Separate timescales for spatial and anatomical information processing during action observation

Waltzing B.M.[1] *, McAteer S. [1], Moreno-Verdú M. [1], Van Caenegem E.E. [1], Yue Du[2], Hardwick R.M.[1]

[1]Institute of Neurosciences, UC Louvain, Belgium Avenue Mounier 54, 1200, Bruxelles, Belgium

[2]Department of Neurology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, United States

*Correspondence should be addressed to Baptiste Waltzing (baptiste.waltzing@uclouvain.be)

Author note

Word count: 9819

All data and code used for the task and data analysis can be found:

https://osf.io/q2rd8/?view_only=e492221e800a4d78b44040910e10985b

Declaration of Interest: The authors declare no competing interest.

Abstract

Introduction: Observing actions primes us to perform similar movements. Prior work indicates this effect is influenced by factors such as spatial congruence, perspective, and presenting biological/non-biological stimuli. We hypothesized that the influence of these factors would vary depending on the amount of time that participants had to process visual stimuli.

Method: Experiment 1 was a reaction time task (n=29) with stimuli varying in spatial congruence (congruent, incongruent, neutral), perspective (first- or third-person) and stimulus type (biological or non-biological). Experiment 2 (n=50) used the same stimuli in a "Forced Response" paradigm, which controlled the time participants had to prepare a response. This allowed us to assess responses as a function of preparation time.

Results: Experiment 1 showed effects of spatial congruence, with longer reaction times and more errors for spatially incongruent stimuli. This effect was greater for biological stimuli. Experiment 2 showed that spatial information was processed faster than anatomical information, inducing incorrect responses at short preparation times for spatially incongruent biological stimuli. There was little-to-no corresponding effect for non-biological stimuli. Both experiments also showed weak-to-no effects of perspective, which appear to have been driven by spatial congruence.

Discussion: Our results indicate that spatial information is processed faster than anatomical information during action observation. These data are consistent with the dual visual streams hypothesis, whereby spatial information would be processed rapidly via the dorsal stream, while anatomical processing would occur later via the ventral stream. These data also indicate differences in processing between biological and non-biological stimuli.

Key words: Action Observation, Spatial congruence, Perspective, Stimuli processing

Public significance statements: This study provides novel insight into the time-course of information processing, showing that spatial information is processed faster than anatomical information during action observation. The results also challenge the established view that visual perspective is critical to action observation effects, demonstrating that this may instead result from lower-level effects of spatial congruence.

Introduction

Action observation (i.e. observing a movement being performed) plays a central role in our everyday lives. We observe the movements of others in many contexts, including to imitate them in order to learn new movements (Gatti et al., 2013), to respond with a complementary action such as shaking hands (Curioni et al., 2020; Faber et al., 2016), or without any specific intention. In recent years, action observation has also been used in the medical field, notably for the rehabilitation of movement-related disorders (Caligiore et al., 2017; López et al., 2019; Machado et al., 2019; Nicholson et al., 2019). Despite this widespread interest, there are still fundamental questions regarding how stimuli presenting actions are processed; addressing these questions is a key challenge in optimizing the use of action observation in order to use it as effectively as possible in applied situations.

In non-human primates, the effects of action observation are mediated by mirror neurons. These neurons, first discovered in the F5 region of the brains of macaques, are activated both during the observation of an action, and during the execution of the same action (di Pellegrino et al., 1992; Rizzolatti et al., 1996). Neurons with similar properties have been identified in premotor and parietal areas, and are thought to form a “mirror neuron system” that could mediate the effects of action observation (Blakemore & Frith, 2005). In humans, action observation leads to the recruitment of functionally similar premotor and parietal areas that are considered to form an “action observation system” (Fadiga et al., 1995; Hardwick et al., 2018). These discoveries provide a potential neural basis for behavioural effects whereby observing the actions of another person can influence our own movements.

Research has demonstrated that observing actions performed by other people can prime us to perform similar movements (Edwards et al., 2003; Hardwick & Edwards, 2011, 2012; Press

et al., 2011). In particular, previous work indicates that reaction times are reduced following the observation of an action compatible with the required response (Brass et al., 2001, Edwards et al. , 2003). Subsequent studies have investigated factors that influence such priming effects (for a review see (Kemmerer, 2021)). In this study, we focused on three of them in particular. The first is the nature of the stimulus, which may be biological or non-biological. Studies have shown that the observation of a biological stimulus (e.g. a hand (Gowen et al., 2010)) can induce a priming effect if the requested movement is congruent with the observed movement. There is mixed evidence that this priming effect is smaller or absent during the observation of non-biological stimuli (e.g. geometric shapes (Biermann-Ruben et al., 2008)) and is therefore argued that there would be a particular processing for biological stimuli (for a review see (Gowen & Poliakoff, 2012)). This greater priming effect could be explained by the pre-activation of motor areas when the action is observed (Jeannerod, 2001). A second factor is perspective. It has been shown that observing an action from a first-person perspective (consistent with observing our own movements through our own eyes) had a greater priming effect and was therefore associated with faster reaction times than actions observed from a third-person perspective (observing an action from the vantage point of another person) (Mibu et al., 2020). This effect could be explained by the fact that some studies have shown greater activation of areas of the action observation system when observing actions from a first-person perspective than from a third-person perspective (Angelini et al., 2021; Ge et al., 2018; Oosterhof et al., 2012). The third factor we were interested in was the spatial congruence of the observed action. Studies have shown that observing an action that is spatially congruent with the required action (e.g. a right hand in first-person perspective for a response with the right hand) (fig 1A) has a greater priming effect than observing an action that is spatially incongruent (e.g. a left hand in first-person

perspective for a response with the right hand) (Avikainen et al., 2003; Bekkering et al., 2000; Chiavarino et al., 2007; Wohlschläger & Bekkering, 2002). This could be explained by greater activation of the contralateral hemisphere of the hand observed in the first-person perspective but greater activation of the ipsilateral hemisphere in the third-person perspective (Shmuelof & Zohary, 2008).

We therefore examined how these three factors influenced action observation. Experiment 1 used a classical reaction time task to study possible interactions between the factors of stimulus type, perspective and spatial congruence. We predicted that although perspective may have an effect, the most important point would be spatial congruence, with shorter reaction times for spatially congruent stimuli than for spatially incongruent stimuli. This hypothesis is inspired by the work of Simon et al. (Simon & Wolf, 1963) who showed that the spatial position of the observed stimuli played a key role in their processing, with shorter reaction times when they were spatially congruent. While traditional reaction time-based studies provide general information about stimulus processing, they are limited in their ability to examine the precise time-course of information processing. To address these limitations, Experiment 2 used a forced response paradigm (Haith et al., 2016; Hardwick et al., 2019; Schouten & Bekker, 1967; Vleugels et al., 2020). This procedure limits the processing time available to participants, providing a measurement of accuracy as a function of the response preparation time available, allowing us to obtain a novel insight into how the stimulus is processed. In particular, we expect to observe differences in processing between biological and non-biological stimuli. These differences would be due to the activation of the action observation system, which includes motor-related areas specifically following the observation of biological stimuli (Hardwick et al., 2018). Similar to our prediction for Experiment 1, we also hypothesised that spatial congruence may interact with perspective during this task.

Experiment 1

Experiment 1 Methods

In this first experiment, we investigated how action observation could be influenced by factors including the nature of the stimulus, perspective, and the spatial congruence of the stimulus with the participant's responses. To do this, we performed a reaction time task to examine variations in both reaction time and errors. All procedures were reported in accordance to the 'Action Observation' part of the "Guidelines for Reporting Action Simulation Studies" checklist (Moreno-Verdú et al., 2024). This study was not preregistered.

Participants

A group of 30 healthy young participants were recruited via the Prolific online platform (https://www.prolific.com/). A single participant was excluded for an extremely high number of unanswered or incorrect trials and very short reaction times (see section 1.1 of supplementary material for more details). This left 29 participants aged between 18 and 34 years (mean = 25.3 years, SD = 4.2 years). All participants were right handed, 10 were women, 19 were men. They were all naive about the purpose of the experiment. All participants gave their consent before the start of the experiment and were financially compensated (3£) for their time. The study was approved by the IPSY ethics committee of UCLouvain.



Figure 1. A. General experimental task set up. Participants positioned their right hand with the index, middle and ring fingers resting on the f, g and h keys respectively. The stimulus appeared in the centre of the screen, indicating which key should be pressed. Underneath were 3 black squares, each corresponding to a key and providing visual feedback. The square of the key pressed turned green if the response was correct and red if the response was incorrect. B. Reaction time paradigm. In each trial the participant heard a sequence of three

equally spaced tones, and a stimulus always appeared at the same time as the third tone. Participants were instructed to respond as quickly and accurately as possible once the stimulus appeared. C. Biological stimuli. The different biological stimuli are presented, which can show a right or left hand, first- or third-person perspective, with index, middle or ring finger raised. The coloured squares are not part of the stimuli, but indicate the spatial congruence: yellow for spatially congruent stimuli, red for spatially incongruent stimuli and blue for spatially neutral stimuli. A darker shade is used for biological stimuli and a lighter shade for non-biological stimuli. This colour code is reused in the results plots. D. Non-biological stimuli. These stimuli were presented in the same position as the biological stimuli, whose low-level characteristics they mimic.

General Task Procedures

The task was created in PsychoPy2 version 2023.2.2 (Peirce et al., 2019) and run online via PsychoPy2's associated webpage Pavlovia (https://pavlovia.org/) (Bridges et al., 2020).

This reaction time task consisted of three different conditions: the familiarisation condition, the biological stimuli condition, and the non-biological stimuli condition. The task was the same for all three conditions, but each condition was characterised by different stimuli. Participants sat in front of a computer keyboard with the index, middle, and ring fingers of their right hand positioned on the f, g, and h keys of the keyboard, respectively (fig 1A). For each trial, the participants heard three short tones (50ms duration) spaced 400ms apart (fig 1B). To make it easier to distinguish between the different tones, the first two tones had a lower pitch than the final tone (i.e. notes "La" and "Si", respectively). A visual stimulus was presented at the same time as the third tone. Depending on the stimulus that appeared, the participants had to respond by pressing on the keyboard with their index, middle, or ring finger. Participants were instructed to answer as quickly and as accurately as possible once the stimulus appeared on the screen. They were given a maximum of 1s to respond, or the trial was considered to be 'time out'. Once they had answered, visual feedback was displayed

168 on the screen to indicate whether or not the answer was correct. The feedback consisted of
169 three small black squares at the bottom of the screen, each corresponding to one of the three
170 keyboard buttons. The box corresponding to the button that the participant responded with
171 changed to provide feedback, turning green if the response was correct, or red if it was
172 incorrect. The trial had a fixed duration of 1 second regardless of the participant's reaction
173 time, and was followed by a 200ms interval in which no stimulus was shown on screen. In all
174 conditions the order of trials was pseudo-randomised such that the same response was
175 presented on a maximum of two consecutive trials. There was a break between each block
176 (this could be as long as the participant desired, with a minimum of at least 10s), during which
177 the instructions were displayed on the screen. Each block began with a short check in which
178 the participant had to press the three keys, in order to prompt the participants to ensure their
179 fingers were placed on the correct keys.

180 *Familiarisation condition*. The familiarization block was used to help participants gain
181 some practice in completing the task. For this condition, one of three different stimuli could
182 be displayed on the screen: an arrow pointing to the left, upwards, or to the right. For these
183 stimuli, participants had to respond with their index, middle and ring fingers respectively. This
184 block consisted of 20 trials for each stimulus. Data from this condition was not included in
185 later analyses.

186 *Biological stimuli condition*. For this condition, the stimuli displayed were images of a
187 hand with one finger raised (fig 1C). Participants were instructed to respond using the finger
188 that appeared raised on the displayed stimulus (i.e. if the stimulus presented an index finger,
189 the participant had to respond with their own index finger by pressing on the f key). The hand
190 could be presented in first- or third-person perspective, be a right or left hand, and have the

index, middle, or ring finger raised, for a total of 12 different stimuli (2 perspectives * 2 hands * 3 fingers). The same three images of the right hand in first-person perspective, one for each finger, were used for all stimuli, with mirroring and/or rotation to create left hand/third-person perspective stimuli. The position of the stimulus relative to the participant's own hand, and thus the spatial congruence of the stimulus relative to the required response, was therefore influenced by the perspective and the hand observed. For example, when the stimulus presented the index finger of a right hand in the first-person perspective, the position of the finger was spatially congruent with that of the participant's own index finger; by contrast, if the stimulus presented the index finger on a *left* hand in first-person perspective, the position of the finger was spatially incongruent with the response required by the participant. While these manipulations affected the positions of the index and ring fingers, being centred, the stimuli with the middle finger were always spatially congruent regardless of the perspective and the hand observed. For this condition, there were two blocks of 120 trials, with each stimulus being presented 10 times per block. The order of the trials was pseudorandomised to limit the number of consecutive responses with the same finger to two. Participants therefore completed a total of 20 trials with each stimulus, and a total of 240 trials in this condition.

Non-biological stimuli condition. Previous studies have suggested differences in processing for biological compared to non-biological stimuli (Gowen & Poliakoff, 2012). Therefore, the aim of this condition was to have non-biological stimuli that mimicked the low-level characteristics of biological stimuli, to see whether the effects observed were specific to action observation or not. The stimuli were the lowercase letters "f", "g" or "h" (fig 1D) in Calibri font. Participants were asked to respond to these stimuli with their index, middle and ring fingers respectively. To obtain the 12 different stimuli equivalent to the biological stimuli,

the letter stimuli were first placed at the respective locations of the index, middle and ring fingers of the right hand stimulus in first-person perspective. The same rotation/mirroring manipulations as applied to the biological stimuli were then applied to these non-biological stimuli. This gave us 12 different stimuli (2 * rotation (equivalent to “perspective” in the biological stimuli condition), 2 * vertical symmetry (equivalent to “hand” in the biological stimuli condition), 3 * letters (equivalent to “finger” in the biological stimuli condition). Like the biological stimuli, the positions of the letters f and h could be spatially congruent (i.e. equivalent right hand, first-person perspective and left hand, third-person perspective) or incongruent (i.e. equivalent left hand, first-person perspective and right hand, third-person perspective). The central position of the letter g meant that it was always spatially congruent, regardless of the orientation of the stimulus. As in the biological stimuli condition, participants completed two blocks, each block comprising 120 trials with 10 trials for each stimulus, for a total of 240 trials with the same pseudorandomisation.

Protocol

Participants always began with the familiarisation condition, after which the order of conditions was counterbalanced across participants; half of the participants completed the biological stimuli condition first, followed by the non-biological stimuli condition, and vice-versa. The median completion time was 24 minutes (including breaks between blocks).

Data analysis

Analyses were performed in R version 4.3.2 (R Core Team 2024).

We measured two variables of interest: reaction time (defined as the time between the appearance of the stimulus and the response given by the participants) and error rate (percentage of incorrect responses out of the total number of responses).

Exclusion criteria. Of the 13920 total trials conducted, 370 trials (representing 2.66% of the total) were excluded from the analyses for having no response.

Reaction time. As we performed a separate analysis for the error rate, trials with incorrect responses were not included in the reaction time analyses (n=1421), leaving a total of n=12129 trials for analysis.

Global Analysis: Data were first analysed using a "Global" model that considered the data in its most granular form. A linear mixed model examined effects and possible interactions between several factors, labelled here in relation to the biological stimuli. This included the factors of "Stimulus Type" (2 levels; biological or non-biological), "Perspective" (2 levels; first-person or third-person), "Hand" (2 levels; left or right), and "Finger" (3 levels; index, middle, or ring). The model included between-participant variability as a random effect (i.e. random intercept) and used the formula: reaction time ~ stimulus type * perspective * hand * finger + (1|participant).

Spatial Congruence Analysis: We anticipated that spatial congruence would have important effects on participant performance, and therefore conducted an analysis to specifically examine this effect. Stimuli were grouped according to the spatial congruence between the observed stimulus and required response. Spatial congruence could therefore be either "neutral" (i.e. all middle finger stimuli regardless of perspective, as the middle finger was always in the same central position on screen), "congruent" (i.e. index and ring finger stimuli for the first-person right hand stimuli, and third-person left hand stimuli), or "incongruent" (i.e. index and ring finger stimuli for the first-person left hand stimuli and third-person right hand stimuli). We therefore used a linear mixed model to see if reaction time was affected by the factors of "Stimulus Type" (2 levels; biological or non-biological) and "Spatial

Congruence" (3 levels; neutral, congruent, incongruent), using the formula: reaction time ~ stimulus type * spatial congruence + (1|participant).

Error Rate. The analysis of error rates was carried out in a similar way to the analysis of reaction times, but using binomial generalized linear mixed models to take account of the binary nature of the outcome (0=incorrect, 1=correct). The same general analyses were conducted as for the reaction time. A "Global Analysis" used the formula: error rate ~ stimulus type * perspective * hand * finger + (1|participant), while a "Spatial Congruence Analysis" examined the data using the formula: error rate ~ stimulus type * spatial congruence + (1|participant).

Response type. We looked at what kind of response participants made when they saw spatially incongruent stimuli. To do this, we first filtered to keep only the spatially incongruent trials. Then the trials were labelled as follows: correct (for trials with a correct response), spatially induced error (for responses given with the index finger when the correct response was the ring finger or vice versa) and spatially neutral error (for incorrect responses given with the middle finger). A generalized linear mixed model was then calculated using the following formula: number of responses ~ stimulus type * type of response (correct, spatial, random) + (1|participant).

We were also interested in the reaction time for each type of response. We calculated the following linear mixed model: reaction time ~ stimulus type * type of response (correct, spatial, random) + (1|participant).

Post hoc comparisons. For all models, post hoc comparisons were conducted using z-tests. All p-values obtained were adjusted using Tukey's method for multiple comparison, and alpha was set to 0.05 for statistical significance.

284 Experiment 1 Results

285 *Reaction Time*

286 *Global Analysis (fig 2A,B).* Results of the global model are presented in Table 1.

Term	Reaction Time		Accuracy	
	χ2	*P*	χ2	*P*
Stimulus Type	*213.5*	*< 0.001**	49.6	*< 0.001**
Perspective	*73.1*	*< 0.001**	0.2	0.673
Hand	*6.5*	*0.011**	3.4	0.064
Finger	656.0	< 0.001*	160.7	*< 0.001**
Stimulus Type * Perspective	7.4	0.007*	2.0	0.154
Stimulus Type * Hand	1.1	0.284	6.0	0.014*
Perspective * Hand	314.0	*< 0.001**	159.1	*< 0.001**
Stimulus Type * Finger	68.2	*< 0.001**	59.0	*< 0.001**
Perspective * Finger	14.9	*< 0.001**	1.8	0.410
Hand * Finger	4.9	0.085	1.3	0.510
Stimulus Type * Perspective * Hand	39.0	*< 0.001**	18.8	*< 0.001**
Stimulus Type * Perspective * Finger	1.0	0.595	0.8	0.659
Stimulus Type * Hand * Finger	4.5	0.103	5.6	0.059
Perspective * Hand * Finger	165.8	*< 0.001**	46.6	*< 0.001**
Stimulus Type * Perspective * Hand * Finger	6.5	0.040*	1.3	0.532

287 Table 1: Results from the Global analyses of Reaction Times and Accuracy. * Indicates
288 statistically significant results.

289 The global model identified several notable factors. First, main effects identified that
290 participants were significantly faster when responding to non-biological stimuli (562 ± 57ms)

compared to biological stimuli (586 ± 53ms, $z = 15.3$, $p < 0.001$)(fig S2), when responding to first-person stimuli (566 ± 53ms) compared to third-person stimuli (582 ± 51ms, $z = 8.0$, $p < 0.001$)(fig S4), and when responding to right hand (571 ± 51ms) stimuli compared to left hand stimuli (576 ± 51ms, $z = 2.7$, $p = 0.006$). This analysis also identified finger-related effects; post-hoc comparisons identified that participants were generally faster when presented with stimuli requiring responses with the middle finger (543 ± 50ms), compared to the index (584 ± 55ms, $z = 19.0$, $p<0.001$) or ring fingers (597 ± 54ms, $z = 24.6$, $p<0.001$), while responses with the index finger were generally faster than those with the ring finger ($z = 5.6$, $p<0.001$). Secondly, important interactions between the perspective and observed hand were identified; generally, in the first-person perspective, participants were faster when responding to a right hand (549 ± 55ms) than a left hand (584 ± 52ms) ($z = 15.0$, $p< 0.001$), while in the third-person perspective, participants were faster when responding to a left hand (569 ± 51ms) than a right hand (596 ± 51ms) ($z = 11.2$, $p< 0.001$). This overall pattern of results was highly consistent with effects that depended on the spatial congruence between the observed stimulus and the required response. As such, further analysis concentrated on examining this effect directly.

Spatial Congruence Analysis (fig 2C). The model for spatial congruence showed a significant interaction between stimulus type and spatial congruence ($\chi^2 = 106.8$, $p < 0.001$) as well as a main effects of stimulus type ($\chi^2 = 210.1$, $p < 0.001$) and spatial congruence ($\chi^2 = 1047.4$, $p < 0.001$). Post-hoc comparisons focusing on biological stimuli showed that reaction times were fastest for the neutral stimuli (547 ± 57ms), then congruent (579 ± 57ms), then incongruent (646 ± 55ms) (all $z > 9.9$, all $p < 0.001$). Results were similar for the non-biological stimuli, with the shortest reaction times for the neutral (540 ± 53ms) then congruent (556 ± 64ms) then incongruent (592 ± 60ms) stimuli (all $z > 5.2$, all $p < 0.001$). Interestingly, while there was no significant difference in reaction times between neutral biological and non-

biological stimuli (z= 2.2, p = 0.22), participants were significantly faster when responding to non-biological stimuli compared to biological stimuli for both spatially congruent (z = 7.5, p< 0.001) and spatially incongruent stimuli (z = 16.0, p< 0.001).



Figure 2. Reaction time analysis. For all plots, yellow bars indicate spatially congruent stimuli, red bars indicate spatially incongruent stimuli, and blue bars indicate spatially neutral stimuli. A darker shade is used for biological stimuli and a lighter shade for non-biological stimuli. Error

bars represent ±1SD, each point represents a single participant. A) Mean reaction time for all biological stimuli. Panels are separated according to hands (columns) and perspective (lines). B) Mean reaction time for all non-biological stimuli. The panels are located in the same relative position as the biological stimuli whose characteristics they mimic (see A). C) Mean reaction time for congruent (index or ring finger for the right hand in first-person perspective or the left hand in third-person perspective), incongruent (index or ring finger for the left hand in first-person perspective or the right hand in third-person perspective) and neutral stimuli (all middle finger stimuli).

Error rate

Global Analysis (fig 3A,B). Results of the global analysis for error rates is presented in Table 1. Notably, analysis of main effects identified that participants made more errors when responding to biological stimuli compared to non-biological stimuli ($z = 2.5$, $p = 0.014$, biological stimuli = 10.81 ± 6.11%, non-biological stimuli = 7.30 ± 4.54%). We also identified a finger effect, whereby there were less errors when answering with the middle finger (3.98 ± 3.13%) than with the index (10.06 ± 5.40%, $z = 7.8$, $p< 0.001$) and ring fingers (13.16 ± 7.58%, $z = 13.8$, $p< 0.001$), whereas the index finger had less errors than the ring finger ($z = 6.1$, $p< 0.001$). The analysis also identified several interactions (see Table 1), and the overall pattern of results were again highly consistent with effects depending on spatial congruence. We therefore conducted a specific analysis to examine this effect in greater detail.

Spatial Congruence Analysis (fig 3C). The model for spatial congruence showed a significant interaction between stimulus type and spatial congruence ($\chi^2 = 76.5$, $p < 0.001$) as well as main effects of stimulus type ($\chi^2 = 53.2$, $p < 0.001$) and spatial congruence ($\chi^2 = 405.8$, $p < 0.001$). Post-hoc comparisons for the biological stimuli showed that the percentage of error was lowest for the neutral (2.85 ± 3.03%), then congruent (7.26 ± 6.53%), then incongruent (22.58 ± 12.63%) stimuli (all $z > 6.65$, all $p < 0.001$). Post hoc-analysis for the non-

biological stimuli revealed the percentage error did not differ significantly for the neutral (5.13 ± 4.31%) and congruent stimuli (5.84 ± 5.26%) ($z = 1.1$, $p = 0.581$), and both were lower than the percentage error for the incongruent stimuli (10.93 ± 7.63) (both $z > 6.3$, both $p < 0.001$).



Figure 3. Error rate analysis. Bars are color coded as followed; yellow is spatially congruent stimuli, red is spatially incongruent stimuli, and blue is neutral stimuli. A darker shade is used for biological stimuli and a lighter shade for non-biological stimuli. Error bars represent ±1SD,

each point represents a single participant. A) Mean error rate for all biological stimuli. Panels are separated according to hands (columns) and perspective (lines). B) Mean error for all non-biological stimuli. The panels are located in the same relative position as the biological stimuli whose characteristics they mimic (see A). C) Mean error for congruent (index or ring finger for the right hand in first-person perspective or the left hand in third-person perspective), incongruent (index or ring finger for the left hand in first-person perspective or the right hand in third-person perspective) and neutral stimuli (all middle finger stimuli). Biological stimuli are on the left and non-biological stimuli on the right.

Response type Analysis

Number of responses (fig 4A). For this model, the interaction between response type and stimulus type was significant ($\chi^2 = 175.2$, $p < 0.001$). The main effect of response type was also significant ($\chi^2 = 2826.7$, $p < 0.001$) unlike the main effect of stimulus type ($\chi^2 = 2.8$, $p = 0.092$). For biological stimuli, the number of correct responses (60 ± 10) was higher than the number of spatial errors (15 ± 8, $z = 25.9$, $p<0.001$) and the number of 'spatially neutral' errors (3 ± 3, $z = 26.7$, $p< 0.001$). The number of spatial errors was also higher than the number of 'spatially neutral' errors ($z = 13.9$, $p< 0.001$). For non-biological stimuli the number of correct responses (70 ± 6) was higher than the number of spatial errors (4 ± 5, $z = 29.4$, $p< 0.001$) and the number of 'spatially neutral' errors (4 ± 3, $z = 28.2$, $p< 0.001$) but there was no difference between the number of spatial and 'spatially neutral' errors ($z = 0.4$, $p = 0.99$). All comparisons between corresponding biological and non-biological conditions showed less errors for non-biological stimuli (all $z > 3.2$, all $p< 0.015$).

Reaction time (fig 4B). For the reaction times of these different types of response, the interaction between response type and stimulus type was not significant ($\chi^2 = 1.3$, $p = 0.510$). However, the main effect of response type was significant ($\chi^2 = 330.8$, $p < 0.001$), as was the main effect of stimulus type ($\chi^2 = 241.3$, $p < 0.001$). For biological stimuli, the reaction time for

correct responses (647 ± 55ms) did not differ to that for ‘spatially neutral’ errors (602 ± 111ms) ($z = 2.2$, $p = 0.23$), and both were greater than the reaction time for spatial errors (546 ± 62ms). For non-biological stimuli the reaction time for correct responses was the highest (592 ± 60ms) followed by that for ‘spatially neutral’ errors (535 ± 122ms) and finally the reaction time for spatial errors (484 ± 158ms) was the shortest (all significant $z > 3.3$, $p < 0.01$). All comparisons between corresponding biological and non-biological conditions showed less errors for non-biological stimuli (all $z > 4.3$, all $p < 0.001$).



Figure 4. Error type analysis. For all plots, error bars represent SD, each point represents a participant and the color code is as followed; red for correct response, purple for spatially neutral error and cyan for spatially induced error. A darker shade is used for biological stimuli and a lighter shade for non-biological stimuli. Error bars represent ±1SD, each point represents a single participant. A) number of response for each type of response for spatially incongruent

biological and non-biological stimuli. B) Mean reaction time for each type of response for spatially incongruent biological and non-biological stimuli.

Experiment 1 Discussion

Several noteworthy results emerged from this experiment. Firstly, spatial congruence had a major impact on performance, with longer reaction times and poorer accuracy for spatially incongruent stimuli than for spatially congruent stimuli. Responses to spatially neutral stimuli were fastest with low levels of error, probably because these stimuli were always centred and therefore not subject to spatial congruence effects. Secondly, participants were generally faster and more accurate when responding to non-biological stimuli compared to biological stimuli. However, spatial congruence again modulated this effect, as there were no differences in reaction time when participants responded to non-biological and biological stimuli presented in a neutral position. Furthermore, our analysis of the errors made indicates that biological stimuli were more likely to induce spatial errors, whereas there was no difference between the likelihood of 'spatial' and 'spatially neutral' errors for non-biological stimuli. These data suggest that the spatial information of biological stimuli may be more compelling than for non-biological stimuli. Thirdly, our results indicate that perspective may be less important than would be assumed. Although an effect of perspective was present for reaction time, with faster reaction times for first-person perspective than for third-person perspective, this effect was not present for accuracy. Furthermore, when we break down the results, we see that in first-person perspective the responses are faster and more accurate for stimuli from the (spatially congruent) right hand compared with the left hand (spatially incongruent), whereas for third-person perspective, participants provided faster and more accurate responses to the (spatially congruent) left hand compared to the right hand (spatially incongruent). This again suggests the importance of spatial congruence.

418 The results of Experiment 1 highlight notable effects of spatial congruence during
419 action observation. They also show a conflict between spatial and anatomical information,
420 suggesting a difference in their processing. This fits well with the hypothesis of two streams
421 of vision: the dorsal stream for processing spatial information and the ventral stream for
422 anatomical recognition (Goodale & Milner, 1992). It should be noted, however, that having
423 two variables of interest (i.e. reaction time and accuracy), can make interpretation of the
424 results complex (e.g the main effect of perspective on reaction time, but not error rates). In
425 addition, the reaction time task gives us information about the 'end point' of stimulus
426 processing, but does not give us information about its time-course. Our second experiment
427 addressed these issues using a forced-response paradigm.

428 **Experiment 2**

429 Experiment 2 Method

430 The second experiment was inspired by previous studies that used a 'forced response'
431 paradigm to effectively control the time participants have available to prepare a response
432 (Haith et al., 2016; Hardwick et al., 2019; Vleugels et al., 2020) (fig 5A). This allows the
433 measurement of how accuracy changes as a function of the time that participants had to
434 prepare their response. Using this procedure in the present experiment allowed us to assess
435 the amount of time required to process different features of the presented stimuli.



Figure 5. A. Forced Response paradigm. Participants heard a sequence of three equally spaced tones, but here the stimulus appeared at a variable time between the first and third tones. Participants were instructed to respond synchronously with the third tone. This effectively controlled the amount of time that the participant had to process the stimulus and prepare the corresponding response. The preparation time (PT) was defined as the time between the appearance of the stimulus and the participant's response. B. Models used for analysis of the forced response task. The single process model (blue) follows a sigmoidal response profile, with an initial plateau where the probability of responses begins around chance levels, before increasing to a final plateau where the probability for that response is close to 100%. In orange, the dual process model allows for situations where different responses could be produced as a function of the time available; in the situation shown here an initial decrease below chance level of the probability to produce that type of response before increasing to reach the final plateau.

Participants

A group of 57 healthy young participants were recruited via the Prolific online platform (https://www.prolific.com/). Seven participants were excluded from the analyses for failing to follow task instructions (see the exclusion criteria section for more details). This left a total of 50 participants aged between 18 and 35 years (mean = 25.5 years, SD = 4.5 years). All the participants were right handed, 12 were women, 38 were men. They were all naive about the purpose of the experiment. All participants gave their consent before the start of the

experiment and were financially compensated (£5.50). The study was approved by the IPSY ethics committee of UCLouvain.

General Task Procedures

The task was created in PsychoPy2 version 2023.2.2 (Peirce et al., 2019) and run online via PsychoPy2's associated webpage Pavlovia (https://pavlovia.org/) (Bridges et al., 2020).

The general procedure for Experiment 2 was similar to that of Experiment 1. Participants responded to visual stimuli presented in three different conditions; familiarisation, biological stimuli, and non-biological stimuli. The stimuli and associated responses were the same as in Experiment 1.

As in Experiment 1, participants heard three short 50ms tones spaced 400ms apart on each trial. Here, however, in each trial a stimulus appeared at a variable time between the first and last tones, and participants were instructed to provide their response synchronously with the third tone (fig 5A). This allowed us to systematically vary the amount of allowed "preparation time" (i.e time between the presentation of the stimulus and the intended time of the response at the third tone; note that all analyses used the 'actual' preparation time, i.e. the time between the presentation of the stimulus and the participant's response) participants had to process the stimulus and prepare a response; presenting the stimulus very early during the sequence of tones allowed a long preparation time, whereas presenting the stimulus very late in the trial provided a very limited preparation time. Note that the timings used included trials in which the stimulus was presented so late that the participant would not realistically have time to process it, forcing them to guess as to which response would be correct. As such, participants were expected to perform at around chance levels when allowed only very limited preparation times, whereas longer preparation times should reflect stimulus processing, allow

examination of how response accuracy varied with time. To encourage participants to respond synchronously with the final tone, they were instructed to respond both at the right time and with the correct finger, but that their highest priority was to respond at the right time, even if this meant that they had to guess the correct response. Visual feedback was provided in the same manner as in Experiment 1, and additional feedback was provided to aid participants to respond with good timing. If participants responded 100ms before the third tone, the message "too early" appeared in red on the screen, and if they responded 100ms after the third tone, the message "too late" appeared in red. If they responded between -100ms and +100ms of the third tone, the message "on time" appeared in green. After the third tone there was a period of 800ms during which feedback remained on screen. If the participant provided a response during the trial, there was an interval of 200ms before the next trial. If the participant did not provide a response, the message "no key pressed" appeared on the screen for 2 seconds. As in Experiment 1, between each block, the participants had to rest for at least 10 seconds, during which the instructions were displayed before they could restart. They then had to press the three keys to check that their fingers were correctly in place.

Familiarisation Condition. Participants completed 1 block of 144 trials. Each of the three stimuli was presented at the start of the trial (i.e. 0ms, leaving 800ms of preparation time) and then every 17ms thereafter (modelled on the most common 60Hz computer monitor refresh rate) until 799ms (i.e. leaving 1ms of preparation time) for a total of 48 different timings. The order of the trials was pseudo-randomised to ensure that the different timings were distributed throughout the block, and to limit the number of consecutive responses with the same finger to 2. The first two trials were specifically chosen to have longer preparation times to let the participants get used to the task.

503 *Biological stimuli Condition*. Participants completed 4 blocks of 144 trials for a total of
504 576 trials. The 12 different stimuli each had one trial for each of the 48 timings ranging from
505 0ms to 799ms before the last tone in steps of 17ms. The trials were distributed over the 4
506 blocks to ensure an equivalent distribution of each stimulus and each timing. In addition, the
507 order of trials in each block was pseudo-randomised to ensure that the different timings were
508 distributed throughout the block, to limit up to 3 consecutive responses requiring the same
509 button to be pressed, and up to 2 consecutive repeats of the same stimulus.

510 *Non-biological stimuli blocks*. As with the biological stimuli condition, participants
511 completed 4 blocks of 144 trials. The distribution of trials in the different blocks and the
512 pseudo-randomisation were the same as for the biological stimuli blocks.

513 *Protocol*

514 Participants always began by completing the familiarisation condition, after which
515 condition order was counterbalanced across subjects as in Experiment 1, with half the
516 participants completing the biological stimulus condition before the non-biological stimulus
517 condition, and the other half performing the conditions in the opposite order. The median
518 time of completion was 53 minutes, including breaks.

519 *Data analysis*

520 Analyses were performed in R version 4.3.2 (R Core Team 2024).

521 *Exclusion criteria.* In the forced response task, to verify that the participants complied
522 with the instruction to respond at the same time as the third tone, the percentage of
523 responses given within ±100ms of the third tone was calculated for the hand and control
524 blocks. Participants were excluded from our analyses if less than 50% of their responses across

the whole experiment were outside the instructed time window. In addition, to ensure that participants were not just concentrating on the timing of their responses without ever trying to answer correctly, participants with a proportion of correct answers of less than chance (33%) throughout the whole experiment, and participants with more than 50% of their answers made using the same finger/key were excluded. As noted above, a total of 7 participants were excluded based on these criteria, leaving a final sample of 50 participants for analysis.

Data Visualization. Data were visualized using a sliding window (Haith et al., 2016; Hardwick et al., 2019; Vleugels et al., 2020), considering the proportion of correct/incorrect responses within ±50ms from each time point. We calculated 95% confidence intervals on this data using bootstrapping (1000 iterations) with replacement.

Computational Models (fig 5B). Previous work employing forced response tasks has used computational models to identify different forms of stimulus processing (Haith et al., 2016; Hardwick et al., 2019). The present study compared the ability of two possible models to explain behaviour in the forced response task. These models assume that if participants are forced to respond with very short preparation times, their response will be at random. However, once a participant has sufficient time (t – a random value taken from a gaussian distribution) they will be able to produce a specific response with a high level of accuracy.

The first “single process” model considers only a single process; as such, this model has a sigmoidal form, beginning with responses being given at random, then, as the likelihood that time t has elapsed increases, the proportion of correct responses begins to increase until it reaches a plateau at close to 100% correct responses. This model uses 4 parameters: (1) the initial plateau around responding by chance, (2) the mean and (3) standard deviation of the

548 time t, and (4) the proportion of correct responses at the final plateau. This single process
549 model assumes that there is no conflict between different types of information in the stimulus,
550 allowing the stimulus to be processed as a single global piece of information.

551 The second "dual process" model assumes that two separate processes take place. This
552 model assumes that after the initial plateau at chance level, an initial, prepotent response
553 becomes available from time t_1. However, a second response, which requires more processing
554 time to prepare, becomes available at time t_2, replacing the initially prepared response as the
555 action that will be performed. This would capture phenomenon in which participants would
556 initially prepare a more 'intuitive' response (e.g. based on previous experience or salient
557 features of the stimulus), but later replace this with a more reasoned answer. This more
558 complex model includes 7 parameters: (1) the initial plateau around chance levels, (2) the
559 mean and (3) standard deviation of the time t_1, and (4) the point at which responses based on
560 t1 reach a plateau, (5) the mean and (6) standard deviation of the time t_2, and (7) a final
561 plateau. This model allows the possibility that there are conflicts between different types of
562 information in the stimulus which are processed in parallel, but require differing amounts of
563 processing time to become available to act upon.

564 In the present study the data from all the participants was pooled across the relevant
565 condition, and each model was fit to this pooled data. The Akaike information criterion (AIC)
566 was calculated for each model, with comparisons of these scores being used to identify the
567 most favourable model. The code used in the present manuscript was adapted from that used
568 in previous papers using the same model (Haith et al., 2016; Hardwick et al., 2019).

569 *SMART method*. The SMART (Smoothing Method for Analysis of Response Time-
570 course) method allows investigation of the continuous time-course of the behaviour using

cluster-based permutation analysis, providing greater temporal precision when compared to traditional binning methods (for a detailed overview and examples of the code used see (van Leeuwen et al., 2019). First, the time-series of responses was calculated for each participant using a gaussian kernel of width 15ms. The different time-series of the participants were then average weighted across the participants. The 95% confidence intervals were then calculated via the estimated standard error of the weighted mean. Finally, a cluster-based permutation test was performed to determine which cluster was statistically different from a baseline (obtained via the initial plateau parameter of the corresponding model fit described above) or another condition. The code used was that supplied in the original publication describing the procedure (van Leeuwen et al., 2019).

Analyses. Results from Experiment 1 indicate that the factor of spatial congruence had important effects on participant performance. Analyses presented in Experiment 2 therefore focus primarily on this factor (though note further analysis of corresponding main effects and interactions are presented in the supplementary materials).

Stimulus Type and Spatial Congruence: To examine this interaction, data were categorized into one of 6 conditions based on a 2x3 design according to their stimulus type (i.e. biological or non-biological) and spatial congruency (i.e. spatially congruent, incongruent and neutral). Computational models were fit to each condition to establish the complexity of stimulus processing, after which the SMART method was used to identify regions where participant performance differed from their baseline level. Notably, Experiment 1 established that participants had a preference for responding with the middle finger, presumably due to its spatially neutral nature. Therefore, for each condition we used the model fit to establish the baseline likelihood of a given response (i.e. the initial plateau parameter of the fastest

process of the model) as the baseline for comparison using the SMART method. Finally, the SMART method was used to compare data for biological and non-biological stimuli across corresponding spatial conditions.

Response Type Analysis: Following on from the results obtained in the first experiment, we were interested in the type of responses, and more specifically the types of errors, that participants produced for spatially incongruent stimuli. Specifically, if errors were induced by the spatially incongruent nature of the stimuli, we would expect to see more 'spatially induced' errors than spatially neutral types of errors. This analysis provided a further in-depth examination of trials in which spatially incongruent stimuli were presented. Again, data were split into 6 conditions based on a 2x3 design based on their stimulus type (biological or non-biological) and the response provided (correct response, spatial error, spatially neutral error). Further analysis steps follow the same procedure as that for analysis of stimulus type and spatial congruence above.

Perspective analyses: Results from Experiment 1 indicated that effects of visual perspective were secondary to those resulting from spatial congruence. We therefore conducted a series of analyses to assess the presence or absence of effects of perspective without separating the data in relation to spatial congruence. An "interaction" analysis split the data into 4 conditions based on a 2x2 design, considering possible interactions between perspective (first or third-person) and stimulus type (biological, non-biological).

All data and code used for the task and data analysis can be found here.

Experiment 2 Results

Stimulus type and spatial congruence

616 Visual inspection of the results (fig 6A) shows that at very short (less than 200ms) preparation
617 times, participants do not have time to process the stimulus and respond with approximately
618 chance levels of accuracy. However, this initial plateau varies somewhat according to the type
619 of stimulus; spatially neutral stimuli have a slightly higher initial proportion of correct
620 responses. After this initial period as the allowed preparation time increases, there is an
621 increase in the proportion of correct responses up to a plateau close to 100%. There is,
622 however, a notable exception to this pattern of results; for spatially incongruent biological
623 stimuli, as the allowed preparation time increases, we initially observe a decrease in the
624 proportion of correct responses, before the increase.

625 This difference is confirmed by the model fitting results, where the simpler, single process
626 model was able to better explain the data for the majority of conditions (see Table 2);
627 however, data from Biological, Spatially Incongruent stimuli were best explained by the dual
628 process model, which could account for a decrease in accuracy below chance levels of
629 performance.

Condition		**AIC Values**		
		Single Process Model	Dual Process Model	Difference (Single - Dual)
Biological	Neutral	**10154**	10174	-20
	Congruent	**11280**	11290	-10
	Incongruent	11681	**11672**	9
Non-Biological	Neutral	**10338**	10354	-16
	Congruent	**10297**	10320	-23
	Incongruent	**10543**	10563	-20

630 Table 2: AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) (Akaike, 1974) values for models fit to data from
631 each condition. Bold text indicates the lower AIC score, indicating the better fit model. For

difference scores, negative values indicate a better fit for the single process model, and positive values indicate a better fit for the dual process model.

We then used the SMART method to determine detailed comparisons of the time courses for each condition. In the majority of conditions, this analysis demonstrated a relationship whereby accuracy increased with the amount of time participants had to prepare their responses (for full results see Table S2). However, consistent with the computational modelling results, the SMART analysis confirmed that accuracy for Biological, Spatially incongruent data first fell significantly below initial baseline levels from 341-458ms, later rising above the baseline from 500ms onwards.

We then made comparisons between corresponding conditions to identify whether there were any clusters during which the proportion of correct responses was different (fig 6B; for full results see Table S3). For spatially congruent stimuli, a cluster from 394ms indicated a lower final plateau in accuracy for the biological stimuli. For spatially incongruent stimuli, a cluster from 334ms indicated that biological stimuli showed a lower final plateau and a decrease below the baseline. Finally, we found no significant differences for spatially neutral stimuli presenting biological or non-biological images.



Figure 6. Sliding windows presenting the interaction between stimulus type and spatial congruence. The color code is as followed; yellow is spatially congruent stimuli, red is spatially incongruent stimuli, and blue is neutral stimuli. A darker shade of these colours is used for biological stimuli and a lighter shade for non-biological stimuli. Shaded areas present 95% confidence intervals. Lines at the bottoms of the plot indicate significant differences identified using the SMART method, either against baseline (A) or against another condition (B). A. Comparison against baseline. Evolution of the proportion of correct responses as a function of preparation time. The left panel is for biological stimuli and the right is for non-biological stimuli. B. Comparison between biological and non-biological conditions.

Response Type Analysis

When visually inspecting the data (Figure 7), we see that the line presenting the likelihood of producing a correct response is the same as the data for the spatially incongruent condition in the “stimulus type and spatial congruence analysis” (i.e. red lines in figures 6 and 7), with a decrease in the proportion of correct responses below chance level only for biological stimuli. Visual inspection of the biological spatial error shows us that at the same time as the decrease in proportion of correct responses, there is an increase in the proportion of spatial errors (fig 7). Although also present for the non-biological stimuli, this effect is much smaller. The ‘spatially neutral errors’ show the same pattern for the biological and non-biological stimuli, with a period at chance level before decreasing to a plateau close to 0%.

These observations are confirmed by the model fitting results (Table 3). For biological stimuli, both correct responses and spatial errors are best explained by the dual process model, whereas spatially neutral responses are best explained by the single process model. For non-biological stimuli, only spatial errors were better explained by the dual process model.

Response Type		AIC Values		
		Single Process Model	Dual Process Model	Difference (Single - Dual)
Biological	correct	11681	**11672**	9
	spatial	12309	**11991**	318
	Spatially neutral	**9585**	9609	-24
Non-Biological	correct	**10543**	10563	-20
	spatial	8623	**8609**	14
	Spatially neutral	**9864**	9892	-28

Table 3: AIC values for models fit to data from each condition. Bold text indicates the lower AIC score, indicating the better fit model. For difference scores, negative values indicate a better fit for the single process model, and positive values indicate a better fit for the dual process model.

When applying the SMART method (table S2), starting with biological stimuli, correct responses first dipped significantly below baseline from 341 to 458ms, before rising significantly above baseline from 500ms onward. By contrast, spatial errors rose significantly above baseline from 307ms to 615ms, before falling significantly below baseline from 730ms onwards. In comparison, spatially neutral errors followed a simpler trajectory, dropping significantly below baseline from 310ms onwards, and remaining low thereafter. For the non-biological stimuli, in contrast to the biological stimuli, correct responses never fell below baseline levels, and instead increasingly only significantly above baseline from 374ms. By contrast, spatial errors rose significantly above baseline from 282ms to 383ms, before falling significantly below baseline levels from 429ms. Finally, spatially neutral errors fell significantly below baseline from 303ms.

We then made comparisons between corresponding conditions (fig 7B)(table S3). For correct responses, while the curves were similar, biological responses fell significantly below non-

biological stimuli from 334ms onwards, with a slower inflection and a lower final plateau. We found a corresponding effect on spatial errors; again, the curves had similar shapes, but differed from 355ms onwards, with a greater likelihood of errors for biological compared to non-biological stimuli. Finally, comparison of the curves for spatially neutral errors found no differences between the biological and non-biological conditions.



Figure 7. Sliding windows presenting the interaction between stimulus type and type of responses to spatially incongruent stimuli. The color code is as followed; red for correct response, purple for spatially neutral error, and cyan for spatial error. A darker shade of these colours is used for biological stimuli and a lighter shade for non-biological stimuli. Shaded

areas present 95% confidence intervals. Lines at the bottoms of the plot indicate significant differences identified using the SMART method, either against baseline (A) or against another condition (B). A. Comparison against baseline. Evolution of the probability of a given type of responses as a function of preparation time. B. Comparison between biological and non-biological for each type of response.

Perspective analysis

Visual inspection of the data indicated that all data followed a generally sigmoidal shape, with accuracy generally rising more slowly for biological than non-biological stimuli. Model fitting identified that for all conditions, the single process model was the most favourable (all AIC diff < -17)(table S1-2). Using the SMART method, we found that the proportion of correct responses increased significantly above baseline for all conditions (see Table S3), though the rise occurred more slowly for biological compared to non-biological stimuli. Notably, when using the SMART method to directly examine possible effects of perspective, we found no significant differences between first- and third-person stimuli for the biological condition, nor were there any differences when comparing the corresponding stimuli in the non-biological condition.



Figure 8. Sliding window visualizations of the data in relation to visual perspective for biological and non-biological stimuli. In beige is the evolution for first-person perspective stimuli. In green for third-person perspective stimuli. The lines at the bottom of the plot are coloured when there is a statistical difference between the 2 conditions; note here there were no significant differences across the whole timescale measured for either type of stimuli.

Experiment 2 Discussion

Several noteworthy results can be highlighted in this experiment. Firstly, as in Experiment 1, we can see a major effect of spatial congruence with, in particular, a difference in behaviour for spatially incongruent biological stimuli. Indeed, these stimuli are better explained by a dual-process model, which can account for an initial decrease in the proportion of correct responses before an increase. These results are consistent with participants making incorrect responses based on *where* the stimulus is presented, rather than *what* it presents. This is supported by the type of response participants made to spatially incongruent stimuli; as the proportion of correct responses decreases, there is a corresponding increase in spatial errors. Interestingly, this pattern of results was markedly stronger for biological stimuli.

Indeed, for non-biological stimuli, there was no decrease in the proportion of correct responses, and the increase in spatially induced responses, although significant, was much smaller than for the biological stimuli. These results, which are in line with those of Experiment 1, therefore show a difference between the processing of biological and non-biological stimuli, and more particularly of spatial information. Finally, while Experiment 1 identified a weak effect of perspective, in Experiment 2 there were no significant differences between first- and third-person perspective for either biological or non-biological stimuli. This result again emphasizes that the importance of perspective during action observation may be overestimated when compared to spatial congruence.

General Discussion

The present study characterized the role of the factors of stimulus type (biological or non-biological), spatial congruence, and perspective (first- and third-person) during action observation. Experiment 1 used a classical reaction time paradigm to examine how participants responded to these factors. Experiment 2 used a forced response paradigm to examine the time-course of stimulus processing, and how the effects of these factors varied depending on the allowed processing time.

Results across the two experiments indicate that spatial congruence has a major impact on the observation of actions, as introducing conflicts between the required response and the spatial location of the stimulus led to a significant increase in incorrect responses. Interestingly, this effect was stronger in biological compared to non-biological images, consistent with a difference in the processing of these two types of stimuli. Furthermore, in contrast with previous reports, we found little difference for first-person perspective over

third-person perspective, and our results suggest such effects could be mostly driven by spatial congruence.

Stronger spatial congruence effects for biological stimuli

The present experiments indicate that the spatial congruence of the stimulus has a major impact on participants' performance. Interestingly, this effect was more pronounced for biological stimuli than for non-biological stimuli. In particular, results of Experiment 2 indicate that participants initially respond on the basis of the stimulus' spatial information, even if this is irrelevant for this task, before this initial automatic response is replaced by a response based on anatomical recognition. It therefore seems that there are different timescales of information processing for spatial and anatomical information. Interestingly, these effects were smaller or absent for non-biological stimuli, consistent with previous work proposing differences in their processing (for review see (Gowen & Poliakoff, 2012)).

These results are consistent with the ‘dual visual streams hypothesis’ (Goodale & Milner, 1992), which proposes that spatial processing ('where’) and object recognition (‘what’) are respectively processed by separate dorsal and ventral visual steams. In particular, the dorsal stream is known for its role in visually guided actions, which require rapid visual processing to allow us to quickly adapt movements according to visual feedback (Króliczak et al., 2008). By contrast, the ventral stream processes information related to visual form, and does not have the same level of immediacy. Thus, in the context of Experiment 2, which examined the time-course of information processing, spatial information processed via the dorsal stream would be available to influence participant responses earlier than anatomical information processed via the ventral stream. The differences observed between biological and non-biological stimuli could be explained by two non-exclusive proposals. The first is that the dorsal stream is

776 particularly sensitive to biological stimuli. Motor simulation theory proposes that action
777 observation activates the same neural circuitry as action execution (Jeannerod, 2001), and
778 since the dorsal stream is known for its role in visuomotor control (Goodale & Milner, 1992),
779 it is possible that it is more strongly attuned to biological stimuli. In addition, the dorsal stream
780 contains areas such as the inferior parietal lobule (Freud et al., 2016), known to contain mirror
781 neurons that are activated during observation of action, and thus in the present experiment
782 would be recruited only by our biological stimuli. Increased activation of these regions by
783 observation of biological stimuli could in turn make the information processed by the dorsal
784 stream more compelling. The second is that the dorsal stream passes information to premotor
785 areas that are activated during action observation (Goodale & Milner, 1992), and this
786 activation could be necessary to induce this response based on spatial information.

787 Effect of perspective

788 The results suggest that perspective has a relatively minor effect on action priming, and that
789 effects of perspective may in fact mostly be driven by spatial congruence. Effects of
790 perspective in Experiment 1 were limited only to reaction times, which were faster for first-
791 than third-person perspective, with differences that were smaller in magnitude than those
792 identified for spatial congruence. Similarly, no effects of perspective were identified in
793 Experiment 2. These results suggest the effects of perspective described in the literature so
794 far could be partially or even mostly driven by spatial congruence. Indeed, several studies on
795 perspective have compared right hands in first-person perspective with right hands in third-
796 person perspective (Angelini et al., 2021; Ge et al., 2018; Oosterhof et al., 2012);our present
797 results suggest that the differences observed in such experiments may be driven more by a
798 change in spatial congruence than by a change in perspective. This interpretation is in

agreement with other results (Avikainen et al., 2003; Bekkering et al., 2000; Chiavarino et al., 2007; Shmuelof & Zohary, 2008; Wohlschläger & Bekkering, 2002) that show an interaction between perspective and the identity of the hand observed. It therefore seems important that future studies on the effects of perspective during action observation choose their stimuli carefully. An optimal solution would be to compare both right and left hands in first- and third-person perspective, but in cases where the overall number of trials needs to be limited, comparing a right hand in a first-person perspective with a left hand in a third-person perspective would allow 'true' comparisons between perspectives that are not potentially confounded by differences in spatial congruence.

Effect of stimulus type

Results of the present study indicate that participants were generally faster and more accurate when responding to non-biological stimuli compared to biological stimuli. We note, however, that the main effect of stimulus type was in fact likely driven by the interaction between stimulus type and spatial congruence, as we identified minimal differences in responses to spatially neutral biological and non-biological stimuli in Experiment 1, and no differences in Experiment 2. These results go against the current literature, which shows a tendency towards a preference for biological stimuli, or a status quo between the two (Gowen & Poliakoff, 2012). One possible explanation is that, as proposed by Gowen and Poliakoff, the priming effect induced by different types of stimuli depends mainly on their characteristics (e.g. saliency, size) and not on whether they are biological in nature. It is therefore possible that the low-level properties of the stimuli were one of the causes of the preference for non-biological stimuli. Specifically, even though the position of the relevant part of the stimulus to respond to (i.e. the letter vs the finger) was presented in a consistent manner across our biological and

822 non-biological stimuli, the biological stimuli presented more overall information (i.e. not only
823 the relevant finger, but also the rest of the hand) than the non-biological stimuli (which
824 showed only the relevant letter on an otherwise blank screen). We note that the selection of
825 control stimuli for action observation studies is a complex issue, (see for example (Loporto et
826 al., 2011)) and provide further discussion of this point in the 'strengths and limitations' section
827 below.

828 Strengths and limitations

829 One of the main strengths of this paper is the information provided by the forced response
830 task. Without it, we would not have been able to observe the differences in information
831 processing, particularly between spatially incongruent biological and non-biological stimuli.
832 The use of this paradigm therefore enabled us to obtain important new temporal information.
833 In addition, analysis using the SMART method meant that we did not lose the precision of the
834 temporal information that would have been the case with binning analysis (van Leeuwen et
835 al., 2019).

836 The choice of suitable non-biological stimuli is a difficult one as there are an infinite number
837 of possibilities. The approach used in the present study allowed us to maintain the position
838 of the most relevant information of interest across equivalent stimuli. This approach appears
839 to have been somewhat successful, as responses to spatially neutral stimuli did not differ for
840 any of our comparisons between biological and non-biological stimuli. However, it is not
841 possible to generalise our results to all non-biological stimuli. Certain parameters, such as the
842 salience of the stimuli, may not have been perfectly matched up with their non-biological
843 counterparts. We note, however, that this does not undermine our main findings, which
844 highlight an effect of spatial congruence on biological stimuli, which will still be correct even

845 if the non-biological results are not generalizable. Nonetheless, further studies with different
846 types of non-biological stimuli are needed to test this generalisation.

847 Finally, the results of Experiment 2 suggest that a 'finger effect' was present in the forced
848 response task. At very short reaction times (approximately <200ms), if responses were given
849 truly randomly, we would expect the proportion of responses with the index, middle and ring
850 fingers should be the same (i.e. 33%). However, we found that around 40% of responses were
851 with the middle finger and 30% with the index and ring fingers. This preference could be
852 explained by the fact that these stimuli never presented any conflict between spatial and
853 anatomical information for responses with the middle finger. Future studies using similar
854 methodology could ask whether this represents a conscious strategy by interviewing
855 participants during debriefing. This preference has the effect of modifying the baseline when
856 the stimuli requiring a response with the middle finger are separated from the others (thus in
857 the analysis of spatial congruence) with a higher baseline for neutral stimuli than for
858 congruent or incongruent stimuli. The possible impact that this effect could have is minimised
859 (or even eliminated) thanks to our analysis method, which allows us to calculate the baseline
860 specific to each condition, and then compare how the proportion corresponding responses
861 varies in relation to this baseline (note that with SMART method, we only made pairwise
862 comparisons between conditions with similar baselines).

863 Constraints on Generality

864 The aim of this study was to understand how different factors influenced action observation
865 and how stimuli were processed in a normal context. To this end, we recruited young healthy
866 participants. Participants were aged between 18 and 35 and had no known neurological
867 problems. To have a more homogeneous group and to facilitate experimental design and data

analysis, all participants were right-handed. How different pathologies affect the results we found will need to be explored in future research.

Conclusion

These experiments show that spatial congruence has a major impact on action observation, with longer reaction times and more errors when there is a conflict between the response requested and the spatial position of the stimulus. This phenomenon can be explained by the fact that spatial information is processed more quickly than anatomical information, thus inducing a first automatic response based on spatial information that may be incorrect. Interestingly, this phenomenon is more pronounced for biological than non-biological stimuli, which is consistent with a difference in processing between these two types of stimuli. Furthermore, we found little difference between first- and third-person perspective. Our results also suggest that the perspective effect previously identified in the literature may be driven mainly by spatial congruence.

Author Contributions (CRediT)

Author	Conceptualization	Methodology	Software	Validation	Formal Analysis	Investigation	Resources	Data Curation	Writing – original draft	Writing – reviewing & editing	Visualization	Supervision	Project Administration	Funding Acquisition
Waltzing B.M.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			
McAteer S.			x		x					x				
Moreno-Verdú M.			x		x					x				
Van Caenegem E.E.										x				
Yue Du			x											
Hardwick R.M.	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x		x	x	x

References

Akaike, H. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, *19*(6), 716–723. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control. https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.1974.1100705

Angelini, M., Del Vecchio, M., Lopomo, N. F., Gobbo, M., & Avanzini, P. (2021). Perspective-dependent activation of frontoparietal circuits during the observation of a static body effector. *Brain Research*, *1769*, 147604. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2021.147604

Avikainen, S., Wohlschläger, A., Liuhanen, S., Hänninen, R., & Hari, R. (2003). Impaired Mirror-Image Imitation in Asperger and High-Functioning Autistic Subjects. *Current Biology*, *13*(4), 339–341. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-9822(03)00087-3

Bekkering, H., Wohlschläger, A., & Gattis, M. (2000). Imitation of gestures in children is goal-directed. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A: Human Experimental Psychology*, *53*(1), 153–164. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1080/713755872

Biermann-Ruben, K., Jonas, M., Kessler, K., Siebner, H. R., Bäumer, T., Schnitzler, A., & Münchau, A. (2008). Observing repetitive finger movements modulates response times of auditorily cued finger movements. *Brain and Cognition*, *68*(1), 107–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2008.03.005

Blakemore, S.-J., & Frith, C. (2005). The role of motor contagion in the prediction of action. *Neuropsychologia*, *43*(2), 260–267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2004.11.012

Brass, M., Bekkering, H., & Prinz, W. (2001). Movement observation affects movement execution in a simple response task. *Acta Psychologica*, *106*(1), 3–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-6918(00)00024-X

Bridges, D., Pitiot, A., MacAskill, M. R., & Peirce, J. W. (2020). The timing mega-study: Comparing a range of experiment generators, both lab-based and online. *PeerJ*, *8*, e9414. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.9414

Caligiore, D., Mustile, M., Spalletta, G., & Baldassarre, G. (2017). Action observation and motor imagery for rehabilitation in Parkinson's disease: A systematic review and an integrative hypothesis. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *72*, 210–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.11.005

Chiavarino, C., Apperly, I. A., & Humphreys, G. W. (2007). Exploring the functional and anatomical bases of mirror-image and anatomical imitation: The role of the frontal lobes. *Neuropsychologia*, *45*(4), 784–795. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.08.007

Curioni, A., Knoblich, G. K., Sebanz, N., & Sacheli, L. M. (2020). The engaging nature of interactive gestures. *PloS One*, *15*(4), e0232128. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0232128

di Pellegrino, G., Fadiga, L., Fogassi, L., Gallese, V., & Rizzolatti, G. (1992). Understanding motor events: A neurophysiological study. *Experimental Brain Research*, *91*(1), 176–180. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00230027

Edwards, M. G., Humphreys, G. W., & Castiello, U. (2003). Motor facilitation following action observation: A behavioural study in prehensile action. *Brain and Cognition*, *53*(3), 495–502. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-2626(03)00210-0

Faber, T. W., van Elk, M., & Jonas, K. J. (2016). Complementary Hand Responses Occur in Both Peri- and Extrapersonal Space. *PloS One*, *11*(4), e0154457. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0154457

Fadiga, L., Fogassi, L., Pavesi, G., & Rizzolatti, G. (1995). Motor facilitation during action observation: A magnetic stimulation study. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *73*(6), 2608–2611. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.1995.73.6.2608

Freud, E., Plaut, D. C., & Behrmann, M. (2016). 'What' Is Happening in the Dorsal Visual Pathway. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *20*(10), 773–784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.08.003

Gatti, R., Tettamanti, A., Gough, P. M., Riboldi, E., Marinoni, L., & Buccino, G. (2013). Action observation versus motor imagery in learning a complex motor task: A short review of literature and a kinematics study. *Neuroscience Letters*, *540*, 37–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2012.11.039

Ge, S., Liu, H., Lin, P., Gao, J., Xiao, C., & Li, Z. (2018). Neural Basis of Action Observation and Understanding From First- and Third-Person Perspectives: An fMRI Study. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, *12*, 283. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2018.00283

Goodale, M. A., & Milner, A. D. (1992). Separate visual pathways for perception and action. *Trends in Neurosciences*, *15*(1), 20–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-2236(92)90344-8

Gowen, E., Bradshaw, C., Galpin, A., Lawrence, A., & Poliakoff, E. (2010). Exploring visuomotor priming following biological and non-biological stimuli. *Brain and Cognition*, *74*(3), 288–297. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2010.08.010

Gowen, E., & Poliakoff, E. (2012). How does visuomotor priming differ for biological and non-biological stimuli? A review of the evidence. *Psychological Research*, *76*(4), 407–420. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-011-0389-5

Haith, A. M., Pakpoor, J., & Krakauer, J. W. (2016). Independence of Movement Preparation and Movement Initiation. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *36*(10), 3007–3015. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3245-15.2016

Hardwick, R. M., Caspers, S., Eickhoff, S. B., & Swinnen, S. P. (2018). Neural correlates of action: Comparing meta-analyses of imagery, observation, and execution. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *94*, 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.08.003

Hardwick, R. M., & Edwards, M. G. (2011). Observed reach trajectory influences executed reach kinematics in prehension. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *64*(6), 1082–1093. https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2010.538068

Hardwick, R. M., & Edwards, M. G. (2012). Motor interference and facilitation arising from observed movement kinematics. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *65*(5), 840–847. https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2012.672995

Hardwick, R. M., Forrence, A. D., Krakauer, J. W., & Haith, A. M. (2019). Time-dependent competition between goal-directed and habitual response preparation. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *3*(12), Article 12. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0725-0

Holahan, C. J., Culler, R. E., & Wilcox, B. L. (1978). Effects of Visual Distraction on Reaction Time in a Simulated Traffic Environment. *Human Factors*, *20*(4), 409–413. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872087802000404

Jeannerod, M. (2001). Neural simulation of action: A unifying mechanism for motor cognition. *NeuroImage*, *14*(1 Pt 2), S103-109. https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2001.0832

Kemmerer, D. (2021). What modulates the Mirror Neuron System during action observation?: Multiple factors involving the action, the actor, the observer, the relationship between actor and observer, and the context. *Progress in Neurobiology*, *205*, 102128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pneurobio.2021.102128

Króliczak, G., McAdam, T. D., Quinlan, D. J., & Culham, J. C. (2008). The Human Dorsal Stream Adapts to Real Actions and 3D Shape Processing: A Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Study. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *100*(5), 2627–2639. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.01376.2007

López, N. D., Monge Pereira, E., Centeno, E. J., & Miangolarra Page, J. C. (2019). Motor imagery as a complementary technique for functional recovery after stroke: A systematic review. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*, *26*(8), 576–587. https://doi.org/10.1080/10749357.2019.1640000

Loporto, M., McAllister, C., Williams, J., Hardwick, R., & Holmes, P. (2011). Investigating central mechanisms underlying the effects of action observation and imagery through transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, *43*(5), 361–373. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222895.2011.604655

Machado, T. C., Carregosa, A. A., Santos, M. S., Ribeiro, N. M. da S., & Melo, A. (2019). Efficacy of motor imagery additional to motor-based therapy in the recovery of motor function of the upper limb in post-stroke individuals: A systematic review. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*, *26*(7), 548–553. https://doi.org/10.1080/10749357.2019.1627716

Mibu, A., Kan, S., Nishigami, T., Fujino, Y., & Shibata, M. (2020). Performing the hand laterality judgement task does not necessarily require motor imagery. *Scientific Reports*, *10*(1), 5155. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-61937-9

Moreno-Verdú, M., Hamoline, G., Van Caenegem, E. E., Waltzing, B. M., Forest, S., Valappil, A. C., Khan, A. H., Chye, S., Esselaar, M., Campbell, M. J., McAllister, C. J., Kraeutner, S. N., Poliakoff, E., Frank, C., Eaves, D. L., Wakefield, C., Boe, S. G., Holmes, P. S., Bruton, A. M., … Hardwick, R. M. (2024). Guidelines for reporting action simulation studies (GRASS): Proposals to improve reporting of research in motor imagery and action observation. *Neuropsychologia*, *192*, 108733. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2023.108733

Nicholson, V., Watts, N., Chani, Y., & Keogh, J. W. (2019). Motor imagery training improves balance and mobility outcomes in older adults: A systematic review. *Journal of Physiotherapy*, *65*(4), 200–207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphys.2019.08.007

Oosterhof, N. N., Tipper, S. P., & Downing, P. E. (2012). Viewpoint (In)dependence of Action Representations: An MVPA Study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *24*(4), 975–989. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00195

Peirce, J., Gray, J. R., Simpson, S., MacAskill, M., Höchenberger, R., Sogo, H., Kastman, E., & Lindeløv, J. K. (2019). PsychoPy2: Experiments in behavior made easy. *Behavior Research Methods*, *51*(1), 195–203. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-01193-y

Press, C., Cook, J., Blakemore, S.-J., & Kilner, J. (2011). Dynamic modulation of human motor activity when observing actions. *The Journal of Neuroscience: The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, *31*(8), 2792–2800. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1595-10.2011

Rizzolatti, G., Fadiga, L., Gallese, V., & Fogassi, L. (1996). Premotor cortex and the recognition of motor actions. *Brain Research. Cognitive Brain Research*, *3*(2), 131–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-6410(95)00038-0

Schouten, J. F., & Bekker, J. A. M. (1967). Reaction time and accuracy. *Acta Psychologica*, *27*, 143–153. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918(67)90054-6

Shmuelof, L., & Zohary, E. (2008). Mirror-image representation of action in the anterior parietal cortex. *Nature Neuroscience*, *11*(11), 1267–1269. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2196

Simon, J. R., & Wolf, J. D. (1963). Choice Reaction Time as a Function of Angular Stimulus-Response Correspondence and Age. *Ergonomics*, *6*(1), 99–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/00140136308930679

van Leeuwen, J., Smeets, J. B. J., & Belopolsky, A. V. (2019). Forget binning and get SMART: Getting more out of the time-course of response data. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, *81*(8), 2956–2967. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-019-01788-3

Vleugels, L. W. E., Swinnen, S. P., & Hardwick, R. M. (2020). Skill acquisition is enhanced by reducing trial-to-trial repetition. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *123*(4), 1460–1471. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00741.2019

Wohlschläger, A., & Bekkering, H. (2002). Is human imitation based on a mirror-neurone system? Some behavioural evidence. *Experimental Brain Research*, *143*(3), 335–341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-001-0993-5