

# Radial Bias Pilot 1

Rania Ezzo

July 21, 2021

## Contents

<b>1 Experiment Description of Pilot 1</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Parameters . . . . .	1
1.2 Subject Instructions . . . . .	1
1.3 Experimental Design . . . . .	1
1.4 Block sequence . . . . .	2
<b>2 Subject Data (Relative motion)</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Psychometric Fits . . . . .	4
2.2 Sensitivity Polar Plots: Relative Motion . . . . .	6
2.3 Bias Polar Plots: Relative Motion . . . . .	8
2.4 Bias Polar Plots (Absolute Value): Relative Motion . . . . .	10
<b>3 Subject Data (Absolute motion)</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1 Sensitivity Polar Plots: Absolute Motion . . . . .	12
3.2 Sensitivity Vector Plots: Absolute Motion . . . . .	13
3.3 Bias Polar Plots: Absolute Motion . . . . .	14
3.4 Bias Polar Plots (Absolute Value): Absolute Motion . . . . .	15
<b>4 Group Data (Relative motion)</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1 Sensitivity Polar Plots: Relative Motion . . . . .	16
4.2 Z-score Sensitivity Polar Plots: Relative Motion . . . . .	16
4.3 Bias Polar Plots: Relative Motion . . . . .	17
4.4 Z-score Bias Polar Plots: Relative Motion . . . . .	17
4.5 Bias Polar Plots (Absolute Value): Relative Motion . . . . .	17
4.6 Z-score Bias Polar Plots (Absolute Value): Relative Motion . . . . .	18
<b>5 Group Data (Absolute motion)</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1 Sensitivity Polar Plots: Absolute Motion . . . . .	19
5.2 Bias Polar Plots: Absolute Motion . . . . .	19
<b>6 Supplementary Images: PFs per location</b>	<b>20</b>
6.1 RE PFs Per Location . . . . .	20
6.2 FH PFs Per Location . . . . .	22
6.3 BB PFs Per Location . . . . .	24
6.4 PW PFs Per Location . . . . .	26
6.5 NH PFs Per Location . . . . .	28

<b>1 EXPERIMENT DESCRIPTION OF PILOT 1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>7 Supplementary Images: Subject Cartesian Line Plots</b>	<b>30</b>
7.1 Sensitivity Cartesian Line Plots: Relative Motion . . . . .	30
7.2 Bias Cartesian Line Plots: Relative Motion . . . . .	31
<b>8 Supplementary Images: Group Cartesian Line Plots</b>	<b>32</b>
8.1 Sensitivity Cartesian Line Plots: Relative Motion . . . . .	32
8.2 Bias Cartesian Line Plots: Relative Motion . . . . .	33
<b>9 Current Goals</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>10 Incorporating fMRI</b>	<b>35</b>
10.1 Goals . . . . .	35
10.2 Runs needed . . . . .	35
10.3 Inverted Encoding Model . . . . .	35
<b>11 Extending to Plaid Stimuli</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>12 Supplemental Questions</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>13 Updates</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>14 To Do</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>15 Software to Cite</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>16 Data that still needs updating</b>	<b>39</b>
16.1 RE Psychometric Fits (Cardinal/Oblique) . . . . .	39
16.2 RE Polar Plots Percent Correct (W/ eyetracking vs. No eyetracking) . . . . .	40
16.3 Quality Control & Misc. . . . .	40
16.4 FH Psychometric Fits (Cardinal/Oblique) . . . . .	41
16.5 BB Psychometric Fits (Cardinal/Oblique) . . . . .	42
16.6 Sensitivity Cartesian Bar Plots . . . . .	43
16.7 Bias Cartesian Bar Plots . . . . .	44

## 1 Experiment Description of Pilot 1

To compare discriminability for radial motion directions compared to tangential motion directions with 1D drifting gratings at 8 polar angle locations at 7 deg eccentricity. A total of 4 motion directions will be per location, 2 radial (inwards and outwards) and 2 tangential.

### 1.1 Parameters

Eccentricity from central fixation: 7 degrees

Locations tested (polar angle relative to fixation): 0-315 degrees in 45 degree increments

Stimulus: sine wave gratings w/ 0.4 deg sigma gaussian mask

Stimulus spatial frequency: 1 c/deg

Stimulus drift speed: 8 deg/s

Stimulus contrast: 50% contrast per grating + gaussian mask

Stimulus aperture diameter: 2.5 deg

Black circular aperture was put onto screen to avoid perceptual artifacts from screen edges  
 Aborts trials that have breaks in fixation during stimulus presentation (stimulus\_start - 300 ms TO stimulus\_end)

Number of subjects: 5

## 1.2 Subject Instructions

For each of the following trials, a fixation dot will appear on the screen. A drifting pattern will appear at some distance from the center. Your task is to determine whether the pattern is drifting clockwise or counterclockwise relative to the reference.

Please remain fixated on the dot throughout the trials.

Press the RIGHT ARROW for clockwise direction.

Press the LEFT ARROW for counterclockwise direction.

## 1.3 Experimental Design

The pilot uses a 2AFC paradigm, within a block each trial includes a drifting grating presented at 1 of 4 possible positions, while the subject maintains fixation at the central dot. A method of constant stimuli is used which is set based on the performance of the training session (see Methods). The angular values added to the internal reference frame is chosen at random from the following constants [-8, -4, -2, -1, -0.5, 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8] – logarithmic spacing from 0.5 to 8. The observer must determine whether the direction of motion if clockwise or counterclockwise relative to the internal reference. The sequence of each trial for the 4 motion standards (specific to diagonal locations) at one location is depicted below:





Figure 1: Blue arrow represents the internal reference, the orange arrow represents an example of the direction at which the stimulus is presented (can be clockwise or counterclockwise to the blue arrow).

#### 1.4 Block sequence

Four blocks were run, and each block corresponded to 1 of the 4 conditions being tested (tangential lower left motion, tangential upper right motion, radial upper left motion, radial lower right motion). The internal reference frames for each block is shown below:











Prior to the actual experiment, the "standard" motion direction corresponding to that specific block will be showed to the observer to use as an internal reference. Then a training session is conducted to determine how much tilt is required to meet 75% accuracy with staircase procedure (MLPest), and to allow subject to practice task with feedback. The estimated angular value to add/subtract to the standard to achieve 75% performance of the clockwise/counterclockwise will be used to determine constants. For this pilot, constants [-8, -4, -2, -1, -0.5, 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8] were chosen for all 8 blocks. Note positive and negative values for clockwise v. counterclockwise tilt. Each block contained 4 locations x 5 tilt values x 2 (clock v cc) x 20 repetitions = 800 trials. There are 8 blocks \* 800 trials = 6400 total trials (3200 tang, 1600 radial-in, 1600 radial-out). Each full-block takes 45 min; all 8 blocks took 360 min.

Example sequence of blocks for RE

1. diag-UL [angles: +- 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8] (45 min)
2. card-HR [angles: +- 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8] (45 min)
3. diag-LR [angles: +- 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8] (45 min)
4. card-VL [angles: +- 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8] (45 min)
5. diag-UR [angles: +- 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8] (45 min)
6. card-HL [angles: +- 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8] (45 min)
7. diag-LL [angles: +- 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8] (45 min)
8. card-VU [angles: +- 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8] (45 min)

## 2 Subject Data (Relative motion)

### 2.1 Psychometric Fits






Figure 2: LEFT: 200 trials per point. RIGHT: Each point is 400 trials.

## 2.2 Sensitivity Polar Plots: Relative Motion





Figure 3: Same subject (RE) but at half distance.






Figure 4: LEFT: 200 trials per point. RIGHT: 400 trials per point. 95% CI from 1000 bootstraps.

### 2.3 Bias Polar Plots: Relative Motion





Figure 5: Same subject (RE) but at half distance.






Figure 6: LEFT: 200 trials per point. RIGHT: 400 trials per point. 95% CI from 1000 bootstraps.

## 2.4 Bias Polar Plots (Absolute Value): Relative Motion





Figure 7: Same subject (RE) but at half distance.






Figure 8: LEFT: 200 trials per point. RIGHT: 400 trials per point. 95% CI from 1000 bootstraps.

### 3 Subject Data (Absolute motion)

#### 3.1 Sensitivity Polar Plots: Absolute Motion




Figure 9: 200 trials per point. 95% CI from 1000 bootstraps.

### 3.2 Sensitivity Vector Plots: Absolute Motion




Figure 10: Vector direction corresponds to direction of drift; magnitude corresponds to sensitivity.

### 3.3 Bias Polar Plots: Absolute Motion




Figure 11: 200 trials per point. 95% CI from 1000 bootstraps.

### 3.4 Bias Polar Plots (Absolute Value): Absolute Motion




Figure 12: 200 trials per point. 95% CI from 1000 bootstraps.

## 4 Group Data (Relative motion)

### 4.1 Sensitivity Polar Plots: Relative Motion




Figure 13: LEFT: 600 trials per point. RIGHT: Each point is 1200 trials. Error bars represent SEM across subjects.

### 4.2 Z-score Sensitivity Polar Plots: Relative Motion





Figure 14: LEFT: 600 trials per point. RIGHT: Each point is 1200 trials. Error bars represent SEM across subject z-scores.

### 4.3 Bias Polar Plots: Relative Motion



### 4.4 Z-score Bias Polar Plots: Relative Motion





Figure 15: I think these aren't useful since the dashed line no longer indicates no bias (just mean).

### 4.5 Bias Polar Plots (Absolute Value): Relative Motion



#### 4.6 Z-score Bias Polar Plots (Absolute Value): Relative Motion




Figure 16: I think these aren't useful since the dashed line no longer indicates no bias (just mean).

## 5 Group Data (Absolute motion)

### 5.1 Sensitivity Polar Plots: Absolute Motion




Figure 17: LEFT: Polar plots of average sensitivity, CIs represent SEM. RIGHT: Vector plots of average sensitivity.

### 5.2 Bias Polar Plots: Absolute Motion






Figure 18: LEFT: Polar plots of bias. RIGHT: Polar plots of average abs(bias).


## 6 Supplementary Images: PFs per location


### 6.1 RE PFs Per Location







## 6.2 FH PFs Per Location







### 6.3 BB PFs Per Location







#### 6.4 PW PFs Per Location






## 6.5 NH PFs Per Location





## 7 Supplementary Images: Subject Cartesian Line Plots

### 7.1 Sensitivity Cartesian Line Plots: Relative Motion







Figure 19: LEFT: 200 trials per point. RIGHT: 400 trials per point. 95% CI from 1000 bootstraps.

## 7.2 Bias Cartesian Line Plots: Relative Motion








Figure 20: LEFT: 200 trials per point. RIGHT: 400 trials per point. 95% CI from 1000 bootstraps.

## 8 Supplementary Images: Group Cartesian Line Plots

### 8.1 Sensitivity Cartesian Line Plots: Relative Motion




## 8.2 Bias Cartesian Line Plots: Relative Motion



## 9 Current Goals

1. Several papers demonstrate that sensitivity to radial orientations is greater than tangential orientations; similarly, radial direction bias is reported for moving dot stimuli. But orientation and motion direction is always orthogonal with 1D drifting gratings. Is sensitivity greater for radial motion or radial orientations w/ 1D drifting gratings? If the radial sensitivity is greater in respect to motion direction, then the radial orientation effect is weaker than the radial motion effects (or visa versa).
  - Interesting because the reported effects seem at odds, physiologically. Component neurons generally respond to motion that is orthogonal to their preferred orientation.
  - So far, data points to radial bias in respect to motion domain (conflict w/ Hong).
2. Is sensitivity generally greater in cardinal locations compared to non-cardinal locations?
  - Note: if sensitivity is higher in cardinal locations, this could be due to the location or due to the feature of the stimulus (cardinality in orientation/motion).
3. Is the difference in radial and tangential sensitivity more pronounced in non-cardinal locations compared to cardinal locations?
  - Note: Cardinal bias might enhance sensitivity disproportionately for orientation, which minimizes radial bias differences on the cardinal axes.



## 10 Incorporating fMRI

### 10.1 Goals

- Better understand the topography of MT; Compare cortical surface area dedicated to upper vs. lower vertical meridian (and visual field generally)
- Compare BOLD magnitude for different motion directions (radial vs. tangential) in lower vertical meridian separately in V1, MT, and MST;
- Within MT, MST, V1, which motion directions (inward, outward, tangential) have the highest decoding accuracy?

### 10.2 Runs needed


1. MT+ functional localizer (moving vs. static stimuli); static
2. Way to map retinotopy of MT, MST, and V1 (Huk et al., 2002 and Amano et al., 2009)

### 10.3 Inverted Encoding Model

- Can we predict what stimulus was shown – radial vs. tangential?
  - Use stimulus to map channel responses for each motion direction, and use as weights to reconstruct signal
  - First create encoding model by using basis functions for each motion direction
  - Then, for each ROI voxel, for each trial, calculate channel weights for each basis function (“forward model”)
  - Fit to testing data on different trials/runs to reconstruct population-level stimulus representation
  - We would expect better decoding for radial motion directions in lower vertical meridian

## 11 Extending to Plaid Stimuli

1. How does this extend to plaid stimuli? Does the bias apply to the component motion direction or the perceived motion direction?



## 12 Supplemental Questions

1. Is there an HVA or VMA present for any/all of the conditions? (SF in design matters in this case)
2. Is there a difference in sensitivity to radial-inward vs. radial-outwards motion?
  - So far, there doesn't seem to be a difference at 7 deg eccentricity.
3. Maybe abandon question about how these biases change w/ eccentricity.

## 13 Updates

- Design Related
  - Fixed so that data (latex images/eyelink file) does not upload to github
  - Fixed physical aperture for monitor so it's more optimal for people of different heights
- Analysis Related
  - Added absolute value bias plots
  - Plotted absolute terms of direction in polar plot (8 colors)
  - Probably best not to recollect Nina's data (fits are good, but high bias; will show individual subject data in supplementary)
- Other improvements
  - n/a
- For discussion
  - Is bias higher for off-cardinal locations? Look into Albright 1989
  - Reasoning for LVF radial bias? (Edwards/Badcok 1993, Von Helmholtz 1909/1962)
  - fMRI design
  - Plaid design
  - Reference repulsion/attraction
  - Results Section for paper
  - Eye tracker in RM 956
    - \* Afp server not compatible with PC? – currently backing up data on my GDrive
    - \* CRT monitor calibration.

## 14 To Do

- Feedback for Analysis
  - Create branching logic for possible mechanisms
  - Test myself with monitor at half viewing distance (new params: stimulus diameter x2, SF /2, speed x2)
  - Create a table of r-squared values (per fit)
  - Create an addition average sensitivity by z-score (use norm function), and SEM would be of the weighted average.
  - IGNORE: Can also use precision-weighted average, goodness of fit, or likelihood to weight subjects for average plots
  - IGNORE: Can even normalize (z-score?), or subtract/divide by mean, average, and then add/multiply by mean (to make error bars relative across subjects)
  - Do I need to fix CIs for 2 condition?
  - I think I can get rid of 95 pct CIs, only keep 68 pct CIs

- Can try adding 6 random data points each of the 4 conditions at each tilt value to see if plots significantly change
  - Plot TangRight Sensitivity against TangLeft Sensitivity; then on top RadialIn vs RadialOut in a different color
  - Add CIs to bar plots per condition of sensitivity/bias across all locations
  - \*Update PF functions for cardinal/oblique separately
  - Create bar plots of sensitivity/bias within (first/second half) per block and across blocks
  - Check in with Nina about the Eyelink File
  - LATER: fit linear mixed effects model to include condition (radial/tang) and location as covariates – should see effects for both. Can also do conditions (radialin, radialout, tangright, tangleft).
- Feedback for Experiment Design
    - \*Equally distribute difficulty levels and clock/counterclockwise within each block?
    - \*Explore 2-up 1-down converging staircases as method to compute slope and bias for my purposes (try this on myself)
    - \*Print thank you message before saving eyelink data (last trial)
    - \*Ensure speed is the same across locations (Billy & Jon both mention some seem faster)
    - \*Billy also reported that LL radial motion seemed more clockwise – double check that CRT monitor does not cause issues with stretching
  - Feedback for Presentation/Other
    - Type up instructions for experiment
    - Latex file – any way to generate in parent folder?
    - Can let subjects rotate keyboard when right/left if more intuitive for subject
    - Table for now: If we want to capture polar angle differences, might need to increase SF? (confirmed in other exp around 6 cpd, 6 deg ecc)
    - Double check sigma of gaussian for reporting purposes (and at what eccentricity contrast drops below 1 perc)

## 15 Software to Cite

- PsychToolbox Extensions (Brainard, 1997; Pelli, 1997; Kleiner et al, 2007)
- Prins, N & Kingdom, F. A. A. (2018) Applying the Model-Comparison Approach to Test Specific Research Hypotheses in Psychophysical Research Using the Palamedes Toolbox. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9:1250. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01250

## 16 Data that still needs updating

### 16.1 RE Psychometric Fits (Cardinal/Oblique)




Figure 21: RE new data (speed 8 deg/s) across 8 blocks that each contain 1 reference vector. Top row: All trials (combining cardinal and oblique blocks). Each point = (20 x 8 locations); Second row: subset of data in first row, including only the oblique motion directions (diagonal locations). Each point = (20 x 4 locations); Last row: subset of data in first row, including only the cardinal motion directions (cardinal locations). Each point = (20 x 4 locations). Positive bias = more counterclockwise responses. All means/confidence intervals were computed from samples of posterior distribution using Markov chain Monte Carlo method (from PAL\_PFHB\_fitModel.m) - 5000 samples, 3 chains.

#### RE SENSITIVITY/SLOPE

Radial out beta = [cardinal & diagonal directions = 0.58, cardinal = 0.72, diagonal = 0.48]

Radial in beta = [cardinal & diagonal directions = 0.58, cardinal = 0.73, diagonal = 0.48]

Tangential beta = [cardinal & diagonal directions = 0.48, cardinal = 0.63, diagonal = 0.40]

#### RE BIAS

Radial out alpha = [cardinal & diagonal directions = -0.66, cardinal = -0.52, diagonal = -0.82]

Radial in alpha = [cardinal & diagonal directions = -0.31, cardinal = -0.43, diagonal = -0.16]

Tangential alpha = [cardinal & diagonal directions = -0.25, cardinal = -0.48, diagonal = 0.02]

## 16.2 RE Polar Plots Percent Correct (W/ eyetracking vs. No eyetracking)




Figure 22: Polar plots by performance (range 50-100%). Each point is 400 trials (collapsed across blocks). LEFT: new data w/eyetracking. RIGHT: old data.

## 16.3 Quality Control & Misc.




Figure 23: To check that performance does not vary too much between blocks. Cardinal blocks are interwoven with diagonal blocks, and consistently show better performance. LEFT: data with eyetracking. RIGHT: data without eye tracking.

## 16.4 FH Psychometric Fits (Cardinal/Oblique)




Figure 24: Same arrangement as previous page, but for subject FH (only includes half of full dataset: UR, VL, LL, HR).

### FH SENSITIVITY/SLOPE

Radial out beta = [cardinal & diagonal directions = 0.29, cardinal = 0.62, diagonal = 0.20]

Radial in beta = [cardinal & diagonal directions = 0.28, cardinal = 0.70, diagonal = 0.22]

Tangential beta = [cardinal & diagonal directions = 0.27, cardinal = 0.41, diagonal = 0.20]

### FH BIAS

Radial out alpha = [cardinal & diagonal directions = -0.61, cardinal = -0.59, diagonal = -0.49]

Radial in alpha = [cardinal & diagonal directions = -0.27, cardinal = -1.39, diagonal = 1.66]

Tangential alpha = [cardinal & diagonal directions = -0.48, cardinal = -0.78, diagonal = -0.03]

## 16.5 BB Psychometric Fits (Cardinal/Oblique)




Figure 25: Same arrangement as previous page, but for subject BB (only includes partial dataset: VU, LR). Not error range is too large (uninterpretable)

### BB SENSITIVITY/SLOPE

Radial out beta = [cardinal & diagonal directions = 0.44, cardinal = 0.47, diagonal = 0.43]

Radial in beta = [cardinal & diagonal directions = 0.55, cardinal = 0.74, diagonal = 0.46]

Tangential beta = [cardinal & diagonal directions = 0.45, cardinal = 0.78, diagonal = 0.33]

### FH BIAS

Radial out alpha = [cardinal & diagonal directions = 0.37, cardinal = -0.21, diagonal = 0.95]

Radial in alpha = [cardinal & diagonal directions = -1.60, cardinal = -1.14, diagonal = -2.1]

Tangential alpha = [cardinal & diagonal directions = 0.09, cardinal = 0.04, diagonal = 0.14]

## 16.6 Sensitivity Cartesian Bar Plots




Figure 26: LEFT: 200 trials per point. RIGHT: Each point is 400 trials. Green asterisk indicates 68% CI do not overlap. Black asterisk indicates 95% CI do not overlap.

### 16.7 Bias Cartesian Bar Plots




Figure 27: LEFT: 200 trials per point. RIGHT: Each point is 400 trials. Green asterisk indicates 68% CI do not overlap. Black asterisk indicates 95% CI do not overlap.