

Supplement to: The pupillary light response reflects eye-movement preparation

Sebastiaan Mathôt, Lotje van der Linden, Jonathan Grainger, and Françoise Vitu

Laboratoire de Psychologie Cognitive, CNRS, Aix-Marseille université

This supplement contains additional analyses to accompany the manuscript *The Pupillary Light Response Reflects Eye-movement Preparation*.

Overview

- The PLR is locked to saccade onset
- Visual-change-induced constriction
- Accounting for gaze bias due to fixational eye movements

The PLR is locked to saccade onset

An important question is whether the latency of the PLR (t_0) is locked to the presentation of the auditory cue, or to the onset of saccadic response. If the PLR was locked to the cue, this would suggest that it is a high-level effect that results from an endogenous shift of attention towards the cued side (cf. Binda et al., 2013; Mathôt et al., 2013; Naber et al., 2013). In contrast, if the PLR was locked to the saccadic response, this would suggest that it is a low-level, motoric effect that is linked to the execution of the eye movement, similar to the pre-saccadic shift of attention (Hoffman and Subramaniam, 1995; Kowler et al., 1995; Deubel and Schneider, 1996).

To test this, we divided trials into ten bins, separately for each participant, based on saccadic response time (SRT). Next, we determined the latency of the PLR (t_0) for the Constant and Onset conditions for each bin, as described in the main text (*Modeling the PLR using exponential decay*).




Figure 1. Latency of the PLR (t_0) as a function of saccadic reaction time (SRT) for the Constant and Onset conditions. Regardless of SRT, response latency is about 100 ms lower in the Constant than in the Onset condition.

As shown in Figure 1, the latency reduction of the PLR in the Constant condition relative to the Onset condition was around 100 ms independent of SRT, indicating that the PLR was locked to saccade onset, and not to the presentation of the auditory cue. This was confirmed by a Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with Bin (10 levels) and Condition (Constant; Onset) as within-subject factors and t_0 as dependent variable. This revealed a main effect of Condition ($F(1, 7) = 106.12, p < .0001$), reflecting an overall latency reduction, but no main effect of Bin ($F(9, 7) = 1.21, p = .3056$), nor a Condition by Bin interaction ($F(9,9) = 0.30, p = .9726$).

Visual-change-induced constriction

Our analyses focus on the difference between Land-on-Bright and Land-on-Dark trials, because the absolute shape of the pupillary response differs between conditions. More specifically, there is an overall constriction in the Swap and Onset conditions (main-text Figure 1c,d), which is not present in the Constant condition (main-text Figure 1b). This constriction is due to the intra-saccadic display change that occurred in the Swap and Onset conditions (Barbur et al., 1992). However, an identical visual change occurred in Land-on-Bright and Land-on-Dark trials, and we therefore assume that the difference between Land-on-Bright and Land-on-Dark trials (main-text Figure 1a) is not distorted by visual-change-induced constriction. Crucially, however, our main conclusions are not dependent on this assumption, because the latency of visual-change induced constriction is too high (somewhat higher than the PLR itself; Gamlin et al., 1998) to

account for the very early preparatory effects that we observe here.

Accounting for gaze bias due to fixational eye movements

When you attend to a stimulus without looking directly at it (i.e. covert attention), small fixational eye movements tend to gravitate towards the attended stimulus (Engbert and Kliegl, 2003). Since every saccadic eye movement is preceded by a covert shift of attention (e.g., Deubel and Schneider, 1996), one might expect that fixational eye movements bring the eyes slightly closer to the saccade target already before the eyes set in motion.

In our data, gaze position was indeed biased towards the saccade target from 242 ms before saccade onset, as determined using an LME analysis with Participant as random effect, Target Side (Left or Right) as fixed effect, and Horizontal Gaze Position as dependent measure. This bias gradually increased to 0.03° just before the onset of the saccade. Although this bias was extremely small, we nevertheless verified that it did not affect our results. First we discarded all trials in which gaze position was, on average, biased towards the saccade target (51.6%). This left a subset of data in which gaze was biased slightly away from the saccade target (0.3°). All analyses described above were repeated on this subset of data.

Compared to the main analyses, there were only two minor differences: When estimating the model parameters, there was no longer a difference in final pupil-size difference between the Constant and Onset conditions (p_2 ; $t(7) = 0.7120$, $p = 0.4995$), and the difference in initial the pupil-size bias (p_1) was no longer significant using our Bonferroni-corrected alpha level of .0125 ($t(7) = 2.537$, $p = .0387$). Other than that, there were no notable differences between the full dataset and this subset of the data. Crucially, this illustrates that our results are not due to a gaze-position bias prior to the eye movement, and demonstrates the robustness of the results.

References

- Barbur JL, Harlow AJ, Sahraie A (1992) Pupillary responses to stimulus structure, colour and movement. *Ophthalmic and Physiological Optics* 12:137–141.
- Binda P, Pereverzeva M, Murray SO (2013) Attention to bright surfaces enhances the pupillary light reflex. *Journal of Neuroscience* 33:2199–2204.

Deubel H, Schneider WX (1996) Saccade target selection and object recognition: Evidence for a common attentional mechanism. *Vision Research* 36:1827–1837.

Engbert R, Kliegl R (2003) Microsaccades uncover the orientation of covert attention. *Vision Research* 43:1035–1045.

Gamlin PDR, Zhang H, Harlow A, Barbur JL (1998) Pupil responses to stimulus color, structure and light flux increments in the rhesus monkey. *Vision Research* 38:3353–3358.

Hoffman JE, Subramaniam B (1995) The role of visual attention in saccadic eye movements. *Perception & Psychophysics* 57:787–795.

Kowler E, Anderson E, Doshier B, Blaser E (1995) The role of attention in the programming of saccades. *Vision Research* 35:1897–1916.

Mathôt S, van der Linden L, Grainger J, Vitu F (2013) The pupillary response to light reflects the focus of covert visual attention. *PLoS ONE* 8:e78168.

Naber M, Alvarez GA, Nakayama K (2013) Tracking the allocation of attention using human pupillary oscillations. *Frontiers in Psychology* 4.