(34%) responded significantly better to closer stimuli but were unaffected by the amplitude of the stimulus; 15 (34%) responded significantly better to higher-amplitude stimuli but were unaffected by the distance of the stimulus; and 11 (25%) responded significantly better to closer stimuli and, independently, to higher-amplitude stimuli. Amplitude is one of many possible cues that humans use to determine the distance to an auditory event. Therefore, we suggest that the amplitude-sensitive neurons described here use this particular cue to code distance. These neurons will tend to respond to nearby stimuli because they respond better to higher-amplitude sounds. However, more than half of the neurons (59%) code distance by means of some other cue or combination of cues, such that they respond to nearby stimuli independently of the amplitude. Reverberation of the sound from the walls of the room may be important. Another possible set of cues for distance involves familiarity with the sound source. However, the first neuron tested in monkey 2 was significantly dependent on distance even though the monkey had never heard the stimulus before. Another possible cue is the difference in amplitude between the two ears; a very large difference implies a sound source close to one ear. However, the neurons were sensitive to distance even when the stimulus was presented on the midline, that is, when the amplitude was equal in both ears. Finally, the calculation of distance near the head may depend on the highly complex distorting effect of the head and pinnae on the sound spectrum. This last effect would be especially pronounced at such close distances as 10 cm. A full analysis of the relative influence of these different cues will require further experiments.

The cortical pathways for auditory spatial processing are not well understood. Perhaps distance information is calculated in a different brain area and then relayed to the cortical neurons in PMv. Recently, we studied neurons in a portion of parietal area 7b, in the upper bank of the lateral sulcus, and found similar tridimensional, tectal–visual–auditory neurons (M.S.A.G. and C.G.G., manuscript in preparation). Area 7b projects to PMv, but whether the tridimensional region of 7b projects to the tridimensional region of PMv has not yet been determined.

Previous experiments showed that multimodal neurons in PMv encode the locations of nearby objects, within about reaching distance, through touch, vision, and even visual memory. Our results show that PMv neurons also represent nearby auditory space. Because a high proportion of PMv neurons respond during movements of the head, mouth, arms and hands, the purpose of this multimodal map of space may be to guide movements towards and around the objects that surround the body.

Methods

Two adult M. fascicularis were trained to sit in a primate chair; they did not perform any task. (For details of the experimental procedures, see ref. 16.) During daily recording sessions, a microdrive was used to lower an electrode into PMv. Once a neuron was isolated, it was tested for somatosensory, visual and auditory responses. Somatosensory receptive fields were plotted by manipulating the joints and stroking the skin. Visual receptive fields were plotted with objects presented on a wand. Auditory stimuli included tones, clicks, claps, jingling keys and other sounds. Controlled tests were done using white noise (20–22,000 Hz) presented over Cambridge Soundworks 3-inch (7.62 mm) speakers mounted in a circular array around the monkey's head at ear level. The angular position and distance of the speakers to the head was adjustable. The sound pressure level of the stimulus was measured at the monkey's head using a Radio Shack sound level meter, repeatedly calibrated with a 0.25-inch (6.35 mm) Bruel and Kjaer microphone. Neurons were tested either with the speaker behind the head, or in the dark, so that the monkey could not see the distance to the sound source. Eye position was not controlled during the presentation of auditory stimuli. Some PMv neurons are influenced by eye position. However, the short latency of the auditory response eliminates the possibility that it was caused by a change in eye position elicited by the presentation of the stimulus. In addition, there are no reports of transient bursts of activity in PMv associated with eye movement, whereas most of the auditory responses in PMv were transient, short-latency bursts (Fig. 1b).
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Perception’s shadow: long-distance synchronization of human brain activity
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Transient periods of synchronization of oscillating neuronal discharges in the frequency range 30–80 Hz (gamma oscillations) have been proposed to act as an integrative mechanism that may bring a widely distributed set of neurons together into a coherent ensemble that underlies a cognitive act. Results of several experiments in animals provide support for this idea (see, for example, refs 4–10). In humans, gamma oscillations have been
described both on the scalp\textsuperscript{11–16} (measured by electroencephalography and magnetoencephalography) and in intracranial recordings\textsuperscript{17}, but no direct participation of synchrony in a cognitive task has been demonstrated so far. Here we record electrical brain activity from subjects who are viewing ambiguous visual stimuli (perceived either as faces or as meaningless shapes). We show for the first time, to our knowledge, that only face perception induces a long-distance pattern of synchronization, corresponding to the moment of perception itself and to the ensuing motor response. A period of strong desynchronization marks the transition between the moment of perception and the motor response. We suggest that this desynchronization reflects a process of active uncoupling of the underlying neural ensembles that is necessary to proceed from one cognitive state to another\textsuperscript{2}.

Ten subjects were shown 'Mooney' faces (Fig. 1a, b), which are easily categorized as faces when presented in upright orientation, but usually seen as meaningless black and white shapes when presented upside-down\textsuperscript{16,19}. Subjects were asked to report as quickly as possible whether they had seen a face or not by pressing one of two different keys. On average, 79 ± 2\% of upright presentations were perceived as faces. Conversely, 76 ± 2\% of upside-down presentations were reported as meaningless. We analysed only the cases of upright presentations that were perceived as faces and inverted presentations that were perceived as meaningless, referred to here as the 'perception' and 'no-perception' conditions. The electroencephalogram (EEG) was recorded through 30 electrodes, and a precise time–frequency analysis was carried out up to 100 Hz.

We first computed the pseudo Wigner–Ville time–frequency transforms\textsuperscript{20} of single trials and averaged these transforms over all trials. This procedure is best adapted to detect the so-called 'induced' gamma response, which is triggered by, but not phase-locked to, stimulus onset\textsuperscript{15} ('phase-locking' is synchronization of oscillations). We obtained two induced gamma-activity peaks (Fig. 1c, d). The first induced response, lying at 36 ± 5 Hz for both conditions, peaked at ~230 ms after stimulus onset, was significantly larger for the perception condition (Wilcoxon T = 5, Z = 2.29, P < 0.05) and has been consistently described as the correlate of the perceptual process itself\textsuperscript{11–17}. Similar conclusions are reached by studies of evoked potential\textsuperscript{21}. In contrast, the second induced gamma peak has not been reported so far. It peaked at ~800 ms with a maximum frequency of 40 ± 5 Hz, following the subject's reaction time closely, and was slightly (but not significantly) stronger in the no-perception than in the perception condition. The latency of this peak indicates the possible involvement of post-perceptual processes.

We then studied phase synchrony, the main focus of our work. We
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**Figure 1** Stimuli and emission time–frequency charts. a, b, Examples of 'Mooney' faces, high-contrast pictures of a human face. These pictures are easily recognized as human faces when seen upright (a), but are difficult to recognize when inverted (b). c, d, Spectral power following stimulation. A time–frequency transform was computed in each trial and then summed over all trials, subjects and electrodes. The chart retains mainly the induced component of the gamma response. Both charts exhibit two periods of increased gamma-power emission (between 20 and 60 Hz). Power peaks at ~230 ms after stimulus onset, and
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**Figure 2** Time courses of phase synchrony and gamma activity. Results shown are averages over trials, electrodes, and subjects. Values are in standard deviations from the 500-ms baseline. Thick line, face-perception condition (P); thin line, no-perception condition (NP); dashed line, synchrony computed on shuffled data (Sh); the grey strip indicates dispersion of these data ±3 standard errors; horizontal red lines indicate ± standard error of reaction time. a, Phase synchrony for the P and NP conditions. NP synchrony remains stable and near the shuffling average until 700 ms. Phase synchrony for the P condition increases at 230 ms.
The biological significance of phase synchrony computed from scalp EEGs has been doubted because it is difficult to rule out the occurrence of spurious synchronization resulting from volume conduction. However, such spurious synchronization cannot account for our results. Volume conduction induces a pattern of synchronization that decays rapidly as the separation between electrodes increases beyond 2 cm on the surface of the cortex. In contrast, we found that synchrony can be established between recording sites situated far away from each other on the head surface; only 7% of the synchronies reported here were between neighboring recording sites. It is also conceivable that distant synchronization could result from a powerful deep source that diffuses widely over the scalp. But if this were the case, the phase-synchrony pattern should coincide with gamma activity, the electrodes with higher emission being the most synchronous ones. Our results do not show this (Fig. 3). Finally, the desynchronizing periods found here are impossible to explain by volume conduction. If synchrony effects were just a reflection of gamma activity then desynchronization should be associated with periods of low gamma activity. Our results show the opposite effect: desynchronization coexisted with periods of above-average gamma activity. Furthermore, the same gamma level led to strong desynchronization in the perception condition but had no effect on the no-perception condition (Fig. 2). Finally, the zero-centred phase-lag distribution found here also suggests that the measured synchronies did not have an artefactual origin.

The finding of gamma oscillations has often been taken, erroneously, as an indication of synchrony. Indeed, changes in gamma-band spectral content cannot be conflated with the phase synchrony between pairs of electrodes at which such gamma activity occurs. Only synchrony measures bear directly on the possible role of gamma activity in cognition, as synchrony provides direct information about electrode pairs and their regional location, which power emission alone cannot provide. To our knowledge, our results are the first to support the theory that phase synchrony is directly involved in human cognition. The long-range character of the phase synchrony indicates that gamma-phase synchrony (and desynchrony) may be viewed as a mechanism that subserves large-scale cognitive integration, and not just local visual-feature binding. Finally, we stress that the detection of phase synchrony/desynchrony over the scalp amounts to a dynamic brain mapping that is essential for the study of the neural basis of cognitive tasks.

Methods

Protocol and recordings. Experimental design and data analysis have been described in detail elsewhere. In brief, Mooney faces were presented randomly for 200 ms in upright or inverted positions, in a total of 320 trials. Ten subjects (20–30 years old; seven females) gave their response by pressing buttons situated under their right and left index fingers. EEGs were recorded by 30 electrodes at standard 10–20 positions, to which we added a lower row (M1, M2, P9, P10, PO9, PO10, O9, and O10). Sampling was taken at 500 Hz.

Time–frequency analysis. After automatic correction of eye-movement artefact trials, signals were high-pass-filtered at 15 Hz and time–frequency-analysed using the pseudo-Wigner–Ville transformation. Resulting time–frequency maps were normalized and averaged through trials, electrodes and subjects.

Phase-synchrony detection. Previous methods for measuring phase synchrony between electrode pairs have included spectral coherence, which mixes energy and phase information, and detection of maximal values after filtering, which is inaccurate and slow when large data sets are involved. In the method introduced here, for each subject phase synchrony was computed only for the frequency $f_0$ of his/her maximal gamma activity (varying from 35 to 45 Hz, depending on the subject). Phase was measured from narrow-band-filtered signals ($f_0 \pm 3\,\text{Hz}$) by convolution with a complex exponential wavelet designed for $f_0$. An instantaneous phase value, $\varphi(t, k)$, which is a complex number of unit magnitude, was thus obtained for one electrode, $i$, at a chosen frequency, $f_0$, at time $t$, and trial $k$. For each electrode pair, $i$ and $j$, and time $t$, and for all of the $k = 1, \ldots, N$ trials, a global phase-locking value $\varphi(t, k)$ is computed as:

$$\varphi(t, k) = \frac{\sum_i \varphi_i(t, k)}{N}$$

$\varphi_i(t, k)$ is a real value bounded between 1 (if phase difference is constant) and 0 (if phase difference is random).

Normalization. To calculate synchrony values comparable between near (<2 cm) and distant electrode pairs, we carried out a normalization procedure so that the $\varphi(t, k)$ values were compared with the 500-ms baseline preceding the stimulus. Given $\varphi_i$, let $\mu_i$ and $\sigma_i$ be the mean and standard deviation computed from a 500-ms prestimulus baseline; the normalized phase-locking values are then computed as $\varphi'_i = (\varphi_i - \mu_i)/\sigma_i$. The same normalization procedure is applied to time–frequency matrices on a frequency–by-frequency basis.

Topographical synchrony. To display the lines indicating synchrony over individual pairs of electrodes (Fig. 3) we used the following statistical procedure. Let $W_1$ be a 180-ms time window between stimulus arrival and motor response, and let $\varphi(W_1)$ be the average phase synchrony between electrodes $i$ and $j$ over the entire time window, $W_1$. To enhance changes, we compared $W_1$ with the previous time window, $W_1-1$, and defined the phase-locking value between pairs finally as $\Delta \varphi(W_1) = \varphi(W_1) - \varphi(W_1-1)$. For each $\Delta \varphi(W_1)$, 200 values were analogously computed on shuffled data $\Delta \varphi'_i(W_1)$. A $\Delta \varphi_i$ value is retained as statistically significant only if greater than (or less than) any of the 200 shuffled values $\Delta \varphi'_i$, thus corresponding to a two-tailed probability value of $P = 0.01$.
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