini, Angelo Maravita. 2019. Different tool training induces specific effects on body metric representation. *Experimental Brain Research* **237**:2, 493-501. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Francesco Parisi. 2019. Temporality and metaplasticity. Facing extension and incorporation through material engagement theory. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* **18**:1, 205-221. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Michela Candini, Virginia Giuberti, Erica Santelli, Giuseppe di Pellegrino, Francesca Frassinetti. 2019. When social and action spaces diverge: A study in children with typical development and autism. *Autism* **10**, 136236131882250. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Antonia F. Ten Brink, J. Matthijs Biesbroek, Quirien Oort, Johanna M.A. Visser-Meily, Tanja C.W. Nijboer. 2019. Peripersonal and extrapersonal visuospatial neglect in different frames of reference: A brain lesion-symptom mapping study. *Behavioural Brain Research* **356**, 504-515. [[Crossref](#)]
16. C. Spaccasassi, D. Romano, A. Maravita. 2019. Everything is worth when it is close to my body: How spatial proximity and stimulus valence affect visuo-tactile integration. *Acta Psychologica* **192**, 42-51. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Rory J. Bufoacchi, Gian Domenico Iannetti. 2018. An Action Field Theory of Peripersonal Space. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **22**:12, 1076-1090. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Samuel B. Hunley, Stella F. Lourenco. 2018. What is peripersonal space? An examination of unresolved empirical issues and emerging findings. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science* **9**:6, e1472. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Magda L. Dumitru, Achille Pasqualotto. 2018. Helmets improve estimations of depth and visual angle to safe targets. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* **80**:8, 1879-1884. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Filomena Anelli, Francesca Frassinetti. 2018. Prisms for timing better: A review on application of prism adaptation on temporal domain. *Cortex* . [[Crossref](#)]
21. Rob Ellis. Bodies and Other Objects **34**, . [[Crossref](#)]
22. Ivan Patané, Lucilla Cardinali, Romeo Salemmme, Francesco Pavani, Alessandro Farnè, Claudio Brozzoli. Action Planning Modulates Peripersonal Space. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, ahead of print1-14. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
23. Elizabeth S. Collier, Rebecca Lawson. 2018. Getting a grasp on action-specific scaling: A response to Witt (2017). *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* **21**. . [[Crossref](#)]
24. Jean-Paul Noel, Andrea Serino, Mark T. Wallace. Increased Neural Strength and Reliability to Audiovisual Stimuli at the Boundary of Peripersonal Space. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, ahead of print1-18. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]

25. Otto Lappi. 2018. The Racer's Mind—How Core Perceptual-Cognitive Expertise Is Reflected in Deliberate Practice Procedures in Professional Motorsport. *Frontiers in Psychology* 9. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
26. Yann Coello. Action Spaces Representation in Social Contexts 230-254. [\[Crossref\]](#)
27. Marlene Weller, Kohske Takahashi, Katsumi Watanabe, Heinrich H. Bühlhoff, Tobias Meilinger. 2018. The Object Orientation Effect in Exocentric Distances. *Frontiers in Psychology* 9. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
28. Justine Cléry, Olivier Guipponi, Soline Odouard, Claire Wardak, Suliann Ben Hamed. 2018. Cortical networks for encoding near and far space in the non-human primate. *NeuroImage* 176, 164-178. [\[Crossref\]](#)
29. Michel Guerraz, Alexandra Breen, Lisa Pollidoro, Marion Luyat, Anne Kavounoudias. 2018. Contribution of Visual Motion Cues from a Held Tool to Kinesthesia. *Neuroscience* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
30. Alice Cartaud, Gennaro Ruggiero, Laurent Ott, Tina Iachini, Yann Coello. 2018. Physiological Response to Facial Expressions in Peripersonal Space Determines Interpersonal Distance in a Social Interaction Context. *Frontiers in Psychology* 9. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
31. Luca Rinaldi, Giovanni Bertolini, Christopher J. Bockisch, Angelo Maravita, Luisa Girelli, Peter Brugger. 2018. More far is more right: Manual and ocular line bisections, but not the Judd illusion, depend on radial space. *Brain and Cognition* 122, 34-44. [\[Crossref\]](#)
32. Eleonora Vagnoni, Jessica Lewis, Ana Tajadura-Jiménez, Flavia Cardini. 2018. Listening to a conversation with aggressive content expands the interpersonal space. *PLOS ONE* 13:3, e0192753. [\[Crossref\]](#)
33. Christopher C. Davoli, Emily K. Bloesch, Richard A. Abrams. 2018. The power of the imagination to affect peripersonal space representations. *Visual Cognition* 26:3, 196-206. [\[Crossref\]](#)
34. ###, Hyung-Chul Li, ###. 2018. The effect of tool length on distance compression to the pointed object. *Korean Journal of Cognitive Science* 29:1, 17-38. [\[Crossref\]](#)
35. Anna Sedda, Ettore Ambrosini, Giada Dirupo, Diana Tonin, Laura Valsecchi, Tiziana Redaelli, Michele Spinelli, Marcello Costantini, Gabriella Bottini. 2018. Affordances after spinal cord injury. *Journal of Neuropsychology* 113. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
36. Peter Gärdenfors, Marlize Lombard. 2018. Causal Cognition, Force Dynamics and Early Hunting Technologies. *Frontiers in Psychology* 9. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
37. Antonia F. Ten Brink, Johanna M. A. Visser-Meily, Tanja C. W. Nijboer. 2018. Dynamic assessment of visual neglect: The Mobility Assessment Course as a diagnostic tool. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology* 40:2, 161-172. [\[Crossref\]](#)
38. Angelo Maravita, Daniele Romano. The parietal lobe and tool use 481-498. [\[Crossref\]](#)
39. Shaun Gallagher. Situating Interaction in Peripersonal and Extrapersonal Space: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives 67-79. [\[Crossref\]](#)
40. Angela Bartolo, Yves Rossetti, Patrice Revol, Christian Urquizar, Laure Pisella, Yann Coello. 2018. Reachability judgement in optic ataxia: Effect of peripheral vision on hand and target perception in depth. *Cortex* 98, 102-113. [\[Crossref\]](#)
41. Mariano D'Angelo, Giuseppe di Pellegrino, Francesca Frassinetti. 2017. Invisible body illusion modulates interpersonal space. *Scientific Reports* 7:1. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
42. Tony Thomas, Meera Mary Sunny. 2017. Altered Visuo-spatial Processing in the Peri-personal Space: A New Look at the Hand-Proximity Effects. *Journal of the Indian Institute of Science* 97:4, 443-450. [\[Crossref\]](#)
43. Elena Aggius-Vella, Claudio Campus, Sara Finocchietti, Monica Gori. 2017. Audio Spatial Representation Around the Body. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
44. Gennaro Ruggiero, Francesca Frassinetti, Yann Coello, Mariachiara Rapuano, Armando Schiano di Cola, Tina Iachini. 2017. The effect of facial expressions on peripersonal and interpersonal spaces. *Psychological Research* 81:6, 1232-1240. [\[Crossref\]](#)
45. Brian Day, Elham Ebrahimi, Leah S. Hartman, Christopher C. Pagano, Sabarish V. Babu. 2017. Calibration to tool use during visually-guided reaching. *Acta Psychologica* 181, 27-39. [\[Crossref\]](#)
46. S. Kastner, Q. Chen, S.K. Jeong, R.E.B. Mruczek. 2017. A brief comparative review of primate posterior parietal cortex: A novel hypothesis on the human toolmaker. *Neuropsychologia* 105, 123-134. [\[Crossref\]](#)
47. Eleonora Vagnoni, Vasiliki Andreanidou, Stella F. Lourenco, Matthew R. Longo. 2017. Action ability modulates time-to-collision judgments. *Experimental Brain Research* 235:9, 2729-2739. [\[Crossref\]](#)
48. Ivan Patané, Alessandro Farnè, Francesca Frassinetti. 2017. Cooperative tool-use reveals peripersonal and interpersonal spaces are dissociable. *Cognition* 166, 13-22. [\[Crossref\]](#)
49. Tina Iachini, Francesco Ruotolo, Michela Vinciguerra, Gennaro Ruggiero. 2017. Manipulating time and space: Collision prediction in peripersonal and extrapersonal space. *Cognition* 166, 107-117. [\[Crossref\]](#)

50. Konstantina Kilteni, H. Henrik Ehrsson. 2017. Sensorimotor predictions and tool use: Hand-held tools attenuate self-touch. *Cognition* **165**, 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Wataru Teramoto, Keito Honda, Kento Furuta, Kaoru Sekiyama. 2017. Visuotactile interaction even in far sagittal space in older adults with decreased gait and balance functions. *Experimental Brain Research* **235**:8, 2391-2405. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Kathryn L. Williams. 2017. Understanding the role of sensory processing in occupation: An updated discourse with cognitive neuroscience. *Journal of Occupational Science* **24**:3, 302-313. [[Crossref](#)]
53. F. Quesque, G. Ruggiero, S. Mouta, J. Santos, T. Iachini, Y. Coello. 2017. Keeping you at arm's length: modifying peripersonal space influences interpersonal distance. *Psychological Research* **81**:4, 709-720. [[Crossref](#)]
54. Veronica Weser, Gianluca Finotti, Marcello Costantini, Dennis R. Proffitt. 2017. Multisensory integration induces body ownership of a handtool, but not any handtool. *Consciousness and Cognition* . [[Crossref](#)]
55. Libby J. Cunningham, Killian O'Rourke, Ciara Finlay, MaryBeth Gallagher. 2017. A preliminary investigation into the psychometric properties of the Dublin Extrapersonal Neglect Assessment (DENA): A novel screening tool for extrapersonal neglect. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation* **27**:3, 349-368. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Mikhail A. Lebedev, Miguel A. L. Nicolelis. 2017. Brain-Machine Interfaces: From Basic Science to Neuroprostheses and Neurorehabilitation. *Physiological Reviews* **97**:2, 767-837. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Sang-won Leigh, Harpreet Sareen, Hsin-Liu Kao, Xin Liu, Pattie Maes. 2017. Body-Borne Computers as Extensions of Self. *Computers* **6**:1, 12. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Matthew C. Costello, Emily K. Bloesch. 2017. Are Older Adults Less Embodied? A Review of Age Effects through the Lens of Embodied Cognition. *Frontiers in Psychology* **8** . [[Crossref](#)]
59. K.F. Valyear, A.M. Fitzpatrick, E.F. McManus. The Neuroscience of Human Tool Use 341-353. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Nathan van der Stoep, Albert Postma, Tanja C.W. Nijboer. Multisensory Perception and the Coding of Space 123-158. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Albert Postma, Jan J. Koenderink. A Sense of Space 1-34. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Emiliano Ricciardi, Dario Menicagli, Andrea Leo, Marcello Costantini, Pietro Pietrini, Corrado Sinigaglia. 2017. Peripersonal space representation develops independently from visual experience. *Scientific Reports* **7**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
63. Elena Aggius-Vella, Claudio Campus, Sara Finocchietti, Monica Gori. 2017. Audio Motor Training at the Foot Level Improves Space Representation. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience* **11** . [[Crossref](#)]
64. Shaun Gallagher, Sergio F. Martínez, Melina Gastelum. Action-Space and Time: Towards an Enactive Hermeneutics 83-96. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Samuel B. Hunley, Arwen M. Marker, Stella F. Lourenco. 2017. Individual Differences in the Flexibility of Peripersonal Space. *Experimental Psychology* **64**:1, 49-55. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Rabindra A. Ratan, Michael Dawson. 2016. When Mii Is Me. *Communication Research* **43**:8, 1065-1093. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Maryam Alimardani, Shuichi Nishio, Hiroshi Ishiguro. 2016. Removal of proprioception by BCI raises a stronger body ownership illusion in control of a humanlike robot. *Scientific Reports* **6**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
68. Raffaella Ricci, Adriana Salatino, Francesca Garbarini, Irene Ronga, Rosanna Genero, Anna Berti, Marco Neppi-Mòdona. 2016. Effects of attentional and cognitive variables on unilateral spatial neglect. *Neuropsychologia* **92**, 158-166. [[Crossref](#)]
69. . Skill Differences 59-74. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Alessio Facchin, Nicoletta Beschin, Alessia Pisano, Cristina Reverberi. 2016. Normative data for distal line bisection and baling tray task. *Neurological Sciences* **37**:9, 1531-1536. [[Crossref](#)]
71. Matthew H. Roberts, Joel I. Shenker. 2016. Non-optic vision: Beyond synesthesia?. *Brain and Cognition* **107**, 24-29. [[Crossref](#)]
72. A. Drakul, C. J. Bockisch, A. A. Tarnutzer. 2016. Does gravity influence the visual line bisection task?. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **116**:2, 629-636. [[Crossref](#)]
73. Alessandro Piedimonte, Francesca Garbarini, Lorenzo Pia, Tiziana Mezzanato, Anna Berti. 2016. From intention to perception: The case of anosognosia for hemiplegia. *Neuropsychologia* **87**, 43-53. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Michael E. R. Nicholls, Emily Beckman, Owen Churches. 2016. An investigation of the mechanisms underlying the effects of viewing distance and stimulus length on attentional asymmetries during line bisection. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* **78**:5, 1351-1362. [[Crossref](#)]
75. Birte Moeller, Hartmut Zoppke, Christian Frings. 2016. What a car does to your perception: Distance evaluations differ from within and outside of a car. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* **23**:3, 781-788. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Ivan Patané, Tina Iachini, Alessandro Farnè, Francesca Frassinetti. 2016. Disentangling Action from Social Space: Tool-Use Differently Shapes the Space around Us. *PLOS ONE* **11**:5, e0154247. [[Crossref](#)]

77. L. Cardinali, C. Brozzoli, L. Finos, A.C. Roy, A. Farnè. 2016. The rules of tool incorporation: Tool morpho-functional & sensori-motor constraints. *Cognition* **149**, 1-5. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Aijun Wang, You Li, Ming Zhang, Qi Chen. 2016. The Role of Parieto-Occipital Junction in the Interaction between Dorsal and Ventral Streams in Disparity-Defined Near and Far Space Processing. *PLOS ONE* **11**:3, e0151838. [[Crossref](#)]
79. Claudia Scorolli, Elena Daprati, Daniele Nico, Anna M. Borghi. 2016. Reaching for Objects or Asking for Them: Distance Estimation in 7- to 15-Year-Old Children. *Journal of Motor Behavior* **48**:2, 183-191. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Laura Aymerich-Franch, Gowrishankar Ganesh. 2016. The role of functionality in the body model for self-attribution. *Neuroscience Research* **104**, 31-37. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Gennaro Ruggiero, Ortensia D'Errico, Tina Iachini. 2016. Development of egocentric and allocentric spatial representations from childhood to elderly age. *Psychological Research* **80**:2, 259-272. [[Crossref](#)]
82. J. Andrew Pruszynski, Roland S. Johansson, J. Randall Flanagan. 2016. A Rapid Tactile-Motor Reflex Automatically Guides Reaching toward Handheld Objects. *Current Biology* **26**:6, 788-792. [[Crossref](#)]
83. Tina Iachini, Yann Coello, Francesca Frassinetti, Vincenzo Paolo Senese, Francesco Galante, Gennaro Ruggiero. 2016. Peripersonal and interpersonal space in virtual and real environments: Effects of gender and age. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* **45**, 154-164. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Lorenzo Pia, Francesca Garbarini, Carlotta Fossataro, Dalila Burin, Anna Berti. 2016. Sensing the body, representing the body: Evidence from a neurologically based delusion of body ownership. *Cognitive Neuropsychology* **33**:1-2, 112-119. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Marie Martel, Lucilla Cardinali, Alice C. Roy, Alessandro Farnè. 2016. Tool-use: An open window into body representation and its plasticity. *Cognitive Neuropsychology* **33**:1-2, 82-101. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Ivan Patané, Alessandro Farnè, Francesca Frassinetti. 2016. Prismatic Adaptation Induces Plastic Changes onto Spatial and Temporal Domains in Near and Far Space. *Neural Plasticity* **2016**, 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Takaya Takeuchi, Kazuhiro Yasuda, Yoshimi Himeno, Hiromi Kuroki, Hiroyasu Iwata. 2016. Development of Unilateral Spatial Neglect Treatment Support System that Promotes Attentional Disengagement and Movement. *Journal of Life Support Engineering* **28**:4, 133-138. [[Crossref](#)]
88. I.A. Khvatov, A.Yu. Sokolov, A.N. Kharitonov, K. N. Kulichenkova. 2016. Body scheme in rats *Rattus norvegicus*. *Experimental Psychology (Russia)* **9**:1, 112-130. [[Crossref](#)]
89. I.A. Khvatov, A.Yu. Sokolov, A.N. Kharitonov. 2016. Modifying body schemata in skinks *Tiliqua gigas*. *Experimental Psychology (Russia)* **9**:3, 54-71. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Filomena Anelli, Michela Candini, Marinella Cappelletti, Massimiliano Oliveri, Francesca Frassinetti. 2015. The Remapping of Time by Active Tool-Use. *PLOS ONE* **10**:12, e0146175. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Susie Vrobel. 2015. A new kind of relativity: Compensated delays as phenomenal blind spots. *Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology* **119**:3, 303-312. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Daniel Schreij, Christian N. L. Olivers. 2015. The behavioral urgency of objects approaching your avatar. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* **77**:8, 2669-2683. [[Crossref](#)]
93. Aijun Wang, Zhenzhu Yue, Ming Zhang, Qi Chen. 2015. Interaction between spatial inhibition of return (IOR) and executive control in three-dimensional space. *Experimental Brain Research* **233**:11, 3059-3071. [[Crossref](#)]
94. Tina Iachini, Stefano Pagliaro, Gennaro Ruggiero. 2015. Near or far? It depends on my impression: Moral information and spatial behavior in virtual interactions. *Acta Psychologica* **161**, 131-136. [[Crossref](#)]
95. Kimberley Jovanov, Paul Clifton, Ali Mazalek, Michael Nitsche, Timothy N. Welsh. 2015. The limb-specific embodiment of a tool following experience. *Experimental Brain Research* **233**:9, 2685-2694. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Jennifer Greenwood. 2015. Is mind extended or scaffolded? Ruminations on Sterelney's (2010) extended stomach. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* **14**:3, 629-650. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Rabindra Ratan, Young June Sah. 2015. Leveling up on stereotype threat: The role of avatar customization and avatar embodiment. *Computers in Human Behavior* **50**, 367-374. [[Crossref](#)]
98. Alison R. Lane, Keira Ball, Amanda Ellison. 2015. Dissociating the neural mechanisms of distance and spatial reference frames. *Neuropsychologia* **74**, 42-49. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Giuseppe Giglia, Lorenzo Pia, Alessia Folegatti, Angela Puma, Brigida Fierro, Giuseppe Cosentino, Anna Berti, Filippo Brighina. 2015. Far Space Remapping by Tool Use: A rTMS Study Over the Right Posterior Parietal Cortex. *Brain Stimulation* **8**:4, 795-800. [[Crossref](#)]

100. Vittorio Belmonti, Giovanni Cioni, Alain Berthoz. 2015. Switching from reaching to navigation: differential cognitive strategies for spatial memory in children and adults. *Developmental Science* **18**:4, 569-586. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Maria Brincker. 2015. Beyond sensorimotor segregation: On mirror neurons and social affordance space tracking. *Cognitive Systems Research* **34-35**, 18-34. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Andrea Stevenson Won, Jeremy Bailenson, Jimmy Lee, Jaron Lanier. 2015. Homuncular Flexibility in Virtual Reality. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* **20**:3, 241-259. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Sally A. Linkenauger, Heinrich H. Bühlhoff, Betty J. Mohler. 2015. Virtual arm#s reach influences perceived distances but only after experience reaching. *Neuropsychologia* **70**, 393-401. [[Crossref](#)]
104. F. de Vignemont, G.D. Iannetti. 2015. How many peripersonal spaces?. *Neuropsychologia* **70**, 327-334. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Jean-Paul Noel, Petr Grivaz, Patrick Marmaroli, Herve Lissek, Olaf Blanke, Andrea Serino. 2015. Full body action remapping of peripersonal space: The case of walking. *Neuropsychologia* **70**, 375-384. [[Crossref](#)]
106. N. Van der Stoep, T.C.W. Nijboer, S. Van der Stigchel, C. Spence. 2015. Multisensory interactions in the depth plane in front and rear space: A review. *Neuropsychologia* **70**, 335-349. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Valentina Sclafani, Elizabeth A. Simpson, Stephen J. Suomi, Pier Francesco Ferrari. 2015. Development of space perception in relation to the maturation of the motor system in infant rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*). *Neuropsychologia* **70**, 429-441. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Justine Cléry, Olivier Guipponi, Claire Wardak, Suliann Ben Hamed. 2015. Neuronal bases of peripersonal and extrapersonal spaces, their plasticity and their dynamics: Knowns and unknowns. *Neuropsychologia* **70**, 313-326. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Francesca Garbarini, Carlotta Fossataro, Anna Berti, Patrizia Gindri, Daniele Romano, Lorenzo Pia, Francesco della Gatta, Angelo Maravita, Marco Neppi-Modona. 2015. When your arm becomes mine: Pathological embodiment of alien limbs using tools modulates own body representation. *Neuropsychologia* **70**, 402-413. [[Crossref](#)]
110. Matthew R. Longo, Sarah Trippier, Eleonora Vagnoni, Stella F. Lourenco. 2015. Right hemisphere control of visuospatial attention in near space. *Neuropsychologia* **70**, 350-357. [[Crossref](#)]
111. Angela Rossetti, Daniele Romano, Nadia Bolognini, Angelo Maravita. 2015. Dynamic expansion of alert responses to incoming painful stimuli following tool use. *Neuropsychologia* **70**, 486-494. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Wladimir Kirsch. 2015. Impact of action planning on spatial perception: Attention matters. *Acta Psychologica* **156**, 22-31. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Pierre Steiner. 2015. A problem for representationalist versions of extended cognition. *Philosophical Psychology* **28**:2, 184-202. [[Crossref](#)]
114. Giuseppe di Pellegrino, Elisabetta Làdavas. 2015. Peripersonal space in the brain. *Neuropsychologia* **66**, 126-133. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Gunnar Declerck. 2015. How we remember what we can do. *Socioaffective Neuroscience & Psychology* **5**:1, 24807. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Carl Gabbard. Perception of Action Space: Using Multiple Frames of Reference 703-707. [[Crossref](#)]
117. G. Ganesh, T. Yoshioka, R. Osu, T. Ikegami. 2014. Immediate tool incorporation processes determine human motor planning with tools. *Nature Communications* **5**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
118. Tina Iachini, Yann Coello, Francesca Frassinetti, Gennaro Ruggiero. 2014. Body Space in Social Interactions: A Comparison of Reaching and Comfort Distance in Immersive Virtual Reality. *PLoS ONE* **9**:11, e111511. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Yoshihiro Itaguchi, Kazuyoshi Fukuzawa. 2014. Hand-use and tool-use in grasping control. *Experimental Brain Research* **232**:11, 3613-3622. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Tina Iachini, Gennaro Ruggiero, Francesco Ruotolo, Michela Vinciguerra. 2014. Motor resources in peripersonal space are intrinsic to spatial encoding: Evidence from motor interference. *Acta Psychologica* **153**, 20-27. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Marcello Costantini, Francesca Frassinetti, Manuela Maini, Ettore Ambrosini, Vittorio Gallese, Corrado Sinigaglia. 2014. When a laser pen becomes a stick: remapping of space by tool-use observation in hemispatial neglect. *Experimental Brain Research* **232**:10, 3233-3241. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Wladimir Kirsch, Wilfried Kunde. 2014. Impact of planned movement direction on judgments of visual locations. *Psychological Research* **78**:5, 705-720. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Ravinder Jerath, Molly W. Crawford. 2014. Neural correlates of visuospatial consciousness in 3D default space: Insights from contralateral neglect syndrome. *Consciousness and Cognition* **28**, 81-93. [[Crossref](#)]
124. Berenice Valdés-Conroy, Manuel Sebastián, José A. Hinojosa, Francisco J. Román, Gerardo Santaniello. 2014. A close look into the near/far space division: A real-distance ERP study. *Neuropsychologia* **59**, 27-34. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Laura Piccardi, Marina Leonzi, Simonetta D'Amico, Assunta Marano, Cecilia Guariglia. 2014. Development of navigational working memory: Evidence from 6- to 10-year-old children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* **32**:2, 205-217. [[Crossref](#)]

126. Gabrielle Benette Jackson. 2014. Skillful action in peripersonal space. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 13:2, 313-334. [[Crossref](#)]
127. Matteo Baccarini, Marie Martel, Lucilla Cardinali, Olivier Sillan, Alessandro Farn , Alice C. Roy. 2014. Tool use imagery triggers tool incorporation in the body schema. *Frontiers in Psychology* 5. . [[Crossref](#)]
128. Kristen L. Macuga, Scott H. Frey. 2014. Differential contributions of the superior and inferior parietal cortex to feedback versus feedforward control of tools. *NeuroImage* 92, 36-45. [[Crossref](#)]
129. Tiziano Furlanetto, Alberto Gallace, Caterina Ansuini, Cristina Becchio. 2014. Effects of Arm Crossing on Spatial Perspective-Taking. *PLoS ONE* 9:4, e95748. [[Crossref](#)]
130. Rosanne L. Rademaker, Daw-An Wu, Ilona M. Bloem, Alexander T. Sack. 2014. Intensive tool-practice and skillfulness facilitate the extension of body representations in humans. *Neuropsychologia* 56, 196-203. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Claudio Brozzoli, H. Henrik Ehrsson, Alessandro Farn . 2014. Multisensory Representation of the Space Near the Hand. *The Neuroscientist* 20:2, 122-135. [[Crossref](#)]
132. Kenny R. Coventry, Debra Griffiths, Colin J. Hamilton. 2014. Spatial demonstratives and perceptual space: Describing and remembering object location. *Cognitive Psychology* 69, 46-70. [[Crossref](#)]
133. Daniel Black. 2014. Where Bodies End and Artefacts Begin. *Body & Society* 20:1, 31-60. [[Crossref](#)]
134. Indra T. Mahayana, Chia-Lun Liu, Chi Fu Chang, Daisy L. Hung, Ovid J. L. Tzeng, Chi-Hung Juan, Neil G. Muggleton. 2014. Far-space neglect in conjunction but not feature search following transcranial magnetic stimulation over right posterior parietal cortex. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 111:4, 705-714. [[Crossref](#)]
135. Liliane Borel, Christine Redon-Zouiteni, Pierre Cauvin, Michel Dumitrescu, Arnaud Dev ze, Jacques Magnan, Patrick P ruch. 2014. Unilateral Vestibular Loss Impairs External Space Representation. *PLoS ONE* 9:2, e88576. [[Crossref](#)]
136. T. C. W. Nijboer, A. F. ten Brink, M. Kouwenhoven, J. M. A. Visser-Meily. 2014. Functional Assessment of Region-Specific Neglect: Are There Differential Behavioural Consequences of Peripersonal versus Extrapersonal Neglect?. *Behavioural Neurology* 2014, 1-6. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Indra Mahayana, Hartono, Lili Tcheang, Chiao-Yun Chen, Chi-Hung Juan, Neil Muggleton. 2014. Posterior parietal cortex and visuospatial control in near and far space. *Translational Neuroscience* 5:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
138. A. Sengul, S. Shokur, H. Bleuler. Brain Incorporation of Artificial Limbs and Role of Haptic Feedback 257-268. [[Crossref](#)]
139. Cristina Massen. 2013. Cognitive representations of tool-use interactions. *New Ideas in Psychology* 31:3, 239-246. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Noline W. Prins, Shijia Geng, Eric A. Pohlmeier, Abhishek Prasad, Justin C. Sanchez. Representation of natural arm and robotic arm movement in the striatum of a marmoset engaged in a two choice task 399-402. [[Crossref](#)]
141. William Overman, Allison Pierce, Lucas Watterson, Jennifer K. Coleman. 2013. Use of a non-navigational, non-verbal landmark task in children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 37:6, 485-497. [[Crossref](#)]
142. Nathan Van der Stoep, Johanna M. A. Visser-Meily, L. Jaap Kappelle, Paul L. M. de Kort, Krista D. Huisman, Anja L. H. Eijssackers, Mirjam Kouwenhoven, Stefan Van der Stigchel, Tanja C. W. Nijboer. 2013. Exploring near and far regions of space: Distance-specific visuospatial neglect after stroke. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology* 35:8, 799-811. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Luciano Gamberini, Claudio Carlesso, Bruno Seraglia, Laila Craighero. 2013. A behavioural experiment in virtual reality to verify the role of action function in space coding. *Visual Cognition* 21:8, 961-969. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Abby Tabor, Mark J. Catley, Simon Gandevia, Michael A. Thacker, Lorimer G. Moseley. 2013. Perceptual bias in pain: A switch looks closer when it will relieve pain than when it won't. *Pain* 154:10, 1961-1965. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Borja Rodr guez-Herreros, Denise D.J. de Grave, Joan L pez-Moliner, Eli Brenner, Jeroen B.J. Smeets. 2013. Shifted visual feedback of the hand affects reachability judgments in interception. *Vision Research* 88, 30-37. [[Crossref](#)]
146. Federico Nemmi, Maddalena Boccia, Laura Piccardi, Gaspare Galati, Cecilia Guariglia. 2013. Segregation of neural circuits involved in spatial learning in reaching and navigational space. *Neuropsychologia* 51:8, 1561-1570. [[Crossref](#)]
147. Paul M. Jenkinson, Patrick Haggard, Nicola C. Ferreira, Aikaterini Fotopoulou. 2013. Body ownership and attention in the mirror: Insights from somatoparaphrenia and the rubber hand illusion. *Neuropsychologia* 51:8, 1453-1462. [[Crossref](#)]
148. R. E. B. Mruczek, I. S. von Loga, S. Kastner. 2013. The representation of tool and non-tool object information in the human intraparietal sulcus. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 109:12, 2883-2896. [[Crossref](#)]
149. George D. Park, Michael Strom, Catherine L. Reed. 2013. To the end! Distribution of attention along a tool in peri- and extrapersonal space. *Experimental Brain Research* 227:4, 423-432. [[Crossref](#)]
150. B. J. Grzyb, L. B. Smith, A. P. del Pobil. 2013. Reaching for the Unreachable: Reorganization of Reaching with Walking. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development* 5:2, 162-172. [[Crossref](#)]

151. Sandra Sülzenbrück, Herbert Heuer. 2013. Movement paths in operating hand-held tools: tests of distal-shift hypotheses. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **109**:11, 2680-2690. [[Crossref](#)]
152. Jason P Gallivan, D Adam McLean, Kenneth F Valyear, Jody C Culham. 2013. Decoding the neural mechanisms of human tool use. *eLife* **2**. . [[Crossref](#)]
153. Wladimir Kirsch, Wilfried Kunde. 2013. Moving further moves things further away in visual perception: position-based movement planning affects distance judgments. *Experimental Brain Research* **226**:3, 431-440. [[Crossref](#)]
154. Ann-Kathrin Stock, Edmund Wascher, Christian Beste. 2013. Differential Effects of Motor Efference Copies and Proprioceptive Information on Response Evaluation Processes. *PLoS ONE* **8**:4, e62335. [[Crossref](#)]
155. Geoff Sanders. 2013. Sex Differences in Motor and Cognitive Abilities Predicted from Human Evolutionary History with Some Implications for Models of the Visual System. *Journal of Sex Research* **50**:3-4, 353-366. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Andy Clark. Re-Inventing Ourselves 113-127. [[Crossref](#)]
157. Priscila Caçola, Amanda Martinez, Christopher Ray. 2013. The ability to modulate peripersonal and extrapersonal reach space via tool use among the elderly. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics* **56**:2, 383-388. [[Crossref](#)]
158. Alison R. Lane, Keira Ball, Daniel T. Smith, Thomas Schenk, Amanda Ellison. 2013. Near and far space: Understanding the neural mechanisms of spatial attention. *Human Brain Mapping* **34**:2, 356-366. [[Crossref](#)]
159. James R. Brockmole, Christopher C. Davoli, Richard A. Abrams, Jessica K. Witt. 2013. The World Within Reach. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* **22**:1, 38-44. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Rabindra Ratan. Self-Presence, Explicated 322-336. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Berenice Valdés-Conroy, Francisco J. Román, Jose A. Hinojosa, S. Paul Shorkey. 2012. So Far So Good: Emotion in the Peripersonal/Extrapersonal Space. *PLoS ONE* **7**:11, e49162. [[Crossref](#)]
162. Qi Chen, Ralph Weidner, Peter H. Weiss, John C. Marshall, Gereon R. Fink. 2012. Neural Interaction between Spatial Domain and Spatial Reference Frame in Parietal–Occipital Junction. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* **24**:11, 2223-2236. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
163. L. A. Baugh, E. Hoe, J. R. Flanagan. 2012. Hand-held tools with complex kinematics are efficiently incorporated into movement planning and online control. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **108**:7, 1954-1964. [[Crossref](#)]
164. Bruno Seraglia, Konstantinos Priftis, Simone Cutini, Luciano Gamberini. 2012. How tool use and arm position affect peripersonal space representation. *Cognitive Processing* **13**:S1, 325-328. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Barbara Tomasino, Peter H. Weiss, Gereon R. Fink. 2012. Imagined tool-use in near and far space modulates the extra-striate body area. *Neuropsychologia* **50**:10, 2467-2476. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Krist Vaesen. 2012. The cognitive bases of human tool use. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **35**:4, 203-218. [[Crossref](#)]
167. Ambra Sposito, Nadia Bolognini, Giuseppe Vallar, Angelo Maravita. 2012. Extension of perceived arm length following tool-use: Clues to plasticity of body metrics. *Neuropsychologia* **50**:9, 2187-2194. [[Crossref](#)]
168. Antal Haans, Wijnand A. IJsselstein. 2012. Embodiment and telepresence: Toward a comprehensive theoretical framework. *Interacting with Computers* **24**:4, 211-218. [[Crossref](#)]
169. Angela Giardina, Carlo Caltagirone, Lisa Cipolotti, Massimiliano Oliveri. 2012. The role of right and left posterior parietal cortex in the modulation of spatial attentional biases by self and non-self face stimuli. *Social Neuroscience* **7**:4, 359-368. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Shun Nishide, Jun Tani, Toru Takahashi, Hiroshi G. Okuno, Tetsuya Ogata. 2012. Tool–Body Assimilation of Humanoid Robot Using a Neurodynamical System. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development* **4**:2, 139-149. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Stéphane Jacobs, Claudio Brozzoli, Alessandro Farnè. 2012. Neglect: A multisensory deficit?. *Neuropsychologia* **50**:6, 1029-1044. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Lina Aimola, Igor Schindler, Anna Maria Simone, Annalena Venneri. 2012. Near and far space neglect: Task sensitivity and anatomical substrates. *Neuropsychologia* **50**:6, 1115-1123. [[Crossref](#)]
173. Wladimir Kirsch, Oliver Herbort, Martin V. Butz, Wilfried Kunde. 2012. Influence of Motor Planning on Distance Perception within the Peripersonal Space. *PLoS ONE* **7**:4, e34880. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Priscila Caçola, Carl Gabbard. 2012. Modulating peripersonal and extrapersonal reach space via tool use: a comparison between 6- to 12-year-olds and young adults. *Experimental Brain Research* **218**:2, 321-330. [[Crossref](#)]
175. Lucilla Cardinali, Stéphane Jacobs, Claudio Brozzoli, Francesca Frassinetti, Alice C. Roy, Alessandro Farnè. 2012. Grab an object with a tool and change your body: tool-use-dependent changes of body representation for action. *Experimental Brain Research* **218**:2, 259-271. [[Crossref](#)]

176. Nicholas P. Holmes. 2012. Does tool use extend peripersonal space? A review and re-analysis. *Experimental Brain Research* **218**:2, 273-282. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Ricardo Nemirovsky, Chris Rasmussen, George Sweeney, Megan Wawro. 2012. When the Classroom Floor Becomes the Complex Plane: Addition and Multiplication as Ways of Bodily Navigation. *Journal of the Learning Sciences* **21**:2, 287-323. [[Crossref](#)]
178. Cristina Massen. 2012. Die Planung und kognitive Repräsentation von Handlungen mit Werkzeugen. *Psychologische Rundschau* **63**:2, 79-91. [[Crossref](#)]
179. Ivar Hagendoorn. 2012. Inscribing the body, exscribing space. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* **11**:1, 69-78. [[Crossref](#)]
180. Assaf Y. Dvorkin, Ross A. Bogey, Richard L. Harvey, James L. Patton. 2012. Mapping the Neglected Space. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair* **26**:2, 120-131. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Lorenzo Jamone, Bruno Damas, Nobotsuna Endo, José Santos-Victor, Atsuo Takanishi. 2012. Incremental Development of Multiple Tool Models for Robotic Reaching Through Autonomous Exploration. *Paladyn, Journal of Behavioral Robotics* **3**:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
182. Hiroshi Shibata, Jiro Gyoba, Yasuhiro Takeshima. 2012. Perception of the end position of a limb loaded with a weight. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* **74**:1, 225-238. [[Crossref](#)]
183. Tom Froese, Marek McGann, William Bigge, Adam Spiers, Anil K. Seth. 2012. The Enactive Torch: A New Tool for the Science of Perception. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics* **5**:4, 365-375. [[Crossref](#)]
184. Claude P. R. Heath, Patrick G. T. Healey. Making Space for Interaction: Architects Design Dialogues 250-261. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Liana E. Brown, Robert Doole, Nicole Malfait. 2011. The Role of Motor Learning in Spatial Adaptation near a Tool. *PLoS ONE* **6**:12, e28999. [[Crossref](#)]
186. Tao Li, Scott Watter, Hong-Jin Sun. 2011. Differential visual processing for equivalent retinal information from near versus far space. *Neuropsychologia* **49**:14, 3863-3869. [[Crossref](#)]
187. Jason P. Gallivan, Adam McLean, Jody C. Culham. 2011. Neuroimaging reveals enhanced activation in a reach-selective brain area for objects located within participants' typical hand workspaces. *Neuropsychologia* **49**:13, 3710-3721. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Davood G Gozli, Liana E Brown. 2011. Agency and Control for the Integration of a Virtual Tool into the Peripersonal Space. *Perception* **40**:11, 1309-1319. [[Crossref](#)]
189. Claudio Brozzoli, Tamar Makin, Lucilla Cardinali, Nicholas Holmes, Alessandro Farnè. Peripersonal Space 449-466. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Claudio Brozzoli, Tamar Makin, Lucilla Cardinali, Nicholas Holmes, Alessandro Farnè. Peripersonal Space 449-466. [[Crossref](#)]
191. Michael E.R. Nicholls, Jason D. Forte, Tobias Loetscher, Catherine A. Orr, Mark J. Yates, John L. Bradshaw. 2011. Near, yet so far: The effect of pictorial cues on spatial attention. *Brain and Cognition* **76**:3, 349-352. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Denise D J de Grave, Eli Brenner, Jeroen B J Smeets. 2011. Judgments of Reachability are Independent of Visuomotor Adaptation. *Perception* **40**:8, 962-974. [[Crossref](#)]
193. Marcello Costantini, Ettore Ambrosini, Corrado Sinigaglia, Vittorio Gallese. 2011. Tool-use observation makes far objects ready-to-hand. *Neuropsychologia* **49**:9, 2658-2663. [[Crossref](#)]
194. . Bibliography 451-518. [[Crossref](#)]
195. Stella F. Lourenco, Matthew R. Longo, Thanujeni Pathman. 2011. Near space and its relation to claustrophobic fear. *Cognition* **119**:3, 448-453. [[Crossref](#)]
196. Y.P. Ivanenko, N. Dominici, E. Daprati, D. Nico, G. Cappellini, F. Lacquaniti. 2011. Locomotor body scheme. *Human Movement Science* **30**:2, 341-351. [[Crossref](#)]
197. S. Gravano, Y.P. Ivanenko, G. Maccioni, V. Macellari, R.E. Poppele, F. Lacquaniti. 2011. A novel approach to mechanical foot stimulation during human locomotion under body weight support. *Human Movement Science* **30**:2, 352-367. [[Crossref](#)]
198. Denise D. J. de Grave, Eli Brenner, Jeroen B. J. Smeets. 2011. Using a Stick Does Not Necessarily Alter Judged Distances or Reachability. *PLoS ONE* **6**:2, e16697. [[Crossref](#)]
199. Eric L. Amazeen, Philip H. Tseng, André B. Valdez, Diego Vera. 2011. Perceived Heaviness Is Influenced by the Style of Lifting. *Ecological Psychology* **23**:1, 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
200. Matej Hoffmann, Hugo Marques, Alejandro Arieta, Hidenobu Sumioka, Max Lungarella, Rolf Pfeifer. 2010. Body Schema in Robotics: A Review. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development* **2**:4, 304-324. [[Crossref](#)]
201. Benjamin R. Kunz, Sarah H. Creem-Regehr, William B. Thompson. 2010. Visual capture influences body-based indications of visual extent. *Experimental Brain Research* **207**:3-4, 259-268. [[Crossref](#)]
202. Miranda Anderson, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Tamami Fukushima. 2010. "Involving Interface": An Extended Mind Theoretical Approach to Roboethics. *Accountability in Research* **17**:6, 316-329. [[Crossref](#)]

203. Marcello Costantini, Ettore Ambrosini, Gaetano Tieri, Corrado Sinigaglia, Giorgia Committeri. 2010. Where does an object trigger an action? An investigation about affordances in space. *Experimental Brain Research* **207**:1-2, 95-103. [[Crossref](#)]
204. Sarah H. Creem-Regehr, Benjamin R. Kunz. 2010. Perception and action. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science* **1**:6, 800-810. [[Crossref](#)]
205. Philip Tseng, Jan Tuennermann, Nancy Roker-Knight, Dorina Winter, Ingrid Scharlau, Bruce Bridgeman. 2010. Enhancing Implicit Change Detection through Action. *Perception* **39**:10, 1311-1321. [[Crossref](#)]
206. Marina Vasilyeva, Stella F. Lourenco. Spatial Development . [[Crossref](#)]
207. Sally A. Linkenauger, Veronica Ramenzoni, Dennis R. Proffitt. 2010. Illusory Shrinkage and Growth. *Psychological Science* **21**:9, 1318-1325. [[Crossref](#)]
208. Michael E. R. Nicholls, Tobias Loetscher, Maxwell Rademacher. 2010. Miss to the Right: The Effect of Attentional Asymmetries on Goal-Kicking. *PLoS ONE* **5**:8, e12363. [[Crossref](#)]
209. Ines Ann Heber, Sarah Siebertz, Marc Wolter, Torsten Kühlen, Bruno Fimm. 2010. Horizontal and vertical pseudoneglect in peri- and extrapersonal space. *Brain and Cognition* **73**:3, 160-166. [[Crossref](#)]
210. Lambros Malafouris. 2010. The brain–artefact interface (BAI): a challenge for archaeology and cultural neuroscience. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience* **5**:2-3, 264-273. [[Crossref](#)]
211. Richard Helvie. Disruptions in Physical Substrates of Vision Following Traumatic Brain Injury 281-305. [[Crossref](#)]
212. Matthew R. Longo, Stella F. Lourenco. 2010. Bisecting the mental number line in near and far space. *Brain and Cognition* **72**:3, 362-367. [[Crossref](#)]
213. M. Jane Riddoch, Magda Chechlac, Carmel Mevorach, Eirini Mavritsaki, Harriet Allen, Glyn W. Humphreys. 2010. The neural mechanisms of visual selection: the view from neuropsychology. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1191**:1, 156-181. [[Crossref](#)]
214. Joseph B. Hopfinger, C. Christine Camblin, Emily L. Parks. 2010. Isolating the internal in endogenous attention. *Psychophysiology* **134**. . [[Crossref](#)]
215. Daniel J. Povinelli, James E. Reaux, Scott H. Frey. 2010. Chimpanzees' context-dependent tool use provides evidence for separable representations of hand and tool even during active use within peripersonal space. *Neuropsychologia* **48**:1, 243-247. [[Crossref](#)]
216. A. Lichtenstein, M. Sünderhauf. 2010. Peripersonal vs. extrapersonal realm and processing of visual information. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes* **43**:13, 89-94. [[Crossref](#)]
217. Catherine L. Reed, Ryan Betz, John P. Garza, Ralph J. Roberts. 2010. Grab it! Biased attention in functional hand and tool space. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* **72**:1, 236-245. [[Crossref](#)]
218. Charity J. Morgan, Julia B. LeSage, Stephen M. Kosslyn. 2009. Types of deception revealed by individual differences in cognitive abilities. *Social Neuroscience* **4**:6, 554-569. [[Crossref](#)]
219. Jeanine K Stefanucci, Michael N Geuss. 2009. Big People, Little World: The Body Influences Size Perception. *Perception* **38**:12, 1782-1795. [[Crossref](#)]
220. Giuseppe Vallar, Angelo Maravita. Personal and Extrapersonal Spatial Perception . [[Crossref](#)]
221. Vaughan Bell, Peter W. Halligan. Cognitive Neurology . [[Crossref](#)]
222. Hayato Tsuda, Tomoko Aoki, Naohiko Oku, Yasuyuki Kimura, Jun Hatazawa, Hiroshi Kinoshita. 2009. Functional brain areas associated with manipulation of a prehensile tool: A PET study. *Human Brain Mapping* **30**:9, 2879-2889. [[Crossref](#)]
223. Stella F. Lourenco, Matthew R. Longo. 2009. The plasticity of near space: Evidence for contraction. *Cognition* **112**:3, 451-456. [[Crossref](#)]
224. J. Bourgeois, Y. Coello. 2009. Rôle des propriétés inertielles segmentaires sur la perception de l'étendue de l'espace péripersonnel. *Psychologie Française* **54**:3, 225-239. [[Crossref](#)]
225. Gunnar Declerck, Olivier Gapenne. 2009. Actuality and possibility: On the complementarity of two registers in the bodily constitution of experience. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* **8**:3, 285-305. [[Crossref](#)]
226. S. Fuke, M. Ogino, M. Asada. 2009. Acquisition of the Head-Centered Peri-Personal Spatial Representation Found in VIP Neuron. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development* **1**:2, 131-140. [[Crossref](#)]
227. Claudio Brozzoli, Francesco Pavani, Christian Urquizar, Lucilla Cardinali, Alessandro Farnè. 2009. Grasping actions remap peripersonal space. *NeuroReport* **20**:10, 913-917. [[Crossref](#)]
228. Michael A. Arbib, James B. Bonaiuto, Stéphane Jacobs, Scott H. Frey. 2009. Tool use and the distalization of the end-effector. *Psychological Research Psychologische Forschung* **73**:4, 441-462. [[Crossref](#)]

229. Lucilla Cardinali, Francesca Frassinetti, Claudio Brozzoli, Christian Urquizar, Alice C. Roy, Alessandro Farnè. 2009. Tool-use induces morphological updating of the body schema. *Current Biology* **19**:12, R478-R479. [[Crossref](#)]
230. Lucilla Cardinali, Claudio Brozzoli, Alessandro Farnè. 2009. Peripersonal Space and Body Schema: Two Labels for the Same Concept?. *Brain Topography* **21**:3-4, 252-260. [[Crossref](#)]
231. Stéphane Jacobs, Bernard Bussel, Michèle Combeaud, Agnès Roby-Brami. 2009. The use of a tool requires its incorporation into the movement: Evidence from stick-pointing in apraxia. *Cortex* **45**:4, 444-455. [[Crossref](#)]
232. Marian E. Berryhill, Robert Fendrich, Ingrid R. Olson. 2009. Impaired distance perception and size constancy following bilateral occipitoparietal damage. *Experimental Brain Research* **194**:3, 381-393. [[Crossref](#)]
233. Otto Bjoertomt, Alan Cowey, Vincent Walsh. 2009. Near space functioning of the human angular and supramarginal gyri. *Journal of Neuropsychology* **3**:1, 31-43. [[Crossref](#)]
234. Christopher C. Davoli, Richard A. Abrams. 2009. Reaching Out With the Imagination. *Psychological Science* **20**:3, 293-295. [[Crossref](#)]
235. Nadia Dominici, Elena Daprati, Daniele Nico, Germana Cappellini, Yuri P. Ivanenko, Francesco Lacquaniti. 2009. Changes in the Limb Kinematics and Walking-Distance Estimation After Shank Elongation: Evidence for a Locomotor Body Schema?. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **101**:3, 1419-1429. [[Crossref](#)]
236. Massimiliano Cappuccio. 2009. Constructing the Space of Action: From Bio-Robotics to Mirror Neurons. *World Futures* **65**:2, 126-132. [[Crossref](#)]
237. Zhenzhu Yue, Gérard-Nisal Bischof, Xiaolin Zhou, Charles Spence, Brigitte Röder. 2009. Spatial attention affects the processing of tactile and visual stimuli presented at the tip of a tool: an event-related potential study. *Experimental Brain Research* **193**:1, 119-128. [[Crossref](#)]
238. Laila Craighero. 2009. Reviews: Space and Sense. *Perception* **38**:1, 157-158. [[Crossref](#)]
239. Gail A. Eskes, Anna M. Barrett. Neuropsychological Rehabilitation 281-305. [[Crossref](#)]
240. Elisabetta Làdavas, Andrea Serino. 2008. Action-dependent plasticity in peripersonal space representations. *Cognitive Neuropsychology* **25**:7-8, 1099-1113. [[Crossref](#)]
241. Eric A. Malek, Jeffrey B. Wagman. 2008. Kinetic Potential Influences Visual and Remote Haptic Perception of Affordances for Standing on an Inclined Surface. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* **61**:12, 1813-1826. [[Crossref](#)]
242. Nicholas P. Holmes, Charles Spence, Peter C. Hansen, Clare E. Mackay, Gemma A. Calvert. 2008. The Multisensory Attentional Consequences of Tool Use: A Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Study. *PLoS ONE* **3**:10, e3502. [[Crossref](#)]
243. A. D. Fourkas, V. Bonavolonta, A. Avenanti, S. M. Aglioti. 2008. Kinesthetic Imagery and Tool-Specific Modulation of Corticospinal Representations in Expert Tennis Players. *Cerebral Cortex* **18**:10, 2382-2390. [[Crossref](#)]
244. John C. Adair, Anna M. Barrett. 2008. Spatial Neglect: Clinical and Neuroscience Review. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1142**:1, 21-43. [[Crossref](#)]
245. Kenny R. Coventry, Berenice Valdés, Alejandro Castillo, Pedro Guijarro-Fuentes. 2008. Language within your reach: Near-far perceptual space and spatial demonstratives. *Cognition* **108**:3, 889-895. [[Crossref](#)]
246. Sawa Fuke, Masaki Ogino, Minoru Asada. VIP neuron model: Head-centered cross-modal representation of the peri-personal space around the face 145-150. [[Crossref](#)]
247. Brandon Vasquez, James Danckert. 2008. Direction specific costs to spatial working memory from saccadic and spatial remapping. *Neuropsychologia* **46**:9, 2344-2354. [[Crossref](#)]
248. Lambros Malafouris. 2008. Between brains, bodies and things: tectonoetic awareness and the extended self. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **363**:1499, 1993-2002. [[Crossref](#)]
249. Bruce Bridgeman, Merrit Hoover. 2008. Processing Spatial Layout by Perception and Sensorimotor Interaction. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* **61**:6, 851-859. [[Crossref](#)]
250. Geoff Sanders, Anya Madden, Gemma Thorpe. 2008. Task Selection is Critical for the Demonstration of Reciprocal Patterns of Sex Differences in Hand/Arm Motor Control and Near/Far Visual Processing. *Evolutionary Psychology* **6**:2, 147470490800600. [[Crossref](#)]
251. M. A. Umiltà, L. Escola, I. Intskirveli, F. Grammont, M. Rochat, F. Caruana, A. Jezzini, V. Gallese, G. Rizzolatti. 2008. When pliers become fingers in the monkey motor system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105**:6, 2209-2213. [[Crossref](#)]
252. Luciano Gamberini, Bruno Seraglia, Konstantinos Priftis. 2008. Processing of peripersonal and extrapersonal space using tools: Evidence from visual line bisection in real and virtual environments. *Neuropsychologia* **46**:5, 1298-1304. [[Crossref](#)]

253. Melita J. Giummarra, Stephen J. Gibson, Nellie Georgiou-Karistianis, John L. Bradshaw. 2008. Mechanisms underlying embodiment, disembodiment and loss of embodiment. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* **32**:1, 143-160. [[Crossref](#)]
254. Louise Whiteley, Charles Spence, Patrick Haggard. 2008. Visual processing and the bodily self. *Acta Psychologica* **127**:1, 129-136. [[Crossref](#)]
255. Arnaud Saj, Patrik Vuilleumier. 2007. Neglect: Remembering the Space Left Behind. *Current Biology* **17**:24, R1060-R1062. [[Crossref](#)]
256. Nicholas P. Holmes, Gemma A. Calvert, Charles Spence. 2007. Tool use changes multisensory interactions in seconds: evidence from the crossmodal congruency task. *Experimental Brain Research* **183**:4, 465-476. [[Crossref](#)]
257. Geoff Sanders, Marta Perez. 2007. Sex Differences in Performance with the Hand and Arm in near and Far Space: A Possible Effect of Tool Use. *Evolutionary Psychology* **5**:4, 147470490700500. [[Crossref](#)]
258. Elena Azañón, Salvador Soto-Faraco. 2007. Alleviating the 'crossed-hands' deficit by seeing uncrossed rubber hands. *Experimental Brain Research* **182**:4, 537-548. [[Crossref](#)]
259. Dorothée Legrand, Claudio Brozzoli, Yves Rossetti, Alessandro Farnè. 2007. Close to me: Multisensory space representations for action and pre-reflexive consciousness of oneself-in-the-world. *Consciousness and Cognition* **16**:3, 687-699. [[Crossref](#)]
260. Yann Coello, Yvonne Delevoye-Turrell. 2007. Embodiment, spatial categorisation and action. *Consciousness and Cognition* **16**:3, 667-683. [[Crossref](#)]
261. Mauro Ursino, Melissa Zavaglia, Elisa Magosso, Andrea Serino, Giuseppe di Pellegrino. A Neural Network Model of Multisensory Representation of Peripersonal Space: Effect of tool use 2735-2739. [[Crossref](#)]
262. Marcello Costantini, Patrick Haggard. 2007. The rubber hand illusion: Sensitivity and reference frame for body ownership. *Consciousness and Cognition* **16**:2, 229-240. [[Crossref](#)]
263. D.J. Quinlan, J.C. Culham. 2007. fMRI reveals a preference for near viewing in the human parieto-occipital cortex. *NeuroImage* **36**:1, 167-187. [[Crossref](#)]
264. Claudio Brozzoli, Alessandro Farnè, Yves Rossetti. 2007. Divide et impera? Towards integrated multisensory perception and action. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **30**:2, 202-203. [[Crossref](#)]
265. S. Bonifazi, A. Farnè, L. Rinaldesi, E. Làdavas. 2007. Dynamic size-change of peri-hand space through tool-use: Spatial extension or shift of the multi-sensory area. *Journal of Neuropsychology* **1**:1, 101-114. [[Crossref](#)]
266. Nicholas P. Holmes, Daniel Sanabria, Gemma A. Calvert, Charles Spence. 2007. Tool-Use: Capturing Multisensory Spatial Attention or Extending Multisensory Peripersonal Space?. *Cortex* **43**:3, 469-489. [[Crossref](#)]
267. Marco Neppi-Mòdona, Marco Rabuffetti, Alessia Folegatti, Raffaella Ricci, Lucia Spinazzola, Francesca Schiavone, Maurizio Ferrarin, Anna Berti. 2007. Bisecting Lines with Different Tools in Right Brain Damaged Patients: The Role of Action Programming and Sensory Feedback in Modulating Spatial Remapping. *Cortex* **43**:3, 397-410. [[Crossref](#)]
268. Alessandro Farnè, Andrea Serino, Elisabetta Làdavas. 2007. Dynamic Size-Change of Peri-Hand Space Following Tool-Use: Determinants and Spatial Characteristics Revealed Through Cross-Modal Extinction. *Cortex* **43**:3, 436-443. [[Crossref](#)]
269. P. Hoppenot, Y. Rybarczyk, D. Mestre. 2007. Human-like conception of a remote control robotic system. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes* **40**:16, 189-194. [[Crossref](#)]
270. Scott H. Frey. 2007. What Puts the How in Where? Tool Use and the Divided Visual Streams Hypothesis. *Cortex* **43**:3, 368-375. [[Crossref](#)]
271. Olga Prilipko, Margitta Seeck, Bernadette Mermillod, Theodor Landis, Alan J. Pegna. 2006. Postictal But Not Interictal Hemispatial Neglect in Patients with Seizures of Lateralized Onset. *Epilepsia* **47**:12, 2046-2051. [[Crossref](#)]
272. Takahiro Higuchi, Michael E. Cinelli, Michael A. Greig, Aftab E. Patla. 2006. Locomotion through apertures when wider space for locomotion is necessary: adaptation to artificially altered bodily states. *Experimental Brain Research* **175**:1, 50-59. [[Crossref](#)]
273. TAKAHIRO HIGUCHI, KUNIYASU IMANAKA, AFTAB E. PATLA. 2006. Action-oriented representation of peripersonal and extrapersonal space: Insights from manual and locomotor actions 1. *Japanese Psychological Research* **48**:3, 126-140. [[Crossref](#)]
274. E. Poljac, B. Neggers, A.V. van den Berg. 2006. Collision judgment of objects approaching the head. *Experimental Brain Research* **171**:1, 35-46. [[Crossref](#)]
275. Laurel J. Buxbaum. 2006. On the right (and left) track: Twenty years of progress in studying hemispatial neglect. *Cognitive Neuropsychology* **23**:1, 184-201. [[Crossref](#)]
276. Francesco Di Nocera, Alessandro Couyoumdjian, Fabio Ferlazzo. 2006. Crossing the Pillars of Hercules: The Role of Spatial Frames of Reference in Error Making. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* **59**:1, 204-221. [[Crossref](#)]

277. Matthew R. Longo, Stella F. Lourenco. 2006. On the nature of near space: Effects of tool use and the transition to far space. *Neuropsychologia* 44:6, 977-981. [[Crossref](#)]
278. Jody C. Culham, Cristiana Cavina-Pratesi, Anthony Singhal. 2006. The role of parietal cortex in visuomotor control: What have we learned from neuroimaging?. *Neuropsychologia* 44:13, 2668-2684. [[Crossref](#)]
279. Leonardo Fogassi, Giuseppe Luppino. 2005. Motor functions of the parietal lobe. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* 15:6, 626-631. [[Crossref](#)]
280. 2005. Abstracts from CyberTherapy 2005. *CyberPsychology & Behavior* 8:4, 300-370. [[Crossref](#)]
281. Alessandro Farnè, Silvia Bonifazi, Elisabetta Làdavas. 2005. The role played by tool-use and tool-length on the Plastic Elongation of peri-hand space: a single case study. *Cognitive Neuropsychology* 22:3-4, 408-418. [[Crossref](#)]
282. Shinya Yamamoto, Shunjiro Moizumi, Shigeru Kitazawa. 2005. Referral of Tactile Sensation to the Tips of L-Shaped Sticks. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 93:5, 2856-2863. [[Crossref](#)]
283. Jeffrey B. Wagman, Kona R. Taylor. 2005. Perceiving Affordances for Aperture Crossing for the Person-Plus-Object System. *Ecological Psychology* 17:2, 105-130. [[Crossref](#)]
284. Vittorio Gallese. 2005. Embodied simulation: From neurons to phenomenal experience. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 4:1, 23-48. [[Crossref](#)]
285. Norimichi Kitagawa, Charles Spence. 2005. Investigating the effect of a transparent barrier on the crossmodal congruency effect. *Experimental Brain Research* 161:1, 62-71. [[Crossref](#)]
286. Jessica K. Witt, Dennis R. Proffitt, William Epstein. 2005. Tool Use Affects Perceived Distance, But Only When You Intend to Use It. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 31:5, 880-888. [[Crossref](#)]
287. Manos Tsakiris, Patrick Haggard. 2005. The Rubber Hand Illusion Revisited: Visuotactile Integration and Self-Attribution. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 31:1, 80-91. [[Crossref](#)]
288. I. Keller, I. Schindler, G. Kerkhoff, F. von Rosen, D. Golz. 2005. Visuospatial neglect in near and far space: dissociation between line bisection and letter cancellation. *Neuropsychologia* 43:5, 724-731. [[Crossref](#)]
289. Martin Eimer, Bettina Forster, José Van Velzen, Gita Prabhu. 2005. Covert manual response preparation triggers attentional shifts: ERP evidence for the premotor theory of attention. *Neuropsychologia* 43:6, 957-966. [[Crossref](#)]
290. Alessandro Farnè, Atsushi Iriki, Elisabetta Làdavas. 2005. Shaping multisensory action-space with tools: evidence from patients with cross-modal extinction. *Neuropsychologia* 43:2, 238-248. [[Crossref](#)]
291. Wayne Christensen. 2004. Self-directedness, integration and higher cognition. *Language Sciences* 26:6, 661-692. [[Crossref](#)]
292. Nicholas P. Holmes, Gemma A. Calvert, Charles Spence. 2004. Extending or projecting peripersonal space with tools? Multisensory interactions highlight only the distal and proximal ends of tools. *Neuroscience Letters* 372:1-2, 62-67. [[Crossref](#)]
293. Maria Pia Viggiano, Andrea Costantini, Manila Vannucci, Stefania Righi. 2004. Hemispheric asymmetry for spatially filtered stimuli belonging to different semantic categories. *Cognitive Brain Research* 20:3, 519-524. [[Crossref](#)]
294. Krista Schendel, Lynn C. Robertson. 2004. Reaching Out to See: Arm Position Can Attenuate Human Visual Loss. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 16:6, 935-943. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
295. Bruno J Losier, Raymond M Klein. 2004. Covert orienting within peripersonal and extrapersonal space: young adults. *Cognitive Brain Research* 19:3, 269-274. [[Crossref](#)]
296. Ferdinand Binkofski, Giovanni Buccino. 2004. Motor functions of the Broca's region. *Brain and Language* 89:2, 362-369. [[Crossref](#)]
297. Angelo Maravita, Atsushi Iriki. 2004. Tools for the body (schema). *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 8:2, 79-86. [[Crossref](#)]
298. Charles Spence, Francesco Pavani, Angelo Maravita, Nicholas Holmes. 2004. Multisensory contributions to the 3-D representation of visuotactile peripersonal space in humans: evidence from the crossmodal congruency task. *Journal of Physiology-Paris* 98:1-3, 171-189. [[Crossref](#)]
299. Elisabetta Làdavas, Alessandro Farnè. 2004. Visuo-tactile representation of near-the-body space. *Journal of Physiology-Paris* 98:1-3, 161-170. [[Crossref](#)]
300. Louise Whiteley, Steffan Kennett, Marisa Taylor-Clarke, Patrick Haggard. 2004. Facilitated processing of visual stimuli associated with the body. *Perception* 33:3, 307-314. [[Crossref](#)]
301. Beverly C Butler, Gail A Eskes, Robert A Vandorpe. 2004. Gradients of detection in neglect: comparison of peripersonal and extrapersonal space. *Neuropsychologia* 42:3, 346-358. [[Crossref](#)]
302. Takahiro Higuchi, Hajime Takada, Yoshifusa Matsuura, Kuniyasu Imanaka. 2004. Visual Estimation of Spatial Requirements for Locomotion in Novice Wheelchair Users. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* 10:1, 55-66. [[Crossref](#)]

303. Jean-Luc Petit. 2003. La spatialité originaire du corps propre. *Revue de Synthèse* 124:1, 139-171. [[Crossref](#)]
304. Tetsuko Kasai, Takashi Morotomi, Jun'ichi Katayama, Takatsune Kumada. 2003. Attending to a location in three-dimensional space modulates early ERPs. *Cognitive Brain Research* 17:2, 273-285. [[Crossref](#)]
305. Scott H Johnson-Frey. 2003. What's So Special about Human Tool Use?. *Neuron* 39:2, 201-204. [[Crossref](#)]
306. Angelo Maravita, Charles Spence, Jon Driver. 2003. Multisensory integration and the body schema: close to hand and within reach. *Current Biology* 13:13, R531-R539. [[Crossref](#)]
307. Peter H Weiss, John C Marshall, Karl Zilles, Gereon R Fink. 2003. Are action and perception in near and far space additive or interactive factors?. *NeuroImage* 18:4, 837-846. [[Crossref](#)]
308. David Wilkinson, Peter Halligan. 2003. The effects of stimulus size on bisection judgements in near and far space. *Visual Cognition* 10:3, 319-340. [[Crossref](#)]
309. Peter W. Halligan, Gereon R. Fink, John C. Marshall, Giuseppe Vallar. 2003. Spatial cognition: evidence from visual neglect. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7:3, 125-133. [[Crossref](#)]
310. Thomas Klos, Sandra Geggus, Detlev Kohl, Theodor R. von Stockert. 2003. Dissoziation der Wirkung von kontraläsionalem Handeinsatz bei visuellem Neglect im nahen und fernen Raum. *Zeitschrift für Neuropsychologie* 14:1, 23-31. [[Crossref](#)]
311. Bruno Laeng, Tim Brennen. 2003. Of Frames and Mirrors: Reflections on Neglect. A Reply to McCarthy (2002). *Cortex* 39:3, 541-553. [[Crossref](#)]
312. Glyn W. Humphreys, M. Jane Riddoch. From Vision to Action and Action to Vision: A Convergent Route Approach to Vision, Action, and Attention 225-264. [[Crossref](#)]
313. Alessandro Couyoumdjian, Francesco Di Nocera, Fabio Ferlazzo. 2003. Functional representation of 3d space in endogenous attention shifts. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A* 56:1, 155-183. [[Crossref](#)]
314. Naoya Hirose. 2002. An ecological approach to embodiment and cognition. *Cognitive Systems Research* 3:3, 289-299. [[Crossref](#)]
315. Nora S. Newcombe. Spatial Cognition . [[Crossref](#)]
316. Y. P. Ivanenko, R. Grasso, V. Macellari, F. Lacquaniti. 2002. Control of Foot Trajectory in Human Locomotion: Role of Ground Contact Forces in Simulated Reduced Gravity. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 87:6, 3070-3089. [[Crossref](#)]
317. Jacqueline Gottlieb. 2002. Parietal mechanisms of target representation. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* 12:2, 134-140. [[Crossref](#)]
318. Giacomo Rizzolatti, Leonardo Fogassi, Vittorio Gallese. 2002. Motor and cognitive functions of the ventral premotor cortex. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* 12:2, 149-154. [[Crossref](#)]
319. Angelo Maravita, Charles Spence, Steffan Kennett, Jon Driver. 2002. Tool-use changes multimodal spatial interactions between vision and touch in normal humans. *Cognition* 83:2, B25-B34. [[Crossref](#)]
320. Marie McCarthy. 2002. Fractionating the Neglected Space: The Relevance of Reference Frames for Defining Left and Right in Spatial Neglect. *Cortex* 38:4, 465-477. [[Crossref](#)]
321. Elisabetta Làdavas. 2002. Functional and dynamic properties of visual peripersonal space. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 6:1, 17-22. [[Crossref](#)]
322. Anna Berti, Nicola Smania, Marco Rabuffetti, Maurizio Ferrarin, Lucia Spinazzola, Alessandra D'Amico, Emanuele Ongaro, Alan Allport. 2002. Coding of far and near space during walking in neglect patients. *Neuropsychology* 16:3, 390-399. [[Crossref](#)]
323. Massimo Turatto, Francesco Benso, Giovanni Galfano, Carlo Umiltà. 2002. Nonspatial attentional shifts between audition and vision. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 28:3, 628-639. [[Crossref](#)]
324. Bruno Laeng, Tim Brennen, Kristin Johannessen, Kirsti Holmen, Rolf Elvestad. 2002. Multiple Reference Frames in Neglect? An Investigation of the Object-Centred Frame and the Dissociation Between "Near" and "Far" From the Body by Use of a mirror. *Cortex* 38:4, 511-528. [[Crossref](#)]
325. Vittorio Gallese, Maria Alessandra Umiltà. 2002. From self-modeling to the self model: agency and the representation of the self: Commentary by Vittorio Gallese and Maria Alessandra Umiltà. *Neuropsychoanalysis* 4:1, 35-40. [[Crossref](#)]
326. Maria Pia Viggiano, Manila Vannucci. 2002. Drawing and identifying objects in relation to semantic category and handedness. *Neuropsychologia* 40:8, 1482-1487. [[Crossref](#)]
327. A. Varnava, M. McCarthy, J.G. Beaumont. 2002. Line bisection in normal adults: direction of attentional bias for near and far space. *Neuropsychologia* 40:8, 1372-1378. [[Crossref](#)]
328. Alan J. Pegna, Leila Petit, Anne-Sarah Caldara-Schnetzler, Asaid Khateb, Jean-Marie Annoni, Roman Sztajzel, Theodor Landis. 2001. So near yet so far: Neglect in far or near space depends on tool use. *Annals of Neurology* 50:6, 820-822. [[Crossref](#)]
329. Anna Berti, Nicola Smania, Alan Allport. 2001. Coding of Far and Near Space in Neglect Patients. *NeuroImage* 14:1, S98-S102. [[Crossref](#)]

330. John C. Marshall, Gereon R. Fink. 2001. Spatial Cognition: Where We Were and Where We Are. *NeuroImage* 14:1, S2-S7. [[Crossref](#)]
331. Atsushi Iriki, Michio Tanaka, Shigeru Obayashi, Yoshiaki Iwamura. 2001. Self-images in the video monitor coded by monkey intraparietal neurons. *Neuroscience Research* 40:2, 163-173. [[Crossref](#)]
332. Georg Kerkhoff. 2001. Spatial hemineglect in humans. *Progress in Neurobiology* 63:1, 1-27. [[Crossref](#)]
333. Sabrina Pitzalis, Francesco Di Russo. 2001. Spatial Anisotropy of Saccadic Latency in Normal Subjects and Brain-Damaged Patients. *Cortex* 37:4, 475-492. [[Crossref](#)]
334. F Frassinetti, M Rossi, E Làdavas. 2001. Passive limb movements improve visual neglect. *Neuropsychologia* 39:7, 725-733. [[Crossref](#)]
335. Angelo Maravita, Masud Husain, Karen Clarke, Jon Driver. 2001. Reaching with a tool extends visual-tactile interactions into far space: evidence from cross-modal extinction. *Neuropsychologia* 39:6, 580-585. [[Crossref](#)]
336. E. Colle, Y. Rybawzyk, P. Hoppenot. ARPH: an assistant robot for disabled people 176-181. [[Crossref](#)]
337. Y. Rybarczyk, E. Colle, P. Hoppenot. Contribution of neuroscience to the teleoperation of rehabilitation robot 6. [[Crossref](#)]
338. Vittorio Gallese. The Ventro-dorsal Stream: Parieto-premotor Neural Circuits and Their Role in Primate Cognition 329-352. [[Crossref](#)]
339. Lydia Beck, Marc Wolter, Nan Mungard, Torsten Kuhlen, Walter Sturm. Combining Virtual Reality and Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI): Problems and Solutions 335-348. [[Crossref](#)]