

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Suppressing movements with phantom limbs and existing limbs evokes comparable electrophysiological inhibitory responses

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1700537> since 2019-05-02T12:02:30Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.cortex.2019.02.024

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

Suppressing movements with phantom limbs and existing limbs evokes comparable electrophysiological inhibitory responses

Valentina Bruno^a, Irene Ronga^a, Carlotta Fossataro^a, Francesca Capozzi^b, Francesca Garbarini^{a*}

^a MANIBUS Lab, Department of Psychology, University of Turin, Via Po 14, 10123, Turin Italy

^b Department of Psychology, McGill University, 2001 McGill College Ave, Montreal, Canada

***Corresponding author:**

Francesca Garbarini

Psychology Department, University of Turin

Via Po 14, 10123 Turin, Italy

Phone: +39 011 6703044

Fax: +39 011 8159039

E-mail: francesca.garbarini@unito.it

Abstract

Phantom limb is a common sensation in amputees, who often report vivid experiences of voluntarily moving their phantom. Previous studies showed that phantom movement can be functionally disentangled from imagined movement comparable to the actual movement of an intact limb. How and to what extent phantom movement and real movement share similar physiological mechanisms? Here, we focused on a specific aspect of motor control, the motor inhibition, and we asked whether inhibitory physiological responses are implemented when a phantom movement has to be suppressed. Sixteen two-handed controls and two left upper-limb amputees (with and without phantom movement) underwent a Go/Nogo paradigm, while event-related potentials (ERPs) were recorded. The task was performed with both the right (intact) and the left (phantom) hand, either in real or imagery conditions. Opposite results between the moving-phantom case and the static-phantom case were found. In the real condition, moving-phantom case showed **the classical motor-inhibition related ERP pattern, with large P300 inhibitory wave** when the movements of both (right) intact and (left) phantom limbs have to be suppressed. This inhibitory response was not different from that found in controls (who performed the task with an existing hand; real condition), but, crucially, it was significantly different from the imagery condition of controls. Contrariwise, in the static-phantom case, **the ERP responses to Nogo trials** during real condition were different from the real condition in controls but were not different from their imagery conditions. Importantly, in real condition, Nogo-ERP responses were significantly different between the two phantom cases. Taken together, these findings provide compelling evidence that phantom movements share the same neurophysiological correlates of real movements, not only when an action has to be executed, but also when it should be inhibited.

Keywords: phantom movement; motor inhibition; ERPs; phantom limb; motor imagery

1. Introduction

1 People with a body amputation commonly continue to perceive the presence of their missing limb, as if
2 it was still present (Herta Flor, Nikolajsen, & Staehelin Jensen, 2006). Amputees report that their
3 phantom limb has certain sensory properties like touch (Melzack, 2006) and up to 80% of these phantom
4 sensations are experienced as painful (Kikkert et al., 2017; Weeks, Anderson-Barnes, & Tsao, 2010).
5 Interestingly, some patients with phantom limbs claim they can voluntarily move their phantom
6 (Garbarini, Bisio, Biggio, Pia, & Bove, 2018; Raffin, Giraux, & Reilly, 2012; Raffin, Mattout, Reilly, &
7 Giraux, 2012; Ramachandran & Hirstein, 1998). They experience sensations of reaching out to grab an
8 object, making a fist, or moving their fingers individually (Ramachandran & Hirstein, 1998). It has been
9 described that phantom movement involves some aspects of “real” motor execution. For example,
10 **voluntary movements of the phantom hand trigger characteristic patterns of distal movements in the**
11 **residual limb muscle activity, which differed from the activity recorded in the same muscle groups during**
12 **proximal movements**, suggesting that the brain’s motor areas can be differentially activated according to
13 the movement the patients intend to perform with their phantom (Reilly, Mercier, Schieber, & Sirigu,
14 2006). Furthermore, an ischemic nerve block applied to the **residual limb** abolished not only
15 electromyographic (EMG) signal of the **residual limb**, but also the ability to voluntarily move the
16 phantom (Reilly et al., 2006).

17 Many neuroimaging studies, examining the cerebral activity associated with phantom limb movements
18 (Hugdahl et al., 2001; Lotze, Flor, Grodd, Larbig, & Birbaumer, 2001; Roux et al., 2003), showed a
19 maintained representation of the missing hand in the primary sensorimotor missing hand cortex (Kikkert,
20 Johansen-Berg, Tracey, & Makin, 2018; Makin et al., 2013) and an increased activity in motor areas,
21 such as the contralateral primary motor cortex (M1) and the supplementary motor area (SMA), in a
22 similar way as real/actual movements do (Raffin, Giraux, et al., 2012; Reilly et al., 2006). Even using a
23 different neuroimaging technique, such as the electroencephalography (EEG) time-frequency analysis, it

24 has been shown that, in a case with congenital absence of arm, similar sensorimotor rhythms were present
25 in both real movements and phantom movements (Walsh, Long, & Haggard, 2015). These neuroimaging
26 findings suggest that, when amputees “perform” voluntary movements with their phantom limb, they
27 recruit a similar neurophysiological brain activity as that employed during the actual movements of an
28 existing limb.

29 Importantly, amputees, when asked to perform real or imagined movements with their phantom, report
30 different perceptions and sensations during each task. Some studies tried to disentangle motor imagery
31 from motor execution both with behavioral (Garbarini et al., 2018; Raffin, Giraux, et al., 2012) and
32 neuroimaging measures (Hugdahl et al., 2001; Lotze et al., 2001; Raffin, Mattout, et al., 2012; Roux et
33 al., 2003). From a behavioral point of view, it has been observed that motor execution with the phantom
34 is slower than with the intact limb, whereas the time to imagine a movement is similar for both the
35 phantom and intact limbs, suggesting that amputees limb loss differentially affects these two tasks
36 (Raffin, Giraux, et al., 2012). In a recent study (Garbarini et al., 2018), the intermanual transfer of
37 sequence learning, occurring when one hand motor skills improve after training with the other hand, was
38 used to dissociate motor execution from motor imagery with a phantom limb. It has been reported that
39 only after an active training with the phantom limb, and not with an imagery training, the moving-
40 phantom case showed a faster performance of the intact hand, as in two-handed controls actually
41 performing the training with an existing hand (Garbarini et al., 2018). Neuroimaging studies on real and
42 imagery phantom movements showed that **two distinct brain networks are activated during motor**
43 **execution (i.e. hand area of the contralateral M1, hand area of the contralateral primary somatosensory**
44 **cortex – S1, contralateral dorsal premotor areas, bilateral medial premotor areas, ipsilateral anteromedial**
45 **part of the cerebellum) and motor imagery (i.e. contralateral dorsal premotor areas, bilateral medial**
46 **premotor areas, bilateral inferior areas) (Raffin, Mattout, et al., 2012). Interestingly, these two networks**
47 **partially overlap (i.e. parts of SMA, the dorsal premotor cortex, the posterior parietal cortex and the**

48 cerebellum as well as M1), and they are similar to those activated during imagination and execution with
49 the intact limb (Hugdahl et al., 2001; Lotze et al., 2001; Raffin, Mattout, et al., 2012; Roux et al., 2003).
50 However, when considering effective connectivity between brain areas, it has been shown that, as in
51 healthy controls (Bruno, Fossataro, & Garbarini, 2018; Kasess et al., 2008; Solodkin, Hlustik, Chen, &
52 Small, 2004; Tak, Kempny, Friston, Leff, & Penny, 2015), real and imagery tasks with the phantom limb
53 had an opposite effect on the SMA–M1 network: while during motor execution, SMA exerts an
54 excitatory effect on M1, since the movement has to be performed; during motor imagery, SMA exerts an
55 inhibitory effect on M1, since the movement has to be suppressed (Raffin, Giraux, et al., 2012).
56 Taken together, these previous findings suggest that, when a movement has to be executed, real and
57 phantom limbs share common behavioral and physiological mechanisms. But, what happens when a
58 phantom movement has to be suppressed? Are inhibitory physiological responses fully implemented, as
59 during the suppression of a real movement? The ability to suppress, withhold, delay or interrupt ongoing
60 or planned actions is a fundamental aspect of motor control in everyday life. Thus, if controlling phantom
61 and real movements rely on common mechanisms, we should expect that suppressing movements with
62 existing and phantom limbs evokes comparable inhibitory responses. The most common task employed
63 in the study of motor inhibition is the Go/Nogo task. During this task, participants are required to respond
64 to frequent imperative stimuli and they must withhold the response to other infrequent alternatives
65 (Donders, 1969). Several electrophysiological studies on the Go/Nogo task described an enhanced
66 frontocentral negativity occurring around 140–300 ms, as well as an enhanced central positivity
67 occurring around 300–600 ms, following the presentation of a Nogo stimulus (Falkenstein, Hoormann,
68 Christ, & Hohnsbein, 2000; Falkenstein, Koshlykova, Kiroj, Hoormann, & Hohnsbein, 1995;
69 Pfefferbaum, Ford, Weller, & Kopell, 1985; Veen & Carter, 2002). These peaks are referred to as N200
70 and P300 respectively, and they have been interpreted as indexes of response inhibitory process in the

71 frontal lobe (Bokura, Yamaguchi, & Kobayashi, 2001; Cojan, Archimi, Cheseaux, Waber, &
72 Vuilleumier, 2013; Kok, 1986; Smith, Johnstone, & Barry, 2008).

73 The purpose of the present study was to investigate whether and to what extent phantom limbs share
74 similar physiological mechanisms with actual limbs, not only when a movement has to be performed,
75 but also when it has to be inhibited. To this aim, we recorded event-related potentials (ERPs) during a
76 Go/Nogo task in two upper-limb amputees who have already participated in a previous study (Garbarini
77 et al., 2018). Both the amputees reported vivid sensations on their phantom, but in different ways: one
78 reported the ability to move her phantom (moving-phantom case), the other reported vivid phantom limb
79 sensation without phantom movement, which, in turn, he perceived as paralyzed (static-phantom case).
80 See details in section 2.1. The ERPs collected in amputees were compared to those collected in two-
81 handed controls. All participants underwent two different conditions of the task: the real condition,
82 during which a real key press in response to Go trials was requested (either with the intact or with the
83 phantom hand) and an imagery condition, during which a mental simulation of the key press in response
84 to Go trials was requested (either with the intact or with the phantom hand). If a/the? phantom movement
85 has similar physiological properties as the real movement, we should expect that, during the Go/Nogo
86 task, the ERP pattern of the moving-phantom case will be comparable to that found in two-handed
87 controls, with the typical inhibitory ERP response associated to Nogo trials. In two-handed controls, the
88 inhibitory ERP response was expected to be greater in real condition than in imagery condition and,
89 coherently, a similar pattern was expected in the moving-phantom case. On the contrary, the static-
90 phantom case, who did not experience kinematical sensations with his phantom, was expected to use
91 motor imagery to perform the real Go/Nogo task with his phantom limb, thus showing a similar ERP
92 pattern as controls during the imagery task.

93

94 **2. Materials and methods**

95 *2.1 Participants*

96 Two left upper-limb amputees took part in this study. Both of them reported phantom limb sensations,
97 but in different ways. The first phantom case was a 31 years old female, with 18 years of education. Her
98 left upper limb was amputated under the shoulder as a consequence of arm paralysis due to brachial
99 plexus injury after a car accident 11 years ago. Her phantom limb sensation started immediately after the
100 accident and continues to persist, although it may vary daily depending on various factors (e.g., stress).
101 At the time of testing, on a visual analog scale (VAS) aiming at assessing pain intensity on her phantom
102 limb ranging from 0 (absolutely not painful) to 10 (absolutely painful), she reported a score of 0,
103 indicating that she did not perceive painful sensation on her phantom (even if she reported phantom pain
104 in the past, for about two years after the accident). She reported to be able to move her phantom at will,
105 and her perceived movement control is limited to relatively simple movements (e.g., grasping, pressing,
106 pointing). We named her “moving-phantom case”. The second phantom case was a 53 years old male,
107 with 13 years of education. He got the amputation of the left upper limb after an accident at work when
108 he was 35. The amputation was made above the left elbow and he was not using any prosthesis. At the
109 time of testing, he did not report painful sensations on his phantom (even if he reported phantom pain in
110 the past), but sometimes he felt it as ticklish. He reported a score of 0 on the VAS about pain intensity
111 on his phantom limb. He did not report the ability to move his phantom, which, in turn, described as rigid
112 and contracted. We named him “static-phantom case”. Sixteen two-handed volunteers (6 men; mean age
113 \pm sd: 23.9 ± 1.3 years; mean of educational years \pm sd: 17.6 ± 0.8) were recruited as controls. All
114 participants (i.e. the two phantom cases and controls) were right-handed, according to the Standard
115 Handedness Inventory (Oldfield, 1971). Neither amputees nor controls had suffered a brain lesion or had
116 a history of neurological or psychiatric illness. All participants were naïve to the purpose of the study
117 and gave written informed consent according to the declaration of Helsinki. The Ethical Committee of
118 the University of Turin gave approval to the project (prot. n. 125055, 12/07/16).

119

120 2.2 *Experimental design*

121 Each participant underwent an EEG recording session while she/he performed a Go/Nogo task (see
122 details in the next paragraph). During the same session, participants were asked to perform the task in
123 both *real* and *imagery* condition. The only difference between the two conditions was that during the
124 *imagery* condition, the subjects had to imagine the hands' movements (i.e. key press, see details in the
125 next paragraph) with a kinesthetic motor imagery, (Bisio et al., 2017; Bruno et al., 2018; Jeannerod,
126 1995; Piedimonte, Garbarini, Rabuffetti, Pia, & Berti, 2014) instead of moving the hand as in *real*
127 conditions.

128

129 2.3 *Go/Nogo task and procedure*

130 A similar version of the Go/Nogo task used by Cojan and colleagues, aiming at comparing motor
131 inhibition mechanisms responsible for paralysis during hypnosis and those recruited by voluntary
132 inhibition (Cojan et al., 2013) was used. Participants were seated on a chair in front of a 21-inches Sony
133 CRT screen placed at a distance of 55 cm, in a dimly illuminated room. Visual stimuli were presented
134 on the computer screen. Each stimulus represented the dorsal view of a hand (left or right) and it could
135 be colored in grey, green, or red. Each trial started with a fixation cross (jittered interval 6000-8000 ms),
136 followed by a preparation cue (i.e. Preparation) which represented a grey hand, either left or right (jittered
137 interval 1000-1200 ms). The grey hand instructed the participant to prepare to press a key on the keyboard
138 with the corresponding hand. Then, the grey hand could turn either green (i.e. Go stimulus) or red (i.e.
139 Nogo stimulus) (fixed duration of 750 ms). During **the** real condition, participants had to press the key
140 as quickly as possible when the hand turned green (75%), and to withhold the prepared response if the
141 hand turned red (25%). During **the** imagery condition, participants had to imagine to press the key when
142 the hand turned green and to withhold the prepared (imagined) response if the hand turned red. After

143 each imperative stimulus (Go or Nogo), the fixation cross re-appeared (Figure 1A). It is important to note
144 that the task, both in real and imagery condition, required that both phantom-limb cases performed it
145 with their left/phantom and their right/intact hand. While the moving-phantom case was able to perform
146 the task with her phantom, the static-phantom case was asked to “try to perform” the task with his
147 phantom. The presentation of stimuli was pseudorandomized, in a way that more than two sequential
148 Nogo stimuli never appeared. Stimuli display and reaction times (RTs) collection were controlled by E-
149 prime v.2 (Psychology Software Tools, <http://www.pstnet.com>). Before starting the experiment, all the
150 participants (i.e. the two phantom-cases and controls) performed a short 10 trials practice to familiarize
151 with the task. Six blocks of 40 trials (half right hand, half left hand) were performed per condition (i.e.
152 real; imagery), resulting in a total of 480 stimuli: 90 real Go left, 90 real Go right, 30 real Nogo left, 30
153 real Nogo right, 90 imagery Go left, 90 imagery Go right, 30 imagery Nogo left, 30 imagery Nogo right.
154 All the participants (i.e. the two cases and the two-handed controls) performed alternately a block of real
155 and a block of imagery condition. Half of the controls started with a real block, the other half with an
156 imagery one. The two phantom-cases started both with a real block (Figure 1B). Each block lasted about
157 6 minutes. A 2 minutes break was performed between each block.

158

159

--- Figure 1 about here ---

160

161 *2.4 Electroencephalogram recording and processing*

162 Participants were seated in a comfortable chair in a silent, temperature-controlled room. They were asked
163 to focus on the task, keep their eyes open and try to avoid blinking when stimuli appeared. Continuous
164 EEG activity was acquired from 32 channels (HandyEEG, SystemPlus Evolution, Micromed, Treviso,
165 Italy) by using tin electrodes mounted in an elastic cap according to the International 10-20 system and
166 referenced to the nose. Eye movements (electrooculogram, EOG) were recorded from two surface

167 electrodes, one placed over the right lower eyelid and the other placed lateral to the outer canthus of the
168 right eye. Electrode impedances were kept below 5 k Ω . Signal was digitized at a sampling rate of 1,024
169 Hz (SD32; Micromed, Treviso, Italy). Data were continuously streamed to a laptop connected to a second
170 computer generating the stimuli. These two computers interfaced via a serial port for precise
171 synchronization.

172

173 **3. Data analysis**

174 **Electrophysiological data**

175 ERPs were pre-processed and analyzed offline using Letswave v.6 (<https://www.letswave.org/>, Mouraux
176 & Iannetti, 2008). The analyses were performed on both Go and Nogo trials (stimulus-locked). Epochs
177 were selected from 500 ms prior to onset to 1000 ms after the onset of the imperative stimulus (total
178 epoch duration: 1500 ms). All the epochs were band-pass filtered (1–30 Hz) using a fast Fourier
179 transform filter. Each epoch was baseline corrected using the 500 ms pre-stimulus recording period as
180 reference. Artifacts due to eye blinks or eye movements were subtracted using a validated method based
181 on an Independent Component Analysis (Jung et al., 2000). Only correct responses to Go and Nogo
182 imperative stimuli were analyzed. Blinks were found to be the most frequent cause of rejection. Epochs
183 belonging to the same experimental condition were averaged time-locked to the onset of the stimulus.
184 Thus, separately for each hand (left/phantom hand, right/intact hand), for each condition (Go, Nogo) and
185 for each task (real, imagery), 8 average waveforms (Go real left/phantom, Go real right/intact, Go
186 imagery left/phantom, Go imagery right/intact, Nogo real left/phantom, Nogo real right/intact, Nogo
187 imagery left/phantom, Nogo imagery right/intact) were obtained for each subject.

188

189 *3.1. Group analysis*

190 We firstly performed a group analysis on the two-handed controls to investigate: i) if our task was able
191 to reproduce the classical electrophysiological pattern associated with motor inhibition (Bokura et al.,
192 2001); ii) if there were any differences in ERPs between real and imagery conditions. Mean ERP
193 responses to Go and Nogo stimuli were analyzed by a point-by-point repeated-measure **ANOVA** with
194 three within-subject factors: Condition (two levels: Go; Nogo), Side (two levels: left; right) and Task
195 (two levels: real; imagery). Cluster-based permutation testing approach (1000 random permutations
196 testing across all 32 channels) was employed to correct for multiple comparisons across different time
197 points (cluster threshold was set at the 95th percentile of the cluster magnitude distribution; i.e. $p < 0.05$,
198 Maris & Oostenveld, 2007). This yielded seven distinct waveforms, representing the significance of the
199 main effect of each of the three factors across time, as well as their first order and second-order
200 interactions. To further explore the interactions, we then performed for each contrast of interest two-
201 tailed paired **T-tests**, by means of cluster-based permutation testing approach (1000 random permutations
202 testing across all 32 channels) to correct for multiple comparisons across different time points (cluster
203 threshold was set at the 95th percentile of the cluster magnitude distribution; i.e. $p < 0.05$, Maris and
204 Oostenveld 2007).

205

206 *3.2 Single-subject analyses*

207 **Based on the results of the group-analysis in two-handed controls, showing a crucial difference between**
208 **real condition and imagery condition in the amplitude of the Nogo-P300 wave, we focused our single-**
209 **subject analyses of the phantom limb cases on this component. In each participant (i.e. including**
210 **amputees and two-handed controls), the mean amplitude of Nogo-P300 peak at Fz was measured for**
211 **each Nogo stimulus of the left/phantom and right/intact hand, during both real and imagery condition.**
212 **P300 wave was defined as the most positive deflection following the onset of Nogo stimulus. In**
213 **particular, the amplitude of P300 was computed for each individual subject in a 100 ms time window**

214 centered on her/his average peak in Nogo trials (P300 range: 280–380 ms). Then, Nogo-P300 peaks were
215 normalized in z-scores, calculated within-subject across all conditions (i.e. real, imagery, left, right). Z-
216 scores peaks were used as dependent variables.

217 By means of SingleBayes_ES.EXE program
218 (http://homepages.abdn.ac.uk/j.crawford/pages/dept/Single_Case_Effect_Sizes.htm) we compared, in
219 separated analyses, P300 amplitudes of both experimental cases (moving-phantom and static-phantom)
220 to the P300 amplitudes recorded in the control group. The program is specifically devised to test whether
221 an individual's score is significantly different from a control or normative sample (Crawford, Garthwaite,
222 and Porter 2010). It provides a point estimate of the effect size for the difference between the case and
223 controls (Z-CC) with an accompanying 95% credible interval and it provides a point and interval estimate
224 of the abnormality of the case's score (i.e. it estimates the percentage of the population that would obtain
225 a lower score, together with a 95% credible interval on this percentage) (Crawford, Garthwaite, and
226 Porter 2010). This test was used to perform four comparisons, in which the amplitude of the left Nogo-
227 P300 of each phantom limb case, during the real task, was compared with that of controls, either during
228 the real task or the imagery task. The α value was set at 5%, and Bonferroni correction for multiple
229 comparisons was applied (p-value: $0.05/4=0.0125$).

230 The above described Crawford's test was used also to investigate the presence of both a side effect and
231 a task effect in the two cases. With respect to the side effect, to analyze potential differences between left
232 (phantom) and right (intact) hand during Nogo trials of the real task, we computed for all the participants
233 a delta (right minus left) where positive values indicate a greater P300 amplitude in response to right
234 than left stimuli. The resulting delta of each phantom-case was compared with the same delta of controls.
235 The α value was set at 5%, and Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons was applied (p value:
236 $0.05/2=0.025$). With respect to the task effect, to analyze potential differences between real and imagery
237 conditions in the left/phantom side, we computed for all the participants a delta (real minus imagery)

238 where positive values indicate greater P300 amplitude in real **condition** than in imagery condition. The
239 resulting delta of each case was compared with the same delta of two-handed controls. The α value was
240 set at 5%, and Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons was applied (**p-value**: $0.05/2=0.025$).
241 Finally, the performance of the two cases was directly compared by means of the C_CTC.exe program
242 (http://homepages.abdn.ac.uk/j.crawford/pages/dept/Compare_Two_Cases.htm). **This program** uses
243 Bayesian statistical methods to draw inferences concerning the difference between the test scores of two
244 single cases by referring their scores to a control sample. The **p-values** for this test are used to determine
245 whether we can reject the null hypothesis that the difference between the two cases is an observation
246 from the distribution of differences between pairs of controls. Point and interval estimates of the effect
247 size for the difference (Z-PCC) between the two cases are reported (Crawford, Garthwaite, & Wood,
248 2010). This test was used to perform four comparisons, in which the two cases was compared on the
249 following variables: left Nogo-P300 real, left Nogo-P300 imagery, Nogo-P300 delta right-left, Nogo-
250 P300 delta real-imagery. **It is to note that these programs are all implemented Bayesian statistics, which**
251 **is more adequately suited for supporting null results.** See Supplementary materials for other analyses
252 including both Go and Nogo trials and both N200 and P300 waves.

253

254 **Behavioral data**

255 The statistical analyses on behavioral data were performed on mean RTs in response to Go stimuli. The
256 analyses were performed on all the RTs collected in response to right/intact hand stimuli during the real
257 task, because i) no behavioral data were collected for the two phantom-cases with respect to left/phantom
258 hand stimuli during the real task; ii) no behavioral data were collected during the imagery task. Analyses
259 were performed only on correct responses (i.e. incorrect responses corresponded to a wrong key press or
260 a delayed response). Trials with RTs faster than 150 ms or deviating more than 2 standard deviations

261 from individual mean RT were also excluded. As for electrophysiological data, Crawford's tests were
262 used to compare each phantom case with controls and the two phantom-cases between each other.

263

264 **4. Results**

265 **Electrophysiological data**

266 *4.1 Group analysis*

267 Grand average waveforms are depicted in Figure 2 and 3. To note, ERPs evoked by Nogo stimuli in real
268 condition presented the typical neurophysiological markers of motor inhibition responses, with the
269 emerge of N200/P300 complex, replicating previous studies using similar paradigms (Bokura et al.,
270 2001). The point-by-point ANOVA revealed different significant effects. As expected, a significant main
271 effect of Condition was found. At Fz, this factor was a significant source of variance within three different
272 time intervals: 165-256 ms [coinciding with the latency of N200 ($F_{1,15}=49.8$, $p<0.0000038$)]; 294-415
273 ms [coinciding with the latency of P300 ($F_{1,15}=31.9$, $p<0.0005$)]; and 487-650 ms [coinciding with the
274 latency of the negative shoulder following P300 wave ($F_{1,15}=28.3$, $p<0.0001$)], with greater responses
275 after Nogo than in Go stimuli (Figure 2A). Importantly, although a similar pattern of activity was present
276 during imagery condition, the point-by-point ANOVA showed a significant main effect of Task at Fz
277 within these intervals: 258-345 ms [coinciding with the latency of P300 ($F_{1,15}=39.3$ $p=0.000028$)], 443-
278 523 ms [coinciding with the latency of the negative shoulder of P300 ($F_{1,15}=11.4$, $p=0.004$)], with
279 significant lower amplitudes during imagery with respect to real task (Figure 2B). Furthermore, the
280 ANOVA found a significant Condition*Task interaction. At Fz, this factor was a significant source of
281 variance within two different time intervals: 126-215 ms [coinciding with the latency of N200 wave
282 ($F_{1,15}=34.2$, $p<0.00032$)]; and 254-359 ms [coinciding with the latency of P300 wave ($F_{1,15}=40.1$,
283 $p=0.000013$)]. Two-tailed paired T-tests revealed that larger Nogo-N200 and Nogo-P300 were elicited
284 in real with respect to the imagery task (p always <0.001) (Figure 3).

285 --- Figure 2 about here ---

286 --- Figure 3 about here ---

287

288 *4.2 Single-subject analyses*

289 Our main goal was to examine electrophysiological activity associated with the inhibition of motor action
290 in phantom limb syndrome with and without phantom movement. Voluntary motor inhibition was probed
291 by correct responses to Nogo stimuli in the normal condition, which required an interruption of the
292 prepared action. The waveforms in response to right/intact and left/phantom Nogo stimuli of the moving-
293 phantom case, controls, and static-phantom case are depicted in Figure 4A.

294 The moving-phantom case showed the typical neurophysiological pattern of motor inhibition (Bokura et
295 al., 2001), with the emerge of the classical ERP pattern not only in response to right/intact stimuli but,
296 crucially, also in response to left/phantom Nogo stimuli, in a way similar to two-handed controls. In
297 particular, when the amplitude of the left Nogo-P300 of the moving-phantom case, during the real task,
298 was compared with the left Nogo-P300 amplitude of the two-handed controls performing the real task,
299 Crawford's test did not find any significant differences ($p=0.3$) (Figure 4B). However, when it was
300 compared with the left Nogo-P300 amplitude of the two-handed controls performing the imagery task, a
301 significant difference was found ($Z\text{-}CC=2.880$; $p=0.006$); i.e. the Nogo-P300 amplitude was significantly
302 greater when the moving-phantom case performed the real task than when two-handed controls
303 performed the imagery task (see Figure 4B).

304 On the contrary, the static-phantom case showed the classical ERP pattern in response to Nogo stimuli
305 only when performing the task with the right/intact hand. In particular, when the amplitude of the left
306 Nogo-P300 of the static-phantom case, during the real task, was compared with the left Nogo-P300
307 amplitude of the controls performing the real task, Crawford's test found a significant difference ($Z\text{-}$
308 $CC=-2.654$; $p=0.010$), with significant greater Nogo-P300 amplitudes in two-handed controls than in the

309 static-phantom case (Figure 4B). However, when it was compared with the left Nogo-P300 amplitude of
310 the two-handed controls performing the imagery task, no significant difference was found (see Figure
311 4B), suggesting a similar performance between the imagery task of the two-handed controls and the real
312 task of the static-phantom case (see Figure 4B). Coherently, when directly comparing P300 amplitude in
313 response to left/phantom Nogo stimuli during the real task of the two cases, a significant difference was
314 found ($Z\text{-PCC}=2.488$; $p=0.0125$), corresponding to a greater P300 in moving- than in static-phantom
315 case (Figure 4B).

316 With respect to the side effect in the real task, the delta right-left did not differ between the moving-
317 phantom case and controls ($p=0.3$), suggesting that similar P300 amplitudes were evoked irrespective of
318 the side (Figure 4C). Conversely, the delta right-left of the static-phantom case was significantly different
319 with respect to both controls ($Z\text{-CC}=2.889$; $p=0.006$) and moving-phantom case ($Z\text{-PCC}=-2.553$;
320 $p=0.011$), with significantly higher delta values for the static-phantom case, suggesting a lower P300
321 amplitude in response to left than right Nogo stimuli (Figure 4C).

322 With respect to the task effect in the left/phantom side, we found that the delta real-imagery did not differ
323 between the moving-phantom case and controls ($p=0.3$), indicating that they showed similarly different
324 ERP patterns between the real than in the imagery tasks (Figure 4D). Contrariwise, the delta real-imagery
325 of the static-phantom case was significantly different with respect to both controls ($Z\text{-CC}=-2.211$;
326 $p=0.024$) and moving-phantom case ($Z\text{-PCC}=2.084$; $p=0.027$), with significant lower values for the
327 static-phantom case, indicating a similar P300 amplitude evoked in the real and in the imagery task
328 (Figure 4D) (P300 mean amplitude z-scores; *moving-phantom case*: real left/phantom= 0.43; delta real
329 right/intact-left= -0.08; delta left/phantom real-imagery= 0.86; *controls*: real left/phantom= 0.29 ± 0.16 ;
330 imagery left/phantom= -0.29 ± 0.25 ; delta real right/intact-left= 0.05 ± 0.18 ; delta left/phantom real-
331 imagery= 0.58 ± 0.38 ; *static-phantom case*: real left/phantom= -0.14; delta real right/intact-left= 0.57;
332 delta left/phantom real-imagery= -0.26).

333 See Supplementary materials for the results on the differential response between Nogo and Go stimuli
334 with respect to both N200 and P300.

335

336 --- Figure 4 about here ---

337

338 **Behavioral data**

339 The analysis on RTs relative to the right/intact hand in response to Go trials showed no difference (p
340 always > 0.4) between each of the two cases with respect to controls (RTs; mean±sd: *moving-phantom*
341 *case*: 361.57; *controls*: 317.32±46.17), and no difference between the two cases (p=0.93), suggesting that
342 potential differences (e.g. in age or skills) between the two cases and controls did not affect the behavioral
343 performance during the Go/Nogo task. See Supplementary Figure 4 in Supplementary materials.

344

345 **5. Discussion**

346 In the present study, the phantom limb syndrome was investigated from an electrophysiological
347 perspective, aiming at describing a neural counterpart of the vivid experience, sometimes reported by
348 amputees, of being able to perform voluntary movements with their phantom. In particular, we focused
349 on a specific aspect of the motor control, the movement inhibition (i.e. the ability to suppress, withhold,
350 delay or interrupt ongoing or planned actions) and we asked what happens when a phantom movement
351 has to be suppressed. To this aim, we recorded ERPs during a Go/Nogo tasks, where, according to a
352 consolidated literature in healthy subjects (e.g. Kok 1986; Bokura et al. 2001; Smith et al. 2008), larger
353 inhibition-related ERP components were expected in EEG responses to Nogo stimuli, as compared to
354 EEG responses to Go stimuli. In our experimental design, the effects of “actual” (real key press during
355 Go trials) and mental (imagery key press) Go/Nogo task were investigated in two phantom cases (one
356 with and one without phantom movement) and in 16 healthy controls. First of all, we found that, in

357 healthy controls, suppressing real and imagined movements produces a discriminative EEG pattern, with
358 significantly greater inhibitory ERP responses in the former task relative to the latter. More crucial for
359 the present study, in the moving-phantom case, suppressing “real” movements with the existing limb and
360 the phantom limb evoked comparable inhibitory ERP responses to Nogo stimuli, which were clearly
361 distinguishable from those evoked by imagined movements. On the contrary, in the static-phantom case,
362 who did not experience kinematical sensations with his phantom, inhibitory ERP responses to Nogo
363 stimuli during real and imagery tasks were indistinguishable.

364

365 *Disentangling inhibitory responses during the suppression of real and imagined movements in two-*
366 *handed controls*

367 As expected, a main effect of Condition showed the classical EEG pattern for a Go/Nogo task, with
368 greater amplitude of N200 and P300 components in Nogo trials than in Go trials, irrespective of Side
369 (left/right) and Task (real-imagery). See Figure 2A. Furthermore, a Task effect suggested that,
370 irrespective of Side and Condition (Go/Nogo), the amplitude of P300 component was greater in real than
371 in imagery task. See Figure 2B. More interestingly, a Condition by Task interaction suggested that,
372 irrespective of Side, the Nogo-Go differential response in N200 and P300 components was significantly
373 greater in real than imagery task. See Figure 3.

374 With respect to N200 and P300, several studies on Go/Nogo task showed that these two ERP components
375 are typically associated with motor inhibition and that they are generally elicited by Nogo stimuli (Bokura
376 et al., 2001; Cojan et al., 2013; Falkenstein et al., 1995). Some authors suggested that N200 Nogo effect
377 may reflect a non-motoric stage of inhibition, or recognition of the need for inhibition, while the Nogo
378 P300 may overlap with a positive movement-related potential occurring specifically on trials where overt
379 motor responses must be inhibited (Smith et al. 2008). More specifically, when comparing Go and Nogo
380 stimuli, it has been reported that P300 component in response to Nogo stimuli has a larger amplitude

381 (Bruin et al. 2001; Schmajuk et al. 2006; Nakata et al. 2010; Cojan et al. 2013) and a more anterior
382 distribution (Smith et al. 2008; Barry et al. 2010) than that elicited by Go stimuli. This anterior
383 distribution has been linked to the inhibition of a motor response when a Nogo stimulus is presented, a
384 sort of index of an active inhibitory process (e.g. Woodward et al. 1991; Rockstroh et al. 1992; Smith et
385 al. 2008; Randall and Smith 2011).

386 When ERP responses to Nogo stimuli were considered individually (as in the post hoc comparisons of
387 the Task by Condition interaction), the amplitude of both N200 and P300 components was significantly
388 larger in real than in imagery task (Figure 4, lower part). However, in the Task effect, the overall
389 difference between real and imagery tasks was found only in P300 component (Figure 2B), suggesting
390 that this component is more relevant in disentangling when a real or imagined movement has to be
391 suppressed. In particular, as mentioned above spazio Go-P300 has been described as a motoric stage of
392 inhibition, while Nogo-N200 as a non-motoric motoric stage that is more related to a general need for
393 inhibition (e.g. Smith et al. 2008). Thus, the stronger result on P300 component suggest that real, more
394 than imagined movements, reflect the motoric stage of inhibition; the weaker results on N200 component
395 suggest that the more cognitive stage of inhibition can be less relevant to discriminate between real and
396 imagined movements.

397 Our Task effect is in agreement with previous data on motor imagery (Burle, Vidal, & Bonnet, 2004;
398 Galdo-Alvarez, Bonilla, González-Villar, & Carrillo-de-la-Peña, 2016; González-Villar, Bonilla, &
399 Carrillo-de-la-Peña, 2016), showing that the overt and covert execution of the task seems to be sufficient
400 to produce a discriminative pattern in the EEG activity. Although these previous studies reported that the
401 imagined performance of a stop-signal task produces a pattern of brain electrical activity with diminished
402 amplitude with respect to that associated with real performance of the task, they focused more on the
403 similarities between real and imagery EEG pattern rather than on their differences, supporting the view
404 of a functional equivalence of imagined and real performances (Jeannerod, 2001). On the one hand, our

405 results confirm this functional equivalence, showing a similar effectiveness of real and imagery task in
406 inducing an ERP modulation during Go/Nogo paradigm; on the other hand, they clearly show that the
407 EEG discriminative pattern is greater during actual than covered execution of the task, with respect to
408 P300 component.

409

410 *Suppressing phantom movements induces inhibition-related ERP responses comparable to those induced*
411 *by suppressing real movements and different from those induced by suppressing imagined movements*

412 Crucially for the purpose of the present study, we compared inhibitory motor responses in the two
413 phantom limb cases, with and without phantom movements. Based on the results we found in two-handed
414 controls, we focused on the Nogo-P300 component, which is crucial in the distinction between real vs.
415 imagined movement suppression. We found that, when the moving-phantom case has to “actually”
416 perform the task, she showed the classical ERP pattern associated with motor inhibition, comparable to
417 that found in healthy controls, who performed the task with two existing hands. On the contrary, the
418 static-phantom case, who did not experience kinematical sensations with his phantom, showed this ERP
419 response only for the (right) intact hand, while, for the (left) phantom hand, it was not present.
420 Furthermore, in our results, phantom movement can be functionally disentangled from motor imagery,
421 so that, as in healthy controls, ERP responses were dramatically different when the moving-phantom
422 case was asked to “actually” perform the Go/Nogo task (i.e. to “press” the key with her phantom) or to
423 imagine doing it.

424 Interestingly, single-subject analyses revealed a strong modulation on the P300 component, in which
425 opposite results were found in the two cases. In moving-phantom case, the P300 modulation during real
426 condition was comparable to that found in controls during the same condition, but, crucially, it was
427 significantly different from that found during their imagery condition (see Figure 4B). Contrariwise, in
428 the static-phantom case, the amplitude of the P300 component during real condition was significantly

429 different from real condition of controls and it was comparable to their imagery conditions (see Figure
430 4B). Importantly, a significant difference was found when **the** P300 was compared between the two
431 phantom cases during the real task (see Figure 4B). **In addition, when comparing the differential ERP**
432 **response to Nogo stimuli with the right/intact hand and the left/phantom hand during the real task, no**
433 **difference emerged between the moving-phantom case and controls, suggesting that the moving-phantom**
434 **case showed a comparable response when the movement has to be suppressed with her intact (right) hand**
435 **and with her phantom (left) hand, similarly as two-handed controls (Figure 4C). On the contrary, the**
436 **static-phantom case showed a significant difference with respect to both controls and moving-phantom**
437 **case, with greater differential P300 between the right/intact hand and the left/phantom hand during the**
438 **real task, suggesting the presence of genuinely motoric inhibition only when the movement has to be**
439 **suppressed with his intact (right) hand and not when it has to be suppressed with his phantom (left) hand**
440 **(Figure 4C). Interestingly, single-subject analyses on the delta real-imagery response show that, while**
441 **the moving-phantom case shares with controls similar ERP pattern, the static-phantom case presents**
442 **significant differences with respect to both controls and moving-phantom case (see Figure 4D). When**
443 **the movement has to be suppressed with his phantom, the static-phantom case showed no difference**
444 **during the real and the imagery task contrary to what showed by controls and moving-phantom case,**
445 **which presented a clearly distinct ERP pattern between real execution and motor imagery with their**
446 **left/phantom hand. We can speculate that, since the static-phantom case cannot “move” his phantom**
447 **limb, then he could only imagine to move it, resulting therefore in a similar ERP pattern during the real**
448 **and the imagery task.**

449 According to previous behavioral (Garbarini et al., 2018; Raffin, Giraux, et al., 2012) and fMRI (Raffin,
450 Mattout, et al., 2012) studies, these results strongly support the view that phantom movements and
451 imagery movement are functionally disentangled, also extending this concept to the context of motor
452 inhibition. Indeed, the present results suggest that a similar amount of inhibitory cerebral activity is

453 needed to suppress real and phantom movements, while the amount of inhibition necessary to block the
454 imagined movement is lower and, consequently, the inhibitory-related ERP components appear reduced.
455 Thus, only in moving-phantom case, who experienced the ability to voluntarily move her phantom,
456 inhibitory responses are fully implemented during the real task, when frontal areas exert, via premotor
457 cortex and/or SMA, an inhibitory control over the primary motor cortex. These results can contribute to
458 the debate about cortical reorganization (H. Flor et al., 1998; Herta Flor et al., 2006; Lotze et al., 2001;
459 Ramachandran, Rogers-Ramachandran, & Stewart, 1992) and maintained cortical representation
460 (Kikkert et al., 2016, 2018; Makin et al., 2013) in phantom limb syndrome. The cortical reorganization
461 model (H. Flor et al., 1998; Herta Flor et al., 2006; Lotze et al., 2001; Ramachandran et al., 1992) suggests
462 that the deprivation of sensory inputs in the S1 missing hand cortex leads to cortical reorganization,
463 where the deprived cortex becomes responsive to inputs from its cortical neighbors. Specifically, it has
464 been showed that referred sensations in the phantom (that is, painful and non-painful phantom sensations
465 that can be elicited by stimulating body areas adjacent to but also far from the amputated limb) are a
466 perceptual correlate of reorganizational processes in the S1 cortex (Ramachandran et al., 1992).
467 However, other studies showed instead that multiple factors interact to maintain local structural and
468 functional representations (Makin et al., 2013), with a maintained representation of the phantom hand in
469 the S1 cortex following amputation (Bogdanov, Smith, & Frey, 2012; Raffin, Mattout, et al., 2012) and
470 comparable patterns of movement-related activity when amputees moved their phantom hand compared
471 with two-handed controls moving their non-dominant hand (Makin et al., 2013). Our results seem to
472 support the maintained cortical organization hypothesis, at least in the moving-phantom case, who
473 showed an ERP pattern of motor inhibition with her phantom limb comparable to that found in two-
474 handed controls. In particular, in agreement with previous studies, our results suggest that the
475 representation of the amputated limb is functionally active, just like a real hand.

476 **Although this study was performed only on two phantom limb cases,** these findings provide **a** compelling
477 evidence that phantom movements share the same neurophysiological correlates of real movements, not
478 only when an action has to be executed, but also when it should be inhibited.

479

480 **Acknowledgments**

481 The authors are grateful to the volunteers involved in the study. This work was supported by MIUR-SIR
482 2014 grant (RBSI146V1D) and by the San Paolo Foundation 2016 grant (CSTO165140) to F.G.

483

484 **Declarations of interest:** none.

485 **References**

- 486 Bisio, A., Garbarini, F., Biggio, M., Fossataro, C., Ruggeri, P., & Bove, M. (2017). Dynamic Shaping
487 of the Defensive Peripersonal Space through Predictive Motor Mechanisms: When the “Near”
488 Becomes “Far.” *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *37*(9), 2415–2424.
489 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0371-16.2016>
- 490 Bogdanov, S., Smith, J., & Frey, S. H. (2012). Former Hand Territory Activity Increases After
491 Amputation During Intact Hand Movements, but Is Unaffected by Illusory Visual Feedback.
492 *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, *26*(6), 604–615.
493 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968311429687>
- 494 Bokura, H., Yamaguchi, S., & Kobayashi, S. (2001). Electrophysiological correlates for response
495 inhibition in a Go/NoGo task. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *112*(12), 2224–2232.
496 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1388-2457\(01\)00691-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1388-2457(01)00691-5)
- 497 Bruno, V., Fossataro, C., & Garbarini, F. (2018). Inhibition or facilitation? Modulation of corticospinal
498 excitability during motor imagery. *Neuropsychologia*, *111*, 360–368.
499 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.02.020>
- 500 Burle, B., Vidal, F., & Bonnet, M. (2004). Electroencephalographic nogo potentials in a no-movement
501 context: The case of motor imagery in humans. *Neuroscience Letters*, *360*(1–2), 77–80.
502 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2004.02.034>
- 503 Cojan, Y., Archimi, A., Cheseaux, N., Waber, L., & Vuilleumier, P. (2013). Time-course of motor
504 inhibition during hypnotic paralysis: EEG topographical and source analysis. *Cortex*, *49*(2), 423–
505 436. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.09.013>
- 506 Crawford, J. R., Garthwaite, P. H., & Wood, L. T. (2010). Inferential methods for comparing two
507 single cases. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *27*(5), 377–400.
508 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643294.2011.559158>

- 509 Donders, F. C. (1969). On the speed of mental processes. *Acta Psychologica*, *30*, 412–431.
510 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918\(69\)90065-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918(69)90065-1)
- 511 Falkenstein, M., Hoormann, J., Christ, S., & Hohnsbein, J. (2000). ERP components on reaction errors
512 and their functional significance: A tutorial. *Biological Psychology*, *51*(2–3), 87–107.
513 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-0511\(99\)00031-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-0511(99)00031-9)
- 514 Falkenstein, M., Koshlykova, N. A., Kiroj, V. N., Hoormann, J., & Hohnsbein, J. (1995). Late ERP
515 components in visual and auditory Go/Nogo tasks. *Electroencephalography and Clinical
516 Neurophysiology/ Evoked Potentials*, *96*(1), 36–43. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694\(94\)00182-
517 K](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(94)00182-K)
- 518 Flor, H., Elbert, T., Mühlnickel, W., Pantev, C., Wienbruch, C., & Taub, E. (1998). Cortical
519 reorganization and phantom phenomena in congenital and traumatic upper-extremity amputees.
520 *Experimental Brain Research*, *119*(2 PG-205-12), 205–212. Retrieved from
521 <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s002210050334.pdf>
- 522 Flor, H., Nikolajsen, L., & Staehelin Jensen, T. (2006). Phantom limb pain: a case of maladaptive CNS
523 plasticity? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *7*(11), 873–881. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1991>
- 524 Galdo-Alvarez, S., Bonilla, F. M., González-Villar, A. J., & Carrillo-de-la-Peña, M. T. (2016).
525 Functional Equivalence of Imagined vs. Real Performance of an Inhibitory Task: An EEG/ERP
526 Study. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *10*(September), 1–12.
527 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2016.00467>
- 528 Garbarini, F., Bisio, A., Biggio, M., Pia, L., & Bove, M. (2018). Motor sequence learning and
529 intermanual transfer with a phantom limb. *Cortex*, *101*, 181–191.
530 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2018.01.011>
- 531 González-Villar, A. J., Bonilla, F. M., & Carrillo-de-la-Peña, M. T. (2016). When the brain simulates
532 stopping: Neural activity recorded during real and imagined stop-signal tasks. *Cognitive, Affective*

533 *and Behavioral Neuroscience*, 16(5), 825–835. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-016-0434-3>

534 Hugdahl, K., Rosén, G., Ersland, L., Lundervold, A., Smievoll, A. I., Barndon, R., & Thomsen, T.
535 (2001). Common pathways in mental imagery and pain perception: An fMRI study of a subject
536 with an amputated arm. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42(3), 269–275.
537 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9450.00236>

538 Jeannerod, M. (1995). Mental imagery in the motor context. *Neuropsychologia*, 33(11), 1419–1432.
539 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932\(95\)00073-C](https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932(95)00073-C)

540 Jeannerod, M. (2001). Neural Simulation of Action: A Unifying Mechanism for Motor Cognition.
541 *NeuroImage*, 14(1), S103–S109. <https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2001.0832>

542 Jung, T. P., Makeig, S., Humphries, C., Lee, T. W., McKeown, M. J., Iragui, V., & Sejnowski, T. J.
543 (2000). Removing electroencephalographic artifacts by blind source separation.
544 *Psychophysiology*, 37(2), 163–178. Retrieved from
545 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10731767>

546 Kasess, C. H., Windischberger, C., Cunnington, R., Lanzenberger, R., Pezawas, L., & Moser, E.
547 (2008). The suppressive influence of SMA on M1 in motor imagery revealed by fMRI and
548 dynamic causal modeling. *NeuroImage*, 40(2), 828–837.
549 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.11.040>

550 Kikkert, S., Johansen-Berg, H., Tracey, I., & Makin, T. R. (2018). Reaffirming the link between
551 chronic phantom limb pain and maintained missing hand representation. *Cortex*, 106, 174–184.
552 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2018.05.013>

553 Kikkert, S., Kolasinski, J., Jbabdi, S., Tracey, I., Beckmann, C. F., Berg, H. J., & Makin, T. R. (2016).
554 Revealing the neural fingerprints of a missing hand. *ELife*, 5, e15292.
555 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.15292>

556 Kikkert, S., Mezue, M., Henderson Slater, D., Johansen-Berg, H., Tracey, I., & Makin, T. R. (2017).

557 Motor correlates of phantom limb pain. *Cortex*, 95, 29–36.
558 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2017.07.015>

559 Kok, A. (1986). Effects of degradation of visual stimuli on components of the event-related potential
560 (ERP) in go/nogo reaction tasks. *Biological Psychology*, 23(1), 21–38.
561 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-0511\(86\)90087-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-0511(86)90087-6)

562 Lotze, M., Flor, H., Grodd, W., Larbig, W., & Birbaumer, N. (2001). Phantom movements and pain An
563 fMRI study in upper limb amputees. *Brain*, 124(11), 2268–2277.
564 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/124.11.2268>

565 Makin, T. R., Scholz, J., Filippini, N., Henderson Slater, D., Tracey, I., & Johansen-Berg, H. (2013).
566 Phantom pain is associated with preserved structure and function in the former hand area. *Nature*
567 *Communications*, 4, 1570. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms2571>

568 Maris, E., & Oostenveld, R. (2007). Nonparametric statistical testing of EEG- and MEG-data. *Journal*
569 *of Neuroscience Methods*, 164(1), 177–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JNEUMETH.2007.03.024>

570 Melzack, R. (2006). Phantom Limbs. *Scientific American*, 16(3s), 52–59.
571 <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0906-52sp>

572 Mouraux, A., & Iannetti, G. D. (2008). Across-trial averaging of event-related EEG responses and
573 beyond. *Magnetic Resonance Imaging*, 26(7), 1041–1054.
574 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mri.2008.01.011>

575 Oldfield, R. C. (1971). The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory.
576 *Neuropsychologia*, 9(1), 97–113. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/5146491>

577 Pfefferbaum, A., Ford, J. M., Weller, B. J., & Kopell, B. S. (1985). ERPs to response production and
578 inhibition. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, 60(5), 423–434.
579 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694\(85\)91017-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(85)91017-X)

580 Piedimonte, A., Garbarini, F., Rabuffetti, M., Pia, L., & Berti, A. (2014). Executed and imagined

581 bimanual movements: A study across different ages. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(4), 1073–
582 1080. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034482>

583 Raffin, E., Giraux, P., & Reilly, K. T. (2012). The moving phantom: Motor execution or motor
584 imagery? *Cortex*, 48(6), 746–757. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2011.02.003>

585 Raffin, E., Mattout, J., Reilly, K. T., & Giraux, P. (2012). Disentangling motor execution from motor
586 imagery with the phantom limb. *Brain*, 135(2), 582–595. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awr337>

587 Ramachandran, V. S., & Hirstein, W. (1998). The perception of phantom limbs. The D. O. Hebb
588 lecture. *Brain*, 121(9), 1603–1630. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/121.9.1603>

589 Ramachandran, V. S., Rogers-Ramachandran, D., & Stewart, M. (1992). Massive cortical
590 reorganization after sensory deafferentation in adult macaques. *Science*, 258(5085), 1159–1160.
591 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1843843>

592 Randall, W. M., & Smith, J. L. (2011). Conflict and inhibition in the cued-Go/NoGo task. *Clinical*
593 *Neurophysiology*, 122(12), 2400–2407. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2011.05.012>

594 Reilly, K. T., Mercier, C., Schieber, M. H., & Sirigu, A. (2006). Persistent hand motor commands in
595 the amputees' brain. *Brain*, 129(8), 2211–2223. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awl154>

596 Rockstroh, B., Muller, M., Cohen, R., & Elbert, T. (1992). Probing the functional brain state during
597 P300-evocation. *Journal of Psychophysiology*, 6(2), 175–184. Retrieved from
598 <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.915.3514&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

599 Roux, F. E., Lotterie, J. A., Cassol, E., Lazorthes, Y., Sol, J. C., Berry, I., ... Burchiel, K. J. (2003).
600 Cortical Areas Involved in Virtual Movement of Phantom Limbs: Comparison with Normal
601 Subjects. *Neurosurgery*, 53(6), 1342–1353.
602 <https://doi.org/10.1227/01.NEU.0000093424.71086.8F>

603 Smith, J. L., Johnstone, S. J., & Barry, R. J. (2008). Movement-related potentials in the Go/NoGo task:
604 The P3 reflects both cognitive and motor inhibition. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 119(3), 704–714.

605 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2007.11.042>

606 Solodkin, A., Hlustik, P., Chen, E. E., & Small, S. L. (2004). Fine modulation in network activation
607 during motor execution and motor imagery. *Cerebral Cortex (New York, N.Y. : 1991)*, *14*(11),
608 1246–1255. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhh086>

609 Tak, S., Kempny, A. M., Friston, K. J., Leff, A. P., & Penny, W. D. (2015). Dynamic causal modelling
610 for functional near-infrared spectroscopy. *NeuroImage*, *111*, 338–349.
611 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.02.035>

612 Veen, V. Van, & Carter, C. S. (2002). The anterior cingulate as a conflict monitor: fMRI and ERP.
613 *Physiology & Behavior*, *77*, 477–482. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-9384\(02\)00930-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-9384(02)00930-7)

614 Walsh, E., Long, C., & Haggard, P. (2015). Voluntary control of a phantom limb. *Neuropsychologia*,
615 *75*, 341–348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.06.032>

616 Weeks, S. R., Anderson-Barnes, V. C., & Tsao, J. W. (2010). Phantom Limb Pain. *The Neurologist*,
617 *16*(5), 277–286. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NRL.0b013e3181edf128>

618 Woodward, S. H., Brown, W. S., Marsh, J. T., & Dawson, M. E. (1991). Probing the Time-Course of
619 the Auditory Oddball P3 With Secondary Reaction Time. *Psychophysiology*, *28*(6), 609–618.
620 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1991.tb01003.x>

621

623 **Captions to figures:**

624 **Figure 1. A. Experimental task.** Stimuli were visual, and they represented the dorsal view of a right or
625 a left hand. Gray hands: preparation cue; green hands: Go signal; red hands: Nogo signal. **B.**
626 **Experimental procedure.** Each participant (i.e. controls; moving-phantom case and static-phantom
627 case) underwent an EEG session during which she/he performed the Go/Nogo task. Each EEG session
628 comprised both blocks of real and imagery task.

629

630 **Figure 2. Group analysis results: main effects of Condition and Task. A) Main effect of Condition.**

631 Mean ERPs in response to Go and Nogo signals, irrespective of the side (left, right) and of the task (real;
632 imagery). Data are displayed in microvolts as a function of time post-cue onset, for Fz electrode
633 (referenced to the nose). The green waveform represents Go stimuli and the red waveform represents
634 Nogo stimuli. Point-by-point F value is represented below. Time intervals where the difference between
635 conditions was significant are highlighted in gray and the corresponding scalp topographies are shown.

636 **B) Main effect of Task.** Mean ERPs in response to real and imagery task, irrespective of the side (left,
637 right) and the condition (Go; Nogo). Data are displayed in microvolts as a function of time post-cue
638 onset, for Fz electrode (referenced to the nose). The solid gray waveform represents ERPs in response to
639 the real task and the dashed gray waveform represents ERPs in response to the imagery task. Point-by-
640 point F value is represented below. Time intervals where the difference between the tasks was significant
641 are highlighted in gray and the corresponding scalp topographies are shown.

642

643 **Figure 3. Group analysis results: Condition*Task interaction.** Mean ERPs in response to Go real, Go
644 imagery, Nogo real and Nogo imagery, irrespective of the side (left, right). Data are displayed in
645 microvolts as a function of time post-cue onset, for Fz electrode (referenced to the nose). The solid green
646 waveform represents Go stimuli during the real task, the dashed green waveform represents Go stimuli

647 during the imagery task, the solid red waveform represents Nogo stimuli during the real task, the dashed
648 red waveform represents Nogo stimuli during the imagery task. Point-by-point F value is represented
649 below. Time intervals where the difference between conditions was significant are highlighted in gray
650 and the corresponding scalp topographies are shown. Two-tailed paired T tests results of the contrast of
651 interest (Nogo real vs Go real; Nogo imagery vs Nogo imagery; Nogo real vs Nogo imagery; Go real vs
652 Go imagery) are displayed below the F value. Time intervals during which the contrasts of interest were
653 significantly different are colored in blue and pink, such as the topographical distribution of T values
654 reflecting the statistical comparison.

655

656 **Figure 4. A. ERP waveforms of the moving-phantom case, controls and the static-phantom case.**
657 Mean ERPs of the moving-phantom case (left), controls (center) and static-phantom case (right) Nogo
658 stimuli, both with the left/phantom (upper part) and with the right/intact (lower part) limb, during the real
659 task (solid lines) and during imagery task (dashed lines). Data are displayed in microvolts as a function
660 of time post-cue onset, for Fz electrode (referenced to the nose). **B. Single-subject analyses results.**
661 Mean z-scores of the P300 amplitude in response to Nogo stimuli of the moving-phantom case (left),
662 controls (center) and the static-phantom case (right). **C. Side effect:** Mean z-scores of the P300 amplitude
663 of the delta right/intact-left/phantom of the moving-phantom case (left), controls (center) and the static-
664 phantom case (right) performing the real task. **D. Task effect:** Mean z-scores of the P300 amplitude of
665 the delta real-imagery of the moving-phantom case (left), controls (center) and the static-phantom case
666 (right) in response to Nogo stimuli requiring the suppression of left/phantom movements. - * $p \leq 0.05$,
667 ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. Error bars represent standard error of the mean of two-handed controls.