

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

When Your Arm Becomes Mine: Pathological Embodiment Of Alien Limbs Using Tools Modulates Own Body Representation

Francesca Garbarini^{1:2*}, Carlotta Fossataro¹, Anna Berti^{1:3}, Patrizia Gindri^{1:2}, Daniele Romano^{4:5},
Lorenzo Pia^{1:3}, **Francesco della Gatta⁶**, Angelo Maravita^{4:5}, Marco Neppi-Modona^{1:3}

1. SAMBA (SpAtial, Motor & Bodily Awareness) Research Group, Department of Psychology,
University of Torino, 10123 Torino, Italy

2. San Camillo Hospital of Torino, 10152 Torino, Italy

3. Neuroscience Institute of Torino (NIT), University of Torino, 10126 Torino, Italy

4. Department of Psychology, University of Milano–Bicocca, 20126 Milano, Italy

5. NeuroMi - Milan center for Neuroscience, University of Milano-Bicocca, 20126 Milano, Italy

6. Department of Philosophy, University of Milan, 20122 Milano, Italy

*Francesca Garbarini (Corresponding author)

Via Po 14, 10123 Turin (IT)

phone:+39 011 6703922; fax:+39 011 8159039

fra.garbarini@gmail.com; francesca.garbarini@unito.it

Special Issue on Sensorimotor and social aspects of peripersonal space

Abstract

1
2 Previous evidence has shown that active tool-use can reshape one's own body schema, extending
3
4 peripersonal space and modulating the representation of related body parts. Here we investigate the
5
6 effect of tool-use training on length representation of the contralesional forearm in brain-damaged
7
8 hemiplegic patients who manifested a pathological embodiment of other people body parts. Four
9
10 patients and 20 aged-matched healthy-controls were asked to estimate the mid-point of their
11
12 contralesional forearm before and after 15 min. of tool-use training (i.e. retrieving targets with a
13
14 garbage plier). In the case of patients, training was always performed by the examiner's (alien) arm
15
16 acting in two different positions, aligned (where the pathological embodiment occurs; E+ condition)
17
18 or misaligned (where the pathological embodiment does not occur; E- condition) relative to the
19
20 patients' shoulder. Healthy controls performed tool-use training either with their own arm (action
21
22 condition) or observing the examiner's arm performing the task (observation condition), handling
23
24 (observation with-tool condition) or not (observation without-tool condition) a similar tool.
25
26 Crucially, in the E+ condition, when patients were convinced to perform the tool-use training with
27
28 their own paralyzed arm, a significant overestimation effect was found (as in the Action condition
29
30 with normal subjects): patients mislocated their forearm midpoint more proximally to the hand in
31
32 the post- than in the pre-training phase. Conversely, in the E- condition, they did not show any
33
34 overestimation effect, similarly to healthy subjects in the observation condition (neither in the with-
35
36 tool nor in the without-tool condition significant overestimation effects were found). These findings
37
38 show the existence of a tight link between spatial, motor and bodily representations and provide
39
40 strong evidence that a pathological sense of body ownership can extend to intentional motor
41
42 processes and modulate the sensory map of action-related body parts.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Keywords:** Brain-damaged patients; Embodiment; Peripersonal space re-mapping ; Tool-use
59
60 training; Body metric representation; Action observation.
61
62
63
64
65

1. Introduction

When we interact with the world around us, spatial, motor and bodily representations contribute, in different ways, to the conscious experience of the self as an acting body. We can relate this normal bodily experience to the classical concept of “body schema”, firstly described by Head and Holmes (1911) as an unconscious, bottom-up, dynamic representation relying on proprioceptive information from the muscles, joints and skin. Considering the motor nature of body schema, a fundamental issue to be clarified is the nature of the relationship between body schema and motor and spatial cognition. Head and Holmes suggested that the nature of body schema is not only sensory-motor but also “action-oriented”, in the sense that the possibility of action execution, intrinsic to the body function, can modulate how we represent the spatial extension of our body with respect to the external world (Gallese & Sinigaglia, 2010). Action execution, in turn, takes place in an ‘action space’ which can be coded as ‘near’ or ‘far’ relative to the acting body.

Near (peripersonal) and far (extrapersonal) space are behaviorally defined as the space within and beyond hand reach, respectively (Berti et al., 2001). This definition is based upon both neurophysiological evidence in the monkey and behavioural, PET and TMS evidence in humans showing that near and far space representations in the brain are anatomo-functionally dissociated. In the monkey, near space seems to be represented in frontal area 6 and in the rostral part of the inferior parietal lobe, area 7b (Leinonen, Hyvarinen, Nymani, & Linnankoski, 1979) and area VIP (Colby, Duhamel, & Goldberg, 1993; Duhamel, Bremmer, BenHamed & Graf, 1997), whereas far space is apparently coded in area 8 and area LIP (Colby, Duhamel, & Goldberg, 1996). Behavioural (Berti and Frassinetti, 1996; Maravita, Spence, & Driver, 2003; Farné, Serino, & Ladavas, 2007), PET (Weiss et al., 2000) and TMS (Lane et al., 2013) studies in humans have confirmed this dissociation. Furthermore, recent findings indicate that near and far space representations are not to be considered as static concepts, but as dynamic entities: for example, active tool-use can reshape one’s own body schema, remapping near space to include the tool used to reach for objects located

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

in far space (Maravita & Iriki, 2004, for a review). In the monkey, it has been shown that the area of visual receptive fields (vRFs) of bimodal visuo-tactile parietal neurons (known to map the subject's peripersonal space) can be modified by actions performed with tools (Iriki et al., 1996; Ishibashi et al., 2000). Indeed, the vRFs anchored to the paw were shown to encompass the entire length of the tool used to reach food located in far space, as if the tool held by the animal's hand were incorporated into the body schema. A number of studies in humans – both in brain-damaged and in healthy participants - have shown similar changes following practice to reach far visual stimuli with a tool. It has been shown that reaching with a tool a far ipsilesional target may increase the saliency of that stimulus so as to increase extinction of a contralesional tactile stimulus in patients affected by crossmodal extinction (di Pellegrino, Ladavas, & Farnè 1997; see also Farnè & Ladavas, 2000; Farnè, Iriki, & Ladavas, 2005; Maravita, Husain, Clarke, & Driver, 2001). Several line-bisection studies on patients with selective neglect for near or for far space indicated that tool use can reduce or increase neglect according to the sector of space - within or outside reaching distance - where the lines are positioned (e.g., Ackroyd et al., 2002; Berti & Frassinetti, 2000; Neppi-Mòdona et al., 2007; Pegna et al., 2001). Interestingly, such a dynamical spatial remapping was modulated not only by visual and somatosensory feedbacks, but also by the modality of execution. For example, if the context required a pointing action (usually executed in far space), a far space representation was activated; if the context required a reaching action (usually executed in near space), near space was activated irrespective of the absolute spatial position of the object. Note that in this case the extension of body schema was modulated by the intentional action executed. In healthy subjects, it has been shown that the progressive increase in line bisection errors with increasing stimulus distance was abolished if participants used, instead of a laser pointer, a long stick to reach objects in far space (Longo & Lourenco, 2006). It has been also documented that tool-use may increase the impact of a visual distractor on tactile discrimination (Holmes, Calvert, & Spence 2004; Maravita, Spence, Kennett, & Driver, 2002). More importantly for the present study, a number of studies suggested that the modulatory effect of tool-use in space coding may be accompanied by a parallel

1 change in the representations of body metrics (e.g., Bonifazi et al., 2007; Farné et al., 2007;
2 Maravita & Driver, 2004). This hypothesis has been confirmed in a recent study (Sposito et al.,
3 2012) showing that, in healthy subjects, active tool-use modulates the representation of related body
4 parts; i.e. after tool-use training, participants showed an increased representation of the length of the
5 arm handling the tool. Taken together, these findings indicate the existence of a tight relationship
6 between body schema, action execution and space representation and that body schema is better
7 conceptualized as the neurocognitive result of implicit sensory monitoring for action in a dynamic
8 space. Although viewed as an unconscious representation, body schema is tightly linked to the
9 representation of both intentional processes and spatial coding, contributing in fundamental ways to
10 the emergence of the conscious experience of the self as an acting body in the space.
11

12 A normal interaction with the world implies the implicit notion that the body executing actions in
13 the space is mine (not yours, not others'), i.e. it implies a normal sense of body ownership. But what
14 happens when the sense of body ownership is dramatically altered as, for instance, after a brain
15 damage? In brain-damaged patients with motor and somatosensory impairments, body awareness
16 can be pathologically altered. In some cases, patients may feel a sense of strangeness towards their
17 contralesional limbs felt as separated from their own body. The more frequent manifestation of this
18 disorder is characterized by a sense of disownership, which is the delusional belief that the
19 contralesional limbs do not belong to one's own body but to another person (a disturbance called
20 somatoparaphrenia: Vallar & Ronchi, 2009; Gandola et al., 2011; Romano et al., 2014). The
21 possibility of the existence of an opposite behavior, i.e. patients who misidentify other people's
22 limbs as their own, has been rarely considered. However, in recent studies (Garbarini et al., 2013a;
23 Garbarini & Pia, 2013; Pia et al., 2013a; Garbarini et al., 2014), this behavior has been observed in
24 a sample of hemiplegic and/or hemianesthetic patients, who, while not explicitly denying that their
25 contralesional (left) limbs belonged to themselves (as in the somatoparaphrenic delusion of
26 disownership), claimed that the examiner's left hand was their own whenever it was positioned, in
27 egocentric coordinates, next to their left hand. This delusion of ownership, which we called
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

‘embodiment’, although resembling the “rubber-hand-illusion” (Botvinick & Cohen 1998), was spontaneous and not induced by any experimental procedure. Patients treated and cared for the experimenter’s left arm as if it was their own, showing a consistent embodiment of the alien hand in their own body schema (because of this behavior, we named them ‘E+’ patients). Interestingly, this phenomenon occurs only when the alien hand is located in a position coherent with the patients’ “body image” (another classical notion introduced by Head & Holmes, 1911). The body image is considered to be a conscious, top down, cognitive representation mostly used to make perceptual judgments. It is important to consider that in E+ patients the pathological embodiment occurs only when the alien arm is in egocentric coordinates and it is aligned with the patients’ contralesional shoulder, exactly where it is expected to be according to the body image. If the position of the alien arm is misaligned with respect to the patient’s shoulder, the pathological embodiment does not occur and patients correctly discriminate their own arm/hand from the alien arm/hand (see Methods section 2.2.2 for details of how the embodiment is evaluated). Previous studies stressed the crucial role of the alignment of the alien arm with the shoulder in determining embodiment phenomena during the rubber hand illusion. Pavani and colleagues (2000) have shown that the illusion effect disappears when the fake hand is misaligned with respect to the subject’s shoulder (see also Costantini and Haggard 2007, where stimulation and posture of both the real and the fake hand were manipulated, and Lloyd 2007, where the effect of proximity between the fake and the real hand was investigated). Accordingly, Farnè and co-workers (2000) described, in right-brain damaged patients, a left tactile extinction following visual stimulation of a right rubber hand. Interestingly, this cross-modal extinction was only evident when the rubber hand was aligned with the patients’ shoulder; on the contrary, when the rubber hand was misaligned with respect to the patients’ shoulder, cross-modal extinction was strongly reduced.

Critically for the present study, the pathological embodiment occurs not only with a static alien hand, but also with a moving hand: when the examiner moved his/her left hand, patients, to their surprise, claimed that they were moving their own (paralyzed) hand. Previous studies demonstrated

1 that this phenomenon is not a mere verbal confabulation, but reflects a powerful cognitive mechanism capable
2 of altering the patients' motor and somatosensory functions. For example, in the motor domain, these patients
3 showed significant interference effects of the alien arm movements on the actual movements of their
4 own intact arm (Garbarini et al., 2013a). In the somatosensory domain, when painful stimuli were
5 delivered to the alien embodied hand, patients referred to feel pain on it (Pia et al., 2013a) and showed
6 coherent physiological reactions, as if the own hand was stimulated (Garbarini et al., 2014).
7
8
9

10
11
12 In the present study we asked whether an altered sense of body ownership, as that shown in the
13 delusional embodiment of alien body parts described above, can modulate both intentional motor
14 processes and the spatial extension of the own body representation. As already mentioned, previous
15 evidence in normal subjects has demonstrated that active tool-use modulates the representation of
16 related body parts. It has been shown that participants estimate the mid-point of their forearm to be
17 more distally located after a 15-min training with a 60 cm long tool, as compared to a pre training
18 condition (Sposito et al., 2012). Here, we investigated the effects of the observation of an alien arm
19 performing a tool-use training on the length representation of the own forearm, in both healthy
20 subjects (Experiment 1) and in brain-damaged hemiplegic patients with a pathological embodiment
21 of the alien arm using the tool (Experiment 2). Healthy subjects were tested in two different
22 conditions, where they were asked a) to actually perform the tool-use training with their own arm
23 (Action condition) or b) to observe an alien arm (the examiner's one) performing the tool-use
24 training, while holding (Observation with-tool condition) or not (Observation without-tool
25 condition) a similar tool (see details in Methods section 2.1.2). According to Sposito et al. (2012),
26 we expected to find an overestimation of the forearm length only after active tool-use training
27 (Action condition). We were also interested in verifying if this overestimation effect could be
28 induced by simply observing an alien arm performing the tool-use training. According to Costantini
29 et al. (2011), a difference between the observation with-tool and without-tool conditions could be
30 expected. Indeed, these authors found that observing tool actions may extend the representation of
31 reaching space only when observers shared the same action potentialities with the agent, i.e. while
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

holding a tool compatible with the goal and the spatial range of the observed action.

As far as patients are concerned, in our experiment they were asked to try to perform the tool-use training with their own (paralyzed) limb, while the alien arm performed the tool-use training acting either in the E+ position, where the pathological embodiment systematically occurs, or in the E- position, where the embodiment does not occur (see details in section 2.2.2.). The crucial aspect of this experiment is that, although the task implied the observation of an alien arm performing the training (as in the Observation conditions of Experiment 1 with normal subjects), it was proposed as an active task, where hemiplegic patients were asked to try to perform the required movements with their plegic arm (see details below, section 2.2.4). On the basis of data from previous studies, in the E+ condition, we expected patients to truly believe to be actually performing the task with their own arm and, consequently, to show an overestimation of their forearm length in the post-training phase with respect to the pre-training phase (similarly to healthy subjects actually performing the task in the active condition). Conversely, in the E- condition, we expected patients to be aware of not performing the task with their own arm and, hence, not to show any overestimation of their forearm length, similarly to healthy subjects performing the task in the observation condition. If these predictions were confirmed, this would strongly support the view that the sense of body ownership not only extends to intentional motor processes but also modulates the sensory map of action-related body parts.

2. Materials & Methods

2.1. Experiment 1

2.1.1. Participants

Twenty right-handed healthy volunteers (8 females and 12 males), 57-90 years of age (mean 70,5 ± 10,6), matched for age and educational level with the sample of brain-damaged patients involved in the second experiment (see below, section 2.2.1), were recruited for the experiment. None of the subjects had a history of psychiatric or neurological disorders. All participants gave their written informed consent before taking part to the experimental procedure, which was approved by the ethical committee of the University of Turin, in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (BMJ 1991; 302: 1194). Participants were all naive to the experimental procedure and to the aims of the study.

2.1.2. Experimental design

We employed a between-subject experimental design, with a unique “Action condition” and two different “Observation conditions” (“With-tool” and “Without-tool”), performed by two samples of 10 subjects each. All participants in the Action condition performed a tool-use training with their own arm. On the contrary, during the Observation condition participants had to stay still and observe the examiner’s arm perform the tool-use training: half of the subjects held a similar tool in their hand (Observation With-tool condition); the other half did not hold any tool (Observation Without-tool condition). The Action and the Observation conditions were performed in two different experimental sessions, spaced one week from each other. Half of the participants started with the Action condition and the other half with the Observation condition. See details in Fig 1A and 1B.

2.1.3. Experimental procedure

The experiment comprised three phases. Firstly, participants were blindfolded and asked to perform a forearm bisection task in which they had to estimate, by means of 15 pointing movements, the mid-point of their left forearm (pre-training phase). Secondly, they were asked to perform 15 minutes of tool-use training (in free viewing). Finally, at the end of training, they were blindfolded and asked to perform again the forearm-bisection task (post-training phase). All participants performed the forearm bisection task with the right arm and the training task with the left arm (according to the literature, the effects of training are equally present on the dominant and on the non-dominant arm; Sposito et al., 2012). When we designed the Experiment 1, we chose to train the left arm because we were interested in matching the healthy subjects' performance with that of E+ patients (Experiment 2), more frequently showing a pathological embodiment for the left side of the body. Given the fact that, in the Experiment 2, we recruited also one left brain-damaged patient showing a right limb embodiment, following the suggestion of an anonymous reviewer, we additionally tested 10 right-handed age-matched healthy subjects (5 females and 5 males; 54-85 years of age (mean $68,5 \pm 9,3$), performing the active tool-use training with the right hand.

The forearm bisection task and the tool-use training are described in detail as follows.

Forearm bisection task: Blindfolded participants were instructed to indicate, by using their right/left index finger, the midpoint of their left/right distal upper limb segment comprising the forearm and the hand, considering the elbow and the tip of the middle finger as the two extremities. During the task, the forearm was kept in a radial posture and placed inside a plexiglas parallelepiped (70x10x11 cm), in order to prevent any possible tactile feedback from the bisections. On the top of the screen above the arm was glued a paper rule with the 0-cm scale index in correspondence of the elbow, in order to easily measure the position of the subjective midpoint (p). Then, in order to obtain a percentage score relative to each participant's subjective arm length, we used the following formula: $[(p/\text{arm length}) * 100]$. The task was not a time trial and on-line corrections were not

1
2
3 allowed. Each participant performed a total of 30 bisection pointings, 15 before (Pre-training) and
4
5
6
7 15 after tool-use training (Post-training) (Sposito et al., 2012). See details in Fig. 1A.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Tool use training: All participants performed the task sitting at a table. In the Action condition, they were instructed to retrieve a number of targets by means of a garbage plier (70-cm long) and put them, according to the examiner's instructions, in one of two boxes located along the right or the left side of the table. It is important to note that only distal movements were required during the training phase for triggering the plier lever with the left hand and for orienting the wrist to the left or to the right in order to grasp targets and to put them in the requested box. Targets were different from each other by color (i.e. red, yellow, blue, green), shape (i.e. circle, cube, parallelepiped) and dimension (i.e. big or small).

In the Observation condition, participants were instructed to stay still and to observe the examiner's left arm (in dark gray in Fig. 1B) performing the tool-use training with the garbage plier. They were specifically asked to focus their attention on the action performed by the examiner, orienting their gaze to the left or to the right, according to the location of the box where the examiner put the objects. The alien arm was located in a proximal position with respect to the participant's trunk midline. According to the group membership, participants were handling or not a garbage plier identical to that used by the examiner (Observation With-tool and Observation Without-tool conditions, respectively). See details in Fig. 1B.

2.1.4. Data analysis

In Experiment 1, the mean forearm bisection value of healthy subjects (n=20) was used as dependent variable. These data were entered in a 2x2x2 repeated measures ANOVA with 'tool' (two levels: 'with-tool' and 'without-tool') as between subjects factor and 'condition' (two levels: 'action' and 'observation') and 'training' (two levels: 'pre' and 'post') as within subjects factors. Planned comparisons were performed in order to compute the contrasts of interest.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Given the fact that the adopted design could potentially introduce more noise in the observation conditions (where 10 subjects performed the with-tool task and the other 10 the without-tool task) than in the action condition (where all 20 subjects performed the same task), we checked for the equivalence of variance of the active condition either versus the observation-with-tool and the observation-without-tool condition by means of F-tests for the equivalence of variance. The F-tests were not significant (Active Vs Observation-with-tool: $p = .63$; Active Vs Observation-without-tool: $p = .11$), suggesting that the equivalence of variance can be assumed and the ANOVA run properly. As suggested by an anonymous reviewer, we also run an additional ANOVA to directly test the contrast Observation-with-tool against the Observation-without-tool, ruling out the possible confound of active tool use.

Finally, to compare the left-hand training versus the right-hand training, we performed a 2 x 2 ANOVA with 'side' (two levels: 'left' and 'right') as between-subject factor and 'training' (two levels: 'pre' and 'post') as within subjects factor. The mean forearm bisection value of healthy subjects performing the left-hand training ($n=20$) and the right-hand training ($n=10$) was used as dependent variable. The equivalence of variance of the left-hand training ($n=20$) versus the right-hand training ($n=10$) was checked by means of F-tests. The F-tests were not significant ($p = .43$), suggesting that the equivalence of variance can be assumed and the ANOVA run properly.

2.2. Experiment 2

2.2.1. Participants

Four brain-damaged patients of cerebrovascular origin were recruited at the "San Camillo" Hospital (Turin, Italy). All participants gave their written informed consent before taking part to the experimental procedure, which was approved by the ethical committee of the ASL TO 1 of Turin and in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (BMJ 1991; 302: 1194). Patients were all naive to the experimental procedure and to the purpose of the study.

1 They were all assessed using the following tests: general cognitive tests (Montreal Cognitive
2 Assessment – MOCA or Mini Mental State Evaluation - MMSE); visual field exam; assessment of
3 hemiplegia, assessment of anosognosia for hemiplegia, assessment of hemianesthesia; tests for
4 extrapersonal neglect (Behavioral Inattention Test - BIT – conventional and behavioral subtests;
5 DILLER) and for personal neglect (FLUFF). Patients were also evaluated for somatoparaphrenia
6 (Fotopoulou et al., 2011). Exclusion criteria were: 1) previous neurological or psychiatric history; 2)
7 severe general cognitive impairment (patients under the MMSE cut off or the MOCA cut off were
8 excluded); 3) visual field deficit (patients with visual field scores higher than zero were excluded).
9 See Table 1 for details.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Patients were admitted to the study if they showed a) contralesional upper limb hemiplegia, as
22 reported by the responsible neurologist and confirmed by a motor impairment examination carried
23 out according to a clinical protocol (Spinazzola et al., 2008; 2014; Pia et al., 2014), with the score
24 ranking from 0 to 3 (only patients with a score ≥ 2 were admitted); b) pathological embodiment of
25 an alien arm (E+ patients) (Garbarini et al., 2013a; Pia et al, 2013a). Patients were classified as E+
26 according to the pathological embodiment evaluation (See details below, 2.2.2) described in
27 Garbarini et al., 2013a and Pia et al, 2013a. According to this evaluation, we recruited two right-
28 brain-damaged patients (RBD) showing left-limb-embodiment and one left-brain-damaged patient
29 (LBD) showing right-limb-embodiment.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 involvement was obtained by superimposing the Anatomical Labelling map template AAL
2 (Tzourio-Mazoyer et al., 2002) and the JHU-white matter template (Hua et al., 2008) which
3 categorize the distributions of digital images onto stereotactic space. Patients' brain lesions
4 locations are consistent with those described in previous studies (Garbarini et al., 2013a; Pia et al,
5 2013a). The involved brain structures are shown in Fig. 2.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **2.2.2. Embodiment evaluation**

13 In order to include in the study only E+ patients, we tested them with an ad hoc protocol devised to
14 diagnose the presence/absence of embodiment (Garbarini et al., 2013a; Pia et al, 2013a). Patients sat
15 on a chair with both hands lying on the table. According to the patient's embodiment side (left or
16 right, depending on the damaged hemisphere, right or left, respectively), an alien left/right hand (the
17 examiner's one) was positioned on the table next on the patient's hand in four different positions
18 (see Fig. 3 A-D). Note that the distance between the own and the alien hand was always the same
19 (about 10 cm) in all conditions. The difference between conditions were: 1) the frame of reference
20 of the alien hand position (egocentric in A, B and D and allocentric in C); 2) the alien hand-
21 shoulder configuration (aligned with the patient's shoulder in A, C and D; misaligned in B); the
22 alien hand body-side location (ipsilesional intact side in D; contralesional affected side in A, B and
23 C).

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 Prior to the beginning of the experiment, patients underwent 3 simple tests to assess their
43 compliance with task demands and presence or absence of the embodiment phenomenon in that
44 specific time. A white sheet of tissue was used to cover the patient's and the examiner's arms
45 leaving the hands visible and three cubes of different colors (red, blue and green) were placed on
46 the table. Patients were asked 1) to count how many hands and objects were on the table; 2) to reach
47 their paralyzed hand with their intact hand and 3) to name the color of the cube positioned in front
48 of their own hand. In order to start the experiment, a patient had to be errorless in test 1, i.e. identify
49 the three objects and the three hands on the table. Note that in the Embodiment condition (A), E+
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

the patient fail test 2, i.e. reach the alien hand instead of his/her own hand and test 3, i.e. name the color of the cube in front of the alien hand instead of naming the color of the cube in front of his/her own hand. In the control conditions (B and C), as well as on the intact (ipsilesional) body side (D), the pathological embodiment should not occur and all the patients should correctly reach/identify their own hand (see details in Fig. 3). See an example of this evaluation in Video 1.

2.2.3. Experimental design

In Experiment 2, tool-use training was always performed by the examiner's arm (in dark gray in Fig. 1C), as in the Observation condition of Experiment 1. The crucial aspect of this task is that, although it implied the observation of the alien arm performing the training, hemiplegic patients were instructed to consider it an active task, i.e. they were asked to try to perform the tool-use training with their own paralyzed arm (see details below, section 2.2.4). During the experiment, the alien arm could act in two different positions: a) aligned with the patients' shoulder, in a position more proximal to the patient's trunk midline than the own arm, where the pathological embodiment occurs (E+ condition); b) externally misaligned with respect to the patients' shoulder, in a position more distal to the patient's trunk midline than the own arm, where patients correctly recognize the alien arm as belonging to the examiner (E- condition). The experimental task (i.e. the forearm bisection task and tool-use training, see details below, section 2.2.4) involved only the patient's contralesional side (see details in Fig. 1C). The E+ and the E- conditions were performed in two experimental sessions, distanced one week from each other.

2.2.4. Experimental procedure

Experiment 2, similarly to Experiment 1, comprised three phases: pre-training forearm-bisection task (15 pointings); tool-use training (15 min.); post-training forearm-bisection task (15 pointings) (see details in section 2.1.3, Fig. 1A-C). Note that both bisection tasks and tool-use training were performed by each patient with his/her contralesional side, where embodiment occurred (i.e. with the right side in E+ patient 1; with the left side in E+ patients 2, 3, 4). Furthermore, unlike healthy

1 subjects, hemiplegic patients could not perform the tool-use training, because of hemiplegia, and
2 they all were aware of their motor deficit; i.e. none of them were anosognosic for hemiplegia (see
3 Tab. 1). Hence, in both E+ and E- conditions, tool-use training was performed by the examiner's
4 arm and patients were asked "to try" to use the garbage plier in order to perform the task. See
5 details in Fig. 1C.
6
7
8
9
10

11 **2.2.5 Ownership evaluation**

12 In order to evaluate the patients' ownership during the task, at the end of the training phase of both
13 E+ and E- conditions, we addressed the following questions:
14
15

- 16 1. Did you perform the task with your left/right hand?
 - 17 2. How could you perform task whit your left/right hand?
- 18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **2.2.6 Data analysis**

31 In Experiment 2, the mean forearm bisection value of patients (n=4) was used as dependent
32 variable. These data were entered in a 2x2 repeated measures ANOVA with "embodiment" (two
33 levels: "E+" and "E-") and "training" (two levels: "pre" and "post") as within subjects factors.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Planned comparisons were performed in order to compute the contrasts of interest.

41 Given the small sample size, we also performed a single subject analysis (non-parametric Wilcoxon
42 test, e.g. Garbarini et al., 2013b).
43
44
45
46

47 Finally, in order to compare the difference in performance between pre- and post-training
48 conditions between each single patient and the control sample, we used Crawford's test (two tailed)
49 (Crawford et al., 2010).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

3. Results

3.1 Experiment 1: healthy subjects' forearm bisection task

The ANOVA did not show any significant effect for the between-subjects factor “tool” and for all the interactions with the “tool” factor, as well as for the within-subjects factors “condition” and “training”. The only significant interaction was “condition*training” ($F_{1,18}=15.58$; $p<.001$). In the Action condition, there was a significant increase of the mean forearm bisection values in the post-training relative to the pre-training phase (Action pre= $41.69\% \pm 7.15$ (St.Dev); Action post= $45.78\% \pm 6.9$; planned comparison: $F_{1,18}=5.061$; $p=.038$). This means that, after training, subjects relatively overestimated their forearm length (see Fig.4). Conversely, in the Observation condition, no significant difference between pre- and post-training was found (Observation pre= $42.7\% \pm 7.44$; Observation post= $40.46\% \pm 9.8$; planned comparison: $F_{1,18}=3.181$; $p=.093$). Unexpectedly, a not significant tendency in the opposite direction (i.e. a decrease of the mean bisection values in the post- respect to the pre-training phase) was apparent (see Fig. 4).

The results of the additional ANOVA directly testing the contrast Observation-with-tool vs Observation-without-tool (ruling out the possible confound of the Action condition), show that the presence of the tool in the subject's hand was not a significant factor by itself or in the interaction with the pre/post training measurements.

The results of the additional ANOVA directly testing the contrast left-hand training vs right-hand training, show that the between-subject factor ‘side’ is not significant by itself or in the interaction with the pre/post training measurements. The ANOVA found a significant effect of the within-factor “training” ($F_{1,28}=10$; $p<.003$), suggesting that in both the left- and right-training there was a significant increase of the mean forearm bisection values in the post- with respect to the pre-training condition (see Fig. 5).

3.2 Experiment 2

3.2.1 Embodiment evaluation in E+ patients

In the E+ condition, at the end of the training phase, all patients positively answered to the first question (Did you perform the task with your left/right hand?), claiming to have performed the tool-use training with their own (paralyzed) arm. The second question (How could you perform task with your left/right hand?) produced different answers among patients: E+ 1: “I don’t know how I could do this... The task was tiring but nice!”; E+ 2: “It’s easy to use this plier, only a little movement is enough to trigger the lever... can I try with the other hand?”; E+ 3: “For sure I have done this task with your (the examiner) help...”. E+ 4: “I know that you (the examiner) helped me, but I have done it!”. An example is shown in Video 2: E+ 1 patient is filmed while performing the tool-use training in the E+ condition and clearly shows that he is convinced to perform the task with her own arm. On the contrary, in the E- condition all patients negatively answered to the first question, correctly acknowledging that they did not perform the training with their own arm.

3.2.2 E+ patients’ forearm bisection task

The ANOVA did not show significant effects for the within-subjects factors “embodiment” and “training”, but, more relevant for the purpose of the study, showed significant effects for the interaction “training*embodiment” ($F_{1,3}=38.839$; $p<.01$). In the E+ condition, there was a significant increase of the mean forearm bisection values in the post-training relative to the pre-training phase (E+ pre= 45.40% \pm 11.03 (St.Dev); E+ post= 66.36 % \pm 16.21; planned comparison: $F_{1,3}= 30.15$; $p=.011$). This means that, after training, patients relatively overestimated their forearm length (see Fig. 5). Conversely, in the E- condition, no significant difference between pre- and post-

1
2 training was found (E- pre= 64.27% ± 32.29; E- post= 55.18% ± 27.06; planned comparison: $F_{1,3}=$
3 5.18; $p=.1$). See Fig. 6.

4
5 Single subject analysis revealed that, in the E+ condition, all four patients (similarly to healthy
6
7 subjects in the Action condition of Experiment 1) showed a significant increase of the bisection
8
9 values in the post- with respect to the pre-training phase (Wilcoxon tests: E+1: $Z = 3.29$; $p < .001$;
10
11 E+2: $Z = 3.4$; $p < .001$; E+3: $Z = 3.4$; $p < .001$; E+4: $Z=3.4$; $p < 0.001$), suggesting the presence of
12
13 a consistent overestimation of forearm length after tool-use when patients were convinced to
14
15 perform it with their own hand hemiplegic arm. In the E- condition, two out of four patients (E+ 1;
16
17 E+ 2) did not show any difference between pre- and post-training phase; surprisingly, the other two
18
19 patients showed a significant decrease of the bisection values in the post- respect to the pre-training
20
21 phase (Wilcoxon test: E+3: $Z = 3.4$; $p < .001$; E+4: $Z = 3.4$; $p < .001$), suggesting the presence of a
22
23 relative underestimation effect following the training (similarly to the tendency showed by healthy
24
25 subjects in the Observation condition of Experiment 1). It is also apparent that, in the pre-training,
26
27 forearm bisection values in the E- condition exceed those found in the E+ condition. To this respect,
28
29 it must be pointed out that the difference is not significant and it is caused by the performance of 2
30
31 patients out of 4 (Wilcoxon test: $E+3_{E-vsE+}$: $Z = 3.4$; $p = .00065$; $E+4_{E-vsE+}$: $Z = 3.4$; $p = .00065$). As
32
33 suggested by an anonymous reviewer, we controlled if the ANOVA results (described above) were
34
35 driven by the above reported difference in baseline values. In an ANCOVA model, where the
36
37 baseline values were assumed as a covariate, we verified that the crucial interaction
38
39 “training*embodiment” was still significant ($F_{1,2} = 33.3$; $p = .02$), even controlling for the baseline
40
41 covariate (that was not significant in itself ($F_{1,2} = 9$; $p = 1$)). This suggest that the difference in
42
43 baselines is unlikely to have influenced our findings.

44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 The Crawford’s test (Crawford et al., 2010) was used to compare the results of each patient, tested
54
55 in Experiment 2, with the results of healthy subjects in Experiment 1 (see Fig. 7). First, we tested
56
57 whether the effect of tool-use training (the difference post- minus pre-training bisection values) in
58
59 the E+ condition was significantly different in patients vs healthy subjects. Crawford’s tests (two
60
61
62
63
64
65

tailed) revealed that in three out of four patients the effect was significantly greater (E+ 1: Z DCC [difference between case and controls] = -4.826; p = .0001; E+2: Z DCC= -3.172; p = .005; E+3: Z DCC= -4.420; p = .003). Hence, this means that the relative overestimation effect after tool-use is stronger in patients than in controls. Secondly, we tested whether the effect of tool-use training (the difference post- minus pre-training bisection values) in the E+ condition was significantly different from the effect of the Observation condition in healthy subjects. Crucially, although *de facto* in the E+ condition patients observed an alien arm performing the training (similarly to controls in the Observation condition), Crawford's tests (two tailed) found a significant difference between each patient in the E+ condition and controls in the Observation condition (i.e. after tool-use patients overestimated their forearm length, whereas healthy controls tended to underestimate it) (E+ 1: Z DCC = -4.892; p = .0001; E+2: Z DCC= -3.420; p = .003; E+3: Z DCC= -3.814; p = .006; E+4: Z DCC= -2.483; p = 0.03). Finally, we compared the effect of tool use training (the difference post- minus pre-training bisection values) in the E- condition, in each patient vs healthy subjects. In two out of four patients (E+ 1; E+ 2) Crawford's tests did not find any significant difference with respect to controls. Patients E+ 3 and 4, instead, showed a relative underestimation effect of their forearm length stronger than that found in healthy subjects (E+3: Z DCC= 5.384; p = .007; E+4: Z DCC= 3.862; p = .003).

We also performed Crawford tests in order to compare the pre-training bisection values of each patient with those of the control group. In the E+ condition, we found a significant difference in one out of four patients (E+ 3: Z-CC=2.8; p=.013); in the E- condition, we found a significant difference in two out of four patients (E+3: Z-CC=9.4; p<.0001 and E+4: Z-CC=3.2; p=.004). This greater variability in the bisection task in patients than in controls, suggests that an altered body metric representation, also present in the baseline (pre-training) condition, can be associated to the body ownership disorders observed in this kind of patients.

4. Discussion

1
2 In the present work we sought for evidence that the influence of tool-use training on the body
3 spatial representation is affected by body ownership. Two experiments were carried out, one
4 involving healthy subjects (Experiment 1), the other involving brain-damaged hemiplegic patients
5 with pathological embodiment of an alien arm (Experiment 2). In Experiment 1, we asked whether
6 tool-use actions with the own arm or observing an alien arm using tools can induce comparable
7 modulation effects on the body spatial representation. In Experiment 2, the main question was
8 whether an altered sense of ownership of body parts (embodiment of an alien arm) 1) extends to the
9 representation of the movement of the alien arm using tools and 2) modulates the sensory map of
10 the own arm.
11
12

13
14 In Experiment 1, healthy subjects actually performed a tool-use training (Action condition), or
15 observed the examiner's arm performing the training (Observation condition). In the Action
16 condition, an overestimation effect of their forearm length was found; namely significantly greater
17 forearm bisection values in the post- than in the pre-training phase were apparent. On the contrary,
18 in the Observation condition, no significant difference was found, either when subjects held a
19 similar tool in their hand (with-tool condition) or when they did not (without-tool condition). **No**
20 **difference between left-hand and right-hand training was found.** In the experiment with hemiplegic
21 patients (Experiment 2), although the patients were explicitly required to try to perform an active
22 task with their own plegic arm, the tool-use training was always performed by the examiner's arm
23 (as in the Observation condition of Experiment 1), acting in two different positions, **aligned (E+) or**
24 **misaligned (E-) with respect to the patients' shoulder.** Crucially, in the E+ condition, where the
25 embodiment occurred (i.e. patients were convinced to perform the tool-use training with their own
26 (paralyzed) arm), a significant overestimation effect was found (as in the Action condition with
27 normal subjects): patients mislocated their forearm midpoint more proximally to the hand in the
28 post- than in the pre-training phase. Conversely, in the E- condition, when the pathological
29 embodiment did not occur, they did not show any overestimation effect.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
The results of Experiment 1 replicate previous findings (Sposito et al., 2012; Cardinali et al., 2011),
confirming that, in healthy subjects, active tool-use induces dynamic changes in the representation
of body metrics. In line with Sposito and co-workers findings, no training-dependent difference
between the non-dominant (left) and the dominant (right) hand training was found. However, at
least one study, employing different training tasks, has found significant differences between the
dominant and the non-dominant hand in the augmentation of body representation following tool use
(Rademaker et al., 2014). However, differently from Sposito and co-workers, healthy participants
showed averages below 50% in both the pre- and the post-training conditions. This may be related
to fact that the Experiment 1 sample was made of elderly individuals (57-90 years of age, mean
 $70,5 \pm 10,6$), matched for age and educational level with E+ patients tested in the Experiment 2,
whereas in Sposito's experiment healthy subjects were university students. We might speculate, to
this respect, that elderly subjects tend to underuse their upper (and, possibly, lower) limbs, due to
restricted movement capabilities and necessities, resulting in absolute underestimation of upper (and
lower) limbs length (but relative overestimation following tool-use training).

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
On the other hand, absence of a similar effect in the Observation condition suggests that, at least in
our sample, active tool-use is necessary in order to induce dynamic changes in the body-metrics
representation, whereas tool-use observation alone is not sufficient. However, some effects of tool-
use observation on space representation were found in previous works. In particular, Costantini and
co-workers (Costantini et al., 2011) showed that observing an alien arm performing finalized
actions with a tool may extend the representation of the reaching space of the observer, but only
when the latter shares the same action potentialities with the agent, i.e. when holding a tool
compatible with the goal and the spatial range of the observed action. In our experiment we could
not replicate this result: holding or not the same tool as the experimenter, while observing his/her
arm retrieving targets with the garbage plier, did not induce spatial extension of the observer's
reaching space (that is, it did not significantly influence the subject's estimation of the midpoint of
his/her own forearm). A number of factors can account for the discrepancies of the results between

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

the two experiments. Firstly, the two studies might measure a different kind of representation: a space representation in Costantini's et al. experiment, and a body representation in the present report. Even though the peripersonal space representation and the body schema are tightly linked (e.g. Cardinali, Brozzoli & Farnè, 2009), they can be measured in different ways. Secondly, the dependent variables used in the two studies are different - response time (RT) of the observer in the case of Costantini's et al. experiment, forearm bisection value in our experiment – and, therefore, might be differentially sensitive to the phenomenon investigated. It may well be the case that RT is a more sensitive measure of spatial remapping than forearm bisection. Thirdly, while it is possible that during the observation of finalized actions with a tool a mirror mechanism is activated (Rizzolatti, Fogassi, & Gallese, 2001) that is robust enough to remap the spatial representation of the observer in a RT task such as that employed in the Costantini's et al. study, it is also likely that the same mirror mechanism is not strong enough to significantly modify the sensory representation of the observer's arm in the forearm bisection task devised in our study. Indeed, appropriate visuomotor and proprioceptive feedback signals may be necessary to obtain the above mentioned remapping of the observer's arm length representation. Although very tentative, a possible explanation could be that, during the observation of finalized actions performed with a tool, the inhibitory process known to prevent the imitation of the observed actions (e.g. Stamos, Savaki & Raos, 2010; Mukamel et al., 2011), can have some role in preventing the updating of the body schema and, in turn, the body spatial remapping. It could be hypothesized that it is more demanding for the nervous system, in terms of energetic expense, to activate the plastic processes underlying the remodulation of the sensory map of one part of the body, than those necessary to remap a spatial sector (e.g. far space) into another (e.g. near space).

The above mentioned inhibitory mechanism could also be somehow related to the opposite underestimation trend, shown in the Observation condition at least in some subjects. It is worth noting that the Observation condition is crucial for distinguishing between remapping effects induced by motor activation or by attentional processing. Indeed, if attentional mechanisms could

1 fully explain the effects found following tool-use (e.g., Holmes et al., 2004), similar results should
2 be expected in Action and Observation conditions, where the subject's spatial attention is equally
3 involved (in both conditions the subject has to pay attention to the tip of the garbage plier, grasping
4 targets in far space and putting them in the requested box); and this is not the case.
5
6
7
8

9 In Experiment 2, instead, E+ patients showed an overestimation of their own forearm length after
10 tool-use training performed by the alien (embodied) arm. This clearly suggests that an altered sense
11 of body ownership of someone else's arm can extend to intentional motor processes and modulate
12 own body spatial representation. Furthermore, comparing the results of single patients with those of
13 the sample of healthy subjects, the overestimation effect revealed by each patient during the E+
14 condition was greater than that found in healthy subjects during the Active condition (the difference
15 was significant in three out of four patients at Crawford test), suggesting that when body awareness
16 is selectively impaired, the body-metrics representation is more susceptible to be altered.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 According to previous studies (e.g. Garbarini et al., 2012; Pia et al. 2013b; Garbarini et al., 2013a;
30 Gondola et al., 2014), hemiplegic patients fully aware of their paralysis, when asked to try to
31 perform motor acts with their paralyzed hand/arm, do not produce any effective motor
32 programming. However, when a pathological embodiment occurs, as in the E+ condition of our
33 experiment, the delusion of ownership affects both motor awareness and the sense of agency
34 (patients, although not anosognosic before the task – see Table 1 - are firmly convinced to perform
35 the tool-use training with their own plegic arm). This, in turn, might automatically trigger
36 intentional motor processes for the own plegic arm, which generate the updating of the body
37 schema and lead to the remapping of one's own forearm length (similarly to healthy subjects
38 actually performing the tool use training in the Active condition). It is important to note that the
39 delusion of ownership, as it is also evident in the rubber hand illusion (Pavani et al., 2000; Farnè et
40 al., 2000; Costantini & Haggard, 2007), is observed only when the alien hand is located, in
41 egocentric coordinates, in a plausible position, compatible with the observer body schema. If this
42 condition is not fulfilled, as in the E- condition of our experiment where the alien hand is
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **misaligned** with respect to the patients' shoulder, the embodiment does not occur. In this case,
2 patients immediately ascribe the movements to the examiner's arm and, although required to try to
3 perform the task as in the E+ condition, *de facto* observed the examiner performing the task, and do
4 not show any significant remapping of their forearm length, similarly to healthy subjects during
5 Observation conditions. **According to Cardinali and co-workers (2009) "the body schema does not**
6 **accept any incoherence. This mean that when a conflict occurs between two inputs" - as, in our**
7 **case, two left/right hands on the table -, "the brain solves it in the direction of one of them" (p. 5).**
8 **We can speculate that, in this kind of patients, when the body representation is altered, the more**
9 **coherent position for the arm/hand (i.e. when the arm is perfectly aligned with the shoulder and**
10 **close to the body) can orient the patients' sense of body ownership.**

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 Finally, in the observation condition, it must be acknowledged the presence of a non significant
25 tendency towards underestimation one's own arm length in the majority of control subjects and in
26 two out of four patients. This tendency was significantly greater in the two patients than in healthy
27 subjects. These results were unexpected and we do not have yet a convincing explanation for it.
28
29 Nevertheless they might be worth of further investigation in their own right on a larger sample of
30 patients. The possibility exists that they are related to a specific inhibitory mechanism activated
31 during the observation of someone else's finalized actions preventing action execution when
32 contextual conditions (passive observation of someone else's movement or imaging one's own
33 movement) are inadequate to trigger the anticipatory neurocognitive plastic processes (e.g. space
34 and body metrics remapping) subserving a future action.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 From an anatomical point of view, previous studies (Garbarini et al., 2013a; Pia et al, 2013a)
49 described left-side embodiment following right-brain damage. Here, for the first time, a right-side
50 embodiment following left-brain damage was described in patient E+1 (see Fig. 2). This suggests
51 that, although it seems to be more frequently associated to right-brain lesions, this phenomenon is
52 not related to a specific function of the right hemisphere. Although this datum needs further
53 investigation on a larger sample of patients, it suggests the presence of a right hemisphere

1 dominance for the building of the sense of body ownership rather than an absolute lateralization of
2 this function in the right hemisphere (see also Tsakiris, Costantini, & Haggard, 2008). According to
3 previous studies (Garbarini et al., 2013a; Pia et al, 2013a), pathological embodiment is related to
4 damage to subcortical motor structures (basal ganglia: globus pallidus, putamen) and periventricular
5 white matter. Lesions locations of patients tested here is compatible with this pattern (see Fig. 2),
6 that is also consistent with the one identified for being responsible for somatoparaphrenia (Gandola
7 et al., 2012), thus suggesting a common locus for the two complementary body awareness disorders.
8 Following Gandola et. al. interpretation, we can hypothesize that a damage to the white matter tract
9 linking subcortical structures with cortical sensory-motor and associative areas may prevent the
10 integration of afferent information arising from the affected body part (bottom-up processes) with
11 higher-order and pre-existing body representations (top-down processes) leading to a deficit in the
12 construction of a coherent body representation (Tsakiris et al., 2006, 2007, 2008). We may
13 speculate that when the representation of the contralesional hand is partially impaired or made
14 fragile by the brain damage, as in E+ patients, the brain solves the incoherence of the ‘mutilated’
15 body representation by automatically incorporating an alien hand so to regain consistency and
16 functionality.
17

18
19 In conclusion, these findings demonstrate that, in presence of a delusion of ownership of a body
20 part, the alien body part can be so deeply incorporated into one’s own body schema to extend to
21 action execution and to induce measurable dynamic changes in the body-metrics representation
22 comparable to those observed during really executed movements. This phenomenon is still far from
23 being fully understood at the level of its neurocognitive mechanisms and a number of important
24 questions still need to be answered. For example, the role of motor intentionality in the emergence
25 of the sense of body ownership needs to be more deeply investigated. Does embodiment of an alien
26 arm equally develops in absence of intention to move the own paralyzed arm, e.g. if the patient is
27 asked to passively observe someone else’s arm movement? Or, else, do patients with embodiment
28

1 show similar remapping of one's own hemiplegic arm's length representation when asked only to
2 imagine to reach for far objects with a tool?
3

4 Despite being only on the verge of a full understanding of the embodiment phenomenon, the so far
5 collected experimental results, if further confirmed on a larger sample of patients, might have
6 important fallbacks in the domain of neuropsychological rehabilitation. For example, it could be the
7 case that hemiplegic patients with embodiment of an alien arm might benefit more from an
8 observational motor training (i.e. a motor training actually performed by an alien arm) than a
9 passive motor training, where embodiment does not occur.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 *Limitations of the study*

22 We acknowledge a number of limitations of the present study: 1) the design adopted in both elderly
23 controls (Experiment 1) and brain-damaged patients (Experiment 2) was not the ideal one. In both
24 experiments, in order to avoid sequence effects, patients and controls were tested in two different
25 experimental sessions (at one week distance) and we preferred not to add further experimental
26 sessions, although this choice compromised the optimal full within-subject design, with three
27 experimental sessions in Experiment 1 (Action; Observation with-tool; Observation without-tool)
28 and with four experimental sessions in Experiment 2 (E+ condition with- and without-tool; E-
29 condition with- and without-tool). 2) different instructions were –necessarily- given to control
30 subjects in the Observation conditions (they were requested to stay still and to observe the
31 examiner's arm performing the task), and to patients in the E+ and E- conditions (they were
32 required to perform an “active” task, being asked to ‘try’ to use the garbage plier with their plegic
33 hand), thus rendering the two experiments not fully comparable. On the one hand, in Experiment 1,
34 the Observation conditions (with- and without-tool) were introduced in order to exclude the
35 possibility that a visual feedback alone (vision of the alien arm using the tool) can be able to alter
36 the body metric representation. If so, all the effects found in patients could be ascribed to the visual
37 feedback and not to the pathological embodiment; on the other hand, in Experiment 2, in order to
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

compare the results of the patients' E+ and E- conditions with those found in healthy controls

actually performing the tool-use training, it was crucial to ask the patients to perform an active task.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Acknowledgement

This study was funded by a Compagnia di San Paolo grant and a MIUR-PRIN grant (to A.B.). The authors are very grateful to all participants involved in the study. We are also grateful to Marco Bonifazi and Ludovico Pino for their help during testing.

References

- Ackroyd K., Riddoch M.J., Humphreys G. W., Nightingale S. & Townsend S. (2002). Widening the Sphere of Influence: Using a Tool to Extend Extrapersonal Visual Space in a Patient with Severe Neglect. *Neurocase*, 8, 1-12.
- Berti A. & Frassinetti F. (2000). When far becomes near: re-mapping of space by tool use. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 12, 415–420.
- Botvinick M. & Cohen J. (1998). Rubber hands ‘feel’ touch that eyes see. *Nature*, 391, 756.
- Bonifazi S., Farnè A., Rinaldesi L. & Ladavas E. (2007). Dynamic size-change of peri-hand space through tool-use: spatial extension or shift of the multi-sensory area. *Journal of Neuropsychology*, 1, 101–114.
- Cardinali L., Brozzoli C., & Farnè A. (2009). Peripersonal space and body schema: two labels for the same concept? *Brain Topogr*, 21, 252-60.
- Cardinali L., Brozzoli C., Urquizar C., Salemme R., Roy A. C., & Farnè A. (2011). When action is not enough: Tool-use reveals tactile-dependent access to Body Schema. *Neuropsychologia*, 49, 3750–7.
- Colby, C. L., Duhamel, J. R., and Goldberg, M. E. (1993). Ventral intraparietal area of the macaque: Anatomic location and visual response properties. *J. Neurophysiol.* 69, 902–914.
- Colby, C. L., Duhamel, J. R., and Goldberg, M. E. (1996). Visual, presaccadic, and cognitive activation of single neurons in monkey lateral intraparietal area. *J. Neurophysiol.* 76, 2841–2852.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Costantini M. & Haggard P. (2007). The rubber hand illusion: Sensitivity and reference frame for body ownership. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 16, 229-240.

Costantini M., Committeri G. & Sinigaglia C. (2011). Ready Both to Your and to My Hands: Mapping the Action Space of Others. *PLoS ONE*, 6, e17923.

Crawford J. R., Garthwaite P. H. & Porter S. (2010). Point and interval estimates of effect sizes for the case-controls design in neuropsychology: Rationale, methods, implementations, and proposed reporting standards. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 27, 245-260.

di Pellegrino G., Làdavas E. & Farné A. Seeing where your hands are. (1997). *Nature*, 388, 730-730?.

Farné A., Pavani F., Maneghello F. & Ladavas E. (2000). Left tactile extinction following visual stimulation of a rubber hand. *Brain*, 123, 2350-60.

Farné A., Iriki A. & Ladavas E. (2005). Shaping multisensory action-space with tools: evidence from patients with cross-modal extinction. *Neuropsychologia*, 43, 238–248.

Farné A. & Ladavas E. (2000). Dynamic size-change of hand peripersonal space following tool use. *Neuroreport*, 11, 1645–1649.

Farné A., Serino A. & Ladavas E. (2007). Dynamic size-change of peri-hand space following tool-use: determinants and spatial characteristics revealed through cross-modal extinction. *Cortex*, 43, 436–443.

Fotopoulou A., Jenkinson P. M., Tsakiris M., Haggard P., Rudd A., & Kopelman M. D. (2011). Mirror-view reverses somatoparaphrenia: dissociation between first- and third-person perspectives on body ownership. *Neuropsychologia*, 49, 3946-3955.

Gallese V. & Sinigaglia C., (2010). The bodily self as power for action. *Neuropsychologia*, 48, 746-55.

Gandola M., Invernizzi P., Sedda A., Ferrè E. R., Sterzi R., Sberna M., Paulesu E. & Bottini G. (2012). An anatomical account of somatoparaphrenia. *Cortex*, 48, 1165-78.

Gandola M., Bottini G., Zapparoli L., Invernizzi P., Verardi M., Sterzi R., Santilli I., Sberna M. &

1 Paulesu E. (2014). The physiology of motor delusions in anosognosia for hemiplegia:
2 Implications for current models of motor awareness. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 24, 98–
3 112.
4
5

6
7 Garbarini F., Fornia L., Fossataro C., Pia L., Gindri P. & Berti A. (2014). Embodiment of others'
8 hands elicits arousal responses similar to one's own hands. *Current Biology (in press)*.
9

10
11 Garbarini F., Rabuffetti M., Piedimonte A., Pia L., Ferrarin M., Frassinetti F., Gindri P., Cantagallo
12 A., Driver J. & Berti A., (2012). 'Moving' a paralysed hand: bimanual coupling effect in
13 patients with anosognosia for hemiplegia. *Brain*, 135, 1486–1497.
14
15
16

17
18 Garbarini F. & Pia L. (2013). Bimanual coupling paradigm as an effective tool to investigate
19 productive behaviors in motor and body awareness impairments *Frontiers in Human*
20 *Neuroscience*, 7, 1-5.
21
22
23
24

25
26 Garbarini F., Pia L., Piedimonte A., Rabuffetti M., Gindri P., Berti A. (2013a) Embodiment of an
27 alien hand interferes with intact-hand movements. *Current Biology*, 23, 2-r57-R58.
28
29

30
31 Garbarini F., Piedimonte A., Dotta E., Pia L. & Berti A. (2013b). Dissociations and similarities in
32 motor intention and motor awareness: the case of anosognosia for hemiplegia and motor
33 neglect. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry*, 84, 416-419.
34
35
36
37

38
39 Head H. & Holmes G. (1911). Sensory disturbances from cerebral lesions. *Brain*, 34,102-245.
40

41
42 Holmes, N. P., Spence, C., Hansen, P. C., Mackay, C. E., & Calvert, G. A. (2008). The
43 multisensory attentional consequences of tool use: a functional magnetic resonance imaging
44 study. *PLoS One*, 3, e3502.
45
46
47

48
49 Hua K., Zhang, J., Wakana S., Jiang H., Li X., Reich D. S., Calabresi P. A., Pekar J. J., van Zijl P.
50 C. & Mori S. (2008). Tract probability maps in stereotaxic spaces: analyses of white matter
51 anatomy and tract-specific quantification. *Neuroimage*, 39, 336-347.
52
53
54

55
56 Iriki A., Tanaka M. & Iwamura Y. (1996). Coding of modified body schema during tool use by
57 macaque postcentral neurones. *Neuroreport*, 7, 2325–2330.
58
59

60
61 Lane A.R., Ball K, Smith D.T., Schenk T, & Ellison A. (2013) Near and far space: understanding
62
63
64
65

the neural mechanisms of spatial attention. *Human Brain Mapping* 34, 356–366.

Lloyd D.M. (2007). Spatial limits on referred touch to an alien limb may reflect boundaries of visuo-tactile peripersonal space surrounding the hand. *Brain and Cognition*, 64, 104-109.

Longo M. R. & Luorenco S. F. (2006). On the nature of near space: Effects of tool use and the transition to far space. *Neuropsychologia*, 44, 977-981.

Ishibashi H., Hihara S. & Iriki A. (2000). Acquisition and development of monkey tool-use: behavioural and kinematic analyses. *Can. J. Physiol. Pharmacol.* 78, 1–9.

Maravita A., Clarke K., Husain M. & Driver J. (2002). Active tool use with the contralesional hand can reduce cross-modal extinction of touch on that hand. *Neurocase*, 8, 411–416.

Maravita A. & Driver J. (2004). Crossmodal integration and spatial attention in relation to tool-use and mirror-use: representing and extending multimodal space near the hand. In: G. Calvert, C. Spence, & B. Stein (Eds.), *Handbook of multisensory processes* (pp. 819–835). Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Maravita A. & Iriki A. (2004). Tools for the body (schema). *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8, 79–86.

Maravita A., Spence C., Kennett S. & Driver J. (2002). Tool-use changes multi-modal spatial interactions between vision and touch in normal humans. *Cognition*, 83, B25–B34.

Maravita A., Spence C. & Driver J. (2003). Multisensory integration and the body schema: close to hand and within reach. *Current Biology*, 13, 53.

Masson M. E. J. & Loftus G. R. (2003). Using confidence intervals for graphically based data interpretation. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie Expérimentale*, 57, 203–220.

Mukamel R., Ekstrom A. D., Kaplan J., Iacoboni M. & Fried I. (2010). Single-neuron responses in humans during execution and observation of actions. *Current Biology*. 20, 750-6.

Neppi-Mòdona M., Rabuffetti M., Folegatti A., Ricci R., Spinazzola L., Schiamone F., Ferrarin M. & Berti A. (2007) Bisecting lines with different tools in right brain damaged patients: the

1 role of action programming and sensory feedback in modulating spatial remapping. *Cortex*,
2 43, 397-410.
3

4 Pavani F., Spencer C. & Driver J. (2000). Visual capture of touch: out of the body experience with
5 rubber gloves, *Psychol Sci*, 11, 353-9.
6
7

8
9 Pegna A. J., Petit L., Caldara-Schnetzer A. S., Khateb A., Annoni J. M., Sztajzel R. and Landis T.
10 (2001). So near yet so far: neglect in far or near space depends on tool use. *Annals of*
11 *Neurology*, 50, 820–822
12
13
14

15 Pia L., Garbarini F., Fossataro C., Forna L. & Berti A. (2013a). Pain and body awareness: evidence
16 from brain-damaged patients with delusional body ownership. *Frontiers in Human*
17 *Neuroscience*, 7, 298.
18
19
20
21
22

23 Pia L., Spinazzola L., Rabuffetti M., Ferrarin M., Garbarini F., Piedimonte A., Driver J. & Berti A.
24 (2013b) Temporal coupling due to illusory movements in bimanual actions: Evidence from
25 anosognosia for hemiplegia. *Cortex*, 49, 1694-1703.
26
27
28
29
30

31 Pia L, Spinazzola L, Garbarini F, Bellan G, Piedimonte A, Fossataro C, Livelli A, Burin D, Berti A
32 (2014). Anosognosia for hemianaesthesia: a voxel-based lesion-symptom mapping study.
33 *Cortex (in press)*.
34
35
36
37
38

39 Rademaker R.L., Wu D.A., Bloem I.M., Sack A.T. (2014). Intensive tool-practice and skillfulness
40 facilitate the extension of body representations in humans. *Neuropsychologia*, 56, 196-203.
41
42
43

44 Rizzolatti G., Fogassi L. & Gallese V. (2001). Neurophysiological mechanisms underlying the
45 understanding and imitation of action. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 2, 661-670.
46
47
48

49 Rorden C. & Brett M. (2000). Stereotaxic display of brain lesions. *Behavioural Neurology*, 12,
50 191–200.
51
52
53

54 Romano D., Gandola M., Bottini G. & Maravita A. (2014). Arousal responses to noxious stimuli in
55 somatoparaphrenia and anosognosia: clues to body awareness. *Brain*, 137, 1213–1223.
56
57
58

59 Spinazzola L., Pia L., Folegatti A., Marchetti C. & Berti A. (2008). Modular structure of awareness
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 for sensorimotor disorders: evidence from anosognosia for hemiplegia and anosognosia for
2 hemianaesthesia. *Neuropsychologia*, 46, 915–26.

3
4 Spinazzola L, Bellan G, Pia L, Berti A (2014). Unawareness of Motor and Somatosensory deficits
5 after stroke (UMAS): Validity and Reliability of UMAS Questionnaire. *Applied Psychology*
6
7
8
9 *Bulletin (in press)*.

10
11 Sposito A., Bolognini N., Vallari G. & Maravita A. (2012). Extension of perceived arm length
12 following tool-use: Clues to plasticity of body metrics. *Neuropsychologia*, 50, 2187–2194.

13
14 Stamos A. V., Savaki H. E. & Raos V. (2010). The Spinal Substrate of the Suppression of Action
15 during Action Observation. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 30, 11605-11611.

16
17 Tsakiris M., Costantini M., & Haggard P. (2008). The role of the right temporo-parietal junction in
18 maintaining a coherent sense of one's body. *Neuropsychologia*, 46, 3014-3018.

19
20 Tsakiris M., Hesse M. D., Boy C., Haggard P. & Fink G. R. (2007) Neural signatures of body
21 ownership: A sensory network for bodily self-consciousness. *Cerebral Cortex*, 17, 2235-
22
23 2244.

24
25 Tsakiris M., Prabhu G. & Haggard P. (2006). Having a body versus moving your body: How
26 agency structures body-ownership. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 15, 423-432.

27
28 Tzourio-Mazoyer N., Landeau B., Papathanassiou D., Crivello F., Etard O., Delcroix N., Mazoyer
29 B. & Joliot M. (2002). Automated anatomical labeling of activations in SPM using a
30 macroscopic anatomical parcellation of the MNI MRI single-subject brain. *Neuroimage*, 15,
31
32 273–289.

33
34 Vallar G. & Ronchi R. (2009). Somatoparaphrenia: a body delusion. A review of the
35 neuropsychological literature. *Experimental brain research*, 192, 533-551.

36
37 Weiss, P. H., Marshall, J. C., Wunderlich, G., Tellmann, L., Halligan, P. W., Freund, H. J., Zilles,
38
39 K., and Fink, G. R. (2000). Neural consequences of acting in near versus far space: A
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **TABLE**
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

	E+ PATIENTS			
PATIENT	E+1	E+2	E+3	E+4
AGE	50	65	72	48
SEX	F	M	M	M
EDUCATION	5	17	8	5
ETIOLOGY	I	I	I	H
LESION SIDE	LH	RH	RH	RH
MONTHS FROM ONSET	6	3	2	2
VISUAL FIELD DEFECT	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0
HEMIPLEGIA (HP)	3	2	3	3
ANOSOGNOSIA FOR HP	0	0	0	0
HEMIANESTHESIA (HAE)	3	1	2	3
GENERAL COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT	-	-	-	-
EXTRAPERSONAL NEGLECT	+	-	+	+
PERSONAL NEGLECT	-	-	-	-
SOMATOPARAPHRENIA	-	-	-	-

42
43
44 **Table 1. Patients' demographic and clinical data**
45

46 Presence of embodiment (E+) of the experimenter's arm. Sex: M = Male, F = Female. Education:
47 years of school. Etiology: H = hemorrhage; I = ischemia. Lesion Side: RH = Right Hemisphere; LH
48 = Left Hemisphere. Months from onset: number of months between the onset of the disease and the
49 first assessment. For visual field defect (the two values refer to the upper and lower visual
50 quadrants, respectively), hemiplegia, anosognosia for hemiplegia and hemianesthesia scores were
51 ranged from normal (0) to severe defects (3) (Spinazzola et al., 2008; 2014; Pia et al., 2014).
52
53 General cognitive impairment (- = no deficit; + = presence of deficit;): MOCA cut off $\geq 14.5/30$;
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

MMSE cut off $\geq 24/30$. Extrapersonal neglect (- = no deficit; + = presence of deficit): BIT, conventional subtests cut-off $\geq 129/146$; BIT behavioral subtest cut-off $\geq 67/81$; DILLER cut-off omissions l-r ≥ 5 . Personal neglect (- = no deficit; + = presence of deficit): FLUFF cut off omissions L ≤ 2 . The presence/absence of somatoparaphrenia was evaluated according to Fotopoulou et al., 2011.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Experimental task

A) Bisection task: schematic aerial view of the experimental setting depicting the forearm bisection procedure in Experiments 1 and 2; the subject's arm lied inside a translucent plexiglas parallelepiped to avoid tactile feedback. The numbers on top represent the paper ruler used to calculate the subjective midpoint in cm (see section 2.1.3 for details).

B) Tool-use training, Experiment 1: Healthy volunteers performed the training either with their own arm (Action condition) or observing the examiner's arm (the dark gray one) perform the task, handling (Observation with-tool condition) or not (Observation without-tool condition) a similar tool.

C) Tool-use training, Experiment 2: with patients the training was performed by the examiner's (alien) arm (in dark gray). The alien arm could act a) in a position more proximal to the patient's trunk midline (E+ condition, upper left and right quadrants), where embodiment occurs, or b) in a more distal position (E- condition, lower left and right quadrants), where embodiment does not occur and patients correctly acknowledge that the alien arm belongs to the examiner. The task was performed on the patients' contralesional side.

Figure 2. Patients' lesion reconstruction

E+1. Left-hemisphere lesions, involving: hippocampus, amygdala, middle temporal pole, parahippocampal gyrus, fusiform gyrus, heschl gyrus, temporo-parietal periventricular white matter.

E+2. Right-hemisphere lesions, involving: superior longitudinal fasciculus, anterior limb of internal capsule, external capsule, putamen, globus pallidus, fronto-parietal periventricular white matter.

E+3. Right-hemisphere lesions, involving: supramarginal gyrus, middle temporal pole, heschl gyrus, uncinate fasciculus, cingulum (hippocampus), posterior thalamus, retrolenticular part of internal capsule, putamen, sagittal stratum and temporo-parietal periventricular white matter.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

E+4: Right-hemisphere lesions, involving: precentral gyrus, inferior frontal operculum, inferior frontal gyrus (triangular part), inferior frontal gyrus (orbital part), rolandic operculum, insula, postcentral gyrus, supramarginal gyrus, angular gyrus, heschl gyrus, suoperioir temporal gyrus, temporal pole (superior part), middle temporal gyrus. fronto-temporo-parietal periventricular white matter.

Figure 3. Embodiment evaluation

An alien left/right arm (the examiner's one) was positioned on the table in four different conditions:

A) The alien arm (in grey) is aligned with the patient's contralesional shoulder, in a position more proximal to the patient's trunk midline than the own arm (Shoulder alignment condition).

B) The alien arm (in grey) is (externally) misaligned with respect to the patient's contralesional shoulder, in a position more distal with respect to the patient's trunk midline than the own arm (Shoulder misalignment condition).

C) The alien arm (in grey) is placed in a position more proximal to the patient trunk midline (as in A) but in an allocentric position, i.e. facing the patient (Allocentric condition).

D) The alien arm (in grey) is aligned with the patient's ipsilesional shoulder, in a position more proximal to the patient's trunk midline than the own arm (Intact-side condition).

The patient was asked: 1) to count how many hands and objects were on the table; 2) to reach his/her own hemiplegic hand with his/her own non plegic ipsilesional hand and 3) to identify his/her own hand on the basis of the color of the object facing the hand. In all conditions the patient counts three objects (blue, red and green) and three hands (question 1). In A) (lower part) the patient reaches the alien hand (the grey one) (question 2) and identifies his/her own hand as the one in front of the blue cube (question 3); in B) (lower part) the patient correctly reaches his/her own hand (the pink one) (question 2) and identifies it as the one facing the red cube (question 3); in C) (lower part) the patient correctly reaches his/her own hand (question 2); in D) (lower part) the patient correctly

1 identifies his/her own hand as the one facing the red cube (question 3). Note that in D) question 2
2 was not administered: given the contralesional paralysis, patients could not reach for the intact hand
3 with the affected hand.
4
5
6
7
8

9
10 **Figure 4. Results of Experiment 1: Action vs Observation**

11 Graphic representation of normal subjects' (N=20) mean forearm bisection values (in %) in the pre-
12 training (PRE) and in the post-training phase (POST) during the Action (in red) and the Observation
13 (in blue) conditions. ***P< .0001; **P< .001; *P< .01
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 **Figure 5. Results of Experiment 1: Dominant hand vs Non-dominant hand**

23 Graphic representation of the mean forearm bisection values (in %) in normal subjects performing
24 the active tool-use training with the dominant (right) hand (N=10) (in red) or with the non-dominant
25 (left) hand (N=20) (in blue) in the pre- (PRE) and post-training (POST) conditions. The effect of
26 training is significant (*P< .01) with no difference between training performed with the left (non-
27 dominant) or right (dominant) hand.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 **Figure 6. Results of Experiment 2: E+ condition vs E- condition**

40 Graphic representation of patients' (N=4) mean forearm bisection values (in %) in the pre-training
41 (PRE) and in the post-training phase (POST) during the left/right arm E+ condition (in red) and the
42 left/right arm E- condition (in blue). ***P< .0001; **P< .001; *P< .01.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Figure 7. Comparison between patients (Experiment 2) and healthy subjects (Experiment 1)**

52 **A.** Bar plot showing the effect of tool use training (Post-Pre) on Arm's length estimation in single
53 patients and in control subjects (E+ and Action condition, respectively). A general overestimation
54 effect is evident. Overestimation effects in single patients are compared with those in the control
55 group. **B.** Bar plot showing the effect of tool use Observation (Post-Pre) on Arm's length estimation
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

in single patients and in control subjects (E- and Observation condition, respectively). A general
tendency to underestimation of arm length is apparent. Underestimation effects in single patients are
compared with those in the control group. ***P< .0001; **P< .001; *P< .01

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 1

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)









Figure 4

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

'Training' x 'Condition' $F(1, 18) = 15.558, p < 0.001$



'Time' x 'Side' F(1,28)= .09, p=0.76



'Training' x 'Condition' $F(1,3)=38.83, p<0.01$






Figure 7

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Video 1

[Click here to download Supplementary Material: video 1.mp4](#)

Video 2

[Click here to download Supplementary Material: video 2.mp4](#)

Video Still 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Video Still 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

