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Chen, L. Longtang. Head movements evoked by electrical stimulation in the frontal eye field of the monkey: evidence for independent eye and head control. J Neurophysiol 95: 3528–3542, 2006. First published March 22, 2006; doi:10.1152/jn.01320.2005. When the head is free to move, electrical stimulation in the frontal eye field (FEF) evokes eye and head movements. However, it is unclear whether FEF stimulation-evoked head movements contribute to shifting the line of sight, as is commonly believed. Here we investigated this issue by systematically varying initial eye and head positions at stimulation onset. Despite the large variability of eye and head movements, gaze displacement was entirely accounted for by eye movements. Overall, the majority (3/4) of stimulation-evoked gaze shifts consisted of eye-alone movements, in which head movements were below the detection threshold. When head movements did occur, they were often small (4°–5° in Tu et al. 2001; 20° in van der Steen et al. 1986). van der Steen et al. (1986) conducted a unilateral FEF lesion study in head-unrestrained monkeys and found that the lesioned monkeys were reluctant to track objects in the contralateral visual field. When the monkeys did track visual targets, the monkeys moved their heads more often than their eyes. When gaze shifts occurred, the accompanying head movements were atypically large, and eye movements were small. At gaze completion, the eye was often counter-rotated rapidly to near the center of the orbit unlike its prelesion behavior. These findings were interpreted by the authors as indicating that FEF lesions led to selective eye-movement deficits. Bizzi and Schiller (1970) recorded the neural activity in the FEF of head-unrestrained monkeys. They found that, in agreement with the role of FEF in eye-movement control, FEF neurons discharged in association with eye movements. However, they also found an unusual type of neuron that discharged exclusively during head movements. Even though the exact characteristics and anatomical connectivity of FEF head neurons have not been identified, the presence of the head-movement-related discharge in FEF neurons remains an enigma in the understanding of FEF function (cf. Knight and Fuchs 2001; cat FEF: Guitton and Mandl 1978). Recent development of experimental techniques in head-unrestrained monkeys has made it possible for investigators to revisit the issues of motor control in head-unrestrained conditions (Chen and Walton 2005; Collins and Barnes 1999; Corneil et al. 2002; Cullen et al. 2004; Crawford and Guitton 1997; Freedman and Sparks 1997; Gandhi and Sparks 2001; Goffart et al. 1998; Goossens and van Oostal 1997; Guitton et al. 2003; Isa and Sasaki 2002; Martinez-Trujillo et al. 2003; Peterson 2004; Phillips et al. 1995; Sparks et al. 2001; Stahl 2001; Waftzman et al. 2002). A recent study (Tu and Keating 2000) reported that FEF stimulation evoked both eye and head movements. The authors noted that, at low current intensity (25 μA), FEF stimulation evoked eye movements. When the stimulation intensity was increased to 200–300 μA, stimulation evoked gaze shifts accompanied by head movements. However, these head movements were too small (4.3 ± 0.4° in Tu and Keating 2000) to contribute significantly to gaze shifts. These findings raise new questions regarding the exact role of head movements evoked by FEF stimulation.

Past studies have revealed some seemingly conflicting findings regarding whether the FEF is involved in the control of head movements (Bizzi and Schiller 1970; van der Steen et al. 1986). van der Steen et al. (1986) conducted a unilateral FEF lesion study in head-unrestrained monkeys and found that the lesioned monkeys were reluctant to track objects in the contralateral visual field. When the monkeys did track visual targets, the monkeys moved their heads more often than their eyes. When gaze shifts occurred, the accompanying head movements were atypically large, and eye movements were small. At gaze completion, the eye was often counter-rotated rapidly to near the center of the orbit unlike its prelesion behavior. These findings were interpreted by the authors as indicating that FEF lesions led to selective eye-movement deficits.

Bizzi and Schiller (1970) recorded the neuronal activity in the FEF of head-unrestrained monkeys. They found that, in agreement with the role of FEF in eye-movement control, FEF neurons discharged in association with eye movements. However, they also found an unusual type of neuron that discharged exclusively during head movements. Even though the exact characteristics and anatomical connectivity of FEF head neurons have not been identified, the presence of the head-movement-related discharge in FEF neurons remains an enigma in the understanding of FEF function (cf. Knight and Fuchs 2001; cat FEF: Guitton and Mandl 1978).

Recent development of experimental techniques in head-unrestrained monkeys has made it possible for investigators to revisit the issues of motor control in head-unrestrained conditions (Chen and Walton 2005; Collins and Barnes 1999; Corneil et al. 2002; Cullen et al. 2004; Crawford and Guitton 1997; Freedman and Sparks 1997; Gandhi and Sparks 2001; Goffart et al. 1998; Goossens and van Oostal 1997; Guitton et al. 2003; Isa and Sasaki 2002; Martinez-Trujillo et al. 2003; Peterson 2004; Phillips et al. 1995; Sparks et al. 2001; Stahl 2001; Waftzman et al. 2002). A recent study (Tu and Keating 2000) reported that FEF stimulation evoked both eye and head movements. The authors noted that, at low current intensity (25 μA), FEF stimulation evoked eye movements. When the stimulation intensity was increased to 200–300 μA, stimulation evoked gaze shifts accompanied by head movements. However, these head movements were too small (4.3 ± 0.4° in Tu and Keating 2000) to contribute significantly to gaze shifts. These findings raise new questions regarding the exact role of head movements evoked by FEF stimulation.

The frontal eye field (FEF) extends from the caudal to the anterior end of the arcuate gyrus (Bruce et al. 1985; Schall et al. 1995). Past studies have shown that this region is associated with the initiation of eye movements (Bizzi and Schiller 1970; Bruce et al. 1985; Dias and Segraves 1999; Goldberg et al. 1986; Keating and Gooley 1988; Robinson and Fuchs 1969; Schall 2002; Schiller et al. 1979; Smith 1949; Sommer and Tehovnik 1997; Tehovnik et al. 2000; van der Steen et al. 1986). Whether the FEF participates in generating head movements is not clear. In an early anecdotal observation, Levinsohn (1909, described in Smith 1949) reported that stimulation in the dorsomedial frontal cortex, i.e., the supplementary eye field (SEF) as identified today, evoked head movements that often preceded eye movements. In contrast, this was not observed in the lateral oculomotor region, i.e., the FEF as identified today. Levinsohn noted this unique characteristic as the major difference between dorsomedial and lateral oculomotor regions of the frontal cortex, i.e., the SEF and the FEF.
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The present study addressed the following questions. First, does FEF stimulation evoke head movements? If so, do stimulation-evoked head movements contribute to shifting the line of sight (i.e., gaze)? In other words, is the FEF involved in gaze (eye plus head) feedback control? Gaze feedback hypothesis has been postulated to account for the head involvement in large orienting gaze shifts (Guitton et al. 1990, 2003; Laurutis and Robinson 1986). This hypothesis states that the gaze error (difference between current and desired gaze displacements) signal drives both eye and head movements, such that the range of gaze displacement is extended beyond the range accomplished by eye (re head) displacement alone. This explanation accounts for the fact that large visually guided gaze shifts (e.g., gaze amplitude $\geq 20^\circ$) usually recruit significant contribution of the head (Freedman and Sparks 1997; Fuller 1992; Galiana and Guitton 1992; Guitton et al. 1990, 2003; Laurutis and Robinson 1986; Tomlinson and Bahra 1986). On the other hand, according to this hypothesis, there exists a temporal coupling between head and gaze velocities. As the gaze error diminishes by the end of gaze shifts, the drive to move the head will diminish and head velocity will begin to decrease (Guitton et al. 1990, 2003; Matsuo et al. 2004). Therefore the head should reach its peak velocity prior to, as opposed to hundreds of milliseconds after, the end of gaze shifts. The present stimulation study provided an opportunity to evaluate these predictions in the FEF.

Note that head contribution to gaze shifts is limited to the head displacement between gaze shift onset and gaze shift offset, during which the vestibuloocular reflex (VOR) is suppressed for the eyes and head to move in the same direction (Cullen et al. 2004; Guitton et al. 1990). The total head displacement additionally includes the head movement that may occur prior to the onset of gaze shift (VOR gain $\approx 1$) and the head movement that often lasts beyond the end of gaze shift (VOR gain $\approx 1$) (Bizzi et al. 1971; Chen and Walton 2005; Corneil et al. 2002; Freedman and Sparks 1997; Guitton et al. 1990; Tomlinson and Bahra 1986). Both monkeys used in the present study had previously participated in a SEF study (Chen and Walton 2005) in which stimulation evoked significant contribution of the head to gaze shifts. It is pertinent to know whether differential motor control mechanisms exist in the two eye fields of the same monkeys under the same task controls.

Second, does FEF stimulation evoked head movements independent of gaze shifts? Recent studies have shown that low current stimulation in the superior colliculus (Corneil et al. 2002; Pelisson et al. 2001) or stimulation at contralateral eye positions in the SEF evoked head movements in the absence of gaze shifts (Chen and Walton 2005). In addition, stimulation-evoked postgaze-shift head movements (i.e., the head displacements between gaze shift offset and head offset) in the SEF facilitated re-centering the eyes in the orbits (Chen and Walton 2005). It is pertinent to know under what circumstances FEF stimulation evokes head-alone movements and whether stimulation-evoked postgaze-shift head movements minimized the eye deviation from the center of the orbit (Sparks et al. 2001).

It has been shown that initial eye (IEP) and head (IHP) positions are pertinent variables that determine the metrics of head movements (Chen and Walton 2005; Delreux et al. 1991; Freedman and Sparks 1997; Goossens and van Opstal 1997; Phillips et al. 1995; Tomlinson and Bahra 1986; Volle and Guitton 1993). In this study, IEP and IHP were systematically varied for the sake of assessing FEF stimulation-evoked head movements. We found that FEF stimulation indeed evoked head movements in addition to eye movements; however, the head movements contributed little to shifting the line of sight. Our findings agree with early studies and suggest that head motor control may be independent from eye control in the FEF.

**Methods**

**Subject and experimental procedures**

Two juvenile rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*, 5–7 kg) served as subjects. They were implanted with a chamber (angled 15° from the midsagittal plane) and head-Posts. The details of the surgical implants, chairing setups, and neurophysiological procedures have been described previously (Chen and Walton 2005). All surgical and experimental procedures conformed to the guidelines for the Care and Use of Animals of National Institutes of Health and the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee.

Eye and head positions were tracked using the search coil technique (Fuchs and Robinson 1966; Judge et al. 1980). A 42-in cubic coil and a phase-angle detection system (CNC Engineering) were used to measure horizontal and vertical position signals of gaze (eye re space) and head coils, sampled at 500 Hz. During recording, a lightweight microlaser (Edmund Scientific, No. M52263) was mounted on the monkey’s head to provide the visual feedback of head positions. The signals of gaze and head coils were calibrated under conventional, head-fixed conditions based on the alignment of gaze and head coil signals with the visual targets of known positions. Eye (re head) positions were computed off-line by mathematically converting horizontal and vertical gaze coil signals to unit vectors, rotated with respect to head vectors in Fick coordinates. Movement amplitude was computed following vector rotations. Data were acquired using a Pentium microcomputer running in-house data acquisition software.

Standard microelectrodes (Frederic Haer) were used to penetrate dura, record neuronal signals, and deliver electrical stimulation (for details, see Chen et al. 2001). Neural signals were band-pass (500 to 5 kHz) filtered using a differential BAK amplifier. Microstimulation was carried out using a stimulator (Grass S88) and an optical isolation unit (Grass PSIU6). The stimulation trains consisted of 0.2-ms, monopolar, cathodal pulses. Typical stimulation was 80 $\mu$A (range: 50–150 $\mu$A), 200 Hz (range: 100–200 Hz), and 300 ms (range: 300–500 ms). Prolonged stimulation ensured that the movements of interest (i.e., head movements) were not truncated prematurely (for review, see Freedman et al. 1996; Graziano et al. 2002). When necessary, stimulation of different parameters was explored. Because the threshold of stimulation-evoked head movements in the FEF was not known, we typically applied stimulation of two to three times the threshold current (i.e., the current that evoked movements in 50% of the trials) for eliciting eye movements. It was difficult to monitor the actual current delivered through the high-impedance electrodes (0.5–1.2 M$\Omega$ measured in saline at 1 kHz). All of the current intensity reported here was taken from the face value of the stimulator.

**Behavioral paradigms and microstimulation**

Visual targets were presented on a tangent screen with $49 \times 41$ tri-state (red, green, yellow) light-emitting diodes (LEDs). The LEDs were equally spaced at 2-in intervals in both horizontal and vertical dimensions. The LED board was placed 72 cm (28.5 in) from the monkeys. The room was dimly lit with a 5-W light bulb placed behind the LED board.

The monkeys were trained in a visually guided gaze shift task that permitted independent control of gaze and head positions (Fig. 1A). The behavioral task consisted of two phases: an initial eye/head alignment-and-dissociation phase and a subsequent visually guided gaze shift phase. The initial phase began with monkeys sitting in head.
FIG. 1. Onsets and offsets of visual targets (red, green, and yellow) and microlaser (laser) in the control (A) and stimulation (B) trials. The shaded panels in A and B indicate the initial eye/head (E/H) alignment-dissociation phases of the task; the open panels, visually guided gaze shift phases. Note that stimulation (B) was delivered 200 ms after the extinction of all visual targets and microlaser; these visual sources remained extinguished throughout the rest of the task. Re-illuminating the visual targets in control trials (A) ensured that the animals were motivated to maintain their current eye and head positions rather than anticipating and executing volitional or anticipatory movements. C: schematics illustrating horizontal and vertical head (Hh and Hv), gaze (Gh and Gv), and eye (re head; Eh and Ev) positions at stimulation onset, separated for eye-head dissociation (EHD) and eye-head alignment (EHA) trials. Full circle, particular example of gaze, head, and eye positions out of possible combinations (empty circle).

forward positions, aligning the microlaser beam with a visual target (red LED). Later, a second (green) target was illuminated, and the monkeys deviated their eyes to the target while maintaining a stable head position. The green target was usually displayed in ±27° steps horizontally or vertically with respect to the initial red target (e.g., Fig. 1C). 600–800 ms after the onset of the green target, all targets and the microlaser were extinguished for 400–500 ms. The same red and green targets and microlaser beam were re-illuminated briefly (500–700 ms) and then re-extinguished.

The visually guided gaze shift phase began 400–600 ms after the end of the first phase (Fig. 1A). A yellow target was illuminated at a randomly chosen location. Juice reward was contingent on monkeys making a gaze shift to the yellow target. Note that the location of the yellow targets was spatially (up-down and left-right) balanced and selected at random to minimize any directional bias of movements. Likewise, the red and green targets mentioned in the initial task phase were spatially balanced and selected at random.

In the control trials (Fig. 1A), gaze and head positions were constrained under close-loop real-time control within a 5- and 10°-radius “window,” respectively, around the designated targets. If either gaze or head stepped outside of the window during the designated periods, the trial was aborted.

In ~50% of the trials within a block, electrical microstimulation trials (Fig. 1B) were carried out. Stimulus trials began with the initial eye-head alignment-dissociation task just like that in the control trials. The electrical stimulation phase began with stimulation 200 ms after the extinction of both visual targets and microlaser. The entire stimulation phase was conducted in darkness without constraint over the eye or head positions. Approximately 800–1,400 ms after the onset of stimulation, the visually guided gaze shift phase began. Reward was contingent on the monkey making a gaze shift to a visual (yellow) target, as in the control trials.

Figure 1C illustrates schematic examples of head, gaze, and eye positions independently controlled in EHD (eye-head dissociation) and EHA (eye-head alignment) trials. In the EHD example trial, the eyes were oriented in upper-right direction, while the head remained centered with respect to the body. In the EHA example trials, the head was oriented leftward with respect to the body, while the eyes remained centered in the orbit.

In some large-saccade sites, we carried out nontask-mode stimulation in which the stimulation train was delivered during the intertrial interval (duration: 500–1,500 ms). Nontask-mode stimulation trials were 50% interleaved with task-mode stimulation trials. Unlike the latter, there was no visual target or microlaser illuminated in the former. There was no IEP or IHP constraint throughout the nontask-mode stimulation trials.

Care was taken to exclude the data obtained in stimulating the white matter from the analyses. The electrodes were always advanced deep, and the border between gray and white matter was identified based on the overall diminished unit discharge. Once the electrode was confirmed to have reached the white matter, the electrodes were slowly withdrawn. Stimulation was carried out >100 μm away from the border of the white and gray matters. Because it was impossible to know whether a given electrode penetration was parallel, orthogonal, or oblique with respect to the cortical surface, we considered the stimulation depth separated by 500 μm as different sites. The movements evoked in different sites were analyzed separately.

Data analyses

Data analyses were performed using an in-house program on a Windows platform. Movement onset and offset were determined based on the velocity criteria (gaze: 80°/s for horizontal and vertical onsets and 60°/s for horizontal and vertical offsets; head: 6°/s for both horizontal and vertical onset and offset). For details of the off-line threshold-filter computation, see Chen and Walton (2005). Movements were displayed 100 ms before and 800 ms after stimulation onset, and measurements were taken strictly based on the velocity criteria. Any movement detected before stimulation onset was removed from further analysis. Throughout this paper, only stimulation-evoked gaze shifts and head movements with onset latency ≤300 ms were included in the analysis. The criterion of minimal onset latency for gaze shifts and head movements was 20 and 50 ms, respectively.

Staircase small-saccade (<10°) gaze shifts were occasionally encountered. These trials were excluded from further analysis. Statistical analyses were performed using Statistica (Statsoft). Throughout this paper, the data are described and plotted as means ± SD.

At the end of the experiments, the monkeys were killed with an overdose of pentobarbital, and the brains were removed for histological examination. Stainless-steel pins were inserted in known coordinates during perfusion to facilitate coordinate reconstruction.

RESULTS

A total of 132 (monkey M1: 111, M2: 21) stimulation sites (56 penetrations; M1: 49, M2: 7) were studied in the left FEF of two head-unrestrained monkeys. The low-threshold saccadic sites in the FEF were identified based on stimulation-evoked staircase saccades and smooth pursuit from the caudal end of the arcuate sulcus (Bruce et al. 1985; Fukushima et al. 2000; MacAvoy et al. 1991; Russo and Bruce 1993; Tehovnik et al.
This study was aimed at large-saccade sites in the FEF, as large-amplitude gaze shifts were likely to recruit significant head movements (Guitton et al. 1990; Sparks et al. 2001; Tomlinson and Bahra 1986).

In one of the monkeys, the FEF was meticulously mapped along the rostral-caudal dimension (Fig. 2A). Consistent with the notion that the FEF is topographically organized as a saccadic amplitude map, we found that large saccades were evoked in the rostral sites and small saccades and smooth pursuits were evoked in the caudal sites (Bruce et al. 1985; Fukushima et al. 2000; MacAvoy et al. 1991). Stimulation-evoked gaze shift sites stretched ~9 mm rostro-medially from the small-saccade and smooth pursuit sites. We exhausted the mapping ≤2 mm anterior from the most rostral large-saccade sites of the FEF. There was no evidence of site-specific head movement clustering in the FEF.

Figure 2B illustrates example traces of the stimulation-evoked horizontal gaze (Gh), eye (Eh, re head), and head (Hh) positions and velocities of a staircase, small-saccade (caudal) site in the FEF. These short-latency staircase saccades were evoked by prolonged stimulation (500 ms). The peaks of horizontal gaze and eye-velocity traces were truncated to facilitate the display of horizontal head velocity profiles. During the gaze shift (Fig. 2B, shaded region), horizontal gaze- and eye-velocity traces completely overlapped, whereas horizontal head velocity remained near baseline. The result, in agreement with past studies, confirmed that small gaze shifts (Gh amplitude = 4.8° in Fig. 2B) often do not recruit a significant contribution of the head.

Figure 2C illustrates example traces of the stimulation-evoked movements in a large-saccade site of the FEF. Two main features can be noted. First, after gaze shift onset, the head-position trace deviated from its baseline slowly. It was impossible to detect head movement onset based on visual inspection of the head-position trace. Second, during the gaze shift, the horizontal gaze position almost completely overlapped the horizontal eye (re head) position. Approximately 15 ms before gaze completion, the head started to move above the velocity threshold. Note the eye movement decelerated rapidly toward the end of the gaze shift; hence, the head movement contributed little to the resultant gaze displacement.

The head movement reached its peak velocity (45°/s) ~110 ms after the end of gaze shifts. The gaze position after gaze shifts was stable, i.e., the eye counter rotated in the orbit approximately by the same velocity as the head (VOR gain ≈ 1). Both examples illustrated in Fig. 2 (B and C) were obtained when IEP was centered in the orbit and IHP was centered with respect to the body.

Our results indicate that the characteristics of stimulation-evoked movements varied depending on IEP and IHP at stimulation onset. Particularly, “eye alone,” “eye and head,” and (occasionally) “head-alone” movements could be evoked...
First, the range of horizontal and vertical gaze amplitudes varied significantly as a function of eye position, 0.8: 49° (23 ± 8°; n = 1,154), 0.1: 43° (11 ± 7°; n = 900), and 0.1: 20° (4 ± 3°; n = 212) for IEPi [horizontal IEP (IEPh) ipsilateral to the stimulated side], IEPo (IEPh centered in the orbit), and IEPc (IEPh contralateral to the stimulated side) conditions, respectively. The range of vertical gaze amplitudes was –39: 47° (19 ± 14°), –20: 53° (13 ± 8°), and –14: 39° (8 ± 7°) for IEPi, IEPo, and IEPc conditions, respectively. The orbital effect resembles that observed under head-unrestrained conditions (Russo and Bruce 1993).

Effects of varying horizontal IEP

Figure 4 illustrates the movement traces showing the effects of varying IEPs on horizontal head and gaze velocities after electrical stimulation in a FEF site. The trials were grouped by IEP conditions. Five traces (2 of high peak velocities, 2 of low peak velocities, and 1 of medium peak velocity) were selected to represent horizontal head- and gaze-velocity profiles for each IEP condition. In these trials, IHP remained centered with respect to the body (the range of horizontal and vertical IHP: –8: 8°). Only IEP was systematically varied. The range of IEP was –28: –15°, –10: 15°, and 15: 28° in IEPi, IEPo, and IEPc conditions, respectively.

Three main features of movement timing and dynamics can be noted in Fig. 4. First, the likelihood for FEF stimulation to evoke head movements varied depending on horizontal IEP. In IEP condition (Fig. 4, left), head movements were not detectable even though the current intensity was increased ≥150 μA (bottom left). In contrast, in IEPo (Fig. 4, middle) and IEPc conditions (Fig. 4, right), stimulation did evoke head movements in ~1/3 of the trials. Second, when stimulation did evoke head movements, head movement onset often lagged behind gaze shift onset. Third, head velocities often did not reach their peaks until after gaze shifts were completed. The velocity profile of the late head movements can be best appreciated in IEPc trials.

To quantify the effect of varying horizontal IEP on eye and head contributions to gaze shifts, eye-and-head movements were selected for further analyses (Fig. 5; Table 1). Overall, eye-and-head movements represented <5, 21, and 32% of the stimulation-evoked gaze shift in IEPi (n = 1,214), IEPo (n = 1,149), and IEPc (n = 552) conditions, respectively. That

kinematics of stimulus-evoked gaze shifts and head movements

Figure 3 plots the relationship between movement amplitudes and velocities of the stimulation-evoked gaze shifts (A and B) and head movements (C and D) for the sake of data comparison between task conditions, gaze shifts were separated into EHD (left) and EHA (right) trials (see METHODS). In EHD trials, IEP at stimulation onset ranged –28: 28° horizontally and –25: 28° vertically. In EHA trials, IHP at stimulation onset ranged –32: 32° horizontally and –12: 28° vertically. All stimulation trials of both monkeys were pooled in the analysis. Several kinematic characteristics can be noted.

First, the range of horizontal and vertical gaze amplitudes varied widely during EHD (n = 2,973) and EHA (n = 1,703) trials (Fig. 3A). In contrast, head movements varied over a smaller range (n = 1,203; Fig. 3C). The average horizontal head amplitude was 4.3 ± 2.9°, whereas the average vertical head amplitude was 1.0 ± 1.9° (slope = 0.07; r = 0.21, P < 0.001).

Second, unlike the peak velocity of horizontal gaze shifts that could be as high as 1,000°/s (Fig. 3B), the peak velocity of horizontal head movements never exceeded 100°/s. The peak velocity of horizontal head movements was linearly correlated with horizontal head amplitude (slope = 3.57; r = 0.89; P < 0.01) as has been reported for the head movements occurring during visually guided gaze shifts (Freedman and Sparks 1997; Guitton et al. 1990).

Third, like stimulation-evoked gaze shifts that were primarily contralateral, the vast majority (98.4%; 1,184/1,203) of stimulation-evoked head movements was directed contralaterally with respect to the stimulated side. The remaining had small (–1.7 ± 0.9°) head movements in the ipsilateral direction.

Finally, <1/4 [23% (694/2,973) in EHD trials and 23% (396/1,703) in EHA trials] of stimulation-evoked gaze shifts were accompanied by head movements. In most of the trials, eye-alone movements were observed, i.e., head movements were below the velocity threshold (see METHODS).

Eye-alone movements. The range of horizontal gaze amplitudes varied significantly as a function of eye position, 0.8: 49° (23 ± 8°; n = 1,154), 0.1: 43° (11 ± 7°; n = 900), and 0.1: 20° (4 ± 3°; n = 212) for IEPi [horizontal IEP (IEPh) ipsilateral to the stimulated side], IEPo (IEPh centered in the orbit), and IEPc (IEPh contralateral to the stimulated side) conditions, respectively. The range of vertical gaze amplitudes was –39: 47° (19 ± 14°), –20: 53° (13 ± 8°), and –14: 39° (8 ± 7°) for IEPi, IEPo, and IEPc conditions, respectively. The orbital effect resembles that observed under head-unrestrained conditions (Russo and Bruce 1993).
is, the probability of evoking head movements in FEF stimulation increased as horizontal IEP was deviated in the contralateral direction (i.e., the direction of the stimulation-evoked gaze shifts).

Figure 5E illustrates the results of eye and head contributions to gaze shifts. Regardless of the variability of horizontal and vertical IEPs, eye (re head) amplitudes were linearly correlated with gaze (Gh) amplitudes (Fig. 5, E and F). That is, horizontal and vertical amplitudes of eye (re head) movements totally accounted for horizontal (Fig. 5E) and vertical (Fig. 5F) amplitudes of gaze shifts, respectively. Horizontal (Fig. 5E) and vertical (Fig. 5F) contribution of the head to gaze shifts was negligible.

**Effects of varying horizontal IHP**

Figure 6 illustrates the movement traces showing the effect of horizontal IHP (IHPh) on the horizontal head and gaze velocities in a large-saccade site of the FEF. In these experiments, IEP remained within ±8° centered in the orbit, and IHP was systematically varied. These trials were grouped by IHPh [IHPI (ipsilateral IHPh; range: −32: −20°), IHPO (IHPh centered; range: −10: 10°), and IHPC (contralateral IHPh; range: 20: 32°)] conditions. Five traces (2 of high peak velocities, 2 of low peak velocities, and 1 of medium peak velocity) were selected to represent the horizontal head- and gaze-velocity profiles of each IHP group.

Four major features of movement kinematics can be noted in Fig. 6. First, in IHPC condition (Fig. 6, right), the head was already significantly deviated in the direction of stimulation-evoked movements; hence, the stimulation failed to evoke any detectable head movement. Second, head movements were mostly evoked when the head was centered relative to the body [IHPO (Fig. 6, middle)] or deviated toward the stimulated side [IHPI (Fig. 6, left)]. Horizontal head velocities often did not rise above the velocity detection threshold until near the end of gaze shifts (arrowheads). This result resembled those observed in EHD trials (Fig. 4). Third, head-movement velocity remained relatively low (≥25°/s) near the end of gaze shifts. The apparent dissociation between head and gaze velocities can be appreciated during two staircase gaze shifts (downward empty triangle; Fig. 6). In both examples, the horizontal gaze displacement was ≥50° (≥30 and ≥20° for the 1st and 2nd gaze shifts, respectively). Note that despite the fact that the head was in motion and thus could easily accelerate, head-velocity profile was not altered during the second stimulation-evoked gaze shift. Finally, head movements often reached their peak velocities ≥50 ms after gaze offset (Fig. 6, left and middle).

Figure 7 quantifies the effects of varying IHP on the stimulation-evoked movements of all trials (n = 1,694) of all sites (n = 26; M1 = 19, M2 = 7). The probability for FEF stimulation to evoke eye-and-head movements was 58, 21, and 10% for IHPI (n = 106), IHPO (n = 1,528), and IHPC (n = 60) conditions, respectively (Table 1). The horizontal amplitude of gaze shifts in 90% of these trials was <26°. Horizontal gaze displacement was totally accounted for by horizontal eye displacement (Fig. 7C, □). Head contribution to horizontal (Fig. 7C, gray *) and vertical (data not plotted) gaze shifts was negligible.

**Nontask-mode stimulation**

Nontask-mode stimulation was conducted in 12 large-saccade sites (M1 = 7; M2 = 5) in the FEF (see METHODS; Fig. 7).

**FIG. 4.** Effects of varying horizontal IEP on the stimulation-evoked horizontal gaze (gray; peak truncated) and head (black) velocities in a large-saccade site of the FEF (M1). Data are separated for isilateral IEP (IEPi; range: −28: −15°, left), IEP centered in the orbit (IEP0; range: −10: 10°; middle), and IEP contralateral to the stimulated side (IEPc; range: 15: 28°, right) conditions. In all conditions, IHP remained centered with respect to the body at stimulation onset. Shaded regions indicate the duration of stimulation. Arrowhead and arrow indicate head movement onset and offset, respectively. The threshold current for evoking eye movements was ~35 μA. The average horizontal gaze amplitude was 27 ± 4° (n = 28), 19 ± 4° (n = 26), and 8 ± 2° (n = 21) in IEPi, IEPo, and IEPc conditions, respectively.

**FIG. 5.** Illustrates the results of eye and head contributions to gaze shifts. Regardless of the variability of horizontal and vertical IEPs, eye (re head) amplitudes were linearly correlated with gaze (Gh) amplitudes (Fig. 5, E and F). That is, horizontal and vertical amplitudes of eye (re head) movements totally accounted for horizontal (Fig. 5E) and vertical (Fig. 5F) amplitudes of gaze shifts, respectively. Horizontal (Fig. 5E) and vertical (Fig. 5F) contribution of the head to gaze shifts was negligible.
In these trials \((n = 444)\), the range of IHP at stimulation onset was −31: 32°. At this IHP range, the range of horizontal IEP was −21: 26° in the orbit.

Half \((51\%; n = 227/444)\) of these were eye-alone movements, the remaining were eye-and-head movements. In the latter movements, the maximal horizontal gaze amplitude was 31° \((\text{Fig. 7D})\), whereas the maximal horizontal head amplitude was 16° \((\text{Fig. 7E}; \text{Table 1})\). However, given comparable metrics, head contribution to stimulation-evoked horizontal gaze shifts remained negligible \((\text{Fig. 7F, bottom, } +)\). Horizontal gaze displacement was entirely accounted for by horizontal eye displacement \((\text{Fig. 7F, bottom, } \square)\).

**Visually guided gaze shifts**

Figure 8 illustrates the metrics of visually guided eye-and-head movements \((n = 2,931; M1: 1,557, M2: 1,374)\). These visually guided movements were obtained following the yellow target in the control and stimulation trials \((\text{see METHODS})\). There were three major differences in the eye-head coordination between visually guided and stimulation-evoked movements.

First, for visually guided gaze shifts, horizontal head amplitudes were a monotonic function of horizontal gaze amplitudes \((\text{e.g., Freedman and Sparks 1997; Phillips et al. 1995; cat: Guitton et al. 1990})\). When horizontal gaze shifts were 25–35°...
TABLE 1. Metrics of stimulation-evoked eye-and-head movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EHD</th>
<th>EHA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IEPi</td>
<td>IEPo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>36 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18:55</td>
<td>0.2:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gv</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16 ± 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hh</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.3 ± 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0.2:11</td>
<td>0.1:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hv</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.4 ± 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>−6:7</td>
<td>−5:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HcGh</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>−0.2:4.2</td>
<td>−0.4:2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HcGv</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>−1:2:1</td>
<td>−1:2:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 55 246 340 61 317 6 217 55 246 340 61 317 6 217
Percent of Total 4.5% 21% 32% 58% 21% 10% 49%

Average (mean ± S.D.; *) and data range (minimum: maximum; *) of gaze amplitude (horizontal: Gh; vertical: Gv), head amplitude (horizontal: Hh; vertical: Hv), and head contribution to gaze shifts (horizontal: HcGh; vertical: HcGv) under eye-head dissociation (EHD), eye-head alignment (EHA), and nontask-mode stimulation conditions. Data included the stimulation-evoked eye-and-head movements only.

in IEPo condition, the average horizontal amplitude of the head was 17 ± 8° (n = 301; Fig. 8A, top). In contrast, given comparable horizontal gaze amplitudes, the average horizontal amplitude of FEF stimulation-evoked head movements was only 5 ± 3° (n = 60). The difference was highly significant (F = 130, P < 0.001).

Second, for visually guided gaze shifts, small, but significant vertical head movements were often observed. For example, when the vertical amplitude of gaze shifts was 25–35° in IEPo condition, the average vertical amplitude of the head was 11 ± 8° (n = 401, Fig. 8B, top). In contrast, given comparable vertical gaze amplitudes, the average vertical amplitude of FEF stimulation-evoked head movements was only 1.3 ± 1.2° (n = 20). The difference was significant (F = 34, P < 0.001).

Third, head contribution to visually guided horizontal gaze shifts was a function of horizontal gaze amplitudes and hori-

![Image](https://www.jn.org/)

**FIG. 6.** Effects of varying horizontal IHP on the stimulation-evoked horizontal gaze (gray; peaks truncated) and head (black) velocities in a large-saccade site in the left FEF (M2). Data are separated for ipsilateral IHP (IHPi; range: −32° to −20°; left), IHPr centered in the orbit (IHPo; range: −10° to 10°; middle), and IHPh contralateral to the stimulated side (IHPc; range: 20° to 32°; right) conditions. In all conditions, IEP remained centered in the orbit at stimulation onset. Arrowhead and arrow indicate head movement onset and offset, respectively. Stimulation: 100 μA, 200 Hz, and 300 ms. The threshold current for evoking saccades was −50 μA. Note the lack of re-acceleration of the head in the two staircase gaze shifts (marked by downward empty triangle). In these cases, the head velocities were not altered by either onset or offset of the second gaze shifts, suggesting a temporal dissociation between head velocity and gaze velocity. The average horizontal amplitude of gaze shifts was 24 ± 3° (range: 20° to 29°; n = 10), 27 ± 2° (range: 24° to 30°; n = 10), and 19 ± 2° (range: 16° to 21°; n = 10) for IHPi, IHPo, and IHPc conditions, respectively. The average vertical amplitude of gaze shifts was 5 ± 3°. The average horizontal head amplitude was 10 ± 3° (range: 7° to 15°) and 9 ± 3° (range: 3° to 16°) for IHPi and IHPo conditions, respectively. The average peak head velocity was 52 ± 12° (range: 37° to 70°) and 50 ± 15° (range: 23° to 94°) for IHPi and IHPo conditions, respectively. There was no significant difference between IHPi and IHPo conditions in either horizontal head amplitude (t = 0.9, P > 0.34) or peak horizontal head velocity (t = 0.4, P > 0.70).
horizontal IEP in the orbit (Fig. 8A, bottom). For example, when the horizontal amplitude of gaze shifts was 50° in IEPo condition, the contribution of the head was as large as 13°. In contrast, we never observed FEF stimulation-evoked gaze shifts as large as 50° in horizontal amplitude in IEPo condition. When horizontal amplitude of visually guided gaze shifts was 25–35° in IEPo condition, the average contribution of the head was 4° (n = 301; Fig. 8A, bottom). In contrast, given comparable horizontal gaze amplitude, the average head contribution to FEF stimulation-evoked gaze shifts was only 0.6° (n = 60). The difference was highly significant (F = 139, P < 0.001).

Timing difference between head movement onset and gaze shift onset

Head movement onset varied systematically as a function of horizontal IEP (Fig. 9A) and IHP (B), whereas gaze shift onset remained consistent across EHD and EHA trials. There was a significant correlation between head movement onset and IEP (Fig. 9A) or IHP (B). There was no significant correlation between gaze shift onset and IEP (Fig. 9A) or IHP (B).

Figure 9C illustrates the relative onset of eye and head movements between stimulation-evoked and visually guided eye-and-head movements. The vast majority of the trials [98% (681/651) in EHD trials, 99% (404/410) in EHA trials, and 95% (202/213) in nontask-mode stimulation trials] exhibited positive values, i.e., head movement onset lagged behind gaze shift onset. On average, head movement onset lagged behind gaze shift onset by 86 ± 58, 88 ± 53, and 57 ± 49 ms in EHD, EHA, and nontask-mode stimulation trials, respectively. Head contribution to horizontal gaze shifts was negligible regardless of the latency difference between head and gaze shift onsets (EHD trials: slope = 0.00; r = 0.51; EHA trials: slope = -0.01; r = 0.60; nontask-mode trials: slope = -0.01; r = 0.54).

Peak velocity latencies of head movements

Figure 10 quantifies the latency difference between gaze shift offset and the peak velocities of head movements. Only the trials of head amplitude ≥2° were selected for analysis. More than 90% of stimulation trials [98% (567/576) in EHD trials and 97% (300/311) in EHA trials] exhibited positive values (Fig. 10, A and B; χ², P < 0.001). This indicates that the vast majority of head movements reached their peak velocities after gaze completion. The average peak velocity of head movements of all stimulation (EHD and EHA) trials combined was 136 ± 91 ms, and the mode of the distribution fell on the 121- to 130-ms bin.

One may wonder whether head movements of relatively large amplitudes might reach their peak velocities near the end of gaze shifts. Figure 10, A and B plots the distributions when only the stimulation-evoked head movements of ≥5° were considered. The average peak velocity of head move-
the moment when the head stopped moving. $H_{\text{ph}}$ was positively correlated with horizontal eye position at gaze offset in EHD and EHA trials (Fig. 11). The data of the two trial types overlapped each other (ANCOVA, homogeneity-slope model; $F = 3, P > 0.07$). However, compared with visually guided gaze shifts, FEF stimulation-evoked head movements were smaller. When the eye position following gaze completion was $\pm 20^\circ$, the average $H_{\text{ph}}$ in visually guided movements was $\pm 10^\circ$, whereas the average FEF stimulation-evoked $H_{\text{ph}}$ was significantly smaller ($\pm 4^\circ$). Overall, there was a significant difference between FEF stimulation-evoked $H_{\text{ph}}$ and visually guided $H_{\text{ph}}$ (ANCOVA, homogeneity-slope model, $F = 810, P < 0.001$).

**HEAD ALONE MOVEMENTS.** FEF stimulation sometimes evoked head movements in the absence of gaze shifts (e.g., the 4th IEPc trial in Fig. 4). Nearly all (99%; 308/311) of these head-alone movements were obtained in IEPc condition; the average horizontal amplitude of the head was $5 \pm 2^\circ$ (range: $2^\circ$ $18^\circ$). The remaining movements (2 trials at IEPh $= 0^\circ$ and 1 trial at IEPh $= 13^\circ$) had a relatively smaller horizontal amplitude of the head ($2.4 \pm 0.2^\circ$) compared with those obtained in IEPc condition. The displacement of head-alone movements as a function of eye position at head movement onset (●) is superimposed on Fig. 11. It can be noted that, when eye positions were $>10^\circ$ contralateral to the stimulated side, the

ments of all stimulation (EHD and EHA) trials combined was $150 \pm 102$ ms, and the distribution peak fell on the same 121- to 130-ms bin. In other words, regardless of whether the head movements were small or large, the distribution exhibited peaks at comparable latencies.

The next question is under what circumstances do visually guided gaze shifts recruit head movements similar to those observed by FEF stimulation. We analyzed the visually guided movements with comparable horizontal gaze amplitudes ($\pm 42^\circ$) and total head amplitude ($\pm 2^\circ$; Fig. 10C, □). The average peak head velocity latency of these visually guided movements was $69 \pm 85$ ms ($n = 2,631$), which was significantly different from that evoked by FEF stimulation ($t = 14; P < 0.001$).

Further analysis indicates that different subsets of visually guided gaze shifts recruited head movements of different peak velocity latencies. When the horizontal contribution of the head was $\pm 2^\circ$ (Fig. 10C, ■), the average latency of the peak head velocity (re-gaze offset) was $24 \pm 45$ ms ($n = 1,192$). When the horizontal contribution of the head was $\pm 1^\circ$ (Fig. 10C, □), the average latency of the peak head velocity was $129 \pm 96$ ms ($n = 781$). The difference between the two distributions was highly significant ($t = 33; P < 0.001$). The latter distribution was not significantly different from that of stimulation-evoked eye-head movements ($t = 1.5; P > 0.10$).

**Postgaze–shift head displacement**

Horizontal postgaze-shift head displacement ($H_{\text{ph}}$) was defined as the head displacement between gaze completion and

FIG. 8. Head amplitude (A and B, top) and head contribution to visually guided gaze shifts (A and B, bottom). A: horizontal head amplitude (top) and head contribution to horizontal gaze shifts ($H_{\text{ch}}$; bottom) as a function of horizontal gaze amplitude. Data are separated for IEPc (●), IEPo (□), and IEPi (○) conditions. B: vertical head amplitude (top) and head contribution to vertical gaze shifts ($H_{\text{cv}}$; bottom) as a function of vertical gaze amplitude. Data were obtained from visually guided gaze shifts in the control and stimulation trials of the same monkeys (e.g., Fig. 1A; see METHODS). Data were separated for IEPu (upward IEP, range: 11°; 30°; □), IEPo (range: $-10^\circ$; ●), and IEPd (downward IEP, range: $-30^\circ$; $-11^\circ$; ○) conditions. All data were rectified according to the direction (left vs. right or up vs. down) of gaze shifts; positive values indicate the direction of the movements.

FIG. 9. The onset latency of stimulation-evoked head movements (● and —) and gaze shifts (○ and —) as a function of horizontal initial eye (IEP, A) and head (IEP, B) positions. Positive values in the abscissa indicate contralateral (rightward) directions with respect to the stimulated sides (left FEFs). In EHD trials (A), the average latency for gaze shift onset was $91 \pm 50$ ms (median = 78; range: $20^\circ$ $300^\circ$; $n = 2,947$), whereas the average latency for head movement onset was $179 \pm 61$ ms (median = 184; range: $52^\circ$ $300^\circ$; $n = 1,039$). The correlation between head movement onset and IEP was $-0.23$ ($F = 56, P < 0.001$), whereas that between gaze shift onset and IEP was $-0.01$ ($F = 0.2, P > 0.66$). In EHA trials (B), the average latency for gaze shift onset was $81 \pm 48$ ms (median = 70; range: $20^\circ$ $298^\circ$; $n = 1,694$), whereas the average latency for head movement onset was $178 \pm 60$ ms (median = 182; range: $54^\circ$ $100^\circ$; $n = 761$). The correlation between head movement onset and IEPH was $-0.20$ ($F = 33, P < 0.001$), whereas that between gaze shift onset and IEPH was $-0.04$ ($F = 2.4, P > 0.12$). C: distribution histogram (top) of the latency difference between head movement onset and gaze shift onset and scattergram (bottom) for head contribution to stimulation-evoked horizontal gaze shifts ($H_{\text{ch}}$) as a function of the latency difference between head and gaze shift onsets in EHD (●) and EHA (○) trials. Overlapped bins are marked by □. Only eye-and-head movements were included in the analysis. Movements in EHD and EHA trials were comparable in amplitudes (Table 1).
data points of head-alone movements fell on top of those of EHD and EHA trials. Compared with visually guided gaze shifts, head-alone movements contributed less to minimizing the eye deviation from the center of the orbit (ANCOVA, homogeneity-slope model; $F_{1,1005} = 578$, $P_{1,1021} < 0.001$).

DISCUSSION

The present study provides several lines of evidence indicating that FEF stimulation-evoked head movements contributed little to shifting the line of sight. First, despite the large variability of IEP and IHP and the extent of stimulation-evoked gaze amplitudes, gaze displacement was entirely accounted for by eye (re head) displacement. The majority (3/4) of stimulation-evoked gaze shifts consisted of eye-alone movements, in which head movements were below the detection threshold.

When head movements did occur during stimulation-evoked gaze shifts, head movement onset often lagged gaze shift onset and coincided with rapid eye deceleration. This resulted in little change in the ensuing gaze amplitudes. Second, head velocities were temporally dissociated from gaze velocities. Unlike visually guided coordinated eye-head gaze shifts in which head movements often reached their peak velocities near the end of gaze shifts, FEF stimulation-evoked head movements often reached their peak velocities >100 ms after the end of gaze shifts. Third, head movements were evoked by FEF stimulation regardless of the occurrence of gaze shifts. When IEP was deviated in the direction contralateral to the stimulated side, ~1/3 of stimulation-evoked head movements occurred in the absence of gaze shifts. Finally, postgaze-shift head displacement was positively correlated with the eye position in the orbit, suggesting that these late head movements did contribute to minimizing the eye deviation from the center of the orbit. This process did not involve a change of gaze. Some alternative interpretations of these findings are discussed in the following text.

Stimulation-evoked nonvolitional movement

One may argue that some forms of task-associated movement suppression (or promotion) were involved in the findings of the present study. Specifically, the demands in this study for controlling initial eye and head positions might have contributed to the apparent late onset of stimulation-evoked head movements. This possibility is unlikely for several reasons. First, comparable results were observed in nontask-mode as well as task-mode stimulation trials. In the former task, there was no feasible promotion or suppression of a given type of
movement, yet the stimulation-evoked gaze shifts recruited negligible contribution of the head. Second, FEF stimulation was conducted in darkness, 200 ms after the extinction of visual targets. This procedure minimized the influence of visual fixation-induced motor suppression (Goldberg et al. 1986; Tehovnik and Slocum 2000). Third, the reward was not contingent on any movements during or following stimulation. Rather, the reward was contingent on the visually guided gaze shifts at the end of the trials (see METHODS). Fourth, the direction of stimulation-evoked head movements was not random but primarily contralateral with respect to the stimulated side, suggesting that these head movements were likely evoked by stimulation as opposed to initiated volitionally. Fifth, significant contribution of the head was observed during visually guided gaze shifts (Fig. 8), indicating that the animals were capable of performing coordinated eye-head movements. Finally, stimulation-evoked head movements in the FEF were dramatically different from those in the SEF in which stimulation-evoked gaze shifts recruited significant contribution of the head (Chen and Walton 2005). These results were obtained in the same animals under the same task demands. Therefore it seems that the lack of head contribution to stimulation-evoked gaze shifts was unique for the FEF.

The metrics of FEF stimulation-evoked head movements in this study were in general agreement with the recent study of Tu and Keating (2000). First, low current stimulation in the FEF evoked primarily eye-alone movements. High current stimulation evoked gaze shifts accompanied by head movements that were otherwise undetectable [200–300 μA at 250 Hz in Tu and Keating (2000); ≥150 μA at 200 Hz in this study]. Second, head movement onset often lagged behind gaze shift onset (Fig. 2 in Tu and Keating 2000) (Fig. 9). Third, the average horizontal amplitude of stimulation-evoked head movements was modest [4.3 ± 0.4° in Tu and Keating (2000); 4.3° ± 2.9° in this study]. Fourth, these head movements contributed little to shifting the line of sight (Fig. 2 in Tu and Keating 2000) (Figs. 2, 5, 7, and 9; Table 1). However, note that head contribution to gaze shifts and head amplitude were described interchangeably in Tu and Keating (2000); hence, they concluded that head contribution (amplitude in their measurement) was significant in the report (cf. Scudder et al. 2002).

Head movements and the role of FEF in orienting gaze shifts

Gaze feedback hypothesis has been proposed to account for the head involvement in large orienting gaze shifts (Guitton et al. 1990, 2003; Laurutis and Robinson 1986). The hypothesis states that a gaze motor command provides the drive to move the eyes and head, such that the range of gaze displacement is extended beyond the range accomplished by eye (re head) displacement alone (Freedman and Sparks 1997; Fuller 1992; Guitton et al. 1990, 2003; Laurutis and Robinson 1986; Tomlinson and Bahra 1986). As the FEF is anatomically located upstream from most of the oculomotor structures, the question then is whether the FEF issues a gaze motor command that coordinates eye and head movements, which are presumably controlled independently at the brain stem level. Interestingly, based on the following observations, this possibility appears not supported. First, FEF stimulation-evoked gaze shifts did not recruit significant contribution of the head, albeit stimulation-evoked gaze shifts were 20–42° in horizontal amplitude (horizontal IEP centered in the orbit). In contrast, visually guided gaze shifts with comparable gaze displacements always recruit significant contribution of the head (e.g., Freedman and Sparks 1997; Fig. 8). Second, head velocities appeared dissociated from the occurrence of gaze shifts (e.g., stimulation-evoked large staircase gaze shifts in Fig. 6). Unlike the typical visually guided coordinated gaze shifts, stimulation-evoked head movements did not accelerate rapidly during gaze shifts (Figs. 2, 4, and 6). Third, visually guided coordinated eye-head gaze shifts often began to decelerate by the end of gaze shifts, whereas FEF stimulation-evoked head movements did not (cf. Guitton et al. 1990, 2003). Instead, the head often continued to accelerate and reached its peak velocity >100 ms following gaze offset (Fig. 10, A and B). That is, the head-velocity profile was temporally dissociated from the presumed gaze drive. The results all point to the same conclusion: FEF stimulation-evoked head movements were not driven by the gaze drive signal. It seems that the FEF neither generated a gaze motor command nor coordinated eye and head movements. Note head movements with long peak velocity latencies have been shown embedded in some natural, visually guided gaze shifts (Phillips et al. 1995). Our analysis indicates that this unique type of head movements contributed little to shifting the line of sight (Fig. 10C, □).

The notion of head motor control independent from eye control in the FEF is consistent with the findings of past studies. It has been found that some FEF neurons discharged exclusively during head movements (Bizzi and Schiller 1970). A recent brief report indicated that the motor-burst discharge of some FEF neurons lasted beyond the end of gaze shifts; the duration of the motor burst was positively correlated with the duration of head movements (Knight and Fuchs 2001). These studies suggest that the FEF neuronal discharge encodes some forms of head motor commands that are dissociated from the neural processes that generate gaze shifts.

If the head motor control is indeed independent from the eye control in the FEF, one would predict that under some circumstances FEF stimulation may evoke head movements in the absence of gaze shifts. This prediction was indeed observed. Head-alone movements were evoked by FEF stimulation, particularly when IEP was deviated contralaterally at stimulation onset. It is possible that the independent head control mechanism in the FEF offers the flexibility for better coordinating eye and head movements (Bizzi et al. 1971; Chen and Walton 2005; Goossens and van Opstal 1997; Morasso et al. 1973; Phillips et al. 1995; van der Steen et al. 1986).

One may wonder the exact role of the FEF in the control of head movements. Recent studies have shown that SEF stimulation-evoked head movements facilitated re-centering the eyes in the orbits (Chen and Walton 2005; Sparks et al. 2001). Our findings indicate that FEF stimulation-evoked postgaze-shift head displacements were positively correlated with eye positions, suggesting that these head movements may contribute to minimizing the eye deviation from the center of the orbit (Fig. 11). However, stimulation-evoked postgaze-shift head displacements were relatively small in the FEF as compared with those evoked by SEF stimulation or visually guided gaze shifts. It seems that the FEF may play a role in, but is unlikely the main source of re-centering the eyes in the orbits.
Comparison with the SEF

A recent stimulation study indicates that the SEF contained mechanisms of head control independent from those of gaze control (Chen and Walton 2005). Interestingly, this study also suggests that the FEF contained independent eye and head control mechanisms. However, SEF stimulation evoked significant contribution of the head to gaze shifts (Chen and Walton 2005; Martinez-Trujillo et al. 2003), whereas FEF stimulation evoked little contribution of the head to gaze shifts (Tu and Keating 2000; this study). It appears that some fundamental differences exist in the head control mechanisms between FEF and SEF.

Based on our stimulation studies, the differences in the control of eye and head movements between FEF and SEF are enormous (Chen and Walton 2005; this study). First, <1/3 (29%) of SEF stimulation trials evoked eye-alone movements. In contrast, however, the majority (75%) of FEF stimulation trials did so. Second, when initial eye positions were deviated in the ipsilateral direction, nearly all (97%) of SEF stimulation trials consisted of eye-and-head movements. However, under comparable IEP condition, <5% of FEF stimulation trials consisted of eye-and-head movements; nearly all (95%) were eye-alone movements. Third, when initial eye positions were deviated in the contralateral direction, nearly all (93%) of SEF stimulation-evoked movements were head-alone movements. While under comparable IEP condition, only ~1/3 (308/1,072) of FEF-stimulation-evoked head movements occurred in the absence of gaze shifts. Fourth, in the SEF, ~40% of stimulation-evoked head movements exhibited a peak velocity latency ~50 ms following gaze offset (unpublished observation, L. L. Chen and M. M. G. Walton). In contrast, in the FEF, only 18% of such trials did so (Fig. 10). Fifth, ~1/3 (35%) of SEF stimulation-evoked eye-and-head movements were early-head movements in which head movement onset preceded gaze shift onset, whereas merely 5% of these existed in the FEF (Fig. 9) (Levinsohn 1909, described in Smith 1949). Sixth, SEF stimulation-evoked gaze shifts often evoked significant contribution of the head, whereas FEF stimulation-evoked gaze shifts recruited negligible contribution of the head (Figs. 5 and 7; Table 1). Finally, SEF stimulation evoked significant head contribution to postgaze-shift eye centering, similar to that observed in visually guided gaze shifts. However, a smaller effect was found in the FEF (Fig. 11).

The question then is whether there exist neuronal discharge characteristics in the FEF and SEF that account for their differences in eye and head control. At this point, our knowledge toward this end is very limited. Both FEF and SEF are extensively connected with other cortical and subcortical areas that are implicated for oculomotor functions (Huerta et al. 1986; Leichnetz et al. 1984; Shook et al. 1990; Stanton et al. 1993; Tehovnik et al. 2000). It has been shown that FEF neurons have strong visual and motor sensitivities associated with oculomotor metrics (Bruce et al. 1985; Chen and Wise 1995a; Dias and Segraves 1999; Huerta et al. 1986; Schall 2002; Schlag and Schlag-Rey 1987). In contrast, SEF neurons and those in neighboring cortices are most sensitive to the context in which movements were executed, e.g., self paced versus visually guided or conditional visuomotor association versus spatial attention (Amador et al. 2000; Chen and Wise 1995b, 1996; Fujii et al. 2002; Stuphorn et al. 2000; Tanji 1994; Wise et al. 1997). All of these studies were conducted in head-restrained conditions. Little is known regarding how different types of motor neurons in the FEF and SEF would respond when the head is free to move.

Because FEF/SEF stimulation evoked nonvolitional movements that disengaged the animals’ active fixation (or stabilization) of gaze and head, one may wonder whether the animals developed strategies to impede stimulation-evoked movements. Specifically, did the training of active fixation (in the absence of visual stimuli) induce short- or long-term cortical neural plasticity that led to differential outcomes in the stimulation-evoked movements in the FEF and SEF? This cognitive control issue is out of the scope of the present study. Nonetheless, the following observations do not seem to support this possibility. First, our finding of negligible contribution of the head to FEF stimulation-evoked gaze shifts agreed with the study of Tu and Keating (2000), which did not train monkeys to actively maintain stable head positions. Hence, the training did not seem to alter the metrics of stimulation-evoked head movements. Second, the results of nontask-mode stimulation, although drastically different between FEF and SEF, were consistent with those obtained in task-mode stimulation in either the SEF (Chen and Walton 2005) or the FEF (this study). This indicates that the effect of active fixation, if any, did not cross-contaminate our observations. Therefore these observations suggest: FEF and SEF differed primarily in their predisposed functions and/or cognitive variables, if any, which might influence the movement metrics that were not included in our analyses. Note that cognitive control biases stimulation-evoked movements has been demonstrated under carefully controlled circumstances (e.g., Gold and Shadlen 2000; Tehovnik and Slocum 2004). Adequate manipulation of the relevant variables is needed to elucidate the cognitive control mechanisms.

Comparison with the superior colliculus

It has been shown that electrical stimulation in the superior colliculus evoked constant gaze shifts independent of horizontal IEP (Freedman et al. 1996). This finding has been taken as a critical piece of evidence suggesting that the superior colliculus encodes gaze (eye plus head) displacement (Freedman et al. 1996; cf. May and Porter 1992). Because the superior colliculus is reciprocally connected with the FEF, one may wonder whether the FEF also encodes constant gaze displacement. Interestingly, this possibility was never observed at any stimulation site in the FEF. FEF stimulation-evoked gaze amplitudes varied dramatically depending on eye positions in the orbits (Fig. 5, A and B), similar to the orbital effect observed under head-restrained conditions (Russo and Bruce 1993; Tehovnik et al. 2000). It seems that some fundamental differences exist in the read-out of the electrically evoked commands between the FEF and the superior colliculus.

At least two major lines of evidence suggest that eye and head motor control in the FEF are different from that in the superior colliculus. First, when the head is free to move, the site-specific maximal gaze displacement (70–80°) evoked by collicular stimulation is dramatically extended beyond the oculomotor range (Freedman et al. 1996; Segraves and Goldberg 1992; cat: Pare et al. 1994). This was not observed in FEF stimulation (Fig. 2A). FEF stimulation-evoked gaze shifts pushed the eyes as far as their orbital limits (~42° in horizontal...
amplitude, horizontal IEP centered in the orbit; Table 1) with little contribution of the head. In other words, the gaze map in the FEF remains within the oculomotor limit whether or not the head is free to move (Bruce et al. 1985; Russo and Bruce 1993) (Fig. 2A). It is of interest that this finding is consistent with the previous lesion study in head-free monkeys, in which FEF lesion led to selective eye deficits (van der Steen et al. 1986). The results suggest that the FEF indeed encodes eye (or head) movements.

Second, head-alone movements were evoked by subthreshold (below the threshold for evoking eye saccades) current stimulation in the superior colliculus (Corneil et al. 2002; Pelisson et al. 2001). Also, high-frequency (≥500 Hz) stimulation in the superior colliculus evoked the site-specific maximal gaze shifts, whereas low-frequency (e.g., ≤250 Hz) stimulation tended to truncate or attenuate the amplitude of the evoked movements (Freedman et al. 1996). In contrast, suprathreshold current stimulation was required in the FEF (and SEF) to evoke detectable head movements (Chen and Walton 2005; Tu and Keating 2000; this study). Also, low-frequency (≤200 Hz) stimulation in the FEF/SEF evoked the site-specific maximal gaze shifts (or head movements), whereas high-frequency (400–800 Hz) stimulation tended to attenuate the amplitude of the evoked movements (Chen and Walton 2005; L. L. Chen and D. L. Sparks, unpublished observation). This implies that different coding schemes for eye and head movements may exist between the FEF/SEF and the superior colliculus.

That high current was needed to evoke detectable head movements in the FEF and SEF is of particular interest. To our knowledge, no known head-gating mechanism exists in the frontal cortex or downstream that accounts for these findings. Future studies are needed to verify such a possibility. In addition, large current spread recruits larger population of neurons, suggesting that the head motor commands encoded in the FEF and SEF may be distributed widely across neuronal populations. The exact nature of head motor control in the FEF deserves to be elucidated in the future.
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