



HAL
open science

Brain oscillatory correlates of visuomotor adaptive learning

Lucas Struber, Marie Baumont, Pierre-Alain Barraud, Vincent Nougier,
Fabien Cignetti

► **To cite this version:**

Lucas Struber, Marie Baumont, Pierre-Alain Barraud, Vincent Nougier, Fabien Cignetti. Brain oscillatory correlates of visuomotor adaptive learning. *NeuroImage*, 2021, 245, pp.118645. 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.118645 . hal-03413870

HAL Id: hal-03413870

<https://hal.science/hal-03413870>

Submitted on 5 Jan 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Brain oscillatory correlates of visuomotor adaptive learning**

2 Lucas Struber¹, Marie Baumont¹, Pierre-Alain Barraud¹, Vincent Nougier¹, Fabien Cignetti¹

3 Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, TIMC, 38000 Grenoble, France

4

5 Corresponding author:

6 Lucas Struber – lucas.struber@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

7 UGA Site Santé – Domaine de la Merci – Bât. Jean Roget,

8 38706 La Tronche

9 FRANCE

10 **Abstract**

11 Sensorimotor adaptation involves the recalibration of the mapping between motor
12 command and sensory feedback in response to movement errors. Although adaptation
13 operates within individual movements on a trial-to-trial basis, it can also undergo learning
14 when adaptive responses improve over the course of many trials. Brain oscillatory activities
15 related to these “adaptation” and “learning” processes remain unclear. The main reason for
16 this is that previous studies principally focused on the beta band, which confined the
17 outcome message to trial-to-trial adaptation. To provide a wider understanding of adaptive
18 learning, we decoded visuomotor tasks with constant, random or no perturbation from EEG
19 recordings in different bandwidths and brain regions using a multiple kernel learning
20 approach. These different experimental tasks were intended to separate trial-to-trial
21 adaptation from the formation of the new visuomotor mapping across trials. We found
22 changes in EEG power in the post-movement period during the course of the visuomotor-
23 constant rotation task, in particular an increased (i) theta power in prefrontal region, (ii) beta
24 power in supplementary motor area, and (iii) gamma power in motor regions. Classifying the
25 visuomotor task with constant rotation versus those with random or no rotation, we were able
26 to relate power changes in beta band mainly to trial-to-trial adaptation to error while changes
27 in theta band would relate rather to the learning of the new mapping. Altogether, this
28 suggested that there is a tight relationship between modulation of the synchronization of low
29 (theta) and higher (essentially beta) frequency oscillations in prefrontal and sensorimotor
30 regions, respectively, and adaptive learning.

31 **Keywords:** Sensorimotor adaptive learning, Neural oscillations, Electroencephalography,
32 Machine learning, Sparse modeling.

33 **Highlights:**

- 34 • Increases in post-movement power θ , β and γ bands underpin adaptive learning
- 35 • SMA β synchronization increase relates to trial-to-trial adaptation from errors
- 36 • Visuomotor mapping acquisition is associated with synchronized frontal θ activity

37 **1. Introduction**

38 Adaptation is an essential feature of motor control in which the motor command is
39 adjusted on a trial basis to compensate for disturbances in the external environment or in the
40 motor system itself. It involves the recalibration, or updating, of the brain's internal model that
41 predicts the upcoming state of the motor system from the current state and the ongoing
42 motor command. Any mismatch between the predicted motor state and the actual motor
43 state as estimated through feedback, labelled a sensory prediction error, is used for the
44 update of the model and the adjustment of the motor command (Diedrichsen et al., 2005;
45 Wolpert et al., 1995; Wolpert and Miall, 1996). Adaptation can therefore be viewed as a
46 change in the mapping that relates sensory inputs to motor outputs. Although this remapping
47 operates fundamentally on a trial-to-trial basis, it can also engage a learning phase when
48 sensorimotor mapping evolves over the course of many trials and stabilizes so as to become
49 optimally tuned to specific environments and tasks (Braun et al., 2009a). This raises a
50 fundamental question as to whether adaptation occurring on a trial basis and its improvement
51 across trials arise through the same mechanisms or not.

52 A number of studies have investigated the oscillatory brain activities associated with
53 trial-to-trial reach adaptation using paradigms of visuomotor-rotation wherein a distortion is
54 generated between the movement and its visual representation to induce an adaptive motor
55 response. Most of the studies focused on beta band activity, which is known to play a central
56 role in motor control (Kilavik et al., 2013). They reported a negative correlation between
57 movement error induced by visuomotor distortion and the amplitude of post-movement beta
58 event-related synchronization over the sensorimotor cortex, this negative correlation being
59 enhanced when the bias and variance of the prior errors was additionally considered (Tan et
60 al., 2014a, 2014b). This was interpreted to reflect neural processes that evaluate the
61 outcome of a completed movement with respect to its predicted outcome and do so in the
62 context of errors history. Interestingly, this correlation has been reported not only when the
63 rotational distortion remained the same across trials but also when it varied pseudo-randomly

64 around a mean of zero degree, that is when no learning of a new visuomotor transformation
65 would occur (Albert et al., 2021; Diedrichsen et al., 2005; Donchin et al., 2003). This
66 suggests that amplitude modulation of post-movement beta synchronization with respect to
67 error size is a hallmark of trial-to-trial adaptation and do not reflect the formation of new
68 visuomotor mapping. Recent evidence further suggested that this post-movement beta
69 synchronization relates also to uncertainties in sensory feedback and motor feedforward
70 estimations that determine ‘how readily’ movement error updates the internal model (Palmer
71 et al., 2019; Tan et al., 2016). Hence, there seems to be a link between post-movement beta
72 rebound, trial-to-trial adaptation, and relevance of error to update the internal model. There is
73 also evidence that trial-to-trial adaptation triggers modulation of beta synchronization during
74 movement planning (pre-movement), therefore linking beta synchronization to the processing
75 of previous error and somatosensory information, both critical to the updating of motor plans
76 (Alayrangues et al., 2019; Jahani et al., 2020; Torrecillos et al., 2015). Altogether, the above
77 results suggest that beta synchronization prior to and following a movement could express
78 some sort of functional polymorphism, evaluating movement error and mediating the
79 subsequent adaptation from both motor and sensory information.

80 None of the above studies addressed the question of the learning occurring when a
81 new sensorimotor mapping between feedback and motor command is acquired and
82 becomes stable. A few studies provided some insights into this issue, examining changes in
83 spectral power of the other oscillatory bands by comparing early and late phases of
84 adaptation to a constant perturbation. They reported an increase of gamma power during
85 movement execution as well as an increased power of the slower frequencies (theta and
86 alpha) during pre-movement, especially in the parietal and frontal cortices, during the course
87 of learning (Gentili et al., 2011; Perfetti et al., 2011; Thürer et al., 2018). Thus, rhythms
88 outside the beta band may play a pivotal role in motor learning. Unfortunately, both
89 adaptation and learning were intertwined in these aforementioned studies. Finally, it is worth
90 to mention that besides spectral power, phase information is also involved in the neuronal

91 encoding of motor processes (Combrisson et al., 2017; Hammer et al., 2013; Jerbi et al.,
92 2007). However, motor adaptation and learning have not yet been studied under this
93 perspective.

94 In the present study, we aimed to come up with a more complete understanding of
95 motor adaptation and learning in terms of neural oscillations and synchrony. To this end, we
96 implemented a data-driven multivariate approach – multiple kernel learning (MKL) – that
97 explored the different spectral features of the EEG signals – i.e. power and phase in different
98 bandwidths and regions of interest – prior to (pre-movement) and following (post-movement)
99 the movement during a visuomotor rotation task with constant perturbation. MKL is a
100 powerful method that can decode states of interest from a combination of kernels (Gönen
101 and Alapydin, 2011), such as features of the EEG signals (Schrouff et al., 2016). We
102 examined features of adaptive behavior through an MKL model discriminating early from late
103 stages of a visuomotor constant rotation task. We expected to find a combination of features
104 including but not limited to pre-movement and post-movement beta power to bring
105 information regarding adaptive behavior. However, it would have remained unclear from that
106 modelling whether EEG features that contributed to the decision boundary were related
107 either to trial-to-trial adaptation from errors or formation of the new visuomotor mapping since
108 both processes occur concomitantly in a visuomotor constant rotation task. Accordingly, we
109 also considered two other experimental conditions, including a normal movement condition
110 that relies on the identity mapping and does not involve any adaptation, and a condition with
111 a random rotational perturbation centered on identity mapping. In the latter, there was trial-to-
112 trial adaptation from errors (Albert et al., 2021; Diedrichsen et al., 2005; Donchin et al.,
113 2003), but this adaptation did not lead to the acquisition of a new sensorimotor mapping
114 since the imposed average mapping is the identity policy as in normal movement condition
115 (Braun et al., 2009b). MKL modelling of the constant rotation condition against these
116 additional conditions as well as further univariate analyses provided information on the EEG

117 features most related to the trial-to-trial adaptation from errors and those relating mostly to
118 the acquisition of the new visuomotor mapping.

119 **2. Material and methods**

120 *2.1. Participants*

121 19 right-handed healthy volunteers (9 females and 10 males, age range: 20 – 33 years;
122 mean \pm SD age: 23 ± 3 years) participated in the study. All subjects had no history of
123 neurological or psychiatric disorders and presented normal or corrected-to-normal vision.
124 The study was conducted with the approval of the local ethics committee from Grenoble-
125 Alpes University (IRB00010290-2019-02-12-60). Written informed consent was obtained
126 from all participants.

127 *2.2. Experimental setup*


128 Participants were seated in front of a 27" computer screen, 1.5 meters away, and held
129 a joystick with their right hand, which rested on a padded arm support. An opaque panel
130 prevented the view of the hand and forearm. Participants were equipped with a 128-
131 electrodes cap (Biosemi©). The task, in line with previous studies (e.g. Perfetti et al., 2011;
132 Tan et al., 2014a), consisted in performing target aiming movements with a joystick that
133 controlled a green ball. Each movement started from the center of the screen to one of eight
134 possible and equally spaced targets around a virtual circle (radius, 15 cm – circa 15-20° of
135 wrist flexion). Each trial started with a 1500 to 1900 ms pre-cue period during which the eight
136 targets were presented as red circles with transparent background. It was followed by a 1500
137 ms cue period during which the background of two neighbor targets became red and allowed
138 movement planning. Then, all targets except one of the two red targets disappeared to
139 indicate the GO signal. Participants had to reach the remaining red target as fast and as
140 accurately as possible. Once the target was reached with a 200 ms stop inside the target or
141 when the allowed time elapsed (> 5000 ms), a 2500 ms inter-trial interval preceded the
142 following trial. During this interval, the green ball disappeared and only the reached target
143 remained visible. Subjects were asked to passively let the joystick return to its initial position.
144 The task was implemented using a custom C++ software based on Qt and Measurement
145 Computing© libraries. The software recorded behavioral data (cursor positions) at 2048 Hz.

146 EEG electrodes (Biosemi system) were placed according to the international 10-20 EEG
147 system, and acquired at 2048 Hz. Data synchronization was controlled through triggering
148 from behavioral software.

149 2.3. *Experimental conditions*

150 After 50 familiarization trials, participants performed the normal movement condition
151 (**Norm**) and then the random rotation condition (**RdmRot**), including 80 trials each. In Norm,
152 there was a normal relationship between the display and joystick. In RdmRot, rotation angle
153 between the cursor and the actual movement was selected randomly between -60° to $+60^\circ$ in
154 step of 20° with the average angle over the 80 trials being equal to 0° (Fig. 1). Each rotation
155 angle was presented 10 times except for the 0° angle that was presented 20 times. Finally,
156 participants performed the condition of 60° constant rotation, which was divided in two runs
157 of 80 trials each separated by a 2' break (**CnstRot-1** and **CnstRot-2**; Fig. 1). In all
158 conditions, each target was visited 10 times in a random order.

159 Early and late stages of adaptive learning were defined as the first 30 trials of CnstRot-
160 1 (**Early-CnstRot**) and the last 30 trials of CnstRot-2 (**Late-CnstRot**), respectively, akin to
161 previous studies (Perfetti et al., 2011; Tan et al., 2014a). Norm, RdmRot and CnstRot-1 were
162 used to tease apart neural correlates related either to trial-to-trial adaptation or learning of
163 the visuomotor transformation.



164

165 **Fig. 1.** Experimental design. Subjects started with 80 trials of Norm condition (no distortion), followed by 80 trials
 166 of RdmRot condition (random rotational perturbation), then performed CnstRot condition, divided in two runs of 80
 167 trials each. The first 30 trials of CnstRot-1 defined the Early-CnstRot stage while the last 30 trials of CnstRot-2
 168 defined the Late-CnstRot stage. Every trial started with a pre-cue period displaying the 8 possible target locations.
 169 Then, two targets lighted up during the preparation period and finally only one remained, towards which
 170 participants performed their aiming movement. In Norm condition visual feedback was normal, while in RdmRot
 171 and CnstRot conditions visual feedback was perturbed using random and constant perturbation, respectively.
 172 Distribution of perturbations over trials are presented below each column.

173 *2.4. Behavioral analysis*

174 Behavioral analysis was performed with custom Matlab routines (R2018b). Cursor
 175 positions were down-sampled at 100 Hz and then filtered through a dual low pass
 176 Butterworth filter with a 20 Hz cutoff frequency. Reaction time (RT) was calculated as the
 177 delay between GO signal and the time when the velocity crossed the threshold of three times
 178 its SD at rest. Trials in which participants exhibited an anticipatory behavior (RT < 100ms) or

179 did not reach the target were excluded from further behavioral and EEG analyses. For each
180 trial, several parameters were also computed to quantify adaptive behavior (Braun et al.,
181 2009a; Perfetti et al., 2011; Tan et al., 2014a): (i) movement duration (MT), defined as the
182 time elapsed between movement onset and movement termination (i.e. the moment when
183 target was reached, after the 200ms stop within it); (ii) path length (PL), or normalized
184 covered distance, computed as the total distance traveled by the cursor during the trial
185 divided by the optimal path length, i.e. the length of the line connecting the starting position
186 and the target; (iii) absolute initial angular error (AIE), defined as the absolute angle between
187 the line connecting the initial cursor position to its position 200ms after movement onset –
188 and before any corrective movement – and the line connecting the initial cursor position to
189 the target; and (iv) trial-to-trial adaptation rate (AR) as estimated from state-space modelling
190 (c.f. appendix and Tan et al., 2014a). State-space model performance was assessed using
191 Akaike information criterion (AIC). All parameters respected normality criterion as assessed
192 through Shapiro-Wilk tests. Accordingly, paired *t*-tests and within-subjects ANOVAs
193 combined with Fisher LSD post-hoc tests have been used to investigate differences in mean
194 parameters (averaged across trials). All statistical tests were performed using Statistica 10
195 (StatSoft®), with a level of significance set at $p < 0.05$.

196 *2.5. EEG preprocessing*

197 EEG data preprocessing was performed using Python and open source MNE software
198 (<https://mne.tools>). First, EEG was down-sampled at 200 Hz and referenced to the average
199 signal across all electrodes. Raw EEG signals were band-pass filtered between 1 and 80 Hz
200 with a notch filter at 50 Hz, and detrended. All channels were visually inspected to identify
201 bad channels which were interpolated, and blinking artifacts were rejected through ICA
202 analysis (Delorme et al., 2007). Then, signals were epoched in two periods: 1) pre-
203 movement, locked on GO signal, starting 2000 ms before and ending 700 ms after (to
204 include first part of motion, before any corrective movement); 2) post-movement, locked on
205 movement termination, starting when target was reached (200 ms before movement


206 termination) and ending after the 2500 ms inter-trial interval. All epochs were visually
207 inspected to remove residual noisy epochs. “Bad epochs” based on anticipatory behavior or
208 trials with target not reached were also excluded. To keep a large enough number of trials
209 across participants in our main investigation between Early- and Late-CnstRot, the first 30
210 “good epochs” of CnstRot-1 and the last 30 “good epochs” of CnstRot-2 were considered for
211 each participant. Regarding other conditions, 3.6 ± 3.3 , 7.4 ± 7.1 and 9.4 ± 6.7 over 80
212 epochs were discarded in Norm, RdmRot and CnstRot-1 conditions, respectively (averaged
213 values for pre- and post-movement epochs).

214 *2.6. EEG time-frequency analysis*

215 EEG time-frequency analysis was performed using Matlab (R2018b) and SPM12
216 toolbox (<https://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/>). For every recording sites, each epoch was
217 decomposed in its time frequency representation through a Hilbert transform between 1 and
218 80 Hz, with 1Hz non overlapping intervals and using a two-way, zero phase-lag FIR filter
219 from EEGLAB toolbox (order $3r$ where r is the ratio of the sampling rate to the low-frequency
220 cutoff of the filter, rounded down). Phase and amplitude (power) signals of the complex
221 transform were then extracted for each frequency. This method has been shown previously
222 to be as accurate as power estimation using Morlet wavelet (Bruns, 2004) while preserving
223 phase information (Cohen et al., 2009; Combrisson et al., 2017; Voytek et al., 2013).

224 Relative EEG power changes were then calculated for Early- and Late-CnstRot as the
225 percentage change relative to a stable baseline, by dividing the power signals at each
226 frequency and each time point by the baseline, and then subtracting 100 from the normalized
227 value (expressed in percent). Positive values indicated an EEG power higher than the
228 baseline and will be reported as a synchronization while negative values will be reported as a
229 desynchronization. The baseline was defined for each frequency as the average power
230 during the last 500 ms of the pre-cue period, pooled across trials (i.e. one global baseline
231 was used for the 80 trials of CnstRot-1 and CnstRot-2, before extracting Early and Late
232 subsets). In this 500 ms period, participants were at rest, had stopped performing motion

233 since more than 1000 ms and were presented with only the 8 targets with transparent
 234 background. Power changes were then averaged over epochs. Then, inter-trial coherence of
 235 phase signals over epochs (ITPC) was computed. For each subject, mean ITPC value during
 236 baseline period (same period than for power) was then subtracted from ITPC signals. Typical
 237 examples of time-frequency maps (powers and ITPC averaged across subjects on central
 238 electrode Cz in Early- and Late-CnstRot) are presented on Fig. 2. Power changes and ITPC
 239 were also estimated for conditions Norm, RdmRot, CnstRot-1 the same way.



240


241 **Fig. 2.** Illustration of the EEG features in Early- and Late-CnstRot (on central electrode Cz). First column
 242 represents averaged power changes across subjects during pre-movement window (0 ms corresponds to GO
 243 signal). Theta (4-8 Hz) and gamma (31-80 Hz) waves presented concomitantly two synchronization peaks, after
 244 visual stimuli (immediately after the CUE signal at -1500 ms, and immediately after the GO signal at 0ms). Alpha
 245 (9-12 Hz) and beta (13-30 Hz) waves presented a desynchronization during the cue period, which became even
 246 more consistent after the go signal. Second column represents averaged ITPC across subjects during pre-
 247 movement window. Peaks of ITPC were essentially present in theta and alpha bands, right after the CUE and GO
 248 visual stimuli. Third column represents averaged power changes across subjects during post-movement window
 249 (0 ms corresponds to movement termination). Theta and gamma powers presented a slight progressive
 250 synchronization after movement. Beta and alpha powers, which were largely below the baseline at the end of the
 251 movement, presented a strong synchronization after movement, peaking between 1,5 s and 2.5 s post-
 252 movement. Fourth column represents averaged ITPC across subjects during post-movement window. A peak of
 253 ITPC was present mainly in theta and alpha bands right after the end of the movement. All these modulations are
 254 consistent with current literature (see Kilavik et al., 2013; Palmer et al., 2019; Tan et al., 2014a; Tzagarakis et al.,
 255 2010 for power modulation and Combrisson et al. 2017; Popovych et al. 2016 for ITPC).

256 2.7. MKL classification

257 MKL modelling was performed using Pronto library
258 (<http://www.mlnl.cs.ucl.ac.uk/pronto/>) which is based on the SimpleMKL package
259 (Rakotomamonjy et al., 2008). MKL is a supervised machine learning approach that
260 simultaneously learns from different kernels (Gönen and Alapaydin, 2011; Schrouff et al.,
261 2016) in order to classify two classes, or in the present study, conditions. MKL uses the set
262 of inputs to build kernels representing pair-wise similarity between observations (dot product
263 in Pronto). Then, a support vector machine (SVM; Cortes and Vapnik 1995) allows to define
264 a decision boundary, discriminating between classes, for each kernel. To determine this
265 boundary, model parameters w_m , representing the contribution of each feature (unitary
266 element of each input, e.g. time point) is optimized. Each decision boundary (one per kernel)
267 is then weighted by a parameter d_m to define a global decision boundary. These two steps
268 are implemented recursively in an optimization procedure, with a L1-norm sparsity constraint
269 on the d_m vector, encouraging a sparse selection of non-null kernel contributions. Final kernel
270 contributions d_m and feature contribution w_m are then retrieved (Fig. 3). However, contrary to
271 d_m , w_m are not sparse in MKL modelling, meaning that every features contributed to the
272 model. As such, interpreting w_m is complex and raises several issues (Haynes, 2015;
273 Schrouff et al., 2016), so that we preferred focusing our interpretation of the results on the
274 kernel contributions d_m . MKL algorithm is based on SVM models, which includes a soft-
275 margin hyper-parameter C . This hyper-parameter allows more or less misclassifications
276 during training, affecting SVM decision boundary. To optimize this hyper-parameter, we
277 performed a nested cross-validation scheme in which an inner loop was used for hyper-
278 parameter selection leading to the highest model performance whereas an outer loop used
279 the selected hyper-parameter to assess the performance. This optimization procedure
280 selected $C = 1$ for around 80% of the folds in all our MKL implementations and $C = 0.1$ or 10
281 for the remaining ones. Thus, we chose to set $C = 1$ in order to keep the same hyper-
282 parameter across all folds.

283 In the present study, for every two-class classification, MKL was fed with input signals
284 representing either temporal band-related power changes or temporal band-related ITPC, in
285 the four main bands of interest (theta: 4-8 Hz, alpha: 9-12 Hz, beta: 13-30 Hz and gamma:
286 31-80 Hz). A region-of-interest (ROI) approach was used to limit influence of highly
287 correlated data, averaging power changes and ITPC signals within different ROIs. ROIs
288 definitions and examples of averaged (across subjects and ROIs) temporal band-related
289 power changes are depicted in the left panel of Fig. 3. From a technical standpoint, input
290 signals were converted into nifti files in order to fit the Pronto imaging toolbox. Thus, 44
291 kernels (11 ROIs x 4 bands) of size 38x38 (19 subjects x 2 conditions) were built for each
292 classification. To ensure that the scale of each kernel did not interfere in modelling, all
293 kernels were mean-centered and normalized. Adaptive learning as a whole was decoded
294 classifying Early- against Late-CnstRot for power changes and ITPC signals and during pre-
295 and post-movement separately, leading to four main MKL implementations. We did not
296 include pre- and post-movement periods as well as power changes and ITPC signals in the
297 same model to avoid over-parametrization.

298 When a classification was significant (see section 2.8.), further MKL classifications
299 between conditions were performed to investigate more accurately the role of the identified
300 kernels (CnstRot-1 vs. Norm, CnstRot-1 vs. RdmRot, and Norm vs. RdmRot). CnstRot-2 was
301 discarded from these further classifications due to its intermediate position between CnstRot-
302 1 and Norm both in term of error size and acquisition of the new mapping.



303

304 **Fig. 3.** Illustration of multiple kernel learning modelling procedure for Early- vs. Late-CnstRot. For each subject
 305 but one, and for each electrode, time-frequency power (or ITPC) maps were computed in both Early- and Late-
 306 CnstRot stages. These maps were then averaged across frequencies (in theta, alpha, beta and gamma bands)
 307 and over predefined regions of interest (ROIs) to define the 44 feature vectors in the two conditions (labels of the
 308 feature vectors are the conditions). ROIs were defined as showed on head map on the left side of the figure. For
 309 each region/band couple, a linear kernel K_m , representing the pair-wise similarity between features vectors of
 310 both conditions across subjects was built ($m = 1 \dots 44$). All kernels and their associated labels were then used to
 311 train the model. First, features contributions w_m are estimated to define a decision function f_m per kernel. The
 312 weight of each decision function, d_m , is then estimated to provide a final decision function $f(x)$. These two steps
 313 are implemented recursively in an optimization procedure, leading to a sparse selection of non-null kernel
 314 contributions. The model was then applied to test data (feature vectors of the 19th subject without labels) to
 315 obtain associated predicted conditions. This whole process was repeated as many times as there were subjects,
 316 excluding a different subject each time to assess accuracy of the model. Abbreviations: FP: frontal pole, LPM: left
 317 premotor, SMA: supplementary motor area, RPM: right premotor area, LM: left motor, RM: right motor, LSS: left
 318 somatosensory, RSS: right somatosensory, LP: left parietal, RP: right parietal, OP: occipital pole.

319 2.8. Decoding performance

320 Performances of the MKL models were assessed using a “leave-one-subject-per-class-
 321 out” cross validation scheme. This scheme is the best choice when subjects in different
 322 classes are correlated (i.e. within subject design), keeping testing and training sets
 323 independent. Indeed, to ensure proper cross-validation, it is crucial that correlated
 324 information (here the same subject) is not present both in the train and test sets. Such a

325 dependency would lead to “leakage” and over-optimistic model performance. In our design,
326 the only way to keep testing and training sets completely independent was to split our data
327 by subjects. Thus, each model was trained using all subjects with their corresponding labels
328 (here conditions) except one, and used to predict the labels of the subject left out. This
329 process was repeated as many times as there were subjects. Total accuracy (TA) and class
330 accuracy (CA) were subsequently obtained as the total number of correctly classified test
331 samples divided by the total number of test samples, irrespective of class for TA and for a
332 given class for CA.

333 Since training sets were not independent across folds (overlapping of training data
334 between folds), the use of any parametric tests was excluded to assess the statistical
335 significance (Noirhomme et al., 2014; Pereira et al., 2009). P-value associated to each
336 performance measure was estimated using a 1000-permutation testing framework in which
337 cross-validation and accuracy were recomputed after randomly shuffling training labels
338 (Ojala and Garriga, 2010). The level of significance was set at $p < 0.05$ for TA.

339 2.9. Univariate analyses

340 We conducted further analyses on the kernels that were most contributing to the MKL
341 models in order to refine the distinction between neural processes most related to trial-to-trial
342 adaptation from those most linked to the learning of the new visuomotor transformation. It is
343 however important to mention that these selective analyses were run on a subset of the
344 kernels and as such suffered double dipping (Kriegeskorte et al., 2009). Accordingly,
345 univariate analyses served to make interpretation of MKL models easier, but should not be
346 considered as hypothesis testing *per se*.

347 In this perspective, *t*-tests and one-way ANOVAs were used to evaluate differences of
348 average power or PLV amplitude over time in the kernels that contributed the most to
349 distinguish between Early-CnstRot and Late-CnstRot as well as between Norm, RdmRot and
350 CnstRot-1. Also, we assessed the correlation between this average amplitude and error size


351 in CnstRot-1 and RdmRot conditions. To this end, for each condition, kernel and subject,
352 trials were grouped into 8 bins according to the size of the AIE, and Fisher *r-to-z* transform
353 was computed between bin's order and the average amplitude signal in the post-movement
354 period. Significance of the correlations were afterwards examined using one sample *t*-tests.
355 In kernels associated with trial-to-trial adaptation from errors, correlation between error size
356 and average magnitude should be present in both RdmRot and CnstRot-1 conditions while in
357 kernels associated with learning of the new visuomotor transformation, this correlation should
358 be present only in CnstRot-1 condition. Indeed in the latter, decrease of errors should more
359 or less match with time course of the experiment and the increased level of acquisition of the
360 transformation.

361 **3. Results**

362 *3.1. Decoding early from late stages of visuomotor-constant rotation task*

363 *3.1.1. Behavioral results*

364 Paired *t*-test on RT between Early- and Late-CnstRot was not significant ($p = 0.67$),
365 indicating that the level of readiness remained similar during the task (Mean \pm SD RT: $0.36 \pm$
366 0.02 s; Fig. 4). Other behavioral measures showed that subjects adapted to the constant
367 rotational perturbation. Both the AIE ($41.0^\circ \pm 2.1$ to $22.0^\circ \pm 1.2$; $p < 0.001$) and the AR
368 (0.0230 ± 0.004 to 0.009 ± 0.002 ; $p < 0.001$) decreased from Early- to Late-CnstRot. MT and
369 PL followed the same pattern, decreasing significantly from Early- to Late-CnstRot (Early-
370 CnstRot: MT = 1.15 s \pm 0.05 and PL = 1.70 ± 0.05 ; Late-CnstRot: MT = 0.89 s \pm 0.04 and PL =
371 1.36 ± 0.03 ; $p < 0.001$). Nevertheless, although the level of adaptation was largely improved
372 in Late-CnstRot, it was still not comparable to the level of Norm condition (Fig. 4). Hence,
373 subjects adapted to the new visuomotor transformation although room for improvement
374 remained.



375

376 **Fig. 4.** Kinematic results during visuomotor-constant rotation task. While reaction time (RT) remained stable,
 377 movement time (MT), initial angular error (AIE), normalized path length (PL) and adaptation rate (AR) decreased
 378 during the course of adaptation. Bottom right panel depicts evolution of AIE and AR during the course of CnstRot
 379 condition. Values in Norm condition are provided as reference. Values are mean \pm SE. ** $p < 0.01$ in t -tests.

380

3.1.2. MKL modelling

381


The main objective of the study was to decode the process of adaptive learning based
 382 on EEG spectral features. To do so, we ran four MKL models aiming at classifying early
 383 (Early-CnstRot) and late (Late-CnstRot) stages of a constant perturbation condition based on
 384 power and ITPC from multiple frequency bands and cortical regions during pre- and post-
 385 movement. The MKL model whose kernels were built from power of the different
 386 band/regions couples in post-movement period was statistically significant (TA = 86.84%, $p =$
 387 0.002; CA = 84.21% and 89.47%, $p = 0.004$ and $p = 0.002$ for Early- and Late-CnstRot,

388 respectively). MKL classification based on kernels built from power in pre-movement did not
389 distinguish the two classes (TA = 65.79%, $p = 0.11$). As for ITPC-based modelling, both pre-
390 and post-movement classifications failed to dissociate Early- from Late-CnstRot (TA =
391 60.53% and 26.32%, $p = 0.26$ and $p = 0.97$ for pre- and post-movement, respectively). These
392 results suggested that motor adaptation and learning (on 160 trials) was related to
393 modulation of brain waves' power in post-movement, only.

394 Kernel contribution to the MKL model of Early- vs. Late-CnstRot based on power in
395 post-movement was assessed in terms of frequency bands, ROIs, and ROI for each
396 frequency band (a.k.a. ROI \times band), as depicted in Fig. 5. Three frequency bands actively
397 participated to the classification, including the theta, beta and gamma bands with a
398 contribution of 29.4%, 18.6% and 51.7%, respectively (Fig. 5A). ROIs that contributed the
399 most to the MKL model were mainly distributed over frontal and central regions (e.g., $d_{FP} =$
400 20.5%, $d_{RPM} = 11.6\%$, $d_{SMA} = 17.9\%$, $d_{RM} = 10.3\%$, $d_{LM} = 20.6\%$; Fig. 5B). Interestingly, when
401 looking at ROI \times band kernels (Fig. 5C), it appeared that frontal and premotor cortices were
402 related to the theta band ($d_{FP_theta} = 19.9\%$, $d_{RPM_theta} = 9.0\%$), supplementary motor area to
403 the beta band ($d_{SMA_beta} = 17.9\%$), whereas motor and post-central cortices were associated
404 with the gamma band ($d_{RM_gamma} = 10.3\%$, $d_{LM_gamma} = 19.6\%$, $d_{LP_gamma} = 9.8\%$).

405 Power changes (averaged across subjects) in post-movement window are represented
406 in Fig. 5C for the three main contributing ROI \times band-specific kernels (FP theta, SMA beta and
407 LM gamma, which accounted together for 57.4% of the total contribution) to qualitatively
408 examine their evolution between Early- and Late-CnstRot. For FP theta, power was roughly
409 at a baseline level in Early-CnstRot and became positive in Late-CnstRot, which reflected
410 occurrence of post-movement theta band synchronization with adaptation. A similar trend
411 was found for LM gamma, also indicating the occurrence of a post-movement
412 synchronization in this frequency band during the course of adaptive learning. Regarding
413 SMA beta, there was an increased post-movement rebound, or equivalently post-movement
414 synchronization, from Early- to Late-CnstRot. These trends were confirmed by t -tests on

415 average post-movement synchronization between Early- and Late-CnstRot in each kernels
 416 ($p < 0.001$, $p = 0.003$ and $p = 0.03$ for FP theta, SM beta and LM gamma, respectively).




417

418 **Fig. 5.** Kernel contributions to Early- vs. Late-CnstRot MKL modelling and power changes of the most contributing
 419 kernels. (A) Contribution of each band, shared between theta, beta and gamma. (B) Contribution of each ROI,
 420 distributed mainly across frontal, premotor and motor cortices. (C) Contribution of each kernel (band/ROI couple),
 421 revealing three main clusters of contribution: frontal to premotor theta oscillations, supplementary motor area beta
 422 oscillations and motor/post-central gamma oscillations. Averaged power changes across subjects of the three
 423 main contributing kernels are represented for Early- (red) and Late-CnstRot (green), as well as mean \pm SE values
 424 (over the time period - 0 ms corresponds to movement termination), showing the increase of post-movement
 425 synchronization in these three kernels during adaptation. Averaged power changes across and mean values in
 426 Norm (grey) condition are provided as reference. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$ in t-tests.

427 3.2. *Decoding conditions with (either constant or random) and without visuomotor rotation*

428 3.2.1. *Behavioral results*

429 Within-subjects ANOVA did not reveal ($p = 0.94$) any RT difference between Norm,
430 RdmRot and CnstRot-1 (Mean \pm SD RT: 0.36 ± 0.01 s; Fig. 6), suggesting a comparable level
431 of readiness in all conditions. The other ANOVAs demonstrated an effect of condition on MT
432 ($F_{2,54} = 84.5$; $p < 0.001$), AIE ($F_{2,54} = 143.4$; $p < 0.001$) and PL ($F_{2,54} = 49.0$; $p < 0.001$). Fisher
433 LSD post-hoc testing revealed lower values in Norm as compared to the other two conditions
434 on MT (Norm: 0.49 s \pm 0.01 , RdmRot: 1.07 s \pm 0.03 , CnstRot-1: 1.09 s \pm 0.04 , $p < 0.001$), PL
435 (Norm: 1.06 ± 0.01 , RdmRot: 1.55 ± 0.03 , CnstRot-1: 1.56 ± 0.05 , $p < 0.001$) and AIE (Norm:
436 $6.4^\circ \pm 0.2$, RdmRot: $34.1^\circ \pm 0.4$, CnstRot-1: AIE = $36.1^\circ \pm 1.8$, $p < 0.001$). Interestingly, post-
437 hoc testing did not reveal any difference on those parameters between RdmRot and
438 CnstRot-1 ($p = 0.55$, $p = 0.86$ and $p = 0.27$ for MT, PL and AIE respectively). Likewise, t -test
439 on AR between RdmRot and CnstRot-1 did not reveal any statistical difference (RdmRot:
440 0.010 ± 0.005 , CnstRot-1: 0.014 ± 0.002 , $p = 0.34$), with an equivalent state-space model
441 performance (AIC RdmRot: 380.1 ± 15.1 , AIC CnstRot-1: 366.1 ± 12.5 , $p = 0.32$). Thus,
442 Norm and RdmRot differed regarding error size and adaptation rate whereas RdmRot and
443 CnstRot-1 did not. As such, any difference between Norm and RdmRot provided information
444 on trial-to-trial adaptation after exposure to errors, whereas difference between RdmRot and
445 CnstRot-1 informed on “cumulative” learning of the new visuomotor transformation. The
446 difference between Norm and CnstRot-1 embedded both processes.



447

448 **Fig. 6.** Kinematic comparison of the different experimental conditions. Reaction time (RT) was stable across
 449 conditions. Movement time (MT), Initial angular error (AIE), and Normalized path length (PL), were similar
 450 between RdmRot and CnstRot-1 conditions, and lower in Norm condition. Adaptation rate (AR) was similar
 451 between RdmRot and CnstRot-1. Values are mean \pm SE. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$ in post-hoc Fisher LSD tests.

452

3.2.2. MKL modelling

453

We implemented three MKL models to uncover which of the post-movement power-
 454 based kernels that decoded early from late stages of CnstRot condition were most
 455 associated with trial-to-trial adaptation from errors or cumulative learning of the new
 456 visuomotor transformation: Norm vs. CnstRot-1, Norm vs. RdmRot and CnstRot-1 vs.
 457 RdmRot.

458 The MKL model Norm vs. CnstRot-1 showed a significant discrimination between the
459 two conditions (TA = 82%, $p = 0.002$; CA = 79% and 84%, $p = 0.02$ and 0.006 for Norm and
460 CnstRot-1, respectively). The contribution vector d_m revealed a set of kernels that were
461 equivalent to those of the classification of Early- against Late-CnstRot, with post-movement
462 theta power in frontal pole and premotor areas, beta power in supplementary motor area and
463 gamma power in motor and parietal areas most contributing to the decision function. There
464 was also a noticeable difference (compared to Early- vs. Late-CnstRot) in the balance of the
465 kernel contribution to the decision boundary, with more contributory signal in the theta band
466 than in the higher-frequency beta and gamma bands ($d_{\text{theta}} = 66.3\%$, $d_{\text{beta}} = 10.9\%$ and d_{gamma}
467 $= 14.6\%$; Fig. 7A). Qualitatively, all contributing kernels showed weaker power in CnstRot-1
468 compared to Norm (Fig. 7A). Given that Norm and CnstRot differed both in terms of
469 movement error and level of acquisition of the imposed mapping, these results supported
470 once again the idea that post-movement theta synchronization in frontal pole and premotor
471 regions, as well as beta synchronization in SMA, and gamma synchronization in motor-
472 related and parietal regions were related to adaptive learning.


473 The MKL model Norm vs. RdmRot led to a significant classification of the conditions
474 (TA = 74%, $p = 0.016$; CA = 63% and 84%, $p = 0.2188$ and 0.006 for Norm and RdmRot
475 respectively). Post-movement beta power in the supplementary motor area and gamma
476 power in motor to parietal regions mainly contributed to the model ($d_{\text{beta}} = 46.2\%$ and $d_{\text{gamma}} =$
477 40.6% ; Fig. 7B). Contribution of theta band was still present, but to a much lesser extent than
478 the higher-frequency bands ($d_{\text{theta}} = 11.9\%$), and emerged from parietal areas and not from
479 prefrontal areas as in the case of Early- vs Late-CnstRot MKL model. Accordingly, this result
480 suggested that both supplementary motor area beta power and motor to parietal areas
481 gamma power after movement completion principally reflected trial-to-trial adaptation from
482 errors. The observed lower amplitude of post-movement beta and gamma power in RdmRot
483 compared to Norm suggested an inverse relationship between error and post-movement
484 high-frequency band synchronization (Fig. 7B). This finding also shed new light on frontal

485 and premotor theta power strongly involved in the classification of both Early- vs. Late-
486 CnstRot and Norm vs. CnstRot-1 which may be rather associated with the level of acquisition
487 of the sensorimotor mapping. However, this conclusion on the relationship between post-
488 movement frontal theta band synchronization and update of the mapping lacks direct
489 demonstration as the MKL model RdmRot vs. CnstRot-1 did not show a significant result (TA
490 = 50.00%; $p = 0.55$).

491 *3.2.3. Univariate analyses*

492 Further comparisons between kernels identified through above mentioned MKL models
493 are presented in Fig 7C. For FP theta kernel, within-subjects ANOVA revealed an effect of
494 condition on mean post-movement power ($F_{3,54} = 5.25$; $p = 0.003$). Post-hoc testing revealed
495 a lower power in CnstRot-1 compared with the other conditions ($p < 0.001$ and $p = 0.03$ in
496 comparison to Norm and RdmRot respectively), while Norm and RdmRot conditions
497 presented similar levels ($p = 0.08$). These differences suggested that increase in post-
498 movement FP theta mean power would reflect principally the level of acquisition of the new
499 mapping. Indeed, although the acquisition of the new mapping was underway in CnstRot-1 it
500 remained largely incomplete while it was complete in Norm and RdmRot condition and
501 corresponded to the identity mapping (i.e. $\langle \emptyset \rangle = 0^\circ$).

502 Regarding SMA beta kernel, within-subjects ANOVA also demonstrated an effect of
503 condition ($F_{3,54} = 5.10$; $p = 0.004$). Post-hoc testing revealed a larger mean power in Norm
504 compared to RdmRot and CnstRot-1 ($p = 0.001$ and 0.003 respectively). These differences,
505 in addition to the absence of significant difference between CnstRot-1 and RdmRot,
506 corroborated our guess that mean amplitude of post-movement SMA beta reflected trial-to-
507 trial adaptation from errors, which was similar in CnstRot-1 and RdmRot. On the other hand,
508 within-subjects ANOVA for LM gamma kernel did not reveal any difference between
509 conditions ($p = 0.20$). Hence, this extra analysis remained inconclusive on whether post-
510 movement power in LM gamma relate rather to trial-to-trial adaptation or cumulative learning
511 of the new mapping.



512

513 **Fig. 7.** Results of extra MKL models. (A) Norm vs. CnstRot-1 model: Theta, beta and gamma bands mainly
514 contributed to the model (as in Early- vs. Late-Adapt model), although with a dominance of the theta contribution.
515 Main identified kernels qualitatively showed a larger power in Norm compared to CnstRot-1. This supported the
516 implication of these three kernels in both movement error and acquisition of the new mapping. (B) Norm vs.
517 RdmRot model: beta and gamma bands mainly contributed to the model. SMA beta and LM gamma kernels
518 showed a larger power in Norm compared to RdmRot, suggesting that these kernels were principally related to
519 trial-to-trial adaptation. Note that theta band was also identified as contributing to the model. However, further
520 analysis revealed a parietal contribution on it, which differed from the theta contribution in frontal areas of the
521 Early- vs. Late-CnstRot MKL model. (C) Mean postmovement power for the three main contributing kernels in all
522 conditions. CnstRot-1 postmovement average power was lower than both Norm and RdmRot powers in FP theta
523 kernel suggesting a relationship with level of acquisition of the new transformation. Furthermore, Norm
524 postmovement average power was lower than both RdmRot and CnstRot-1 levels in SMA beta kernel, relating
525 beta modulation to the adaptation process. These extra-analyses remained inconclusive regarding LM gamma
526 kernel. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$ in post-hoc Fisher LSD tests.

527 Finally, we found significant correlations between bin's order (sorted according to
528 decreasing error size) and mean post-movement power for SMA beta in both CnstRot-1 and
529 RdmRot conditions ($R = 0.38 \pm 0.03$, $p = 0.006$ and $R = 0.24 \pm 0.03$, $p = 0.04$ respectively).
530 The smaller the error, the larger the mean post-movement power in SMA in the two
531 conditions. Thus, post-movement power in SMA was modulated by error size. There was
532 also a significant correlation for FP theta in CnstRot-1, but not in RdmRot ($R = 0.23 \pm 0.02$, p
533 $= 0.03$ and $R = 0.12 \pm 0.03$, $p = 0.28$). This absence of relationship in FP theta for RdmRot

534 condition indicated that postmovement theta modulation during adaptive learning rather
535 reflected the formation of the new mapping. Regarding LM gamma kernel, power did not
536 correlate with bins of decreasing error size in both conditions.

537 **4. Discussion**

538 The aim of this study was to come up with a more complete characterization of
539 adaptive learning in terms of neural oscillations and synchrony of distributed brain regions,
540 and try to tease apart two subtending processes, namely trial-to-trial adaptation from errors
541 and cumulative learning of a new sensorimotor mapping. Our main MKL model indicated that
542 post-movement synchronization of beta oscillations in supplementary motor area, gamma
543 oscillations in motor to parietal regions and low-frequency, theta, oscillations in (pre)frontal
544 regions contributed to adaptive learning. Further discriminant models suggested that higher-
545 frequency – beta and gamma – synchrony in motor-related regions was associated rather to
546 trial-to-trial adaptation, while low-frequency synchrony in (pre)frontal regions rather informed
547 on acquisition of the new mapping. Univariate analyses also pointed in the same direction,
548 except for the gamma band. Modulation of SMA synchrony in the beta band was similar
549 when facing both constant and random perturbations, in particular with a power that
550 increased as a function of decreasing error size. This reinforced the idea that post-movement
551 beta power relates to error processing that instantiates trial-to-trial adaptation. Inversely,
552 modulation of frontal synchrony in the theta band differed between the conditions of constant
553 and random perturbations, with the latter condition being similar to the condition with normal
554 movements. Increased theta power during the course of adaptation seems therefore to be a
555 hallmark of the acquisition of a new visuomotor mapping. Finally, univariate outcomes were
556 inconclusive concerning the link between post-movement gamma synchronization and either
557 trial-to-trial adaptation or cumulative learning.

558 An important result was the increase in post-movement beta synchronization during the
559 constant rotation task to a level comparable to normal condition. Hence, there was an
560 attenuation of post-movement beta power at the beginning of adaptive learning, that tended
561 to disappear as learning progressed, confirming earlier results (Palmer et al., 2019; Tan et
562 al., 2014a, 2014b). Furthermore, we were able to relate these brain oscillatory changes to
563 the adaptation process that occurs independently of cumulative learning of the new

564 sensorimotor mapping, thus linking them to the processing of a completed movement with
565 respect to its predicted outcome. This complements previous results which specifically linked
566 post-movement beta synchronization to movement error and confidence in internal model
567 estimations in motor and somatosensory cortices, suggesting that post-movement beta
568 synchronization decrease could signal a need for adaptation of the motor output (Palmer et
569 al., 2019; Tan et al., 2016). The topography of our result was different, being confined mainly
570 to SMA. An explanation for this topographic discrepancy is that we let the MKL to select the
571 most discriminating regions (i.e. data-driven approach) while the above mentioned studies
572 did an a priori choice with respect to EEG channels of interest (i.e. model-based approach).
573 Accordingly, adaptation from errors may be mainly mediated through SMA although other
574 sensorimotor regions also likely contribute to it. Interestingly, it is acknowledged that
575 synchronized beta oscillations bind multiple sensorimotor regions into a large-scale network
576 during motor behavior (Brovelli et al., 2004). This also remains true with subcortical areas
577 such as the subthalamic nucleus whose beta power increases in coherence with that of the
578 sensorimotor cortex after movement offset (Tan et al., 2014b). Consequently, beta oscillatory
579 activity may be synchronized between different sensorimotor cortical (SMA, motor,
580 somatosensory) and subcortical areas to process movement error and mediates subsequent
581 adaptation. In addition, our result strengthens the indication that regions of the medial frontal
582 cortex, especially the SMA and the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC), play a critical
583 role in processing errors and evaluating the outcomes of action (Amiez et al., 2012; Bonini et
584 al., 2014; Botvinick et al., 2004; Ridderinkhof et al., 2004). It is clear that the oscillatory
585 activity we reported here is not limited to SMA but also includes influence from the dACC
586 which lies underneath. Finally, we did not find relationship between adaptive features and
587 pre-movement beta synchronization as suggested before (Torrecillos et al., 2015). This
588 discrepancy may reside in the fact that premovement period could be more involved in the
589 integration of somatosensory information (Alayrangues et al., 2019) than in processing of
590 sensory prediction error, that are both essential for adaptive update of the upcoming

591 movement. Thus, we propose that post-movement modulation of beta power reflects sensory
592 error processing and subsequent signal that engages internal model update.

593 Our MKL main result also revealed that synchronization in post-central regions within
594 the gamma band during the post-movement period was involved in overall adaptive learning.
595 However, we failed to reach a clear conclusion about the particular process that was
596 encoded through gamma modulation. At the most, our study suggested that post-movement
597 gamma modulation would relate to error processing that triggers adaptation on a trial basis
598 rather than to learning a new visuomotor transformation. This would suggest that gamma
599 oscillations may not only serve the function of encoding afferent (proprioceptive) feedback
600 and properties (e.g. velocity, effort, force level) of the movement reported in previous motor
601 control studies (Muthukumaraswamy 2010; see also Nowak et al., 2018 for review and
602 references therein). Besides, the involvement of gamma oscillations in processing of action
603 outcome that triggers motor adaptation recalls previous reports that found a role of gamma
604 oscillations in encoding reward outcomes for adapting to challenging tasks (Quilodran et al.,
605 2008; Rothé et al., 2011). It might be that gamma band is a vehicle to encode outcome
606 expectation in a broad sense, with different regions encoding different dimensions (reward,
607 sensory feedback) of outcome expectancy. Indeed, these previous studies reported
608 modulation of gamma power in frontal regions during adaptation while we located it in post-
609 central regions. This assumption is neurophysiologically plausible as power in gamma band
610 is highly localized (e.g. Sirota et al., 2008), reflecting specific computations of local groups of
611 neurons in the neocortex. This calls for a more elaborated study on the extent to which
612 gamma-modulated oscillations contribute to recalibration of internal model and adaptive
613 behavior.

614 Another important finding of the present study was the implication of post-movement
615 synchrony of prefrontal, and to a lower extent premotor, theta oscillations in adaptive
616 learning. This finding is in line with the overall implication of the prefrontal cortex in the
617 coordination of adaptive goal-directed behavior (Koechlin, 2016; Miller et al., 2010;

618 Ridderinkhof et al., 2004), and also replicates the previous finding of a modulation of
619 prefrontal theta power during visuomotor adaptation (Gentili et al., 2011; Perfetti et al., 2011).
620 Although these latter studies have speculated on the role of theta enhancement in the
621 formation of internal models, they were not designed to tease out whether it relates to
622 changes in the state of the internal model that responds to error on a trial basis or to the
623 accumulation of these changes over time to form a new mapping. The inclusion of a
624 condition in which errors were random and equaled zero on average allowed us to
625 specifically link the increase of prefrontal theta oscillatory activity to cumulative learning of
626 the new sensorimotor mapping. This interpretation is in line with a large consensus about the
627 implication of the prefrontal cortex, especially the ventromedial and lateral components, in
628 encoding and learning predictive models mapping stimulus–action onto expected outcomes
629 (Anguera et al., 2009; Contreras-Vidal and Kerick, 2004; Koechlin, 2016). There is also firm
630 evidence that new acquired motor memories are stored and consolidated in prefrontal and
631 secondary motor cortices (Dandolo and Schwabe, 2019; Pinsard et al., 2019). In particular,
632 the ability to store newly learned behavior as memory-based constructs requires
633 implementing top-down control signals from the prefrontal cortex to motor regions
634 (Narayanan and Laubach, 2006), these latter regions being involved in selecting motor plans
635 in response to stimuli (Koechlin et al., 2003). Finally, our interpretation is also consonant with
636 a recent study having demonstrated that exploitation of learned associations between stimuli
637 and responses during spatial context learning are implemented in prefrontal theta band
638 activity (Spaak and de Lange, 2020).

639 Even though we have emphasized that our approach distinguished between oscillatory
640 activity related to trial-to-trial changes in the internal model (i.e. adaptation) and oscillatory
641 activity responsible for accumulating these changes across trials (i.e. learning), it is also
642 possible that another process, namely cognitive strategy, has affected the study outcomes. It
643 has been shown that individuals employ cognitive strategies to eliminate the error at the
644 beginning of adaptive learning, and that implicit adaptation increasingly takes over from

645 explicit cognitive strategies as skill learning proceeds (Miyamoto et al., 2020; Taylor et al.,
646 2014; Taylor and Ivry, 2011). Thus, our primary outcome on comparison between early and
647 late stages of constant rotation condition (increase of power in theta, beta and gamma
648 bands) could to some extent also reflect the change in the balance between explicit and
649 implicit processes which are at work during adaptive learning. Individuals may have also
650 employed explicit cognitive strategies to adapt in the random rotation condition, possibly
651 affecting our secondary comparison between constant and random rotation conditions. There
652 is evidence that explicit cognitive strategies influence sensorimotor adaptation even in
653 conditions where perturbations are poorly predictable (Albert et al., 2021; Miyamoto et al.,
654 2020). We have very few clues about the neural correlates of implicit and explicit processes
655 in motor learning. To our knowledge, it has been proposed only recently that explicit
656 cognitive and implicit processes are reflected into beta-band activities of distinct regions, the
657 medial frontal region and the lateral central region, respectively (Jahani et al., 2020). Hence,
658 SMA-related increase in beta power during the course of adaptation may not only reflect
659 adaptive changes in the sensorimotor mapping but may also relate to a reduction of
660 movement error guided by a cognitive strategy. It will be important for future studies to
661 confirm that the increase in beta and theta band activities during adaptive learning are
662 hallmarks of trial-to-trial adaptation error and cumulative learning of the new sensorimotor
663 mapping and not a byproduct of the changes in the interactions between explicit strategy and
664 implicit motor adaptation. This will require designing adaptive learning experiments that
665 isolate as much as possible explicit and implicit processes of adaptation, for instance by
666 delaying presentation of the feedback for the former (Brudner et al., 2016; Schween and
667 Hegele, 2017) and limiting reaction time for the latter (Haith et al., 2015; Leow et al., 2017).
668 Another solution to isolate the explicit component of adaptation may consist in asking
669 subjects to report where they plan to aim before each trial (Miyamoto et al., 2020; Taylor et
670 al., 2014). Finally, we cannot rule out the possibility that subjects exposed across trials to
671 random variations in visuomotor transformation were able to learn some meta-parameters
672 related to the multiple transformations; the so-called structural learning that fasters learning

673 in a new situation (Bond and Taylor, 2017; Braun et al., 2010). Hence, our conditions of
674 constant and random rotations may not have been perfectly orthogonal with respect to
675 learning of the new mapping.

676 Our results on the relationship between specific sensorimotor processes and particular
677 EEG bands and regions would not have been possible without a multi-band exploration of
678 the tasks through machine learning MKL modelling. This stresses how important it is to study
679 brain oscillations in adaptive learning, and more generally motor control, beyond beta band.
680 This complements previous observations that not only beta band but also other oscillatory
681 activities are important to enhance motor performance (Chung et al., 2017). In this
682 perspective, looking at the coupling between theta and gamma or beta is an important
683 challenge, such couplings coordinating communication across brain regions and contributing
684 to the formation of memory traces (Lisman and Jensen, 2013). In particular, it has been
685 shown that theta-gamma and theta-beta coupling can predict individual working memory
686 performance (Axmacher et al., 2010) which is known to be engaged in visuomotor adaptation
687 (Anguera et al., 2010; Christou et al., 2016). Closely related is the need to foster whole-brain
688 approaches that integrate not only the sensorimotor regions that have been traditionally
689 explored but also the frontal regions that likely generate theta oscillations. Some studies
690 suggested that dACC would process errors to output a control signal that specifies the need
691 for adjustments toward downstream regions, including the prefrontal cortex, responsible for
692 implementing corresponding adjustments (Ridderinkhof et al., 2004; Shenhav et al., 2016).
693 Given this assumption, investigating the coupling between prefrontal theta and SMA beta
694 oscillations could be valuable in the context of motor adaptation.

695 **5. Conclusion**

696 The current study advances our understanding of adaptive learning in humans by
697 demonstrating changes of oscillatory activity in multiple bands and regions and linking these
698 changes to specific “adaptive” and “learning” motor processes. Consistent with previous
699 studies, the results indicated that beta power, here of the supplementary motor area,

700 underpins error-dependent changes in trial-to-trial performance and as such reflects neural
701 processes that evaluate motor error and likely signal a need for adaptation of the motor
702 output. The other main outcome is the contribution of frontal theta power to adaptive
703 learning, yet without being related to errors. This suggests a role of theta oscillations in
704 storing the newly learned internal model. Whether these spatially and band-wise distinct
705 oscillatory activities constitute neural correlates of implicit motor adaptation, only, or also
706 reflect cognitive strategies that may operate during motor adaptation to learn from errors
707 remains to be tested.

708

709 **6. Data and code availability statement**

710 All raw data are stored on SUMMER, the data server of Grenoble-Alpes university and
711 will be made available without restrictions upon request to [lucas.struber@univ-grenoble-](mailto:lucas.struber@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr)
712 [alpes.fr](mailto:lucas.struber@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr) or fabien.cignetti@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr. Analysis codes can be found on gitlab, at
713 the following address <https://gricad-gitlab.univ-grenoble-alpes.fr/lstruber-research>.

714 **7. Acknowledgments**

715 This work was supported by the French National Research Agency in the framework of
716 the “Investissements d’avenir” program (ANR-15-IDEX-02). The authors declare no
717 competing financial interest.

718 **References**

- 719 Alayrangues, J., Torrecillos, F., Jahani, A., Malfait, N., 2019. Error-related modulations of the
720 sensorimotor post-movement and foreperiod beta-band activities arise from distinct
721 neural substrates and do not reflect efferent signal processing. *Neuroimage* 184, 10–24.
722 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.09.013>
- 723 Albert, S.T., Jang, J., Sheahan, H.R., Teunissen, L., Vandevoorde, K., Herzfeld, D.J.,
724 Shadmehr, R., 2021. An implicit memory of errors limits human sensorimotor
725 adaptation. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* 2, 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-01036-x>
- 726 Amiez, C., Hadj-Bouziane, F., Petrides, M., 2012. Response selection versus feedback
727 analysis in conditional visuo-motor learning. *Neuroimage* 59, 3723–3735.
728 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.10.058>
- 729 Anguera, J.A., Reuter-Lorenz, P.A., Willingham, D.T., Seidler, R.D., 2010. Contributions of
730 spatial working memory to visuomotor adaptation. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 22, 1917–1930.
731 <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21351>
- 732 Anguera, J.A., Seidler, R.D., Gehring, W.J., 2009. Changes in performance monitoring
733 during sensorimotor adaptation. *J. Neurophysiol.* 102, 1868–1879.
734 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00063.2009>
- 735 Axmacher, N., Henseler, M.M., Jensen, O., Weinreich, I., Elger, C.E., Fell, J., 2010. Cross-
736 frequency coupling supports multi-item working memory in the human hippocampus.
737 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 107, 3228–3233. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0911531107>
- 738 Bond, K.M., Taylor, J.A., 2017. Structural learning in a visuomotor adaptation task is explicitly
739 accessible. *eNeuro* 4, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0122-17.2017>
- 740 Bonini, F., Burle, B., Liégeois-Chauvel, C., Régis, J., Chauvel, P., Vidal, F., 2014. Action
741 monitoring and medial frontal cortex: Leading role of supplementary motor area.
742 *Science (80-.)*. 343, 888–891. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1247412>

743 Botvinick, M.M., Cohen, J.D., Carter, C.S., 2004. Conflict monitoring and anterior cingulate
744 cortex: An update. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 8, 539–546.
745 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2004.10.003>

746 Braun, D.A., Aertsen, A., Wolpert, D.M., Mehring, C., 2009a. Learning optimal adaptation
747 strategies in unpredictable motor tasks. *J. Neurosci.* 29, 6472–6478.
748 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3075-08.2009>

749 Braun, D.A., Aertsen, A., Wolpert, D.M., Mehring, C., 2009b. Motor Task Variation Induces
750 Structural Learning. *Curr. Biol.* 19, 352–357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2009.01.036>

751 Braun, D.A., Mehring, C., Wolpert, D.M., 2010. Structure learning in action. *Behav. Brain*
752 *Res.* 206, 157–165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2009.08.031>

753 Brovelli, A., Ding, M., Ledberg, A., Chen, Y., Nakamura, R., Bressler, S.L., 2004. Beta
754 oscillations in a large-scale sensorimotor cortical network: Directional influences
755 revealed by Granger causality. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 101, 9849–9854.
756 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0308538101>

757 Brudner, S.N., Kethidi, N., Graeupner, D., Ivry, R.B., Taylor, J.A., 2016. Delayed feedback
758 during sensorimotor learning selectively disrupts adaptation but not strategy use. *J.*
759 *Neurophysiol.* 115, 1499–1511. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00066.2015>

760 Bruns, A., 2004. Fourier-, Hilbert- and wavelet-based signal analysis: Are they really different
761 approaches? *J. Neurosci. Methods* 137, 321–332.
762 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2004.03.002>

763 Christou, A.I., Miall, R.C., McNab, F., Galea, J.M., 2016. Individual differences in explicit and
764 implicit visuomotor learning and working memory capacity. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 1–13.
765 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep36633>

766 Chung, J.W., Ofori, E., Misra, G., Hess, C.W., Vaillancourt, D.E., 2017. Beta-band Activity
767 and Connectivity in Sensorimotor and Parietal Cortex are Important for Accurate Motor

768 Performance. *Neuroimage* 144, 164–173.
769 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.10.008>

770 Cohen, M.X., Elger, C.E., Fell, J., 2009. Oscillatory activity and phase-amplitude coupling in
771 the human medial frontal cortex during decision making. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 21, 390–
772 402. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2008.21020>

773 Combrisson, E., Perrone-Bertolotti, M., Soto, J.L.P., Alamian, G., Kahane, P., Lachaux, J.P.,
774 Guillot, A., Jerbi, K., 2017. From intentions to actions: Neural oscillations encode motor
775 processes through phase, amplitude and phase-amplitude coupling. *Neuroimage* 147,
776 473–487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.11.042>

777 Contreras-Vidal, J.L., Kerick, S.E., 2004. Independent component analysis of dynamic brain
778 responses during visuomotor adaptation. *Neuroimage* 21, 936–945.
779 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2003.10.037>

780 Cortes, C., Vapnik, V., 1995. Support-Vector Networks. *Mach. Learn.* 273–297.
781 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00994018>

782 Dandolo, L.C., Schwabe, L., 2019. Time-dependent motor memory representations in
783 prefrontal cortex. *Neuroimage* 197, 143–155.
784 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.04.051>

785 Delorme, A., Sejnowski, T., Makeig, S., 2007. Enhanced Detection of Artifacts in EEG Data
786 using Higher-order Statistics and Independent Component Analysis. *Neuroimage* 34,
787 1443–1449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.11.004>

788 Diedrichsen, J., Hashambhoy, Y., Rane, T., Shadmehr, R., 2005. Neural correlates of reach
789 errors. *J. Neurosci.* 25, 9919–9931. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1874-05.2005>

790 Donchin, O., Francis, J.T., Shadmehr, R., 2003. Quantifying generalization from trial-by-trial
791 behavior of adaptive systems that learn with basis functions: Theory and experiments in
792 human motor control. *J. Neurosci.* 23, 9032–9045. <https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.23->

793 27-09032.2003

794 Gentili, R.J., Bradberry, T.J., Oh, H., Hatfield, B.D., Contreras Vidal, J.L., 2011. Cerebral
795 cortical dynamics during visuomotor transformation: Adaptation to a cognitive-motor
796 executive challenge. *Psychophysiology* 48, 813–824. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2010.01143.x)
797 [8986.2010.01143.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2010.01143.x)

798 Gönen, M., Alapaydin, E., 2011. Multiple Kernel Learning Algorithms. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 12,
799 2211–2268.

800 Haith, A.M., Huberdeau, D.M., Krakauer, J.W., 2015. The influence of movement preparation
801 time on the expression of visuomotor learning and savings. *J. Neurosci.* 35, 5109–5117.
802 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3869-14.2015>

803 Hammer, J., Fischer, J., Ruescher, J., Schulze-bonhage, A., Aertsen, A., Mcfarland, D.J.,
804 2013. The role of ECoG magnitude and phase in decoding position , velocity , and
805 acceleration during continuous motor behavior. *Front. Neurosci.* 7, 200.
806 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2013.00200>

807 Haynes, J.D., 2015. A Primer on Pattern-Based Approaches to fMRI: Principles, Pitfalls, and
808 Perspectives. *Neuron* 87, 257–270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.05.025>

809 Jahani, A., Schwey, A., Bernier, P.M., Malfait, N., 2020. Spatially distinct beta-band activities
810 reflect implicit sensorimotor adaptation and explicit re-aiming strategy. *J. Neurosci.* 40,
811 2498–2509. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1862-19.2020>

812 Jerbi, K., Lachaux, J., Diaye, K.N., Pantazis, D., Leahy, R.M., Garnero, L., Baillet, S., 2007.
813 Coherent neural representation of hand speed in humans revealed by MEG imaging.
814 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 104, 7676–7681. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0609632104>

815 Kilavik, B.E., Zaepffel, M., Brovelli, A., MacKay, W.A., Riehle, A., 2013. The ups and downs
816 of beta oscillations in sensorimotor cortex. *Exp. Neurol.* 245, 15–26.
817 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.expneurol.2012.09.014>

818 Koechlin, E., 2016. Prefrontal executive function and adaptive behavior in complex
819 environments. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* 37, 1–6.
820 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2015.11.004>

821 Koechlin, E., Ody, C., Kouneiher, F., 2003. The Architecture of Cognitive Control in the
822 Human Prefrontal Cortex. *Science* (80-.). 302, 1181–1185.
823 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1088545>

824 Kriegeskorte, N., Simmons, W.K., Bellgowan, P.S.F., Baker, C.I., 2009. Circular analysis in
825 systems neuroscience – the dangers of double dipping. *Nat. Neurosci.* 12, 535–540.
826 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2303>

827 Leow, L.A., Gunn, R., Marinovic, W., Carroll, T.J., 2017. Estimating the implicit component of
828 visuomotor rotation learning by constraining movement preparation time. *J.*
829 *Neurophysiol.* 118, 666–676. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00834.2016>

830 Lisman, J.E., Jensen, O., 2013. The Theta-Gamma Neural Code, *Neuron*.
831 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2013.03.007>

832 Miller, K.J., Schalk, G., Fetz, E.E., den Nijs, M., Ojemann, J.G., Rao, R.P.N., 2010. Cortical
833 activity during motor execution, motor imagery, and imagery-based online feedback.
834 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 107, 4430–4435. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0913697107>

835 Miyamoto, Y.R., Wang, S., Smith, M.A., 2020. Implicit adaptation compensates for erratic
836 explicit strategy in human motor learning. *Nat. Neurosci.* 23, 443–455.
837 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-020-0600-3>

838 Muthukumaraswamy, S.D., 2010. Functional properties of human primary motor cortex
839 gamma oscillations. *J. Neurophysiol.* 104, 2873–2885.
840 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00607.2010>

841 Narayanan, N.S., Laubach, M., 2006. Top-down control of motor cortex ensembles by
842 dorsomedial prefrontal cortex. *Neuron* 52, 921–931.

843 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2006.10.021>

844 Noirhomme, Q., Lesenfants, D., Gomez, F., Soddu, A., Schrouff, J., Garraux, G., Luxen, A.,
845 Phillips, C., Laureys, S., 2014. Biased binomial assessment of cross-validated
846 estimation of classification accuracies illustrated in diagnosis predictions. *NeuroImage*
847 *Clin.* 4, 687–694. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2014.04.004>

848 Nowak, M., Zich, C., Stagg, C.J., 2018. Motor Cortical Gamma Oscillations: What Have We
849 Learnt and Where Are We Headed? *Curr. Behav. Neurosci. Reports* 5, 136–142.
850 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40473-018-0151-z>

851 Ojala, M., Garriga, G.C., 2010. Permutation tests for studying classifier performance. *J.*
852 *Mach. Learn. Res.* 11, 1833–1863.

853 Palmer, C.E., Auksztulewicz, R., Ondobaka, S., Kilner, J.M., 2019. Sensorimotor beta power
854 reflects the precision-weighting afforded to sensory prediction errors. *Neuroimage* 200,
855 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.06.034>

856 Pereira, F., Mitchell, T., Botvinick, M., 2009. Machine learning classifiers and fMRI: a tutorial
857 overview. *Neuroimage* 45, S199–S209.
858 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.11.007>

859 Perfetti, B., Moissello, C., Landsness, E.C., Kvint, S., Lanzafame, S., Onofri, M., Rocco, A. Di,
860 Tononi, G., Ghilardi, M.F., 2011. Modulation of Gamma and Theta Spectral Amplitude
861 and Phase Synchronization Is Associated with the Development of Visuo-Motor
862 Learning. *J. Neurosci.* 31, 14810–14819. [https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1319-](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1319-11.2011)
863 11.2011

864 Pinsard, B., Boutin, A., Gabbitov, E., Lungu, O., Benali, H., Doyon, J., 2019. Consolidation
865 alters motor sequence- specific distributed representations. *Elife* 8, 1–20.
866 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.39324>

867 Popovych, S., Rosjat, N., Toth, T.I., Wang, B.A., Liu, L., Abdollahi, R.O., Viswanathan, S.,

868 Grefkes, C., Fink, G.R., Daun, S., 2016. Movement-related phase locking in the delta–
869 theta frequency band. *Neuroimage* 139, 439–449.
870 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.06.052>

871 Rakotomamonjy, A., Bach, F.R., Canu, S., Grandvalet, Y., 2008. SimpleMKL. *J. Mach.*
872 *Learn. Res.* 9, 2491–2521.

873 Ridderinkhof, K.R., Ullsperger, M., Crone, E.A., Nieuwenhuis, S., 2004. The role of the
874 medial frontal cortex in cognitive control. *Science* (80-.). 306, 443–447.
875 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1100301>

876 Schrouff, J., Mourão-Miranda, J., Phillips, C., Parvizi, J., 2016. Decoding intracranial EEG
877 data with multiple kernel learning method. *J. Neurosci. Methods* 261, 19–28.
878 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2015.11.028>

879 Schween, R., Hegele, M., 2017. Feedback delay attenuates implicit but facilitates explicit
880 adjustments to a visuomotor rotation. *Neurobiol. Learn. Mem.* 140, 124–133.
881 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2017.02.015>

882 Shenhav, A., Cohen, J.D., Botvinick, M.M., 2016. Dorsal anterior cingulate cortex and the
883 value of control. *Nat. Neurosci.* 19, 1286–1291. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4384>

884 Sirota, A., Montgomery, S., Fujisawa, S., Isomura, Y., Zugaro, M., Buzsáki, G., 2008.
885 Entrainment of Neocortical Neurons and Gamma Oscillations by the Hippocampal Theta
886 Rhythm. *Neuron* 60, 683–697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2008.09.014>

887 Spaak, E., de Lange, F.P., 2020. Hippocampal and prefrontal theta-band mechanisms
888 underpin implicit spatial context learning. *J. Neurosci.* 40, 191–202.
889 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1660-19.2019>

890 Tan, H., Jenkinson, N., Brown, P., 2014a. Dynamic neural correlates of motor error
891 monitoring and adaptation during trial-to-trial learning. *J. Neurosci.* 34, 5678–5688.
892 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4739-13.2014>

893 Tan, H., Wade, C., Brown, P., 2016. Post-movement beta activity in sensorimotor cortex
894 indexes confidence in the estimations from internal models. *J. Neurosci.* 36, 1516–1528.
895 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3204-15.2016>

896 Tan, H., Zavala, B., Pogosyan, A., Ashkan, K., Zrinzo, L., Foltynie, T., Limousin, P., Brown,
897 P., 2014b. Human subthalamic nucleus in movement error detection and its evaluation
898 during visuomotor adaptation. *J. Neurosci.* 34, 16744–16754.
899 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3414-14.2014>

900 Taylor, J.A., Ivry, R.B., 2011. Flexible cognitive strategies during motor learning. *PLoS*
901 *Comput. Biol.* 7. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1001096>

902 Taylor, J.A., Krakauer, J.W., Ivry, R.B., 2014. Explicit and implicit contributions to learning in
903 a sensorimotor adaptation task. *J. Neurosci.* 34, 3023–3032.
904 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3619-13.2014>

905 Thürer, B., Weber, F.D., Born, J., Stein, T., 2018. Variable training but not sleep improves
906 consolidation of motor adaptation. *Sci. Rep.* 8, 15977. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-34225-w)
907 [018-34225-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-34225-w)

908 Torrecillos, F., Alayrangues, J., Kilavik, B.E., Malfait, N., 2015. Distinct modulations in
909 sensorimotor postmovement and foreperiod β -band activities related to error salience
910 processing and sensorimotor adaptation. *J. Neurosci.* 35, 12753–12765.
911 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1090-15.2015>

912 Tzagarakis, C., Ince, N.F., Leuthold, A.C., Pellizzer, G., 2010. Beta-band activity during
913 motor planning reflects response uncertainty. *J. Neurosci.* 30, 11270–11277.
914 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.6026-09.2010>

915 Voytek, B., D’Esposito, M., Crone, N., Knight, R.T., 2013. A Method for Event-related
916 Phase/Amplitude Coupling. *Neuroimage* 64, 416–424.
917 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.09.023>

918 Wolpert, D.M., Ghahramani, Z., Jordan, M.I., 1995. An Internal Model for Sensorimotor
919 Integration. *Science* (80-.). 269, 1880–1882. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7569931>

920 Wolpert, D.M., Miall, R.C., 1996. Forward Models for Physiological Motor Control. *Neural*
921 *Networks* 9, 1265–1279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0893-6080\(96\)00035-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0893-6080(96)00035-4)

922