Higher Neural Functions and Behavior

Facilitation and inhibition effects of anodal and cathodal tDCS over areas MT+ on the flash-lag effect

[®] Wu Wang,¹ Xiao Lei,² Wenxiao Gong,¹ [®] Kun Liang,¹ and [®] Lihan Chen¹

¹School of Psychological and Cognitive Sciences and Beijing Key Laboratory of Behavior and Mental Health, Peking University, Beijing, People's Republic of China and ²Academy for Advanced Interdisciplinary Studies, Peking University, Beijing, People's Republic of China

Abstract

The perceived position of a moving object in vision entails an accumulation of neural signals over space and time. Due to neural signal transmission delays, the visual system cannot acquire immediate information about the moving object's position. Although physiological and psychophysical studies on the flash-lag effect (FLE), a moving object is perceived ahead of a flash even when they are aligned at the same location, have shown that the visual system develops the mechanisms of predicting the object's location to compensate for the neural delays, the neural mechanisms of motion-induced location prediction are not still understood well. Here, we investigated the role of neural activity changes in areas MT+ (specialized for motion processing) and the potential contralateral processing preference of MT+ in modulating the FLE. Using transcranial direct current stimulations (tDCS) over the left and right MT+ between pre- and posttests of the FLE in different motion directions, we measured the effects of tDCS on the FLE.postt228esult arnodl and nDCS oenhncedandthe HLE-367.2(awitt-360.551hl)-34396(motion)-354.8(nb)-343.8(nb

processings of moving and static objects (13), the average position of a moving object over a certain time (14), postdictive assignments of the post-flash positions to the moment of flashes (15), and predictive assignments of perceived positions (8, 16). Despite the contradictions among the various psychophysical mechanisms, it appears to be gradually realized that none of the mechanisms could singly interpret all of the rich FLE phenomena (4, 6, 17). One common conception of most mechanisms is that motion perception intricately links with position perception (9, 18). However, it is unclear whether modulation of neural activation in cortical areas selectively processing motion could affect motion-induced position mislocalization. Although one study has found the reduced FLE due to neural disruption in area MT+ (4), the neural processes underlying the causal contribution of area MT+ to the FLE are poorly understood.

Area MT+ plays a central role in visual motion processing (19, 20). Neuroimaging studies have found motion perception deficits in patients with brain damage localized to MT+ (21, 22). And transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) studies of MT+ observed visual motion perception impairment (22-25). Interestingly, MT+ shows preferential motion processing and attention to motion in the contralateral visual field (21, 22, 26), although it could potentially integrate motion in the left and right hemifields (25, 27). The motion processing preference of MT+ might result from an MT+ subregion (MT) (22, 26), whose receptive field (RF) extends a much lesser degree to the ipsilateral visual field (28) and response is selective to translational motion (29). Furthermore, MT+ also engages the perceived position of a static object after motion adaptation (30, 31). As the FLE involves the integration of signals for the perceived positions of the static and moving objects, the neural activation changes of MT+ due to transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) could modulate the FLE. Therefore, our aim is to test how tDCS over MT+ modulates the FLE.

tDCS, a noninvasive electrical-stimulating techni ue, has been shown to modulate the excitability of MT+. Generally, anodal stimulation (a-tDCS) increases cortical excitability by depolarization, whereas cathodal stimulation (c-tDCS) decreases it by hyperpolarization (32, 33). Nevertheless, the modulation of neural activity by tDCS is more complicated than the expectation (34), thereby exhibiting inconsistent modulation effects. For instance, c-tDCS on the left MT+ enhanced complex motion (low coherence) perception and worsened simple movement (high coherence) perception (35); a-tDCS on the left MT+ enhanced motion direction identification ability (36); both a- and c-tDCS on the left MT+ improved coherent motion discriminability in the right hemifield (33). These contradictory findings might suggest an interaction of tDCS modulation effects with task characteristics (33, 37). Although tDCS on MT+ indeed modulated motion perception, it is little known how a- and c-tDCS on the left and right MT+ affect the FLE. In addition, due to the possible contralateral processing preference of MT+(22, 26, 29), the stimulated areas (the left vs. the right MT+) might lead to various modulation effects of tDCS over MT+ on the FLE. Therefore, our final aim is to estimate how a- and c-tDCS on the left and right areas MT+ enhance and impair the FLE in different motions (e.g., from the right to the left and the left to the right cross the vertical meridian).

To address the uestions mentioned earlier, we applied the standard visual FLE. In *experiment 1*, we aimed to explore the modulation effects of a- and c-tDCS over the left MT+ on the FLE in different motion directions. Thus, three participant groups were assigned to different stimulation regimes (anodal vs. cathodal vs. sham) to perform two sessions of the flash-lag tasks with 15-min intervals of tDCS. By comparing the FLE magnitudes in different motion directions between two sessions in each group, we assessed the facilitation and inhibition effects of a- and c-tDCS over the left MT+ on the FLE. In *experiment 2*, we further tested the modulation effects of a- and c-tDCS over the right MT+ on the FLE in different motion directions. All experimental conduction was the same as that in *experiment 1*, except for the stimulated area (the right MT+). By comparing the FLE magnitudes in different motion dic-9.9(ft)(s)-i(i).3(o)54ea

fixation cross. In addition to seven various timings of the $\ensuremath{\mathrm{fl}}$



Figure 3. Effects of transcranial direct current stimulations (tDCS) over the left MT+ on the flash-lag effect (FLE) in different motion directions. A: effects of anodal (a)-tDCS. The pretest point of subjective equality (PSE) is significantly higher than the posttest PSE in the right to the left (RL) motion direction; the pretest PSE is nearly equal to the posttest PSE in the left to the right (LR) motion direction. B: effects of cathodal (c)-tDCS. The pretest PSE is significantly lower than the posttest PSE in the RL motion direction; the pretest PSE is nearly equal to the posttest PSE in the LR motion direction. C: effects of the sham tDCS. There are no significant results; the test PSEs are nearly equal. D: effects of tDCS over the left MT+ on the FLE in the RL motion direction. To avoid the individual difference and better verify the effects of tDCS on the FLE in the RL motion direction, we normalized pre- and posttests of the PSE in each group using a min-max normalization method. The normalized pre- and posttest PSEs in three types of stimulations do not significantly differ, respectively; in the anodal stimulation, the normalized pretest PSE is significantly higher than the normalized posttest PSE; in the cathodal stimulation, the normalized pretest PSE is significantly lower than the normalized posttest PSE. Hollow circles represent individual points in each group. **P < 0.01; ns, nonsignificant.

the normalized pretest PSE was higher than the normalized posttest PSE in the anodal stimulation (t_{42} = 4.17, P < 0.001, Cohen's d = 1.10), the normalized pretest PSE was lower than the normalized posttest PSE in the cathodal stimulation (t_{42} = 4.07, P < 0.001, Cohen's d = 1.08) (Fig. 3D).

To further verify the increased effect of tDCS on the FLE in the LR motion direction, we run a 2 (testing: pretest vs. posttest, within-group) \times 2 (stimulation: anodal vs. sham, betweengroup) mixed-model ANOVA with the PSE as the dependent measure (49). We observed a significant testing \times stimulation interaction effect ($F_{1,28}$ = 4.90, P < 0.05, η_p^2 = 0.15) (Fig. 4A). A simple effect analysis indicated that the pretest PSE was higher than the posttest PSE in the anodal stimulation (t_{28} = 3.28, P < 0.01, Cohen's d = 0.86), and no other significant results were found. Furthermore, we compared the discrepancy of increase effect between anodal and sham groups. The increase in PSE (posttest - pretest) was estimated via the independent sample t test (two-tailed), with the result indicating that the increased effect in the anodal group was more than that in the sham group (t_{28} = 2.21, P < 0.05, Cohen's d = 0.81) (Fig. 4B). Likewise, we further confirmed the decreased effect of tDCS on the FLE in the RL motion direction, we run a 2 (testing: pretest vs. posttest, within-group) \times 2 (stimulation: cathodal vs. sham, between-group) mixed-model ANOVA with the PSE as the dependent measure. We observed a significant testing \times stimulation interaction effect ($F_{1,28}$ = 12.22, P < 0.01, $\eta_p^2 = 0.15$) (Fig. 4C). A simple effect analysis indicated that the pretest PSE was lower than the posttest PSE in the cathodal stimulation (t_{28} = 4.79, P < 0.001, Cohen's d = 1.26), and no other significant results were found. Furthermore, we compared the discrepancy of the decreased effect between cathodal and sham groups. The decrease in PSE (posttest – pretest) was estimated via the independent sample *t* test (two-tailed), with the result indicating that the decreased effect in the cathodal group was more than that in the sham group (t_{28} = 3.50, P < 0.01, Cohen's *d* = 1.28) (Fig. 4*D*).

Experiment 2: Effects of tDCS over the Right MT+ on the FLE

Participants.

A total of 45 new participants were recruited to assign into three experimental groups: anodal group (aged 19–27 yr, mean 22.0 ± 2.9 yr; 9 females; 4 left-dominated eye; all right-handedness), cathodal group (aged 19–27 yr, mean 20.0 ± 2.9 yr; 7 females; 8 left-dominated eye; all righthandedness), and sham group (aged 18–26 yr, mean 21.3 ± 2.8 yr; 9 females; 7 left-dominated eye; 1 left-handedness), whose general characteristics were the same as those in *experiment 1*.

Transcranial direct current stimulation.

tDCS parameters were the same as those in *experiment 1*, except that the left MT+ was replaced by the right MT+.

The flash-lag task.

We used the same apparatus, stimuli, and procedure as used in *experiment 1*.

Study protocol.

The protocol was as in *experiment 1* (Fig. 1*C*), except that, for the sham group, the electrode positions on eight participants were placed over the same sites as in the anodal group, and the electrode positions on seven participants were the same sites as in the cathodal group, which makes a counterbalance

Figure 4. Increase and decrease effects of transcranial direct current stimulations (tDCS) over the left MT+ on the flash-lag effect (FLE) in the right to the left (RL) motion direction. A: increased effect of anodal (a)-tDCS. The pretest point of subjective equality (PSE) is significantly higher than the posttest PSE in the anodal group; the pretest PSE is nearly equal to the posttest PSE in the sham group. B: an comparison of the increased effect between the anodal and sham groups. The increased effect improvement is defined as (the posttest $\ensuremath{\mathsf{PSE}}$ – the pretest $\ensuremath{\mathsf{PSE}}$), and the increased effect in the anodal group is significantly higher than that in the sham group. C: decreased effect of cathodal (c)-tDCS. The pretest PSE is significantly lower than the posttest PSE in the cathodal group; the pretest PSE is nearly equal to the posttest PSE in the sham group. D: an comparison of the decreased effect between the cathodal and sham groups. The decreased effect improvement is defined as (the posttest PSE – the pretest PSE), and the decreased effect in the anodal group is significantly higher than that in the sham group. Hollow circles represent individual points in each group. *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01; ns, nonsignificant.



on the electrode position number in two sham groups in two experiments. In addition, the current electrical field (V/m) created by the montage targeting the right MT+ is shown in Fig. 2, *right*.

Data processing and analysis.

We used the same data processing and analysis as in *experiment 1*.

Results.

To estimate the effects of tDCS on the right MT+ on the FLE in different motion directions, we performed a 2 (testing: pretest vs. posttest) \times 2 [motion direction: the right to the left (RL) versus the left to the right (LR)] repeated-measures ANOVA with the PSE as the dependent measure in anodal, cathodal, and sham groups, respectively (see Supplemental Material). For the anodal group, we observed a significant main effect of testing ($F_{1,14}$ = 5.39, P < 0.05, η_p^2 = 0.28) and testing \times motion direction interaction effect ($\dot{F}_{1,14}$ = 7.77, P <0.05, η_p^2 = 0.36) (Fig. 4A). A simple interaction analysis indicated that the posttest PSE was lower than the pretest PSE in the LR motion direction (t_{14} = 5.30, P < 0.01, Cohen's d = 0.54) (Fig. 5A). For the cathodal group, we observed a significant main effect of testing ($F_{1,14}$ = 8.61, P < 0.05, η_p^2 = 0.38) and testing \times motion direction interaction effect ($F_{1,14}$ = 14.11, P <0.01, $\eta_p^2 = 0.50$) (Fig. 5B). A simple interaction analysis indicated that the pretest PSE was lower than the posttest PSE in the LR motion direction (t_{14} = 5.12, P < 0.01, Cohen's d = 0.81) (Fig. 5B). For the sham group, no other significant results were found (Fig. 5C). For three groups, the JNDs did not significantly differ between different testings and motion directions (see Supplemental Fig. S2).

After the normalization of pre- and posttest PSEs in the LR motion direction, we run a 2 (testing: pretest vs. posttest) × 2 (stimulation: anodal vs. cathodal versus sham) repeated-measures ANOVA with the normalized PSE as the dependent measure. We observed a significant testing × stimulation interaction effect ($F_{2,42}$ = 11.00, P < 0.01, $\eta_p^2 = 0.34$) (Fig. 5*D*). A simple interaction analysis (Bonferroni correction) indicated that the normalized pretest PSE was higher than the normalized posttest PSE in the anodal stimulation (t_{42} = 2.16, P < 0.05, Cohen's d = 0.57), the normalized pretest PSE was lower than the normalized posttest PSE in the cathodal stimulation (t_{42} = 4.37, P < 0.001, Cohen's d = 1.15), with no other significant results found (Fig. 5*D*).

To further verify the increased effect of tDCS on the FLE in the RL motion direction, we run a 2 (testing: pretest vs. posttest, within-group) \times 2 (stimulation: anodal vs. sham, betweengroup) mixed-model ANOVA with the PSE as the dependent measure (49). We observed a marginally significant testing \times stimulation interaction effect ($F_{1,28}$ = 3.47, P = 0.073, η_p^2 = 0.11) (Fig. 6A). A simple effect analysis indicated that the pretest PSE was higher than the posttest PSE in the anodal stimulation $(t_{28} = 2.61, P = 0.015 < 0.05, \text{ Cohen's } d = 0.69)$, and no other significant results were found. Furthermore, we compared the discrepancy of the increased effect between anodal and sham groups. The increase in PSE (posttest – pretest) was estimated via the independent sample t test (two-tailed), with the result indicating that the increased effect in the anodal group was marginally more than that in the sham group (t_{28} = 1.86, P = 0.073, Cohen's d = 0.68) (Fig. 6B). Likewise, we further confirmed the decreased effect of tDCS on the FLE in the LR motion direction, we run a 2 (testing: pretest vs. posttest, within-group) \times 2 (stimulation: cathodal vs. sham, between-



Figure 5. Effects of transcranial direct current stimulations (tDCS) over the right MT+ on the flash-lag effect (FLE) in different mo0.8(t11/F111Tf24.08820TD0Tc.59-1.5(46TD[(to)22.3(wa)17.5)]

group) mixed-model ANOVA with the PSE as the dependent measure. We observed a significant testing × stimulation interaction effect ($F_{1,28} = 6.68$, P < 0.05, $\eta_p^2 = 0.20$) (Fig. 6*C*). A simple effect analysis indicated that the pretest PSE was lower than the posttest PSE in the cathodal stimulation ($t_{28} = 3.71$, P < 0.001, Cohen's d = 0.98), and no other significant results were found. Furthermore, we compared the discrepancy of the decreased effect between cathodal and sham groups. The decrease in PSE (posttest – pretest) was estimated via the independent sample *t* test (two-tailed), with the result indicating that the decreased effect in the cathodal group was more than that in the sham group ($t_{28} = 2.60$, P < 0.05, Cohen's d = 0.95) (Fig. 6*D*).

DISCUSSION

We assessed how tDCS over the left and right MT+ modulates the FLE in both the RL and LR motion directions. Our main finding is that after 15-min tDCS on the left MT+, aand c-tDCS enhanced and reduced the magnitude of the FLE in the RL motion direction (Figs. 3 and 4), respectively, that after 15-min tDCS on the right MT+, a- and c-tDCS enhanced and reduced the magnitude of the FLE in the LR motion direction (Figs. 5 and 6), respectively, and that sham tDCS did not affect the magnitude of FLE in both the RL and LR motion directions (Fig. 3*C* and Fig. 5*C*). We suggest that aand c-tDCS over the left and right MT+ can facilitate and inhibit the FLE with the moving bar heading to but not deviating from the side of the brain stimulated, respectively, compared with sham tDCS. These findings may help contribute to understanding the neural mechanism of the FLE.

We found that when a-tDCS was on the left MT+, the magnitude of the FLE in the RL motion direction increased (Fig. 3, A and D and Fig. 4, A and B), and when a-tDCS was on the right MT+, the magnitude of the FLE in the LR motion direction increased (Fig. 5, A and D and Fig. 6, A and B). One directional explanation for this result is that a-tDCS might increase the cortical excitability in MT+(32, 33, 36), which might shift the perceptual localization of the moving bar toward the side of the brain stimulated when a flash appears. As it affected the PSE but not the JND (slope, the speed discrimination threshold), a-tDCS did not affect the subjects' speed discrimination ability but more likely introduced a perceptual decision bias in conditions of high uncertainty (e.g., a flash physically aligned with the moving bar), which may occur in MT+ fundamentally computing motion processing (33, 50). Furthermore the total activity of a subpopulation of MT+ neurons that tuned to the target direction proportionally scales the perceived speed (51, 52), thus atDCS on unilateral MT+ possibly causes an increase in the perceived speed of the moving bar toward the side stimulated (53), which enhances the magnitude of the FLE that is proportional to the perceived speed of the moving bar (4, 16). Alternatively, a-tDCS on unilateral MT+ might impose topdown feedback to the primary visual cortex (V1) coding position processing (54, 55), which indirectly influences the "perceived position" of the moving bar (not its perceived speed) toward the side stimulated.

We also found that when c-tDCS was on the left MT+, the magnitude of the FLE in the RL motion direction decreased (Fig. 3, *B* and *D* and Fig. 4, *C* and *D*), and when c-tDCS was on the right MT+, the magnitude of the FLE in the LR motion

direction decreased (Fig. 5, *B* and *D* and Fig. 6, *C* and *D*). A similar explanation for this result is that the cathodal stimulation might decrease the cortical excitability in MT+ (32, 33, 35), which might shift the perceptual localization of the moving bar away from the side of the brain stimulated when a flash appears. Since c-tDCS also affected the PSE but not the JND, it may also introduce a perceptual decision bias in MT+ (50). Furthermore, c-tDCS on unilateral MT+ possibly decreased the total activity of a subpopulation of MT+ neurons (tuned to target direction), thereby leading to a decrease in the perceived speed of the moving bar toward the side stimulated, which reduces the magnitude of the FLE. Alternatively, c-tDCS on unilateral MT+ might impose top-down feedback to V1, which indirectly influences the "perceived position" of the moving bar away from the side stimulated.

Although our results clearly showed that the current stimulation of MT+ modulates the magnitude of the FLE, the identification of the mechanisms through which tDCS affects visual motion perception still re uires further discussion. Indeed, tDCS can enhance and decrease cortical excitability in MT+ (30, 33, 35, 38). Interestingly, the modulation mechanisms of tDCS on motion perception may be different as visual motion task changes (33, 37). In our study, although the moving bar is easy to detect, atDCS, by increasing the probability of the firing rate, may activate more neurons tuned to the moving bar (56, 57). In particular, even those that originally do not reach the activation in the absence of stimulation may excite as a result of a-tDCS. Hence, a-tDCS might result in temporarily more neurons being activated to represent the moving bar, thereby overestimating the perceived speed of the moving bar than that in no stimulation (53, 58).

Conversely, c-tDCS may depress those neurons tuning to the moving bar and attenuate the moving bar representation, thereby underestimating the perceived speed of the moving bar (52, 58e1-366.7(b34.9(n)6369.7(22.7(5V)-1.617(2224.2(g)-26 decision processing in the FLE, which indicates that early visual signals evoked by the moving bar are necessary for or correlated with the later decision processing (63). Although motion extrapolation or postdiction account did not separately interpret the current results, the modulation effect of tDCS on the FLE suggests that the later decision processing in MT+ likely imposes the top-down feedback to V1, affecting the perceived position of the moving bar. The agreement reconciles with one statement that the primary visual regions contralateral to the poststimulus movement are critical for the FLE (64). Therefore, the present findings suggest that tDCS might modulate the postflash decision processing in the FLE.

The FLE points out the significant difficulties that the visual system has while trying to correctly pinpoint the physical locations of moving objects. But the visual system attempts to correct the positional error by some neural mechanisms, which made psychophysical outcomes on the FLE multifaceted and complicated. Therefore, the modulation effects of tDCS over MT+ on the FLE re uire further verification in various flash-lag paradigms. In addition, we have to consider that modulation of the excitability in MT+ owing to tDCS is unlikely to only affect neuronal function in that targeted brain regions (36). Since the MT+-CZ montage with large disk electrodes allows for ample current spread, it cannot be completely ruled out a possibility that other motion-sensitive areas (such as region V3A/V3), were also activated (35), which possibly modulates the FLE.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

Supplemental Material: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare. 19187522.v1.

GRANTS

This work was supported by grants from Natural Science Foundation of China (T2192932, 62061136001), and the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (2021ZD0202601).

DISCLOSURES

No conflicts of interest, fi

- Thompson B, Deblieck C, Wu A, lacoboni M, Liu Z. Brain stimulation psychophysical and rTMS evidence for the presence of motion opponency in human V5. *Brain Stimul* 9: 876–881, 2016. doi:10.1016/ j.brs.2016.05.012.
- Zinchenko A, Brunner S, Chen L, Shi Z, Paul C, Taylor J, Müller HJ. V5/MT + modulates spatio-temporal integration differently across and within hemifields: causal evidence from TMS. *Neuropsychologia* 161: 107995, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2021.107995.
- 26. **Thakral PP, Slotnick SD.** Disruption of MT impairs motion processing. *Neurosci Lett* 490: 226–230, 2011. doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2010.12.057.
- Akin B, Ozdem C, Eroglu S, Keskin DT, Fang F, Doerschner K, Kersten D, Boyaci H. Attention modulates neuronal correlates of interhemispheric integration and global motion perception. *J Vis* 14: 30, 2014. doi:10.1167/14.12.30.
- Amano K, Wandell BA, Dumoulin SO. Visual field maps, population receptive field sizes, and visual field coverage in the human MT+ complex. *J Neurophysiol* 102: 2704–2718, 2009. doi:10.1152/jn.00102.2009.
- Huk AC, Dougherty RF, Heeger DJ. Retinotopy and functional subdivision of human areas MT and MST. J Neurosci 22: 7195–7205, 2002. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.22-16-07195.2002.
- McGraw PV, Walsh V, Barrett BT. Motion-sensitive neurones in V5/ MT modulate perceived spatial position. *Curr Biol* 14: 1090–1093, 2004. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2004.06.028.
- Whitney D, Ellison A, Rice NJ, Arnold D, Goodale M, Walsh V, Milner D. Visually guided reaching depends on motion area MT+. *Cereb Cortex* 17: 2644–2649, 2007. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhl172.
- Antal A, Nitsche MA, Paulus W. Transcranial direct current stimulation and the visual cortex. *Brain Res Bull* 68: 459–463, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.brainresbull.2005.10.006.
- Battaglini L, Noventa S, Casco C. Anodal and cathodal electrical stimulation over V5 improves motion perception by signal enhancement and noise reduction. *Brain Stimul* 10: 773–779, 2017. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2017.04.128.
- Bestmann S, de Berker AO, Bonaiuto J. Understanding the behavioural consequences of noninvasive brain stimulation. *Trends Cogn Sci* 19: 13–20, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2014.10.003.
- Antal A, Nitsche MA, Kruse W, Kincses TZ, Hoffmann KP, Paulus W. Direct current stimulation over V5 enhances visuomotor coordination by improving motion perception in humans. *J Cogn Neurosci* 16: 521–527, 2004. doi:10.1162/089892904323057263.
- Antal A, Nitsche MA, Kincses TZ, Kruse W, Hoffmann KP, Paulus W. Facilitation of visuo-motor learning by transcranial direct current stimulation of the motor and extrastriate visual areas in humans. *Eur J Neurosci* 19: 2888–2892, 2004. doi:10.1111/j.1460-9568.2004.03367.x.
- Miniussi C, Harris JA, Ruzzoli M. Modelling non-invasive brain stimulation in cognitive neuroscience. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 37: 1702–1712, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.06.014.
- Antal A, Varga ET, Nitsche MA, Chadaide Z, Paulus W, Kovács G, Vidnyánszky Z. Direct current stimulation over MT+/V5 modulates motion aftereffect in humans. *Neuroreport* 15: 2491–2494, 2004. doi:10.1097/00001756-200411150-00012.
- 39. **Pelli DG.** The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: transforming numbers into movies. *Spat Vis* 10: 437–442, 1997.
- 40. **Brainard DH.** The psychophysics toolbox. *Spat Vis* 10: 433–436, 1997. doi:10.1163/156856897X00357.
- Huang Y, Datta A, Bikson M, Parra LC. ROAST: an open-source, fully-automated, realistic volumetric-approach-based simulator for TES. Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc 2018: 3072–3075, 2018. doi:10.1109/EMBC.2018.8513086.[30441043]
- Huang Y, Datta A, Bikson M, Parra LC. Realistic volumetricapproach to simulate transcranial electric stimulation—ROAST—a fully automated open-source pipeline. *J Neural Eng* 16: 056006, 2019. doi:10.1088/1741-2552/ab208d.
- Liu Y, Yang J, Yu Y, Yu Y, Wang W, Li H, Takahashi S, Ejima Y, Wu Q, Wu J. A new method for haptic shape discriminability detection. *Appl Sci* 11: 1–19, 2021. doi:10.3390/app11157049.

- Wang W, Yang J, Yu Y, Wu Q, Yu J, Takahashi S, Ejima Y, Wu J. Tactile angle discriminability improvement: Roles of training time intervals and different types of training tasks. *J Neurophysiol* 122: 1918–1927, 2019. doi:10.1152/jn.00161.2019.
- Wang W, Yang J, Yu Y, Li H, Liu Y, Yu Y, Yu J, Tang X, Yang J, Takahashi S, Ejima Y, Wu J. Tactile angle discriminability improvement: contributions of working memory training and continuous attended sensory input. J Neurophysiol 127: 1398–1406, 2022. doi:10.1152/jn.00529.2021.
- Wang W, Yang J, Yu Y, Wu Q, Takahashi S, Ejima Y, Wu J. Tactile semiautomatic passive-finger angle stimulator (TSPAS). J Vis Exp 161: e61218, 2020. doi:10.3791/61218.
- Bao H-W-S. bruceR: broadly useful convenient and efficient R functions (Online). https://cran.r-project.org/package=bruceR [2022 Jul 3].
- Jain A, Nandakumar K, Ross A. Score normalization in multimodal biometric systems. *Pattern Recognit* 38: 2270–2285, 2005. doi:10.1016/ j.patcog.2005.01.012.
- Nieuwenhuis S, Forstmann BU, Wagenmakers EJ. Erroneous analyses of interactions in neuroscience: a problem of significance. *Nat Neurosci* 14: 1105–1107, 2011. doi:10.1038/nn.2886.
- Battaglini L. Effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on a target moving in front of a static or random dynamic visual noise. *Perception* 49: 882–892, 2020. doi:10.1177/0301006620940222.
- Krekelberg B, Wezel RV, Albright TD. Interactions between speed and contrast tuning in the middle temporal area: implications for the neural code for speed. J Neurosci 26: 8988–8998, 2006. doi:10.1523/ JNEUROSCI.1983-06.2006.
- McKeefry DJ, Burton MP, Vakrou C, Barrett BT, Morland AB. Induced deficits in speed perception by transcranial magnetic stimulation of human cortical areas V5/MT+ and V3A. J Neurosci 28: 6848–6857, 2008. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1287-08.2008.
- Komatsu H, Wurtz RH. Modulation of pursuit eye movements by stimulation of cortical areas MT and MST. *J Neurophysiol* 62: 31–47, 1989. doi:10.1152/jn.1989.62.1.31.
- Saenz M, Fine I. Topographic organization of V1 projections through the corpus callosum in humans. *NeuroImage* 52: 1224–1229, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.05.060.
- Laycock R, Crewther DP, Fitzgerald PB, Crewther SG. Evidence for fast signals and later processing in human V1/V2 and V5/MT+: a TMS study of motion perception. J Neurophysiol 98: 1253–1262, 2007. doi:10.1152/jn.00416.2007.
- Jazayeri M, Movshon JA. Integration of sensory evidence in motion discrimination. J Vis 7: 7.1–7.7, 2007. doi:10.1167/7.12.7.
- Hol K, Treue S. Different populations of neurons contribute to the detection and discrimination of visual motion. *Vision Res* 41: 685– 689, 2001. doi:10.1016/S0042-6989(00)00314-X.
- Boyraz P, Treue S. Misperceptions of speed are accounted for by the responses of neurons in macaque cortical area MT. J Neurophysiol 105: 1199–1211, 2011. doi:10.1152/jn.00213.2010.
- Maus GW, Fischer J, Whitney D. Motion-dependent representation of space in area MT+. *Neuron* 78: 554–562, 2013. doi:10.1016/j. neuron.2013.03.010.
- Fu YX, Shen Y, Gao H, Dan Y. Asymmetry in visual cortical circuits underlying motion-induced perceptual mislocalization. J Neurosci 24: 2165–2171, 2004. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5145-03.2004.
- Schellekens W, van Wezel RJA, Petridou N, Ramsey NF, Raemaekers M. Predictive coding for motion stimuli in human early visual cortex. *Brain Struct Funct* 221: 879–890, 2016. doi:10.1007/ s00429-014-0942-2.
- Hogendoorn H, Burkitt AN. Predictive coding of visual object position ahead of moving objects revealed by time-resolved EEG decoding. *NeuroImage* 171: 55–61, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.12.063.
- Sergent C. The offline stream of conscious representations. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci* 373, 2018. doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0349.
- Keil J, Senkowski D, Moran JK. Early and late evoked brain responses differentially reflect feature encoding and perception in the flash-lag illusion. *NeuroImage* 246: 118787, 2022. doi:10.1016/j. neuroimage.2021.118787.