**Tunneled vision reveals signatures of closed-loop vision**
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**Visual perception is based on continuous eye movements, typically yielding abrupt switching between regions of interest (ROIs), using saccades, and scanning of these ROIs, using drifts 1-3. Whereas saccades are commonly considered to result in part from closed-loop dynamics related to scene analysis, drifts are commonly considered to function in an open-loop scheme – their kinematics are assumed independent of the visual input 1,4. We tested this dependency in human subjects perceiving basic geometrical shapes. We modulated the spatial information that is available to them by changing stimulus size and by changing the effective retinal size – the latter was achieved by real-time tunneling of the gaze to a limited window around its center. The subjects’ scanning trajectories demonstrated clear closed-loop dynamics of saccades and drifts. First, the eyes often scanned the borders of the images, in a manner that necessitated relying on concurrent sensory data. Second, when challenged the visual system maintained acquisition parameters by modifying saccade and drift kinematics. Third, the system converged to its target kinematics anew during each fixational pause (henceforth “pause”), converging to significantly different kinematics depending on the viewing condition and the visual input. Overall, these results reveal clear indications for vision being based on closed-loop mechanisms through which the kinematics of saccades and drifts are adapted on-line to the characteristics of available external information.**

Five participants were asked to identify an image on a screen as one of five options (square, rectangle, circle, triangle and a parallelogram) after viewing it either naturally or through tunneled vision, during which spatial information was exposed only around the center of their continuously-tracked gaze. Two image sizes were presented (Large, 10.80x10.80 deg; Small, 0.90x0.90 deg) and two tunneling windows were used (2.90x1.90 deg for Large images and 0.24x0.16 deg for Small images).

Limiting the available spatial information had a dramatic effect on the distribution of gaze centers5, visualized by their visit rates (the fraction of time spent in each pixel of the image during each trial) (**Fig. 1**{🡨 (1) was the data normalized for trial duration? Otherwise, long trials contribute more than short trials. This could bias while participants that had longer trials - influence more. (2) Since we plot all stimuli with the same size, maybe it would add to show on top of each column the un-normalized size of the stimuli (e.g. filled black square with the size of the relative field-of-view marked by a circle in ‘***b***’ & ‘***d***’). (3) In the left column ‘***a***’ the highest value could reflect either the “gaze centers”, or many horizontal saccades going from side to side in such a way that most of them went through the center. Only in the 1st case the speed in the center will be the lowest. Is this the case?}). During natural viewing of Large shapes, the gaze was typically directed to the center of the shape (**Fig. 1a**). In contrast, during tunneled viewing of Large shapes the gaze was typically directed to the edges of the shapes (**Fig. 1b**). Decreasing spatial information by size reduction yielded patchy distribution of gaze centers, typically closer to shape borders (**Fig. 1c**). Tunneled viewing of Small shapes yielded more focused distributions, clearly preferring borders and edges (**Fig. 1d**). Interestingly, during tunneled viewing of the Small shapes, none of the participants was aware of their tendency to focus on borders, although they all reported awareness to the challenge in gaze direction (Supp?).

Both saccade average rate and drift averaged speed increased in tunneled conditions compared to natural viewing, regardless of image size (**Fig. 2a,b; Supp\_Table1).** Such changes may reflect reactions to input changes, as may be expected in open-loop systems, or may reflect active changes of the visual system, if operating in a closed-loop framework and trying to adapt to the environmental changes. Closed-loop adaptation must involve a set of variables, “controlled variables”, whose values are maintained by the loop within a certain range that allows the current functioning of the system 6-8. Open-loop systems do not have this capacity.

If visual information is acquired during a pause, then the mean rate of acquisition would be proportional to the mean speed of the drift during the pause (Sp) 3,9 and the total spatial information sampled during a pause would be proportional to the total scanning distance (the length of the gaze trajectory) of a pause (Xp). Mean pause duration (Tp) is inversely proportional to the saccade rate, which reflects the number of ROIs sampled per time unit. The increased saccade rate observed here in tunneled conditions is consistent with its dependency on task difficulty 10. Importantly, however, the tunneling-induced changes in saccade rate and drift speed compensated each other, on average, keeping the total distance scanned by the eye per pause unchanged for each stimulus size (Large shapes: 1.33±0.04 versus 1.40±0.04 deg, p=0.4; Small shapes: 1.77±0.08 versus 1.63±0.08 deg, p=0.2, for natural and tunneled vision, respectively). Thus, when tunneled, the visual system appears to increase the ROI sampling rate while maintaining Xp and compromising Sp. Interestingly, a different strategy appeared with size changes. When viewing small sized images, the visual system decreased the ROI sampling rate and here preferred maintaining Sp while compromising Xp (**Fig. 2a,b**).{🡨 Important questions regarding tunneled vision: (1) large part of the time the screen is uniform‑black and the object is not exposed. Did you examine drift and saccades separately when the object is exposed or not? (2) This is especially important when object is small and most of the time the participant is searching for the object. Therefore, there are saccades in the search mode and saccades moving over different parts of the object. (3) Maybe one of the modes (uniform‑black) can be considered as opened-loop, while the other is closed.} [[1. Do the analysis for frames that are blank and those that include image details, separately (if possible…)]]

Under the premise that the visual system indeed controls the drift speed in a closed-loop manner then it should exhibit a convergence dynamics. Indeed, analyzing the mean within-pause dynamics of drift speed showed that the eye converged to its target drifting speed during the first 50 – 150 ms of the pause, following an initial increase and a gradual decrease of the speed. While starting the pause with speeds ~7 deg/sec on average, the eye then converged to ~5 deg/sec in natural viewing and to ~6 deg/sec in tunneled viewing (**Fig. 2c**).

If the visual system maintains Sp across image sizes and compromises it when challenged with tunneling, then the trial-to-trial variability of Sp should reflect that. Indeed, while Sp exhibited relatively little variance during natural viewing ( for Large and Small, respectively), its variance increased significantly when tunneled ( for Large and Small, respectively; **Fig. 2d; Supp\_Table1).** As expected, saccadic kinematics obeyed a main-sequence pattern to the same extent in natural and tunneled conditions for low saccadic amplitudes, amplitudes that scaled with the image size (up to 7.5 deg for Large and 3 deg for Small images); beyond these amplitudes the main-sequence showed higher variations in tunneled vision (**Supp\_Fig. 1**).

The analysis thus far suggests that drift kinematics are controlled in a closed-loop manner, in which the amount of the available visual information affects Sp and Xp, which in turn determine the acquisition of visual information. This loop appears to be influenced by the saccadic rate, which may be determined in another control module or loop (e.g., 11). To analyze the interactions between saccades and drift kinematics in more detail we examined the spatiotemporal trajectories of eye movements during individual trials (**Fig. 3**). Tunneled vision of Large images induced a novel saccadic pattern - border-following (**Fig. 3a**). Most (55±7%) of the saccades made by all participants in all Large-tunneled trials were border-following, and as a result most (62±4%) of the pauses were on borders, compared with 16±5% and 12±8%, respectively, in all other conditions{🡨 (1) It contradicts (or at least it is not consistent with) **figure 1d, which definitely shows that during small tunneled stimuli the heighest gaze-visit-rates are on the borders**. This inconsistency could result from the definition of borders: What you considered as a border in the large stimuli (a distance of the gaze from the border <1.8°), you didn’t considered a border in the small stimuli (**<0.15°, which is 12 times smaller, and smaller than the minimal amplitude for identifying microsaccade!**). I guess that if the thresholds were the same, the result would change completely. That makes the result depending on an arbitrary decision, and creates results that contradict figure 1d. (2) **I think that it is necessary that figure 3a will have also examples for single trials small stimuli.**}[[1. Use the threshold of the small for the large and see what you get – it can be a control, or a replacement of the current analysis (let’s discuss)]] (**Fig. 3b**; see **Methods**). During pauses close to borders drift trajectories scanned differently if vision was challenged or not. When challenged by tunneling or viewing small-size images, the eye tended to drift in a curvier pattern, remaining closer to their starting location (**Fig. 3c;** see **Methods**). The curvature index differed between border and non-border drifts in all conditions (0.52+0.01 vs. 0.48+0.01, respectively, for Large-Tunneled; 0.65+0.05 vs. 0.55+0.02 for Small-Natural; 0.60+0.03 vs. 0.53+0.01 for Small-Tunneled; p<0.05, t-test) except for the Large-Natural condition (0.48±0.04 vs. 0.49±0.01, p=0.7). Drift speed was also affected by the concurrently-scanned visual details - Sp was significantly lower when drifting along borders than otherwise (4.48±0.07 deg/sec versus 5.00±0.07 deg/sec in Large and 3.99±0.10 deg/sec versus 4.92±0.02 deg/sec in Small images, p<0.05).

Whether ocular drifts are controlled by the brain had been a source of enduring debate 1,11-15. Our results demonstrate clearly that ocular drifts are actively controlled by the visual system - drift kinematics depended on the amount of visual information available and on the concurrently-scanned image patterns. Moreover, drift kinematics were converging to their target values, a reliable signature of closed-loop dynamics. Our data suggest that under normal conditions the visual system controls its drift speed such as to maintain it within a specific range. One reason for such a control is to maintain temporal coding relatively constant at a range suitable for neural processing 11,16. When viewing small-size images the visual system does not compromise this control and even tightens it. However, when challenged with tunneled viewing the system compromises drift speed for maintaining constant scanning distances under an increased rate of ROI switching. In this scheme, ROI switching seems to be controlled at another level, influenced by scene- and task-related factors 5,17-21, and to influence the functioning of the drift control loop(s) 11. Overall, these data support two major postulations. One is that the fixational pauses are used for visual acquisition, as if they were not then there was no sense in wasting energy for controlling the drift kinematics. The second is that vision is based on environment-dependent closed-loop mechanisms at both saccadic and drift levels. [[DO WE NEED IT AND IS “WASTING ENERGY” A GOOD TERM HERE?]]

**Methods:**

*Participants*. 5 healthy participants with normal vision at the ages 21-28 participated in the experiments (3 females, 2 right-handed with right dominant eye, 3 right-handed with left dominant eye{🡨 לחלוטין לא סביר שיותר מחצי מהמשתתפים יהיו מוחלפים})[[double-check the dominance test!]]. All participants were given detailed explanation about the eye tracker device and the behavioral task, and were paid for their participation. Informed consents were obtained from all participants, in accordance with the approved Declaration of Helsinki for this project.

*Experimental Setup*. The experiment took place in a dark{?}[[darkened?]] and quiet room where participants sat in front of a high-resolution, fast computer screen (VPixx, 1920x1080, 120Hz). The movements of the dominant eye were recorded at 100Hz (EyeLink II) while the other eye was blindfolded. Participants sat 1 meter away from the screen and placed their chin on a chinrest to reduce head movements.

*Stimuli and gaze windows*. Two kinds of images were created: ‘Large’ and ‘Small’, and each was associated with a specific gaze window – a horizontal rectangle centered on the participant’s gaze at each sample and through which the image was exposed. The Large shapes occupied 10.80±0.15x10.80±0.15 deg (720±10x720±10 pixels), and the Large gaze window was 2.90±0.15x1.90±0.15 deg (190±10x130±10 pixels). The Small shapes occupied 0.90±0.03x0.90±0.03 deg (60±2x60±2 pixels) with a gaze window of 0.24±0.03x0.16±0.03 deg (13±2x9±2 pixels). The ratio between image and window size was the same for both image sizes.

*Experimental Design*. We tested the performance of participants in a five forced choice shapes recognition tasks. In each trial, one out of 5 filled gray basic shapes against a black background was presented (square, rectangle, circle, triangle and a parallelogram; see **Fig. 1** for their outlines). These images were presented in two forms, Large and Small, as described above. Participants were tested during 5 days. During days 1-3 they performed 2 tunneled vision sessions, the first one with Large images and the second one with Small images. On day 4 they performed two tunneled vision sessions, both with Small images. On day 5 they performed 4 sessions of natural viewing, 2 repetitions with each image size: Large, Small, Large, and Small. Each trial lasted up to 30 s (except trials with natural viewing which lasted 3 s, **hence all comparative analyses were further verified using only the first 3 s of all tunneled trials, to control for trial length confounds, Supp\_Table1**){🡨 That means almost all the results (figures 2a-d, 3b-c) are based on the first 3 seconds, while **the identification was long after**. In the tunneled-small-images probably most participants at this part didn’t even expose the image for the first time. If I understood well all these comparison could be based on irrelevant data.}, there were at least 2 repetitions of each shape in each session (10-12 trials per session, only the first two repetitions of each shape were used for analysis), and hence each session lasted up to 12 minutes. At the end of each trial participants reported which of the 5 shapes was presented, received a ‘correct/wrong’ feedback. Success rates were 0.94±0.06 for the Large shapes and 0.60±0.02 for the Small shapes. Only correct trials were used for the analysis [[mention in the text at the outset. Did you also look at non-correct? What about those who were in chance level?]]. In the tunneled vision sessions, participants had to identify a shape that was “hidden” on the screen and exposed only through the gaze window (see above). In the natural vision sessions, participants had to identify the same shapes, naturally viewing them with no constrains.

[[mention reaction time stat?]]

*Eye movement processing*. A velocity based algorithm (modified from Bonneh et al. 22) was used for detecting all saccades and drift. We used the following threshold parameters for saccades detection: 16 deg/sec minimal peak velocity and 0.3 deg minimal amplitude. Each detected saccade was visually examined to verify the quality of saccadic detection. Fixation periods between saccades were labeled drift only if they exceeded 3 samples, a 30 ms minimum duration.

*Borders analysis*. Saccades or drift pauses that started and ended close to a border (<1.8 deg for Large, <0.15 deg for Small) were classified as “border saccade” or “border drift”, respectively.

*Curvature index*. We defined an index for drift curvature, where Xp equals the length of the drift trajectory, and Dp equals the linear distance between its starting and ending points. Hence, C=0 represents a straight line and C=1 represents a closed curve.

**References**

1 Steinman, R. M. & Levinson, J. Z. in *Eye Movements and Their Role in Visual and Cognitive Processes* (ed E. Kowler) 115-212 (Elsevier, 1990).

2 Rucci, M., Iovin, R., Poletti, M. & Santini, F. Miniature eye movements enhance fine spatial detail. *Nature* **447**, 851-854 (2007).

3 Ahissar, E. & Arieli, A. Figuring space by time. *Neuron* **32**, 185-201 (2001).

4 Pitkow, X., Sompolinsky, H. & Meister, M. A neural computation for visual acuity in the presence of eye movements. *PLoS Biol* **5**, e331 (2007).

5 Schütz, A. C., Braun, D. I. & Gegenfurtner, K. R. Eye movements and perception: A selective review. *Journal of vision* **11**, 9-9 (2011).

6 Marken, R. S. You say you had a revolution: Methodological foundations of closed-loop psychology. *Review of General Psychology* **13**, 137 (2009).

7 Ahissar, E. & Assa, E. Perception as a closed-loop convergence process. *eLife* **5**, e12830 (2016).

8 Buckley, C. L. & Toyoizumi, T. A theory of how active behavior stabilises neural activity: Neural gain modulation by closed-loop environmental feedback. *PLoS computational biology* **14**, e1005926 (2018).

9 Rucci, M. & Victor, J. D. The unsteady eye: an information-processing stage, not a bug. *Trends in Neurosciences* **38**, 195-206 (2015).

10 Gao, X., Yan, H. & Sun, H.-j. Modulation of microsaccade rate by task difficulty revealed through between-and within-trial comparisons. *Journal of vision* **15**, 3-3 (2015).

11 Ahissar, E., Arieli, A., Fried, M. & Bonneh, Y. On the possible roles of microsaccades and drifts in visual perception. *Vision research* **118**, 25-30 (2014).

12 Martinez-Conde, S., Macknik, S. L. & Hubel, D. H. The role of fixational eye movements in visual perception. *nature reviews neuroscience* **5**, 229-240 (2004).

13 Herrmann, C. J., Metzler, R. & Engbert, R. A self-avoiding walk with neural delays as a model of fixational eye movements. *Scientific Reports* **7**, 12958 (2017).

14 Kagan, I. Active vision: fixational eye movements help seeing space in time. *Current biology : CB* **22**, R186-188 (2012).

15 Kuang, X., Poletti, M., Victor, J. D. & Rucci, M. Temporal encoding of spatial information during active visual fixation. *Current biology : CB* **22**, 510-514 (2012).

16 Ahissar, E. & Arieli, A. Seeing via miniature eye movements: A dynamic hypothesis for vision. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* **6**, 89 (2012).

17 Yarbus, A. L. *Eye Movements and Vision*. (Plenum, 1967).

18 Noton, D. & Stark, L. Scanpaths in eye movements during pattern perception. *Science* **171**, 308-311. (1971).

19 McPeek, R. M. & Keller, E. L. Saccade target selection in the superior colliculus during a visual search task. *Journal of neurophysiology* **88**, 2019-2034 (2002).

20 Findlay, J. M. & Brown, V. Eye scanning of multi-element displays: II. Saccade planning. *Vision research* **46**, 216-227 (2006).

21 Ko, H. K., Poletti, M. & Rucci, M. Microsaccades precisely relocate gaze in a high visual acuity task. *Nature neuroscience* **13**, 1549-1553 (2010).

22 Bonneh, Y. S. *et al.* Motion-induced blindness and microsaccades: cause and effect. *Journal of vision* **10**, 22 (2010).

**Figure Legends**

**Figure 1. Gaze visit rates.** The distribution of gaze locations, normalized (min-to-max)) per trial and averaged across trials and subjects, for Large shapes with Natural viewing (**a**; 5 participants x 4 trials); Large shapes with Tunneled viewing (**b**; 5 participants x 6 trials); Small shapes with Natural viewing (**c**; 5 participants x 4 trials) and Small shapes with Tunneled viewing (**d**; 5 participants x 10 trials). Color maps were normalized for each panel.{🡨 was the data normalized for trial duration? Otherwise, long trials contribute more than short trials} [[add “only correct?]]

**Figure 2. Kinematics of saccades and drifts.** **(a)** Changes in mean saccadic rates between Natural and Tunneled viewing for Large (blue) and Small (magenta) image sizes. Data for each participant (left) and their mean (right most) are presented (\*, p<0.05, t-test). **(b)** Distributions of mean drift speeds per trial in the four experimental conditions; data as in (a) (\*, p<0.05, Wilcoxon rank sum tests). **(c)** Mean within-trial instantaneous drift speeds presented for big (1st & 3rd plot) and small objects (2nd & 4th plot) and in two time scales. Color code as in (b); error-bars denote SEMs. **(d)** Mean drifts speeds versus pause durations in the four experimental conditions (variances and SEMs: in the right most figures).

**Figure 3. Eye trajectories. (a)** Example of eye trajectories in single trials with Natural (left) and Tunneled viewing. Saccades, lighter blue; fixational pauses, dark blue; traces, horizontal and vertical components as a function of time next to each example. Movies of these examples are in **Supp\_Video1-5**). **(b)** Fractions of border-following saccades in the four experimental conditions in each subject (small dots) and their means (large colored dots). **(c)** Distributions of curvature indices (see Methods) of border drift trajectories (brown) and non-border drifts, in the four experimental conditions. The vertical dotted lines depict the averaged values of curvature indices.{?}

**Supplementary Figure 1. Variations of the saccadic main sequence.** The maximum velocity of a saccade linearly depends on its amplitude in all experimental conditions (R2 = 0.66 (Large-Natural); 0.69 (Small-Natural); 0.70 (Large-Tunneled) and 0.74 (Small-Tunneled). The figure shows the residuals of the linear fit of the main sequence in each condition. Dashed line denotes the saccade amplitude above which the difference was significant. Shaded areas represent the SEMs.

**Supplementary Table 1. Control for trial duration differences.** The analyses described in Fig. 2a,b,d were repeated for the first 3 s of the tunneled conditions, a time period equal to the duration of natural viewing trials. P values represent the probability that the values measured in the relevant tunneled condition were drawn from the same distribution as those measured in the natural viewing conditions.

**Supplementary Movies 1-5. Demonstrations of the eye trajectories presented in Fig. 3.** Movies are slowed down by 2.4.

**Extra Figure 1. Instantaneous drift speed. (a)** Autocorrelations of the instantaneous drift velocity (horizontal and vertical) in Natural vision tasks. The upper row shows the sum of significant correlation values for each time step. The lower row shows trial by trial significant correlation values. The percent of single periodic trials (higher significant correlation at 100ms compared with earlier and later time steps) is presented above the lower row. **(b)** Same as (a) for the Tunneled vision tasks. A peak in the autocorrelation can be seen in 100ms time step for both horizontal and vertical movements in both Large and Small conditions, as well as the presence of many more single periodic trials. **(c)** Autocorrelations of the distance traveled by each drift (horizontal and vertical) in the Natural (black) and Tunneled (blue and magenta) tasks. The decay of the sum of significant correlations is faster for both horizontal and vertical movements in both Large and Small conditions, as indicated by the Tau decay of the exponential fit presented.