



Heriot-Watt University
Research Gateway

Affordances after spinal cord injury

Citation for published version:

Sedda, A, Ambrosini, E, Dirupo, G, Tonin, D, Valsecchi, L, Redaelli, T, Spinelli, M, Costantini, M & Bottini, G 2019, 'Affordances after spinal cord injury', *Journal of Neuropsychology*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 354-369.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jnp.12151>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1111/jnp.12151](https://doi.org/10.1111/jnp.12151)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Heriot-Watt Research Portal](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Journal of Neuropsychology

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the accepted version of the article which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/jnp.12151>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Wiley Self-Archiving Policy. © 2018 The British Psychological Society

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Heriot-Watt Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

Heriot-Watt University has made every reasonable effort to ensure that the content in Heriot-Watt Research Portal complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact open.access@hw.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Affordances after spinal cord injury

Sedda A ^{a*}, Ambrosini E ^{b*}, Dirupo G ^c, Tonin D ^d, Valsecchi L ^e, Redaelli T ^e, Spinelli M. ^e, Costantini M ^f, Bottini G ^{g,h,e}

* These Authors equally contributed to the manuscript

^a Psychology - School of Social Sciences – Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh, UK

^b Department of Neuroscience, University of Padua, Padua, Italy

^c Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences (FAPSE), University of Geneva, Switzerland

^d School of Psychology, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

^e Unipolar Spinal Unit, ASST Grande Ospedale Metropolitano Niguarda, Milan, Italy

^f Centre for Brain Science, Department of Psychology, University of Essex, UK

^g Cognitive Neuropsychology Centre, ASST Grande Ospedale Metropolitano Niguarda, Milan, Italy

^h Department of Brain and Behavioral Sciences, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy

^e NeuroMi, Milan Center for Neuroscience, Milano, Italy


Corresponding author:


Anna Sedda, PhD


Psychology - School of Social Sciences – Heriot Watt University

Edinburgh UK

Email to: a.sedda@hw.ac.uk







Running title: Affordances after spinal cord injury

Affordances after spinal cord injury

Keywords: spinal cord injuries, paraplegia, affordances, action perception

Running Title: Affordances after spinal cord injury

Abstract

Spinal Cord Injury can cause cognitive impairments even when no cerebral lesion is appreciable. As patients are forced to explore the environment in a non-canonical position (i.e. seated on a wheelchair), a modified relation with space can explain motor-related cognitive differences compared to non-injured individuals. Peripersonal space is encoded in motor terms, that is, in relation to the representation of action abilities, and is strictly related to the affordance of reachability. In turn, affordances, the action possibilities suggested by relevant properties of the environment, are related to the perceiver's peripersonal space and motor abilities. One might suppose that these motor-related cognitive abilities are compromised when an individual loses the ability to move. We shed light on this issue in 10 patients with paraplegia and 20 matched controls. All have been administered an affordances-related reachability judgment task adapted from Costantini et al. 2011 and neuropsychological tests. Our findings demonstrate that patients and controls show the same level of accuracy in estimating the location of their peripersonal space boundaries, but only controls show the typical overestimation of reaching range. Secondly, patients show a higher variability in their judgments than controls. Importantly, this finding is related to the patients' ability to perform everyday tasks. Finally, patients are not faster in making their judgments on reachability in peripersonal space, while controls are. Our results suggest that not moving freely or as usual in the environment impact decoding of action related properties even when the upper limbs are not compromised.

Keywords: affordances; spinal cord injuries; peripersonal space; action perception;

Introduction

Spinal Cord Injury (SCI) is a neurological condition that causes motor and/or sensory impairments (McDonald & Sadowsky, 2002). Depending on the lesion level, impairments can be limited to the inferior sector (*paraplegia*) or involve the entire body starting from the cervical vertebrae (*quadriplegia*) (McDonald & Sadowsky, 2002). The most common etiology of non-congenital SCI comprises traumatic events, such as car accidents, with a reported incidence between 236 and 4187 cases per million (Lee, Cripps, Fitzharris, & Wing, 2014).

Growing evidence is showing that patients with traumatic SCI can manifest cognitive consequences of the lesion even when no lesion to the brain is appreciable (Davidoff, Roth, & Richards, 1992). For instance, SCI patients use a different, non-motor, strategy to imagine body rotations than non-injured individuals, regardless of the spinal lesion level (Fiori et al., 2013). Further, they perceive an elongation in their body representation, again independent from the lesion level (Fuentes, Pazzaglia, Longo, Scivoletto, & Haggard, 2013). This body representation disorder might be related to the distorted interaction between the patient and the environment because they are forcedly sitting on the wheel chair. Moreover, they are no longer able to switch from sitting and standing, continuously updating and adapting their spatial coordinates to the environment.

Importantly, motor-related cognitive skills also include the interaction with objects involving motor acts. The concept of “affordances” has been introduced to describe the properties of the environment that furnish the viewer with opportunities to perform actions such as walking (Gibson, 1979), reaching and grasping (Tucker and Ellis, 1998). In other words, a cup is not only a cup, but also an object that one can reach and grasp. For instance, it has been shown that the vision of objects with relevant congruent motor features, such as a handle in a graspable position, can prime compatible actions (Tucker & Ellis, 2004) and facilitate processing of relevant affordance-related semantic features of the objects, such as the verbs denoting their function (Costantini, Ambrosini, Scorolli, & Borghi, 2011). Importantly, the perception of affordances

depends on the perceiver's motor abilities and the state of his/her body. Indeed, it has been shown that postural restraints and different types of locomotion that interferes with participants' motor abilities may affect the accuracy of concurrent affordance-related judgments (Yasuda, Wagman & Higuchi, 2014; Yu & Stoffregen, 2012; Yu, Bardy, & Stoffregen, 2011). Similarly, performing a simultaneous interfering motor task while naming pictures of a tool disrupts the affordance-related facilitation of the processing of relevant semantic features of the tool itself and interferes with its identification (Witt, Kemmerer, Linkenauger, & Culham, 2010).

Relevant to the concept of affordances is the notion of peripersonal space. Firstly identified in monkey and recently explored also in humans, peripersonal space can be functionally described as the space surrounding our bodies, in which we can easily reach objects and act upon them (Brozzoli, Makin, Cardinali, Holmes, & Farnè, 2012). Peripersonal space is opposed to extrapersonal space, which extends beyond it and in which we cannot act directly upon objects without moving towards them or using apted tools to reach them. Peripersonal and extrapersonal areas are differently represented in the brain and refer to diverse frames of reference to encode sensory inputs (Di Pellegrino & Ladavas, 2015). Peripersonal space is encoded in motor terms, that is, in relation to the representation of our body and actions, and is thus strictly related to the affordance of reachability (Delevoye-Turrell, Bartolo, & Coello, 2010). It is interesting to note that, when using appropriate tools, space is flexible as far space can easily be remapped in near peripersonal space (Berti & Frassinetti, 2000). Congruently, recent experiments provide evidence that affordances are effective if the object is in the peripersonal space and if the subject can actually move his limb towards the target. This demonstrates that affordances are modulated by the appropriateness of the physical features of the object, its adequate location in space, and the objective possibility of the viewer to act on it (Ambrosini, Scorolli, Borghi, & Costantini, 2012; Cardellicchio, Sinigaglia, & Costantini, 2011; Costantini, Ambrosini, Tieri, Sinigaglia, & Committeri, 2010; Ferri, Riggio, Gallese, & Costantini, 2011).

In summary, affordances depend on both spatial perception and motor abilities. One might hypothesize that SCI can cause an impairment of patients' affordance perception and a consequent pervasive perturbation

of their spatial coordinates due to the abrupt motor limitation that globally alters their perception and exploration of the environment. Even in case of paraplegia that preserves arms movements, the canonical exploration of space is prevented by the limited movements of the trunk and by the wheelchair that also prevents to approach objects in a natural fashion. As moving in the environment represents such a crucial component of human adaptation (Yasuda, Wagman & Higuchi, 2014; Yu & Stoffregen, 2012; Yu, Bardy, & Stoffregen, 2011) one might hypothesize that SCI causes quite rapidly a different spatial representation in patients with this clinical condition compared to normal subjects, inducing an impairment of the cognitive components involved in affordances and more in general in moving in space.

In this study, we explored this issue, whether individuals with lesions to the spinal cord, causing paraplegia, show a different representation of peripersonal space and a different perception of objects located in it. This might happen due to their different exploration of the environment, related to their inability to walk and engage in reaching movements using the whole body but not to their ability to move their hands. If our hypothesis is true, one would expect that individuals who do not explore the space in a canonical way, even when the ability to move the hands is retained, would not show particular effects associated to peripersonal space and thus to reachability affordances. On the contrary, if such effects were spared, individuals with spinal cord injuries would still be able to “map” peripersonal space as controls do, suggesting that the change in environment exploration does not affect all motor-related cognitive skills. We also took into account cognitive abilities and clinical features of patients, as they might affect these individuals’ motor-related skills.

Materials and methods

Participants

Ten patients with paraplegia have been enrolled in this study. Patients were referred from clinicians at the [location removed for peer review purposes]. All participants were right-handed and had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Detailed information about demographic features and neuropsychological screening of all

participants are shown in Table 1. All patients presented with a lesion of traumatic etiology (onset between 6 and 12 months) and restricted to the dorsal level of the spinal cord (clinical data are reported in Table 2). Exclusion criteria were severe cognitive impairments (basing on cognitive screening), central nervous system pathologies, abuse of alcohol or drugs, and comorbidity with psychiatric pathologies. In addition, 20 normally sighted gender- and age-matched, control participants were recruited from the pool of students of the [location removed for peer review purposes] to take part in the experiment as controls.

The study has been conducted in accordance with the ethical standards of the Declaration of Helsinki, and informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to the experiment. The research protocol and the informed consent form have been approved by the Ethics Committee of [location removed for peer review purposes].

[Table 1]

[Table 2]

Task and procedure

All participants have been administered a neuropsychological screening including the Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE) (Measso et al., 1993), the Phonemic and Semantic Fluency tests (Novelli et al., 1986), the Attentional Matrices (Spinnler e Tognoni, 1987) and the Frontal Assessment Battery (FAB) (Apollonio et al., 2005). Furthermore, all patients have been administered with the Spinal Cord Independence Measure scale (SCIM) (Catz, Itzkovich, Agranov, Ring, & Tamir, 1997) and the American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale (ASIA) (American Spinal Injury Association, 2008) (see Table 2 for scores for each patient). The SCIM measures the ability of patients to perform basic daily living activities independently. The score can go from 0 to 100: the higher the score, the higher the level of independence of the patient. The ASIA allows to determine the severity of the neurological injury, in other words if some sensory and motor functions are preserved. Its score ranges from A (no motor nor sensory function preserved) to E (normal sensation and

motor function). For instance, a lesion level of D5 with an ASIA score of A means that below the fifth dorsal vertebra of the spinal cord, including the sacral area, there is no spared sensory or motor function. On the other hand, a lesion level of D5 with an ASIA score of C would mean that some motor functions are preserved below the level of injury.

Prior to the experiment, we measured the actual reaching range for each participant. This space has been defined as the longest distance at which the participant could place a cup on a table in front of him/her. More in detail, participants, seated at a distance of 25 cm from the table, were asked to place as far as possible a cup handled with their dominant hand for three times. The last cup placement has been taken as final measure, to control for muscles stretching. The distance between the participant's torso and the cup has been measured with a paper measuring tape to the nearest half centimeter. The participants' actual reaching range was collected in order to scale their perceived reaching range, that is, the boundary of their peripersonal space (see Data Analyses section).

To assess the participants' representation of their peripersonal space, we adopted a modified version of the paradigm developed by Costantini et al., 2011. In each trial, participants viewed a 3D colored image (1024×768 pixels, corresponding to approximately 24.3×18.7 degrees of visual angle) of a cup placed on a table in a room, with the handle oriented to the right hand-side. The cup was placed at different viewing distances (12 viewing distances, from 40 to 84 cm, with increments of 4 cm) from the participant in a randomized order. The size of the cup in the image ranged accordingly from 100×123 to 57×65 pixels, corresponding to approximately 2.5×3.1 and 1.4×1.6 degrees of visual angle, respectively). Participants were instructed to judge whether they could reach or not the cup and to press the corresponding "yes" or "no" key on the keyboard. Hand of response was randomized across participants. A blank frame lasting 2000 ms interleaved each trial (inter-trial interval, ITI). The maximum time allowed to respond was set at 3500 ms (Fig. 1). The task was composed by 144 trials (i.e., 12 repetitions for each of the twelve viewing distances). Finally, after the experiment, participants were asked to verbally report at how many distances they thought the cup was placed. No range was given for the answer. This was done to verify that participants were not

Running title: Affordances after spinal cord injury

aware of the number of distinct viewing distances where the cup was placed, which could have allowed them to use an explicit strategy to provide the reachability judgments. No participant correctly guessed the number of distances used. Previous evidence using the same task (e.g., Costantini, Ambrosini, Sinigaglia, & Gallese, 2011) showed a high accuracy in the participants' explicit judgments of the metric distance at which the virtual objects were presented (see Ambrosini et al., 2012).

Stimuli have been presented on a laptop (16.3 inches screen). The computer was positioned at approximately 60 cm from the patient eyes. Answer buttons were letter "a" and "l" of the computer keyboard (European keyboard: these letters are placed at the extremity of the keyboard space). Screen luminosity was kept at maximum level for all participants. OpenSesame (Mathôt, Schreij, & Theeuwes, 2012) has been used to present the images and to collect accuracy and response time.

The neuropsychological screening and the experimental task have been administered in two different days of two consecutive weeks. Patients performed the experiment at the [location removed for peer review purposes] where they were hospitalized while the students were tested at [location removed for peer review purposes].

[Figure 1]

Data analyses

Demographic and neuropsychological measures of patients and controls have been compared by means of a two-tailed Fisher's exact test (gender) and two-tailed independent Student's t tests (age, education, and neuropsychological variables). Homogeneity of variances was tested by the F test and, in case of heterogeneity, Welch's t test was used.

Regarding the reachability judgments, for each participant the boundary of the peripersonal space was estimated by fitting the dichotomic responses for the 12 distances with a psychometric function using a logistic regression model: $y = 1/[1 + e^{-(\alpha + \beta x)}]$, where y is the proportion of participant's "no" responses and x is the

cup distance. The estimated parameters from the logistic model were used to determine the point of subjective equality (PSE, calculated as $-\alpha/\beta$), which indicates the estimated location of the boundary of the participant's peripersonal space and reflects the accuracy of the reachability judgment, and the so-called just-noticeable difference (JND, calculated as $1/\beta \times \log(.75/.25)$), which reflects the precision of the reachability judgment, that is, how neat or blurred is the transition between the participants' peri- and extra-personal spaces. Since that the actual reaching range (and therefore also the PSE) varied between participants, each participant's PSE was scaled by expressing it as the percentage deviation from his/her actual reaching range, with positive values indicating an overestimation. For statistical investigations, the scaled PSEs and JNDs were compared between patients and controls by carrying out two-tailed independent t tests. Moreover, since the patient and ~~the~~ control groups were significantly different in terms of education years and phonemic fluency (see Results and Table 1), and given that it was not possible to perfectly match them for the remaining demographic and neuropsychological confounding variables (Table 1), we carried out a series of analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) to ~~examine the~~ confirm our results of prime interest, that is, the between-group effects, while ruling out possible confounding effects of demographic and neuropsychological variables in modulating item ~~group differences~~.

We also assessed whether the variability in the patients' performance at the reachability judgment task was related to their clinical condition. We performed a series of correlational analysis between the accuracy and precision of patients' reachability judgments (i.e., their PSE and JND values, respectively) and their SCIM and ASIA scores, as well as the number of days passed from the injury to the neuropsychological screening (the ASIA scores were recoded: A = 3, B = 2, C = 1). We first computed both standard Pearson's and Spearman's rank correlations. Moreover, to control for the possible biases due to the presence of outliers, we also computed Pearson's and Spearman's skipped correlations (Wilcox, 2004) by using the Robust Correlation toolbox (Pernet et al., 2013; see Ambrosini & Vallesi, 2016, for details of the analysis and a discussion of the advantages of this approach). We conducted null hypothesis statistical significance testing by using a non-parametric percentile bootstrap test (10000 resamples; two-sided 95%

confidence intervals ($B-CI_{95\%}$), corresponding to an alpha level of 0.05). The results of each correlational analysis were then Bonferroni-corrected for multiple comparisons ($n = 6$).

Finally, we analysed participants' response times (RTs). In this case, trials in which participants failed to respond (0.93%) were excluded from the analysis and raw RTs were log-transformed to improve normality. For each participant, the distances of presentation were re-coded as a function of that participant's perceived reaching range (i.e., his/her PSE). We thus obtained a variable coding for the PSE-scaled distance of presentation of the mug (Distance predictor), which was calculated as the difference between the 12 original distances and each participant's PSE, and a factor coding for the space of presentation of the mug in relation to each participants' PSE (Space factor: peripersonal vs. extrapersonal). Since the PSE-scaled distances were different across participants, we assessed the effects of the experimental manipulations on the RTs by using a linear mixed-effect model as implemented by the function *lmer* from the lme4 library (Bates et al. 2012) in R (version 2.15.2; R Core Team, 2012). We determined the simplest best (final) linear mixed-effect model to fit participants' RTs by using log-likelihood ratio test (for a detailed description of the procedure, see Montefinese et al. 2014; see also Ambrosini, Pezzulo and Costantini, 2015) according to standard procedures (e.g., Baayen et al. 2008; Quené and van den Bergh 2008). The final model included the fixed effects for all the independent variables of interest, that is, the Group factor (controls vs. SCI patients, coded as a [0,1] dummy variable), the Space factor (extrapersonal vs. peripersonal, coded as a [0,1] dummy variable; see above), the PSE-scaled Distance continuous predictor (see above), and the two- and three-way interactions between them. The statistical significance of these fixed effects was assessed by means of Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling (10000 samples) supported by the *pvals.fnc* function of the language R package (version 1.4; Baayen et al. 2008). We report the estimated coefficient (b), standard error (SE), and t values for each parameter included in the final model, as well as the p values (p_{MCMC}) and upper and lower highest posteriori density intervals ($HPD_{95\%}$) estimated on the basis of the posterior distribution of the corresponding parameters obtained through MCMC sampling.

Results

Demographic features

Patients and controls did not show significant differences concerning age and gender ($p = .227$ and $.640$, respectively, see Table 1). However, the analysis revealed that controls' had a significantly higher level of education as compared to SCI patients ($p < .001$, see Table 1).

Neuropsychological parameters

Scores at the neuropsychological tests have been corrected for age and education following normative values of each test (see Task and procedure section for individual references). Comparing corrected scores between patients and controls, we found no differences concerning the MMSE, the Semantic Fluency Test, the Attentional Matrices and the FAB (all $ps > .05$, see Table 1). However, a significant difference emerged between groups at the Phonemic Fluency Test ($p = .006$, see Table 1).

Number of reported distances and actual reaching range

Patients estimate on average 5.2 distances ($SD = 1.69$) presented in the experiment, controls 5.95 ($SD = 2.65$).

No significant differences emerged between groups in this estimates ($t_{28} = .81$, $p = .423$, $d = .326$).

The actual reaching range was significantly different between groups ($t_{28} = 2.22$, $p = .035$, $d = .891$) with patients having, on average, an actual reaching range of 59.7 ($SD = 7.24$) cm and controls of 54.1 ($SD = 6.08$) cm.

Accuracy of reachability judgments

An independent-samples two-tailed t test ~~The analysis~~ on the accuracy of the reachability judgments did not reveal any significant difference between groups concerning the scaled PSE ($t_{28} = 1.70$, $p = .100$, $d = .68$), although the same effect was only barely non-significant ($p = .0501$) when tested with a one-tailed t test.

Running title: Affordances after spinal cord injury

However, a two-tailed one-sample t test against 0 revealed that the controls significantly overestimated their reaching range ($M = 20.53\%$, $SD = 17.45\%$, $t_{19} = 5.26$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.18$), while the SCI patients did not show~~ed~~ any significant bias ($M = 8.83\%$, $SD = 16.18\%$, $t_9 = 1.73$, $p = .118$, $d = .55$)¹.

Precision of reachability judgments

The analysis on the precision of the reachability judgments revealed that SCI patients showed significantly higher JND values ($M = 4.01$ cm, $SD = 1.73$ cm) as compared to controls ($M = 2.79$ cm, $SD = 1.11$ cm, $t_{28} = 2.36$, $p = .025$, $d = .95$). In other words, SCI patients had a more blurred boundary between peripersonal and extrapersonal spaces as compared to controls. Figure 2 shows the psychometric functions aggregated across participants in the SCI (blue lines) and ~~the~~ control (red lines) groups.

[Figure 2]

The significant Group effect on JND values was confirmed ~~both by an the~~ ANCOVA including all the demographic and neuropsychological covariates ($F_{1,21} = 7.47$, $p = .012$, $\eta_p^2 = .26$). The significant Group effect on JND values was also confirmed ~~and~~ by all the subsequent follow-up ANCOVAs including the same covariates one at a time (all $F_{1,27} \geq 4.41$, all $ps \leq .045$, all $\eta_p^2 \geq .14$) except the ANCOVA-one including the FAB score, in which the Group effect was not significant ($F_{1,27} = 3.33$, $p = .079$, $\eta_p^2 = .11$) (see Supplementary Materials, Table 1 and 2).

¹ A sensitivity power analysis revealed that, for both groups, there was a sufficiently high power ($1 - \beta \geq .80$) to find a significant overestimation effect with a Cohen's d effect size of 1 that, albeit large, is comparable to those showed in various previous studies ($d = 1.29$, Ambrosini et al., 2012; $d = 1.36$, Costantini et al., 2011b; $d = .99$, Mark et al., 1997). Therefore, our non-significant finding for the patient group could not be attributed to an a-priori lack of power: had patients showed the same effect as controls, in terms of its magnitude, we definitely had the power to reveal its significance.

Correlational analyses

The results of the correlational analyses revealed a significant correlation between the patients' SCIM scores and their JND values (Pearson's $r = -.774$, $B-CI_{95\%} = -.934$ to $-.521$; $p = .0006$; Spearman's $\rho = -.787$, $B-CI_{95\%} = -.997$ to $-.236$; $p = .0061$; note that no bivariate outliers were detected, so the robust correlations were the same as the standard ones). Therefore, patients' with greater disability were those who gave reachability judgments with less precision (or with higher variability) and, thus, had a more blurred boundary between peripersonal and extrapersonal spaces.

The robust Pearson's correlation between the patients' SCIM scores and their actual reaching range was also significant ($r = -.552$, $B-CI_{95\%} = -.903$ to $-.096$; $p = .014$), but this result was not confirmed by both the robust Spearman's ($\rho = -.443$, $B-CI_{95\%} = -.897$ to $-.317$; $p = .10$) and the standard correlational analyses (Pearson's $r = -.295$, $B-CI_{95\%} = -.798$ to $-.274$; $p = .2938$; Spearman's $\rho = -.196$, $B-CI_{95\%} = -.789$ to $-.459$; $p = .55$), nor it survived the Bonferroni's correction for multiple comparisons; this result, thus, was likely biased by the distribution of the data and, therefore, it will be not discussed further. The other correlations were not significant at either the standard or the robust correlational analyses.

Response times

The results of the linear mixed-effects analysis on the log-transformed RTs are shown in Table 3. The analysis revealed the significance of all the main effects except that of the Group factor. Moreover, all the interactions were significant (Table 3). Of particular interest for our hypothesis is the significant three-way interaction ($b = -.005$, $p_{MCMC} = .043$). This effect showed that the linear decrease of the RTs as the distance of the mug presented in the peripersonal space decreased was more pronounced for the controls as compared to the SCI patients. In other words, the controls were faster than SCI patients in giving their reachability judgments only when the mug was presented in the peripersonal space, and this differential effect became stronger as the distance of the mug became closer to the participant (see Fig. 3).

[Table 3]

[Figure 3]

Discussion

The representation of peripersonal space and, in particular, the relationship between an observer’s representation of his/her body and action abilities and the environment is characterized by his/her ability to detect properties of objects relevant to actions and to internally represent them. As an example, through this skill one can observe a cup and immediately “implicitly know” if it graspable or not. This concept has been defined as “micro-affordances” (Tucker & Ellis, 2004; Lemaitre et al., 2015; Freeman et al., 2016; Faber et al., 2016). Approximately 25% of rehabilitated patients with spinal cord injuries do not become independent ambulators (Wirz et al., 2005). Even in absence of a structural brain damage, the interruption of the cortico-spinal tract can affect the transformation of contextual information into task-specific locomotion commands (Davidoff et al., 1992). As such, affordances play a relevant role in the case of SCI. However, virtually nothing is known about how much a lesion to the spinal cord can affect peripersonal space representation and affordance perception.

To shed light on this issue, we enrolled 10 patients with paraplegia and 20 matched controls exploring whether individuals with paraplegia estimate the extent of their peripersonal space prompted by a graspable object in the same way as non-injured individuals do. We used a task that allows measuring the accuracy and precision of affordances-related reachability judgments for images of graspable objects located in peripersonal or extrapersonal space (adapted from the paradigm developed by Costantini et al. 2011). We predicted that, even when the ability to move the hands is spared as in the case of paraplegia, individuals who are prevented

from exploring space in a canonical way would present a different profile, similarly to what has been found for body representation (Fiori et al., 2013; Fuentes et al., 2013).

Our results show three main findings. Firstly, despite ~~the~~ patients and non-injured individuals groups ~~did not showing~~ any significant difference concerning the level of accuracy in estimating the location of their peripersonal space boundaries², when considering them singly, only non-injured individuals show the typical overestimation of their reaching range, while patients do not. To date, a large number of studies have shown that we normally overestimate the reaching range of our arms –and, thus, the extent of our peripersonal space – that is, we generally tend to perceive that we can reach objects that are out of grasp (Ambrosini et al., 2012). In line with the idea that determining whether a visual object is reachable or not –or whether it falls within peripersonal space or not– is essentially a function of the observer's representations of his/her body and action abilities, two explanations have been proposed for the overestimation bias in perceived reachability. Both explanations are based on the observer's misconception of his/her own action abilities in performing the motor simulation involved in the reachability estimates. According to the whole body engagement hypothesis (Rochat & Wraga, 1997), such an overestimation would originate from our everyday sensori-motor experience of reaching, which naturally requires multiple skeletal degrees of freedom, whereas the reaching range is generally tested in situations that prevent natural body movements and require only one degree of freedom (i.e., the extension of the arm without any other movements such as trunk flexion or hip rotation). According to the postural stability hypothesis (Carello, Groszofsky, Reichel, Solomon, & Turvey, 1989), we would naturally tend to operate in a “risky” setting of our postural system, in which our reaching range is overestimated as long as the projected center of mass of our body is safely supported during the simulated

² The likely reason for the non-significance of the between-groups difference in scaled PSE values is that, despite the non-negligible effect size of this difference (indeed, controls showed a mean scaled PSE that was more than twice the one showed by SCI patients, with a medium-large standardized effect size of $d = .68$; see Results), the between-subjects analysis we performed was not sufficiently powered to detect its significance. It is important here to note that a Bayesian two-sample *t*-test showed that there was no evidence in favour of the null hypothesis of the equality of patients' and controls' scaled PSE values (Scaled-Information Bayes Factor in favour of the null = 0.722; Rouder et al., 2009). Future studies using a higher number of SCI patients are thus needed to verify the significance or non-significance of this effect.

movements. Despite to date neither hypotheses can account for the full pattern of results observed in the literature (Delevoye-Turrell, Bartolo, & Coello, 2010; Fischer, 2000), both accounts are in line with our finding of a lack of overestimation biases in SCI patients. Indeed, SCI patients cannot engage in natural reaching movements involving the same number of musculoskeletal degrees of freedom as non-injured individuals, nor they can operate in a “risky” postural setting and have to be more cautious about losing postural stability. This finding is in agreement with studies on healthy individuals using different types of locomotion, i.e. using a wheelchair, in which results show that postural changes indeed impact on affordances perception (Yasuda, Wagman & Higuchi, 2014; Yu & Stoffregen, 2012; Yu, Bardy, & Stoffregen, 2011).

Secondly, patients who took part in our study show a significantly higher variability in their reachability judgments (in other words, greater values of the just noticeable difference parameter) than non-injured individuals. Put it differently, they are less precise and have a blurred boundary between peripersonal and extrapersonal space. Importantly, this finding is independent from the demographic and neuropsychological features of patients, with the only relevant exception of the score at the FAB, and was modulated by patients’ ability to perform everyday activities such as feeding and self-care, as assessed by the SCIM scale. Patients’ with greater disability, in other words lower scores at the SCIM, were less precise in providing reachability judgments or, in other words, the boundary between their peripersonal and extrapersonal space was more blurred. Notably, this association is not seen for ASIA scores, suggesting that experience and performing activities rather than spared/impaired functions play a role for affordances perception. This result confirm our hypothesis that SCI patients have a different representation of peripersonal space: the modification of their motor abilities and, in particular, their everyday experience of the inability to naturally engage in reaching movements modified the way they represent and experience peripersonal space, causing a blurring of the reaching range.

Related to this idea, a recent study has highlighted the importance of motor abilities in shaping peripersonal space (Scandola et al., 2016). The authors investigate the perception of reachability in control participants and professional fencers, who, contrarily to untrained individuals and, especially, SCI patients,

are well-trained to exert their reaching-related motor abilities and to experience their reaching range. The results showed that fencers had a low variability in their reachability judgments and, thus, a very sharp boundary of their peripersonal space, especially when asked to simulate reaching movements using the fencing sword as compared to a similar hand-held object for which they did not have extended motor experience.

Finally, our data highlight that patients are not faster in making their judgments on reachability in peripersonal space, while non-injured individuals are. Research has shown that “yes” responses are usually faster than “no” responses. Such difference in RTs is thought to reflect the uncertainty about the presence of the target perceptual feature when it is actually absent. The same applies in reachability judgments. The closer the object, the lesser the uncertainty. Interestingly, our patients did not show such a difference, suggesting that they are not sure of what is reachable.

Taken together our results suggest that there is an impact of movement loss on affordances even when the upper limbs are not compromised. In other words, even though an individual is able to use his hands, the very fact of not being able to move and use their whole body to interact with the environment does impact his decoding of action-related space representation and objects’ properties.

Our findings are in line with previous results that suggest an altered mental representation of the world in SCI patients. Previous studies have demonstrated that this impairment affects the body image (Fuentes et al., 2013), especially in terms of an overestimation of the length of the torso and the inferior limbs, and the body schema (Fiori, et al., 2013), as shown by altered motor imagery abilities, i.e. the ability to imagine one’s body part from different visual angles. Interestingly this impairment does not depend on the lesion level. Our data further expand this knowledge suggesting that body and spatial representation is impacted by spinal lesions. In fact, patients show high variability and blurred boundaries for peripersonal space.

Our and previous findings can be explained in light of an altered motor simulation in patients, resulting from the absence of movement, in other words due to the loss of on line action experience. It is known that experience modulates affordances perception; in particular each person, based on his/her motor experience, can simulate actions, taking advantage of this process thanks not to perceptual salience but mostly because of

motor competences (Pezzulo, G., et al., 2010). However, past experience does not seem to be enough to retain these abilities. Our patients were able to move before the lesion, but lost this ability for several months. Apparently, the lack of continuous motor performance cancels the ability to make use of motor-related perceptual features. This significant impairment occurring already in the subacute phase of SCI suggests that body representation relies on the continuous sensory motor updating rather than on a specific motor memory. Recent studies have shown that using a wheelchair can modify the boundaries of peripersonal space even in non-lesioned subjects (Galli, G., et al.; 2015). Importantly, only when the use of a wheelchair is passive (i.e. somebody else is driving the wheelchair), the boundaries of peripersonal space seem to be enlarged (Galli, G., et al.; 2015). Thus, one could suppose that active use of wheelchair remaps peripersonal space even in SCI. However, our patients do not show an alteration in this direction. Possibly, a lesion that compromises sensory and motor afferences does slow the spatial remapping, even when a few months of training on a wheelchair are performed. Put it differently, motor simulation is efficient only if it is accompanied by a real motor act, and the use of a tool is not sufficient to rebalance the system. This finding is also in line with the concept of a body matrix (Moseley et al. 2012) integrating body and space. Future studies could explore in SCI patients directly the body matrix, to understand if also this component of body representation is compromised after a spinal lesion.

References

- Ambrosini, E., Costantini, M., & Sinigaglia, C. (2011). Grasping with the eyes. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 106(3), 1437–1442.
- Ambrosini, E., Scorolli, C., Borghi, A. M., & Costantini, M. (2012). Which body for embodied cognition? Affordance and language within actual and perceived reaching space. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 21(3), 1551–1557.
- Ambrosini, E., & Vallesi, A. (2016). Asymmetry in prefrontal resting-state EEG spectral power underlies individual differences in phasic and sustained cognitive control. *Neuroimage*, 124, 843–857.
- Ambrosini, E., & Vallesi, A. (2017). Domain-general Stroop Performance and Hemispheric Asymmetries: A Resting-state EEG Study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*.
- American Spinal Injury Association: International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord Injury, revised 2000; Atlanta, GA, Reprinted 2008
- Apollonio, I., Leone, M., Isella, V., Piamarta, F., Consoli, T., Villa, M. L., ... & Nichelli, P. (2005). The Frontal Assessment Battery (FAB): normative values in an Italian population sample. *Neurological Sciences*, 26(2), 108–116.
- Berti, a., & Frassinetti, F. (2000). When far becomes near: remapping of space by tool use. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 12(3), 415–420.
- Brozzoli, C., Makin, T., Cardinali, L., Holmes, N., & Farnè, A. (2012). Peripersonal Space: A Multisensory Interface for Body–Object Interactions. In *Neural Bases of Multisensory Processes*. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press.
- Cardellicchio, P., Sinigaglia, C., & Costantini, M. (2011). The space of affordances: A TMS study. *Neuropsychologia*, 49(5), 1369–1372.
- Catz, A., Itzkovich, M., Agranov, E., Ring, H., & Tamir, A. (1997). SCIM-spinal cord independence measure: a new disability scale for patients with spinal cord lesions. *Spinal cord*, 35(12), 850–856.
- Costantini, M., Ambrosini, E., Scorolli, C., & Borghi, A. M. (2011). When objects are close to me: affordances in the peripersonal space. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 18(2), 302–308.
- Costantini, M., Ambrosini, E., Sinigaglia, C., & Gallese, V. (2011). Tool-use observation makes far objects ready-to-hand. *Neuropsychologia*, 49(9), 2658–2663.
- Costantini, M., Ambrosini, E., Tieri, G., Sinigaglia, C., & Committeri, G. (2010). Where does an object trigger an action? An investigation about affordances in space. *Experimental Brain Research*, 207(1–2), 95–103.
- Davidoff, G., Roth, E., & Richards, J. (1992). Cognitive deficits in spinal cord injury: epidemiology and outcome. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*, 73(3), 275–84.

Running title: Affordances after spinal cord injury

- Faber, T. W., van Elk, M., & Jonas, K. J. (2016). Complementary hand responses occur in both peri- and extrapersonal space. *PloS one*, 11(4).
- Ferri, F., Riggio, L., Gallese, V., & Costantini, M. (2011). Objects and their nouns in peripersonal space. *Neuropsychologia*, 49(13), 3519–3524.
- Fiori, F., Sedda, A., Raffaella Ferr E, E., Toraldo, A., Querzola, M., Pasotti, F., ... Bottini, G. (2013). Motor imagery in spinal cord injury patients: Moving makes the difference. *Journal of Neuropsychology*.
- Freeman, S. M., Itthipuripat, S., & Aron, A. R. (2016). High Working Memory Load Increases Intracortical Inhibition in Primary Motor Cortex and Diminishes the Motor Affordance Effect. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 36(20),
- Fuentes, C. T., Pazzaglia, M., Longo, M. R., Scivoletto, G., & Haggard, P. (2013). Body image distortions following spinal cord injury. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery Psychiatry*, 84(2), 201–207.
- Galli, G., Noel, J. P., Canzoneri, E., Blanke, O., & Serino, A. (2015). The wheelchair as a full-body tool extending the peripersonal space. *Frontiers in psychology*, 6, 639.
- Lemaitre, G., Heller, L. M., Navolio, N., & Zúñiga-Peñaranda, N. (2015). Priming gestures with sounds. *PloS one*, 10(11).
- Lee, B. B., Cripps, R. a, Fitzharris, M., & Wing, P. C. (2014). The global map for traumatic spinal cord injury epidemiology: update 2011, global incidence rate. *Spinal Cord*, 52(2), 110–6.
- [Mark LS, Nemeth K, Gardner D, Dainoff MJ, Paasche J, Duffy M, Grandt K. \(1997 \) Postural dynamics and the preferred critical boundary for visually guided reaching. Journal of Experimental Psycholy Hum Percept Perform. Oct;23\(5\):1365-79.](#)
- Mathôt, S., Schreij, D., & Theeuwes, J. (2012). OpenSesame: An open-source, graphical experiment builder for the social sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*.
- Measso, G., Cavarzeran, F., Zappalà, G., Lebowitz, B. D., Crook, T. H., Pirozzolo, F. J., ... & Grigoletto, F. (1993). The mini - mental state examination: Normative study of an Italian random sample. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 9(2), 77-85.
- McDonald, J., & Sadowsky, C. (2002). Spinal-cord injury. *Lancet*, 359(9304), 417–25
- Moseley, G. L., Gallace, A., & Spence, C. (2012). Bodily illusions in health and disease: Physiological and clinical perspectives and the concept of a cortical 'body matrix'. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 36(1), 34–46.
- Novelli, G., Papagno, C., Capitani, E., & Laiacona, M. (1986). Tre test clinici di memoria verbale a lungo termine: taratura su soggetti normali. *Archivio di psicologia, neurologia e psichiatria*.
- Pernet, C. R., Wilcox, R. R., & Rousselet, G. A. (2013). Robust correlation analyses: false positive and power validation using a new open source Matlab toolbox. *Frontiers in psychology*, 3, 606.

Running title: Affordances after spinal cord injury

- Pezzulo, G., Barca, L., Bocconi, A. L., & Borghi, A. M. (2010). When affordances climb into your mind: advantages of motor simulation in a memory task performed by novice and expert rock climbers. *Brain and Cognition*, 73(1), 68-73.
- Rouder, J. N., Speckman, P. L., Sun, D., Morey, R. D., & Iverson, G. (2009). Bayesian t tests for accepting and rejecting the null hypothesis. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 16(2), 225-237.
- Scandola, M., Aglioti, S. M., Bonente, C., Avesani, R., & Moro, V. (2016). Spinal cord lesions shrink peripersonal space around the feet, passive mobilization of paraplegic limbs restores it. *Scientific reports*, 6
- Spinnler, H., & Tognoni, G. (1987). Italian Group on the Neuropsychological Study of Ageing: Italian standardization and classification of neuropsychological tests. *Ital J Neurol Sci*, 6(suppl 8), 1-120.
- Tucker, M., & Ellis, R. (1998). On the relations between seen objects and components of potential actions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human perception and performance*, 24(3), 830.
- Tucker, M., & Ellis, R. (2001). The potentiation of grasp types during visual object categorization. *Visual cognition*, 8(6), 769-800.
- Tucker, M., & Ellis, R. (2004). Action priming by briefly presented objects. *Acta Psychologica*, 116(2), 185-203.
- Warren, A. M., Pullins, J., & Elliott, T. R. (2008). Concomitant Cognitive Impairment in Persons with Spinal Cord Injuries in Rehabilitation Settings, (1992), 1-20.
- Wilcox, R. R. (2005). Inferences based on a skipped correlation coefficient. *Quality control and applied statistics*, 50(6), 681-682.
- Wirz, M., Zemon, D. H., Rupp, R., Scheel, A., Colombo, G., Dietz, V., & Hornby, T. G. (2005). Effectiveness of automated locomotor training in patients with chronic incomplete spinal cord injury: A multicenter trial. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 86(4), 672-680.
- Witt, J. K., Kemmerer, D., Linkenauger, S. a., & Culham, J. (2010). A functional role for motor simulation in identifying tools. *Psychological Science : A Journal of the American Psychological Society / APS*, 21(9)
- Yasuda, M., Wagman, J. B., & Higuchi, T. (2014). Can perception of aperture passability be improved immediately after practice in actual passage? Dissociation between walking and wheelchair use. *Experimental brain research*, 232(3), 753-764.
- Yu, Y., Bardy, B. G., & Stoffregen, T. A. (2010). Influences of head and torso movement before and during affordance perception. *Journal of motor behavior*, 43(1), 45-54.
- Yu, Y., & Stoffregen, T. A. (2012). Postural and locomotor contributions to affordance perception. *Journal of motor behavior*, 44(5), 305-311.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of demographic and neuropsychological variables for SCI patients and control participants.

Measure [mean (SD)]	SCI (n = 10)	Controls (n = 20)	t ₂₈	p
<i>Demographic features</i>				
Age (years)	42.4 (15.3)	35.0 (15.7)	1.236	.227
Education (years)	12.0 (2.1)	14.9 (1.8)	3.845	.001
Gender	1 male	4 males	–	.449 ^a
<i>Neuropsychological tests</i>				
MMSE	29.3 (1.2)	29.3 (1.3)	.047	.963
Phonemic Fluency	30.0 (12.0)	44.7 (13.1)	2.968	.006
Semantic Fluency	44.0 (9.4)	49.7 (13.9)	1.156	.257
Attentional Matrices	52.6 (4.8)	49.2 (5.3)	1.729	.095
FAB	15.6 (1.4)	16.4 (0.7)	1.563 ^b	.147 ^b

^a Fisher’s exact test.

^b Welch’s *t* test.

Neuropsychological values indicate age and education corrected scores (see main text for references to normative values).

Table 2. Clinical data of patients enrolled in the study.

Patient	Lesion level	SCIM	ASIA	Days since onset
SCI01	D5	22	A	196
SCI02	D9	32	A	361
SCI03	D10	21	A	147
SCI04	D7	33	B	222
SCI05	D8	20	C	95
SCI06	D3	28	C	288
SCI07	D4	15	C	187
SCI08	D10	17	C	244
SCI09	D4	15	C	430
SCI10	D5	22	A	200

Lesion level indicates the spinal level of the injury (D = dorsal). SCIM = Spinal Cord Independence Measure scale (score range for our sample: 15 – 33, indicating a low level of independence). ASIA = American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale (Range for our patients: A = no motor nor sensory function preserved; B = partial sensory but not motor function preserved; C = some sensory and motor function preserved, indicating none of the patients had completely preserved functions). Days since onset: days passed from the injury to the neuropsychological screening.

Table 3. Estimated parameters and statistics of linear mixed-effects modeling of RTs

Fixed effects	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>lowHPD</i> _{95%}	<i>upHPD</i> _{95%}	<i>p</i> _{MCMC}
(Intercept)	6.8682	.0450	152.74	6.7888	6.9489	.0001
Group _(SCI)	−.0495	.0779	−0.64	−.1857	.0860	.4662
Space _(PPS)	−.0490	.0221	−0.22	−.0908	−.0054	.0290
Distance	−.0177	.0012	−14.89	−.0201	−.0154	.0001
Group:Space	.1153	.0380	3.03	.0406	.1899	.0020
Group:Distance	.0049	.0020	2.43	.0007	.0087	.0172
Space:Distance	.0338	.0014	23.38	.0311	.0368	.0001
Group:Space:Distance	−.0050	.0025	−2.04	−.0100	−.0003	.0426

b = estimated coefficient for each parameter in the model; *SE* = standard error; *lowHPD*_{95%} and *upHPD*_{95%} = lower and upper bounds of the estimated 95% highest posteriori density intervals; *p*_{MCMC} = Markov Chain Monte Carlo *p* value.

Tables & Figures Caption

Table 1. Demographic and neuropsychological features of patients and controls. Age and education are presented as mean (SD) of years. Neuropsychological values indicate age and education corrected scores (see main text for references to normative values). MMSE = Mini Mental State Examination (cut off = 23,8); FAB= Frontal Assessment Battery.

Table 2. Clinical data of patients enrolled in the study. Lesion level indicates the spinal level of the injury (D = dorsal). SCIM = Spinal Cord Independence Measure scale (score range for our sample: 15 – 33, indicating a low level of independence). ASIA = American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale (Range for our patients: A = no motor nor sensory function preserved; B = partial sensory but not motor function preserved; C = some sensory and motor function preserved, indicating none of the patients had completely preserved functions). Days since onset: days passed from the injury to the neuropsychological screening.

Table 3. Estimated parameters and statistics of linear mixed-effects modeling of RTs.

Figure 1. Schematic presentation of the experimental trials timeline. An example of a peripersonal (40 cm) and extrapersonal (84 cm) hypothetical trial is presented, even though it must be noted that in the real experiment sequence of trials was randomized.

Figure 2. Psychometric functions describing reachability judgments as a function of the group. Psychometric functions are fitted to data averaged across participants in the SCI (blue solid line) and Controls groups (red solid line). The average judgment rate across participants in each group was calculated for each distance value, and logistic functions were fitted to the averaged rates. The distance value at which each curve crosses the 0.5 line is the PSE for each group, which is indicated by the blue and red dashed lines for the SCI

Running title: Affordances after spinal cord injury

and controls, respectively. The light blue and light red shaded regions indicate the extent of the corresponding $PSE \pm JND$ region (see “Data analysis” section).

Figure 3. Response times results.

The figure shows the log-transformed response times of SCI and controls participants (blue and red crosses, respectively) in all trials as a function of the PSE-scaled distance of presentation of the mug (abscissa; see “Data analysis” section for details). Negative and positive distance values indicate, respectively, participants’ peripersonal and extrapersonal spaces. For illustrative purpose, the solid lines show the corresponding locally-weighted linear fit (Lowess, $f = .75$; Cleveland, 1979) for SCI and controls RTs (blue and red line, respectively).