



HAL
open science

From motivation to action: action cost better predicts changes in pre-movement beta-band activity than speed

Emeline Pierrieau, Bastien Berret, Jean-François Lepage, Pierre-Michel Bernier

► To cite this version:

Emeline Pierrieau, Bastien Berret, Jean-François Lepage, Pierre-Michel Bernier. From motivation to action: action cost better predicts changes in pre-movement beta-band activity than speed. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 2023, pp.JN-RM-0213-23. 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0213-23.2023 . hal-04154996

HAL Id: hal-04154996

<https://hal.science/hal-04154996>

Submitted on 7 Jul 2023

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.

Copyright

1 *Title:* From motivation to action: action cost better predicts changes in pre-movement beta-
2 band activity than speed

3 *Abbreviated title:* Beta activity is better explained by action cost than speed

4 *Authors:* Emeline Pierrieau ^{*1}, Bastien Berret ², Jean-François Lepage ^{1,3}, Pierre-Michel
5 Bernier ⁴.

6 *Affiliations:* ¹ Programme de Physiologie, Faculté de Médecine et des Sciences de la Santé,
7 Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Québec J1H 5N4, Canada. ² Université Paris-Saclay,
8 CIAMS, 91405 Orsay, France; CIAMS, Université d'Orléans, 45067 Orléans, France; Institut
9 Universitaire de France, Paris, France. ³ Département de Pédiatrie, Faculté de Médecine et des
10 Sciences de la Santé, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Québec J1H 5N4, Canada.

11 ⁴ Département de Kinanthropologie, Faculté des Sciences de l'Activité Physique, Université
12 de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Québec J1K 2R1, Canada.

13 *Corresponding author email:* emeline.pierrieau@[u-bordeaux.fr](mailto:emeline.pierrieau@u-bordeaux.fr)

14 *Number of pages:* 43

15 *Number of figures:* 5 *Number of tables:* 1

16 *Number of words:*

17 - *Abstract:* 249 - *Introduction:* 648 - *Discussion:* 1499

18 *Conflict of interest statement:* The authors declare no competing financial interests.

19 *Acknowledgments:* We thank François Thénault for his help in developing the scripts used for
20 the experiment and Dominique Delisle-Godin for her help in collecting data. This work was
21 supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Grant
22 418589.

23 Abstract

24 Although pre-movement beta-band event-related desynchronization (13-30 Hz; β -ERD)
25 from sensorimotor regions is modulated by movement speed, current evidence does not support
26 a strict monotonic association between the two. Given that β -ERD is thought to increase
27 information encoding capacity, we tested the hypothesis that it might be related to the expected
28 neurocomputational cost of movement, here referred to as action cost. Critically, action cost is
29 greater both for slow and fast movements as compared to a medium or “preferred” speed.
30 Thirty-one right-handed participants performed a speed-controlled reaching task while
31 recording their EEG. Results revealed potent modulations of β power as a function of speed,
32 with β -ERD being significantly greater both for movements performed at high and low speeds
33 as compared to medium speed. Interestingly, medium-speed movements were more often
34 chosen by participants than low- and high-speed movements, suggesting that they were
35 evaluated as less costly. In line with this, modeling of action cost revealed a pattern of
36 modulation across speed conditions that strikingly resembled the one found for β -ERD. Indeed,
37 linear mixed models showed that estimated action cost predicted variations of β -ERD
38 significantly better than speed. This relationship with action cost was specific to β power, as it
39 was not found when averaging activity in the mu (μ ; 8-12 Hz) and gamma (γ ; 31-49 Hz) bands.
40 These results demonstrate that increasing β -ERD may not merely speed up movements, but
41 instead facilitate the preparation of high- and low-speed movements through the allocation of
42 additional neural resources, thereby enabling flexible motor control.

43

44 Significance statement

45 Heightened β activity has been associated with movement slowing in Parkinson's
46 disease and modulations of β activity are commonly used to decode movement parameters in
47 brain-computer interfaces. Here we show that pre-movement β activity is better explained by
48 the neurocomputational cost of the action rather than its speed. Instead of being interpreted as
49 a mere reflection of changes in movement speed, pre-movement changes in β activity might
50 therefore be used to infer the amount of neural resources that are allocated for motor planning.

51 Introduction

52 Unveiling the neurophysiological basis and functional role of brain activity in the beta-
53 band (β ; 13-30 Hz) is of particular interest to basic motor control scientists as well as clinicians
54 because of its characteristic pattern of modulation with movement, described as event-related
55 desynchronization (ERD; Pfurtscheller and Lopes da Silva, 1999), and its specific alteration in
56 neurological disorders such as Parkinson's disease (PD; Jenkinson and Brown, 2011). Although
57 numerous studies have attempted to link these movement-related changes in β power to
58 behavior, the evidence so far has been inconsistent, making its functional interpretation still an
59 area of active debate (Engel and Fries, 2010; Brittain and Brown, 2014; Spitzer and Haegens,
60 2017).

61 β power has often been related to motor activity: the amplitude of β -ERD has been
62 positively correlated with corticospinal excitability (Takemi et al, 2013) and with the activation
63 level of the sensorimotor cortex (Yuan et al, 2010), and β power from local field potentials of
64 the subthalamic nucleus has been related to the encoding of motor effort (Tan et al, 2015).
65 Furthermore, non-invasive neurostimulation studies have shown that specifically increasing β -
66 band activity tends to decrease movement speed (Pogosyan et al., 2009; Wach et al, 2013). The
67 most striking evidence of a significant association between β power and movement speed comes
68 from patients suffering from PD. PD is notably characterized by motor symptoms such as
69 bradykinesia (i.e., movement slowing; Bloem et al., 2021). β power is increased in PD, and can
70 be attenuated with treatments (Kühn et al., 2006; Ray et al., 2008). The greater the decrease in
71 β power, the greater the improvement in bradykinesia (Jenkinson and Brown, 2011), making β
72 power a promising therapeutic target. Although PD treatment most often targets β power at the
73 subcortical level, there is evidence of abnormalities in cortical β power as well, such as an
74 attenuation of pre-movement β -ERD (Heinrichs-Graham et al., 2014). Still, the relationship

75 between β power and movement speed does not appear monotonic, as several studies have
76 reported no significant difference in β -ERD between slow and fast movements (Stancák and
77 Pfurtscheller, 1995; Zhang et al., 2020; see Kilavik et al., 2013 for a review).

78 From a functional perspective, several studies have provided evidence in favor of a
79 specific role of β activity in regulating computational power through (de)synchronization of
80 neuronal populations within sensorimotor regions (Brittain et al, 2014), being proposed to be
81 related to top-down interactions (Fries, 2015) and expressing the influence of priors on newly
82 formed neuronal assemblies (Betti et al, 2021). Put another way, β power would decrease in
83 order to augment neurocomputational power required for information processing (Brittain and
84 Brown, 2014), as exemplified by greater β -ERD when increasing cognitive demand during
85 motor planning (Grent-'t-Jong et al., 2013; Wiesman et al., 2020). One intriguing conjecture is
86 that β -ERD amplitude may increase as a function of the neurocomputational cost of the
87 movement being prepared, referred to herein as action cost. Action cost can be represented as
88 the sum of a biomechanical cost, which increases with movement speed, and a temporal cost,
89 which decreases with movement speed (Berret and Jean, 2016; Shadmehr et al., 2016). This
90 leads to a u-shaped action cost function, the minimal value of which has been shown to predict
91 the preferred speed of participants in various motor contexts (Berret and Jean, 2016). According
92 to this hypothesis, β -ERD amplitude would thus vary non-monotonically with movement speed,
93 being greater both for slow and fast movements in comparison to movements performed at
94 medium (i.e., near-preferred) speed.

95 We tested this hypothesis by using a speed-controlled reaching paradigm while applying
96 computational modeling to estimate the associated action cost. Results revealed that β -ERD
97 amplitude varied non-monotonically with movement speed, in a manner that was strikingly well
98 predicted by estimated action cost. These results invite to rethink the interpretation of β power

99 as a marker of cortical resources allocated for movement instead of a mere correlate of
100 movement kinematics such as speed.

101

102 Materials and methods

103 1. Participants

104 Thirty-one participants (15 females, 23 ± 3 (mean \pm SD) years old) were recruited for this
105 study. All of them were right-handed based on self-report. They had normal or corrected-to-
106 normal vision and were free of any known neurological or psychiatric condition. All
107 participants gave their informed written consent and received a 30\$ CAD compensation. All
108 procedures were approved by the local ethics committee. The experiment conformed to the
109 standards set by the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki.

110 2. Experimental task

111 2.1. Setup

112 The experimental setup consisted of a table supporting a 20-inch computer monitor that
113 projected visual stimuli onto a mirror positioned horizontally in front of the participants. The
114 monitor (Dell P1130 20-inch monitor; resolution: 1024×768 ; refresh rate: 150 Hz) was
115 mounted face down 29 cm above the mirror with the latter positioned 29 cm above the table
116 surface. Participants' movements were recorded with an acquisition frequency of 100 Hz, using
117 a two-joint manipulandum composed of two lightweight metal rods with a potentiometer at the
118 hinges of the manipulandum. Participants performed their movements by grasping a handle
119 located at the mobile end of the manipulandum with their right hand and sliding it over the
120 table. The position of the handle (and thus participants' hand) was shown to participants using
121 a cursor on the monitor. This provided constant visual feedback of participants' hand position,
122 similar to a computer mouse. A 64-electrode actiCAP (extended 10/20 system, Brain Products)
123 was positioned on participants' head to record scalp electroencephalography (EEG). This was
124 done by measuring the head dimensions in the sagittal and frontal planes to localize the vertex

125 and positioning the reference electrode (FCz) over it. The EEG data were acquired using the
126 BrainVision Recorder software 2.0 (Brain Products) with a sampling rate of 500 Hz.

127 2.2. Overview

128 Participants were seated in front of the table and asked to reach a visual target (cyan-
129 filled circle, diameter = 3 cm) with their right hand. Visual stimuli were presented using
130 Psychtoolbox on MATLAB (MathWorks). Trials were initiated by placing the cursor (white
131 filled circle, diameter = 0.6 cm) on a starting point (light gray filled circle, diameter = 0.6 cm)
132 located at the center of the screen. Participants were told to place their chin on a small support,
133 to keep their right arm in contact with the surface of the table, and to minimize postural changes
134 during the experiment. The target was presented either on the right side of the screen (60° , Rt)
135 at a distance of 10 cm from the starting point, or on the left side of the screen (150° , Lt) 6 cm
136 away from the starting point. These positions were chosen to ensure that the maximal peak
137 velocity participants could reach was significantly different for each target. Indeed, maximal
138 peak velocity increases with distance (Gottlieb et al., 1989) as well as with the biomechanical
139 constraints of the movement (Gordon et al., 1994). The biomechanical constraints of a reaching
140 movement depend upon movement direction and can be represented as an ellipse of mobility
141 of the arm, due to changes in its effective mass because of its inertial properties (Shadmehr et
142 al., 2016). The major axis of the ellipse of mobility corresponds to the directions associated
143 with the lowest effective mass of the arm, and thus the easiest and fastest to reach. Conversely,
144 the minor axis of the ellipse corresponds to the directions in which the effective mass of the
145 arm is the highest, resulting in more difficult and slower movements. In the present task, Rt was
146 located on the major axis and Lt on the minor axis. Hence, maximal velocity was expected to
147 be significantly higher for movements oriented toward Rt than Lt.

148 2.3. Trial timeline

149 Trial timeline is illustrated on Figure 1A. Trials started with the display of a white
150 fixation cross (1.1 x 1.1 cm) 4 cm above the starting point on the screen. Once the cursor was
151 placed on the starting point, participants were required to keep their gaze on the fixation cross
152 for the entire trial duration. They were also asked to minimize eye blinks until they reached the
153 target to avoid artifacts in the EEG signal during the period of interest. After a 2 s delay, the
154 target appeared on the screen. A gauge (6.6 x 1.3 cm) centered on the fixation cross appeared
155 simultaneously to the target. The filling level of the gauge was informative of the speed at which
156 participants would have to perform their movement toward the target: one-quarter filling
157 indicated a slow speed (Low), half filling a medium speed (Med), and three-quarter filling a
158 fast speed (High) (see Figure 1B and next section for details about speed requirements). An
159 auditory go cue occurred 2 s after target and gauge appearance, signaling that the movement
160 could be initiated. Participants were asked to start their movement quickly after they heard the
161 go cue. If participants initiated their movement before the go cue, an error message was
162 displayed for 1 s (“false start”) and the trial was automatically re-run. Once the movement
163 ended, all stimuli disappeared and were replaced by visual feedback of whether the speed
164 criterion was reached or not in the form of a message (“well done!” if the speed criterion was
165 attained, or the difference in cm/s between the peak velocity reached during the trial and the
166 speed criterion if it was not attained). Movements were required to end inside the chosen target
167 to ensure accuracy and thus comparability of trials across conditions. In case the target was
168 missed, an error message was displayed for 1 s (“target missed”) and the trial was re-run.
169 Whatever the visual feedback, it was replaced after 1 s by the appearance of the white fixation
170 cross with the starting point and the cursor. The next trial started when the cursor was placed
171 inside of the starting point. Participants were encouraged to take a break between trials by not
172 immediately replacing the cursor inside of the starting point if they felt the need to move their
173 eyes, head or body, or if they wanted to rest for a few seconds. The experiment was organized

174 in 4 blocks of 60 trials, which comprised 2 blocks of trials requiring movements toward Rt, and
175 2 blocks of movements directed to Lt. The speed conditions varied pseudo-randomly
176 throughout trials in one block so that a same speed condition was not presented twice in a row
177 and each block comprised 20 trials of each speed condition.

178 Participants familiarized with the experimental task and their maximal speeds were
179 estimated before doing the trials described above. Participants first performed 10 movements
180 toward each target at a comfortable pace, organized in blocks of 5 trials presented in an
181 alternating order (5 Rt trials, 5 Lt trials, 5 Rt trials and 5 Lt trials), to familiarize with the setup.
182 Then, they performed 60 trials in which they were asked to reach the presented target as fast as
183 possible (30 Rt trials followed by 30 Lt trials) to estimate their maximal speeds. Rt and Lt trials
184 were separated by a short break that ended when participants felt rested, to avoid an effect of
185 physical fatigue on motor performance (even though fatigue was also minimized on a single-
186 trial basis by allowing participants to delay the start of the next trial by not immediately placing
187 their cursor inside of the starting point as previously explained). Finally, participants
188 familiarized with the different speed criteria by performing trials in each speed condition. More
189 precisely, trials from a given speed condition were repeated until achieving the correct speed
190 five times (not necessarily back-to-back). All of these familiarization and “maximal speed”
191 trials were organized the same way as those in the main experiment, except that no gauge was
192 displayed in the first familiarization and maximal speed trials.

193 2.4. Experimental conditions and their related hypotheses

194 Speed criteria were defined in order to create conditions requiring different peak velocities
195 but similar relative effort (i.e., difference from maximal peak velocity). 6 velocity criteria (2
196 Targets x 3 Gauges) were used in total: for movements toward Rt 120 cm/s when the gauge had
197 a three-quarter filling (HighRt), 95 cm/s when the gauge was half-filled (MedRt), and 70 cm/s

198 when the gauge had a one-quarter filling (LowRt); for movements toward Lt 60 cm/s when the
199 gauge had a three-quarter filling (HighLt), 40 cm/s when the gauge as half-filled (MedLt) and
200 20 cm/s when the gauge had a one-quarter filling (LowLt) (Figure 1B). During trials, these
201 speed criteria were considered as attained if the peak velocity of the movement was comprised
202 in an interval of ± 5 cm/s centered on the speed criterion of the corresponding condition. In
203 addition, to ensure significant differences in movement speed across conditions, these criteria
204 were set so that the High speed criteria was to be close to the maximal speed participants could
205 reach for each target considering differences in amplitude and inertial anisotropy (Gordon et
206 al., 1994; Shadmehr et al., 2016). To verify this assumption, participants were first asked to
207 perform 30 reaching movements toward each target as fast as possible ("maximal speed" trials
208 defined before) and the average maximal peak velocity was then compared to the average peak
209 velocity in High trials a posteriori (see Results section). Therefore, the present design allowed
210 to test the respective influences of speed and effort on β power. Indeed, if β power is influenced
211 by absolute movement speed, then both an effect of Gauge and Target should be expected
212 considering that the two factors significantly influence peak velocities (Figure 1C, left panel),
213 whereas if β power is influenced by the movement speed relative to its maximal value as a
214 measure of expected effort (Tan et al., 2015), then only a significant effect of Gauge should be
215 found in spite of the significantly different speed ranges reached for each target (Figure 1C,
216 middle panel). Finally, modeling work has demonstrated that optimal/preferred movement
217 speed could be selected based on the joint minimization of a trajectory or metabolic cost that
218 increases as movement speed increases, and of a cost of time that increases as movement speed
219 decreases (Berret and Jean, 2016). Based on this model, the relationship between movement
220 speed and action cost is not linear but instead follows a u-shaped curve. As a consequence, β
221 power may vary non-linearly with speed, and therefore decrease in High and Low conditions
222 as compared to Med (Figure 1C, right panel).

223

[Insert Figure 1]

224 3. Data analysis

225 3.1. Behavior

226 Hand position was estimated in real-time with the coordinates of the cursor recorded
227 with the two potentiometers located on the manipulandum. Recorded signals were sampled at
228 100 Hz and were low-pass filtered at 10 Hz using a second-order Butterworth filter. Real-time
229 velocities were determined for each trial using numerical differentiation. The maximal value of
230 these real-time velocities was considered as the peak velocity. Movement onset was defined as
231 the first time point at which velocity exceeded 5% of the peak velocity and movement end as
232 the first time point at which velocity fell below 5% of this same peak velocity (Berret and Jean,
233 2016). RTs were calculated as the latency separating the auditory go cue and movement onset,
234 and MTs as the latency separating movement onset and movement end. Trials in which the
235 cursor was located outside of the presented target at the time of movement end were considered
236 as missed-target trials and were not included in the analysis (representing 2.35% trials). In the
237 same vein, trials in which participants initiated their movement before the go cue occurred were
238 removed from the analysis (representing 1.06% trials). Note that removing those trials did not
239 affect the number of trials per condition included in the analysis because, as previously
240 mentioned, any missed target or false start was automatically re-run during the experiment.

241 3.2. EEG

242 All EEG data were processed offline using custom MATLAB codes and functions from
243 EEGLAB (Delorme and Makeig, 2004) and Fieldtrip (Oostenveld et al., 2011). First, a
244 bandpass filter between 1 and 80 Hz was applied on raw EEG data, with a 59–61 Hz notch filter
245 to attenuate electrical noise. The signal was re-referenced to the average scalp potential. The

246 data were then segmented into epochs of 4.5 s duration locked around the occurrence of the
247 auditory go cue (3 s before to 1.5 s after go cue). The period of interest corresponded to the 2 s
248 delay separating stimuli onset (i.e., target and gauge appearance) and the go cue. Independent
249 component analysis (ICA) was applied to EEG data using the runica algorithm from the
250 EEGLAB toolbox, in order to remove artifactual EEG activity associated with eye and head
251 movements and other sources of noise (Jung et al., 2000). A surface Laplacian transform was
252 applied on the EEG data with artifactual components removed, using the erplab plugin from
253 EEGLAB. The EEG signal was then downsampled to 125 Hz to reduce computation time for
254 time–frequency decomposition. The latter was performed afterward, using Morlet wavelets (4–
255 45 Hz with 1 Hz steps). The wavelet cycles were increased at each frequency in 0.1 steps
256 (starting from 3 to 10.6 cycles) to ensure a balance between sufficient temporal resolution at
257 lower frequencies and frequency resolution at higher frequencies. Finally, the data were
258 normalized for each condition by measuring the absolute change from the average power during
259 the 500 ms preceding the delay period (0.5 to 1 s of the total epoch). The amplitude of β -ERD
260 was quantified as the absolute value of average β power recorded during the delay period
261 separating the stimulus onset and the auditory go cue.

262 3.3. Action cost modeling

263 Action costs were computed from the sum of estimated trajectory cost and cost of time
264 following the method of Berret and Jean (2016). In short, the trajectory cost was based on the
265 distance to the target, the joint torque and the hand jerk. It thus reflects accuracy, smoothness,
266 and effort aspects of the reaching movement, and depends on task parameters (e.g., angle and
267 amplitude of the presented target, anthropometry, starting position of the arm). In contrast, the
268 cost of time rests on the quantification of the affine relationship between movement amplitude
269 and duration that is characteristic of self-paced reaching movements and hence can be inferred

270 from experimental data (see Methods section of Berret and Jean, 2016 for details). Therefore,
271 the model enables the computation of action cost as a function of movement duration. The
272 “optimal” MT (i.e., the one associated with the lowest action cost) is supposed to predict the
273 average MT in a context where participants perform self-paced movements, corresponding to
274 their “preferred” MT. Here, because there was no self-paced reaching condition, the slope of
275 this relationship was retrieved from the data of Young et al. (2009), who used a similar reaching
276 task with high temporal constraints. The intercept was adjusted to predict the average MT found
277 in Med, separately for movements directed to Rt and Lt. In other words, the cost of time was
278 set based on a movement duration-amplitude relationship that predicted MTs corresponding to
279 the ones found in Med at the amplitude used in the present experimental task. Average MTs in
280 Med were selected because analysis of participants’ speed distributions in the task showed that
281 average speeds that were the most often chosen (thereby the closest estimates of “preferred”
282 speeds) were not significantly different from average speeds in Med, both for movements
283 directed to Rt and Lt (see Results). Peak velocities associated with MTs toward each target were
284 computed from the predicted optimal velocity profiles, which were bell-shaped similarly to
285 minimum jerk profiles (Flash and Hogan, 1985; Shadmehr et al., 2016). Action costs were
286 therefore estimated both as a function of MTs and their associated peak velocities, and then
287 normalized between 0 and 1 across velocity ranges centered on the minimal value of the cost
288 functions (i.e., estimated preferred/optimal peak velocity), separately for movements directed
289 to Lt and Rt. These velocity ranges were set to include all measured peak velocity values toward
290 each target.

291 3.4. Experimental design and statistical analyses

292 An intra-participant design was used, so that all the factors included in the statistical
293 analyses were within-participant. 2 x 3 repeated-measures ANOVAs were performed using

294 Target (Rt, Lt) and Gauge (Low, Med, High) as factors on peak velocities, RTs, MTs, absolute
295 error (i.e., average distance between movement endpoint and target center), standard deviation
296 of the absolute error, probability of reaching the speed criterion, as well as β , μ and γ power
297 and estimated action costs. Additional analyses with ANOVAs including Target, Gauge and
298 Block (1 and 2) as factors were conducted to assess whether the main results remained
299 throughout blocks of trials. Action costs were estimated based on average peak velocities across
300 participants and conditions (Gauge), separately for the two target positions (Target) that were
301 used because a distinct model was fitted to each of them (see previous section), considering that
302 maximal and preferred speeds differed across targets (see Results section). T-tests were used
303 for post-hoc analysis, with a Bonferroni correction applied to p-values for multiple
304 comparisons. Effect sizes are reported as partial eta squared (η^2p) for ANOVAs and Cohen's d
305 (d) for t-tests. Cluster-based permutation tests were performed to identify electrodes associated
306 with significant modulations of β , μ and γ power across experimental conditions using functions
307 from Fieldtrip (Oostenveld et al., 2011). Monte Carlo permutations ($n = 1000$) were used to
308 determine p-values for each cluster. A cluster-level correction was set to control for multiple
309 comparisons, using the sum of t-values. A cluster was defined as at least two neighboring
310 electrodes (located less than 4 cm from each other) showing statistically significant t-values.
311 General linear mixed models (GLMMs) were used to evaluate which of peak velocity or
312 estimated action cost best explained the variance in β power. Probability density functions of
313 distributions of peak velocities were estimated using kernel distributions (*ksdensity()* command
314 in Matlab), separately for each target and participant. Kernel distributions are non-parametric
315 representations of probability density distributions, and are thus suited to estimate probability
316 density distributions from multimodal distributions such as the ones that were expected from
317 the experimental manipulation of peak velocities in the present task. Average estimated

318 preferred peak velocities were computed as the mean of the peak velocities corresponding to
319 the maximal probability density functions across participants, separately for each target.

320 All statistical tests were computed using Jamovi v. 1.2.27 (the jamovi project, 2019,
321 computer software, retrieved from <https://www.jamovi.org>), a software that implements R
322 statistical language (R Core Team, 2018, R: a language and environment for statistical
323 computing, computer software, retrieved from <https://www.cran.r-project.org/>).

324 Results

325 Briefly, the experimental task consisted of presenting a target along with a gauge, indicating
326 where to reach and at which speed. The visual stimuli appearance was followed by a delay
327 period before the occurrence of an auditory go cue (Figure 1A). Two different target positions
328 (Target: Rt, Lt) and three different filling levels of the gauge (Gauge: Low, Med, High) were
329 used across trials. Critically, each filling level of the gauge was associated with a different speed
330 criterion based on peak velocity values. These speed criteria were set so that the speed required
331 for the highest filling of the gauge (High) was close to the maximal speed participants could
332 reach for movements directed to each target separately (see Figure 1B for a summary of the
333 experimental conditions and their associated speed criterion and Methods section for details).
334 This experimental design allowed to test three main hypotheses about the association between
335 β -ERD and speed: if β -ERD is modulated as a function of absolute speed, then main effects of
336 both Target and Gauge should be expected considering the distinct speeds reached across
337 conditions (Figure 1C, left panel). Alternatively, if β -ERD is modulated as a function of speed
338 relative to its maximum, only a main effect of Gauge should be observed (Figure 1C, middle
339 panel). Finally, if β -ERD is modulated by action cost instead of speed, only a main effect of
340 Gauge should be expected and β -ERD should be increased in both Low and High as compared
341 to Med given that increasing and decreasing speed represents an additional cost (Figure 1C,
342 right panel, see Methods for details).

343 1. Movement speed

344 The first part of the analysis consisted in verifying that movement speed was effectively
345 modulated in the present task. Peak velocities were indeed strongly influenced both by Target
346 ($F(1,30) = 2264, p < 10^{-10}, \eta^2p = 0.99$) and Gauge ($F(2,60) = 843, p < 10^{-10}, \eta^2p = 0.97$) with a
347 significant interaction between the two ($F(2,60) = 140, p < 10^{-10}, \eta^2p = 0.82$). Post-hoc analysis

348 showed that peak velocities were significantly increased when comparing MedRt to LowRt
349 ($t(30) = 25.7, p < 10^{-10}, d = 4.62$) and HighRt to MedRt ($t(30) = 18.0, p < 10^{-10}, d = 3.23$), as
350 well as when comparing MedLt to LowLt ($t(30) = 27.0, p < 10^{-10}, d = 4.85$) and HighLt to
351 MedLt ($t(30) = 17.8, p < 10^{-10}, d = 3.20$). The effect of Target on peak velocities was also strong,
352 with significant increases found when comparing LowRt to LowLt ($t(30) = 34.6, p < 10^{-10}, d =$
353 6.22), MedRt to MedLt ($t(30) = 39.1, p < 10^{-10}, d = 7.02$) and HighRt to HighLt ($t(30) = 51.2,$
354 $p < 10^{-10}, d = 9.20$). The average peak velocities were as follows: 71.0 ± 8.0 cm/s for LowRt,
355 97.0 ± 8.1 cm/s for MedRt, 124.4 ± 9.4 cm/s for HighRt, 24.0 ± 8.0 cm/s for LowLt, 42.4 ± 6.3
356 cm/s for MedLt and 58.4 ± 6.2 cm/s for HighLt (Figures 2A and 2B).

357 Separating data across blocks (2 levels: Block 1 and Block 2) does not significantly change
358 this result. Indeed, this additional analysis showed significant effects of Target ($F(1,30) =$
359 $2264.4, p < 10^{-15}, \eta^2p = 0.99$) and Gauge ($F(1,30) = 842.9, p < 10^{-15}, \eta^2p = 0.97$) but not of
360 Block ($F(1,30) = 0.0, p = 0.862, \eta^2p = 0.00$). Significant interactions were found between
361 Target and Gauge ($F(2,60) = 139.9, p < 10^{-15}, \eta^2p = 0.82$) as well as Gauge and Block ($F(2,60)$
362 $= 7.5, p = 0.001, \eta^2p = 0.20$), but no interaction was found between Target and Block ($F(1,30)$
363 $= 0.2, p = 0.662, \eta^2p = 0.01$), nor Target, Gauge and Block ($F(2,60) = 2.4, p = 0.100, \eta^2p =$
364 0.07). Post-hoc analysis of the interaction between Gauge and Block revealed that peak velocity
365 was slightly increased in High in Block 2 as compared to Block 1 ($t(30) = 3.2, p = 0.010, d =$
366 0.57) by 1.89 ± 1.21 cm/s (mean \pm 95% CI). No significant difference in peak velocity between
367 Block 1 and Block 2 was found in Med ($t(30) = 0.7, p = 1.00, d = 0.12$) nor in Low ($t(30) = 2.2,$
368 $p = 0.117, d = 0.39$). Although participants appear to have increased their speed in High in
369 Block 2 as compared to Block 1, this effect appeared relatively modest considering the speed
370 difference induced (less than 2 cm/s) in comparison to the speed difference between conditions
371 (around 10 times greater; mean difference of 22.2 cm/s between Low and Med and 21.7 cm/s
372 between Med and High).

373 The probability of performing the movement within the speed criteria was strongly
374 impacted by Target ($F(1,30) = 68.9$, $p = 10^{-9}$, $\eta^2p = 0.70$) and to a lesser extent by Gauge
375 ($F(2,60) = 4.9$, $p = 0.011$, $\eta^2p = 0.14$) and there was no significant interaction between the two
376 ($F(2,60) = 2.6$, $p = 0.085$, $\eta^2p = 0.08$). Post-hoc analysis revealed that the probability of
377 reaching the speed criterion was higher for movements directed to Lt than Rt ($t(30) = 8.3$, $p =$
378 10^{-9} , $d = 1.49$) and for movements performed in High than Low, though with a lower effect size
379 ($t(30) = 2.7$, $p = 0.030$, $d = 0.49$). No significant difference in the probability of achieving the
380 speed criteria was found between Low and Med ($t(30) = 1.6$, $p = 0.369$, $d = 0.29$), or between
381 Med and High ($t(30) = 1.8$, $p = 0.240$, $d = 0.33$).

382 Participants were first asked to perform their movements at maximal speed to ensure that
383 their average maximal speeds for movements directed to each target were close to the speed
384 criteria used in High conditions (see Methods for details). The analysis of these trials confirmed
385 that maximal peak velocities were significantly greater for movements directed to Rt in
386 comparison to movements directed to Lt ($t(30) = 23.5$, $p < 10^{-10}$, $d = 4.23$). The average maximal
387 peak velocity found for movements directed to Lt was not significantly different from the
388 average peak velocity in HighLt ($t(30) = 0.2$, $p = 1.0$, $d = 0.04$, mean difference = 0.2 cm/s,
389 $BF_{10} = 0.20 \pm 0.03$, moderate evidence for H0). However, the average maximal peak velocity
390 found for movements toward Rt were slightly but significantly lower than the average velocity
391 in HighRt ($t(30) = -3.0$, $p = 0.010$; $d = -0.54$; mean difference = -8.8 cm/s, $BF_{10} = 7.80 \pm 1.42e-$
392 6 , moderate evidence for H1). This suggests that the velocity criteria used in HighRt and HighLt
393 were close to the maximal speed participants could reach for movements directed toward those
394 targets but might have been more challenging for HighRt because its velocity criterion slightly
395 exceeded the maximal speed expressed by participants.

396 As could be expected from these results, overall response time was significantly impacted
397 by manipulations of peak velocities. Indeed, a significant influence of Target was found on
398 MTs ($F(1,30) = 123.8, p < 10^{-10}, \eta^2p = 0.80$) as well as a significant influence of Gauge ($F(2,60)$
399 $= 164.2, p < 10^{-10}, \eta^2p = 0.85$) and an interaction between the two ($F(2,60) = 64.3, p < 10^{-10},$
400 $\eta^2p = 0.68$). Post-hoc analysis showed similar results as for peak velocities with increased MTs
401 in LowRt as compared to MedRt ($t(30) = 16.9, p < 10^{-10}, d = 3.03$) and in MedRt as compared
402 to HighRt ($t(30) = 12.0, p < 10^{-10}, d = 2.16$), as well as in LowLt as compared to MedLt ($t(30)$
403 $= 10.1, p = 10^{-10}, d = 1.81$) and in MedLt as compared to HighLt ($t(30) = 13.5, p < 10^{-10}, d =$
404 2.43). MTs were also significantly increased in LowLt as compared to LowRt ($t(30) = 9.4, p <$
405 $10^{-9}, d = 1.69$), in MedLt as compared to MedRt ($t(30) = 13.1, p < 10^{-10}, d = 2.35$) and in HighLt
406 as compared to HighRt ($t(30) = 11.6, p < 10^{-10}, d = 2.08$; Figure 2C).

407 In contrast, RTs were not significantly impacted by Target ($F(1,30) = 0.1, p = 0.794, \eta^2p =$
408 0.00) but by Gauge ($F(2,60) = 17.0, p = 10^{-6}, \eta^2p = 0.36$) with a significant interaction between
409 the two ($F(2,60) = 6.4, p = 0.003, \eta^2p = 0.18$). Post-hoc analysis showed that RTs were
410 significantly increased in Low as compared to High ($t(30) = 4.4, p = 10^{-4}, d = 0.79$) and Med
411 ($t(30) = 3.1, p = 0.014, d = 0.55$), and in Med as compared to High ($t(30) = 5.9, p = 10^{-5}, d =$
412 1.06). The interaction effect comes from the fact that the difference in RTs between movements
413 directed to Rt and Lt tended to change with the filling of the gauge but remained non
414 significantly different across Gauge levels (LowRt vs LowLt: $t(30) = -1.8, p = 0.258, d = -0.32$;
415 MedRt vs MedLt: $t(30) = 1.2, p = 0.771, d = 0.21$; HighRt vs HighLt: $t(30) = 0.3, p = 1.0, d =$
416 0.05 ; Figure 2D).

417 Finally, the absolute error (i.e., average distance between movement endpoint and target
418 center) was significantly higher for movements directed to Rt as compared to movements
419 directed to Lt (main effect: $F(1,30) = 33.4, p = 10^{-6}, \eta^2p = 0.53$; post-hoc: $t(30) = 5.8, p = 10^{-$

420 ⁶, $d = 1.04$) and was increased in High in comparison to both Med and Low (main effect: $F(2,60)$
421 $= 25.4$, $p = 10^{-8}$, $\eta^2p = 0.46$; post-hoc: High vs Low: $t(30) = 5.7$, $p = 10^{-5}$, $d = 1.03$; High vs
422 Med: $t(30) = 6.0$, $p = 10^{-5}$, $d = 1.07$; Med vs Low: $t(30) = 1.7$, $p = 0.318$, $d = 0.30$) without
423 significant interaction between Target and Gauge ($F(2,60) = 1.5$, $p = 0.225$, $\eta^2p = 0.05$). The
424 standard deviation of the absolute error showed similar trends by monotonically increasing with
425 speed (Target/main effect: $F(1,30) = 40.9$, $p = 10^{-7}$, $\eta^2p = 0.58$; Target/post-hoc: Rt vs Lt:
426 $t(30) = 6.4$, $p = 10^{-7}$, $d = 1.15$; Gauge/main effect: $F(2,60) = 28.9$, $p = 10^{-9}$, $\eta^2p = 0.49$;
427 Gauge/post-hoc: High vs Low: $t(30) = 8.2$, $p = 10^{-8}$, $d = 1.47$; High vs Med: $t(30) = 3.4$, $p =$
428 0.006 , $d = 0.61$; Med vs Low: $t(30) = 4.1$, $p = 0.001$, $d = 0.73$; Target*Gauge: $F(2,60) = 0.2$, $p =$
429 0.853 , $\eta^2p = 0.01$). Critically, these differences in movement accuracy had little impact on
430 task performance as the diameter of the target was set relatively large (3 cm) so that participants
431 failed to end their movements inside of the target in only 2.35 % of trials, which were removed
432 from the analysis and re-run (see Methods for details).

433 **[Insert Figure 2]**

434

435 2. β power

436 Cluster-based permutation tests comparing the fastest (HighRt) to the slowest (LowLt)
437 conditions revealed a significant negative cluster ($t_{\text{sum}} = -4478.5$, $p = 0.001$) 1.4 s to 0 s before
438 the go cue. As can be seen in Figure 3A, the cluster appeared over the left fronto-central scalp
439 sites, centered around electrodes C3, C1, FC3 and FC1. Given that motor β -ERD is commonly
440 quantified around these electrodes (e.g., Fischer et al., 2018; Haddix et al., 2021; Chen and
441 Kwak, 2022), as they overlay (pre)motor regions (Scrivener et al., 2021), β -ERD was computed
442 as the mean signal from those four electrodes. The visual depiction of the time course of β

443 power indeed showed distinct modulations across conditions during the delay period preceding
444 the go cue (Figure 3B). Conducting similar cluster-based permutation tests on mu (μ ; 8-12 Hz)
445 and gamma (γ ; 31-49 Hz) power revealed a significant negative cluster for μ power ($t_{\text{sum}} = -$
446 4478.5, $p = 0.001$) centered around similar electrodes as for β power, though larger in size (CPz,
447 CP1, CP3, Cz, C1, C3, FCz, FC1, FC3), but no significant cluster was found for γ power (t_{sum}
448 < 221.5 , $p > 0.084$).

449 These modulations were first quantified by averaging β -ERD over the entire delay period
450 (-2 s to 0 s before go cue). The analysis revealed that the amplitude of β -ERD during the delay
451 period was significantly influenced by Gauge ($F(2,60) = 7.7$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta^2p = 0.20$) but not by
452 Target ($F(1,30) = 0.8$, $p = 0.368$, $\eta^2p = 0.03$), without any significant interaction between the
453 two factors ($F(2,60) = 1.4$, $p = 0.265$, $\eta^2p = 0.04$). Post-hoc analysis revealed that the amplitude
454 of β -ERD was significantly smaller for Med as compared to both Low ($t(30) = -3.1$, $p = 0.014$,
455 $d = -0.55$) and High ($t(30) = -3.4$, $p = 0.006$, $d = -0.61$) but was not significantly different
456 between Low and High ($t(30) = -1.0$, $p = 1.0$, $d = -0.17$) (Figure 3C, left panel). Note that β -
457 ERD was computed by simply subtracting the average β power during a pre-cue baseline period
458 (see Methods for details) to minimize transformation of the EEG signal, but other baseline
459 corrections, such as percent signal change as proposed by Pfurtscheller and Lopes da Silva
460 (1999) led to similar results (main effect of Target: $F(1,30) = 1.5$, $p = 0.225$, $\eta^2p = 0.05$; main
461 effect of Gauge: $F(2,60) = 18.6$, $p = 10^{-6}$, $\eta^2p = 0.38$; interaction effect Target*Gauge: $F(2,60)$
462 $= 1.3$, $p = 0.276$, $\eta^2p = 0.04$).

463 Interestingly, this Gauge effect was specific to modulations of β power as it was not found
464 for μ power (Target: $F(1,30) = 0.1$, $p = 0.718$, $\eta^2p = 0.00$; Gauge: $F(2,60) = 2.7$, $p = 0.078$,
465 $\eta^2p = 0.08$; Target*Gauge: $F(2,60) = 0.5$, $p = 0.621$, $\eta^2p = 0.02$), or for γ power (Target:

466 $F(1,30) = 0.9, p = 0.355, \eta^2p = 0.03$; Gauge: $F(2,60) = 1.8, p = 0.181, \eta^2p = 0.06$;
467 Target*Gauge: $F(2,60) = 2.0, p = 0.141, \eta^2p = 0.06$).

468 As the modulations of β power could have differently evolved across conditions throughout
469 a trial, a second analysis was run on the amplitude of β -ERD averaged over 500 ms temporal
470 windows, ranging from 2 to 0 s before go cue, therefore adding a Time factor to the analysis.
471 Consistent with the first analysis, neither a significant effect of Target was detected ($F(1,30) =$
472 $0.8, p = 0.367, \eta^2p = 0.03$), nor interactions between Target and Gauge ($F(2,60) = 1.3, p = 0.270,$
473 $\eta^2p = 0.04$), Target and Time ($F(3,90) = 1.0, p = 0.412, \eta^2p = 0.03$) and Target, Gauge and Time
474 ($F(6,180) = 1.6, p = 0.141, \eta^2p = 0.05$). However, consistent with the first analysis, significant
475 effects of Gauge ($F(2,60) = 7.6, p = 0.001, \eta^2p = 0.20$), Time ($F(3,90) = 25.6, p < 10^{-10}, \eta^2p =$
476 0.46), and an interaction between Gauge and Time ($F(6,180) = 5.9, p = 10^{-5}, \eta^2p = 0.16$) were
477 observed. Bonferroni-corrected t-tests conducted across Gauge and Time factors (12
478 comparisons) revealed the same pattern as in the first analysis, with significantly lower β -ERD
479 in Med as compared to Low and High, as early as 1.5 s before the go cue (Figure 3C, right
480 panel; Table 1).

481 Finally, β -ERD could also have differently evolved throughout blocks. Additional analysis
482 including a block factor showed a significant effect of Speed on β -ERD ($F(2,60) = 7.7, p =$
483 $0.001; \eta^2p = 0.20$) but neither a significant effect of Target ($F(1,30) = 0.8, p = 0.367, \eta^2p =$
484 0.03) nor Block ($F(1,30) = 0.2, p = 0.648, \eta^2p = 0.01$). The analysis showed no significant
485 interaction with any of these factors ($F < 1.5, p > 0.234, \eta^2p < 0.05$). Therefore, β -ERD does
486 not appear to have been differentially modulated across blocks.

487 **[Insert Figure 3]**

488 **[Insert Table 1]**

489

490 3. Action cost model

491 Considering the pattern of β -ERD found, we hypothesized that pre-movement modulations
492 of β power might be best explained by changes in expected overall action cost, including both
493 trajectory and temporal costs (Figure 1C, right panel; see Methods for details). This hypothesis
494 assumed that action cost was lower in Med than High and Low conditions. Although at first
495 glance the speed instructions of the present paradigm prevented participants from moving at the
496 speed they preferred (i.e., that associated with the lowest cost), peak velocity distributions still
497 revealed biases in participants' chosen speeds. Indeed, in spite of the very different average
498 speeds reached across conditions (see behavioral results), most participants did not show
499 trimodal distributions of peak velocities as would have been expected from the three non-
500 overlapping peak velocity criteria used for each target. Instead, they oftentimes presented near-
501 normal distributions, suggesting that their movement speeds were biased toward certain values.
502 Indeed, even though speed instructions led to significantly different average speeds across
503 conditions (Figure 2B), participants failed to perform their movements in the required criteria
504 in a large proportion of trials (mean \pm SD = 66.5 ± 8.2 %). Speed criteria were voluntarily strict
505 enough to encourage participants to keep their speeds close to the speed criteria and therefore
506 maximize speed differences across conditions. Still, we reasoned that inter-trial variability in
507 movement speed could be exploited to estimate their speed preferences, especially considering
508 that speed distributions appeared biased toward certain values for most participants. Hence, the
509 peak velocity corresponding to the maximal value of probability density functions estimated
510 from these distributions (based on kernel smoothing function for non-parametric distributions,
511 see Methods for details) was used to estimate participants' preferred speed. The average
512 estimated preferred peak velocity of movements toward Rt was 94.8 ± 13.7 cm/s. This value

513 was significantly lower than peak velocities found at HighRt ($t(30) = -11.0$, $p < 10^{-10}$, $d = -1.97$)
514 and higher than peak velocities found at LowRt ($t(30) = 11.9$, $p < 10^{-10}$, $d = 2.15$), but
515 interestingly was not significantly different from peak velocities at MedRt ($t(30) = -1.4$, $p =$
516 0.178 , $d = -0.25$; Figure 4B, top panel). Likewise, estimated preferred peak velocities toward
517 Lt were significantly lower than peak velocities found at HighLt ($t(30) = -8.0$, $p = 10^{-8}$, $d = -$
518 1.44) and higher than peak velocities found at LowLt ($t(30) = 11.2$, $p < 10^{-10}$, $d = 2.01$), but not
519 significantly different from peak velocities at MedLt ($t(30) = 0.4$, $p = 0.688$, $d = 0.07$; Figure
520 4B, bottom panel). The average estimated preferred peak velocity of movements toward Lt was
521 43.0 ± 10.0 cm/s. Together, these data indirectly confirm that although participants' preferred
522 speed was not formally measured, it would have been close to the medium speed used here.

523 **[Insert Figure 4]**

524

525 The cost functions of movements directed toward Rt and Lt were estimated based on a
526 model of action cost developed and applied to experimental data including reaching movements
527 in previous work (Berret and Jean, 2016). This action cost model uses the combination of a
528 trajectory cost which increases with movement speed and can be estimated based on task
529 biomechanical constraints (e.g., angle and amplitude of the presented target, anthropometry,
530 starting position of the arm), and a cost of time which decreases with movement speed and is
531 estimated based on participants' preferred movement duration for a given amplitude. Because
532 previous analysis of speed distributions showed that preferred speed estimates were not
533 significantly different from the average speeds found in Med, average MTs in MedRt and
534 MedLt were set as preferred movement durations in action cost models of movements directed
535 to Rt and Lt respectively (see Methods for details and Figure 5A for illustration). Estimation of

536 peak velocity from the models appeared to fit the present data as the cost function of movements
537 directed to Rt predicted optimal peak velocities (i.e., peak velocities corresponding to the
538 minimum of the cost function; PrefRt) that were not significantly different from the average
539 peak velocities found in MedRt ($t(30) = -1.1$, $p = 0.269$, $d = -0.20$, mean difference = -1.6 cm/s).
540 Likewise, the cost function of movements directed to Lt predicted optimal peak velocities
541 (PrefLt) that were not significantly different from average peak velocities found in MedLt ($t(30)$
542 = -0.3, $p = 0.737$, $d = -0.06$, mean difference = -0.4 cm/s).

543 Critically, action cost predicted by the model followed a pattern close to the one found
544 for β -ERD across conditions (Figure 5B). Once applied to the individual average peak velocity
545 values found across conditions, estimated action cost from the model appeared significantly
546 modulated by Target ($F(1,30) = 8.2$, $p = 0.008$, $\eta^2p = 0.21$), to a smaller extent than by Gauge
547 ($F(2,60) = 38.6$, $p < 10^{-10}$, $\eta^2p = 0.56$), with a significant interaction between the two factors
548 ($F(2,60) = 15.9$, $p = 10^{-6}$, $\eta^2p = 0.35$). Post-hoc analysis revealed a significantly lower estimated
549 action cost in MedRt as compared to LowRt ($t(30) = -10.2$, $p = 10^{-10}$, $d = -1.83$) and to HighRt
550 ($t(30) = -7.2$, $p = 10^{-7}$, $d = -1.30$), as well as in HighRt as compared to LowRt ($t(30) = -4.3$, $p =$
551 0.001 , $d = 0.78$). Likewise, estimated action cost was significantly lower in MedLt as compared
552 to LowLt ($t(30) = -9.4$, $p = 10^{-9}$, $d = -1.69$) and HighLt ($t(30) = -7.0$, $p = 10^{-6}$, $d = -1.26$), but
553 not significantly different between HighLt and LowLt ($t(30) = 2.3$, $p = 0.268$, $d = 0.41$).
554 Additionally, estimated action cost was significantly lower in HighLt in comparison to HighRt
555 ($t(30) = 3.7$, $p = 0.007$, $d = 0.67$) but no significant difference was found when comparing
556 MedLt to MedRt ($t(30) = 0.5$, $p = 1.0$, $d = 0.09$) and LowLt to LowRt ($t(30) = 0.3$, $p = 1.0$, $d =$
557 0.06).

558 Finally, a general linear mixed model (GLMM) was performed to test whether peak
559 velocity and estimated action cost explained a significant proportion of the variance in β -ERD.

560 The model showed a significant influence of action cost ($F(1,154) = 8.5, p = 0.004$) but not of
561 peak velocity ($F(1,153) = 0.1, p = 0.823$) on β -ERD (Figure 5C). The results were similar when
562 including RTs in the model, with a significant influence of action cost on β -ERD ($F(1,153) =$
563 $8.3, p = 0.004$), but not of peak velocity ($F(1,154) = 0.2, p = 0.659$) or RTs ($F(1,179) = 1.5, p$
564 $= 0.223$). Therefore, modulations of pre-movement β -ERD across conditions appeared overall
565 better explained by changes in action cost rather than by the speed of movement initiation and
566 execution.

567 **[Insert Figure 5]**

568 Discussion

569 Using a speed-controlled reaching paradigm, the present study aimed to dissociate
570 movement speed and action cost to determine which of these variables best explains changes
571 in pre-movement β -ERD. Results showed that β -ERD was non-monotonically modulated by
572 movement speed as its amplitude was greater both for slow and fast movements in comparison
573 to movements performed at medium speed, following a u-shaped pattern. This pattern was
574 observed for both targets despite very different ranges of speeds (~50-60 cm/s difference) and
575 appeared specific to β power as it was not found when averaging activity in the μ and γ bands.
576 Additionally, these modulations of β -ERD are unlikely to be explained by changes in movement
577 accuracy or success in achieving the speed criteria considering that the two monotonically
578 decreased with movement speed. Interestingly, GLMMs showed that β -ERD amplitude was
579 better predicted by estimated action cost than by movement peak velocity or RT. As predicted
580 by the model, the further the instructed speed from the optimal/preferred speed (i.e., speed
581 associated with the lowest action cost), the greater the β -ERD. These results demonstrate that
582 β -ERD constitutes a potential non-invasive marker of estimated action cost during motor
583 planning.

584 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first report of a u-shaped association between
585 β -ERD and movement speed. Indeed, β -ERD was attenuated at medium speeds but was
586 comparatively larger both for slow and fast movements. While this observation appears
587 somewhat incongruous with the association between β power and movement speed found in
588 healthy individuals (Pogosyan et al., 2009) and in PD (Jenkinson and Brown, 2011), it is still
589 consistent with some previous work that has reported no significant difference in β -ERD
590 between slow and fast movements (Stancák and Pfurtscheller, 1995; Zhang et al., 2020; see
591 Kilavik et al., 2013 for a review). The notion that beta reflects costs may offer an alternative

592 view reconciling the two. Namely, the amplitude of β -ERD might be modulated as a function
593 of action cost, therefore increasing both with movement time and effort considering that the
594 two are responsible for the devaluation of action (Berret and Jean, 2016; Shadmehr et al., 2016).
595 Consequently, greater β -ERD may facilitate the preparation of both slow and fast movements,
596 improving overall motor flexibility. Evidence for decreased speed when increasing β power
597 (Pogosyan et al, 2009) and increased speed when decreasing β power (Jenkinson and Brown,
598 2011) in the context of movements performed at maximal speed supports this hypothesis, but
599 facilitation of slow (i.e., slower than self-paced) movements does not appear to have been tested
600 yet. Furthermore, this assumption is consistent with the influential hypothesis that β power
601 favors the maintenance of the pre-existing neural state (Engel and Fries, 2010) as well as with
602 force production tasks, which typically reveal non-linear modulations of β power as a function
603 of exerted force (Tan et al., 2015; Fischer et al., 2019; Haddix et al., 2021). It also links the
604 attenuated β -ERD (Heinrichs-Graham et al., 2014) to the restricted motor repertoire observed
605 in PD (Baraduc et al., 2013; Sorrentino et al., 2021). From a neural perspective, this hypothesis
606 is supported by the known influence of β power on the flexibility of neuronal activity, β power
607 being considered as a marker of the excitation/inhibition balance in the primary motor cortex
608 (M1) (McAllister et al., 2013; Rossiter et al., 2014). Furthermore, the motor symptoms observed
609 in PD have been related to reduced plasticity in M1 (Bologna et al., 2018). This alteration of
610 motor flexibility and its associated β power increase might be linked to dopamine depletion
611 (Jenkinson and Brown, 2011), the action of dopamine being considered central in ensuring
612 behavioral flexibility (Jahanshahi et al., 2015; Cools, 2019).

613 The phasic dopaminergic activation preceding movement is modulated according to
614 expected action value in order to assess how much neural resources are worth allocating for an
615 upcoming movement (Hamid et al., 2016; Berke, 2018). Dopamine is thought to attenuate
616 signal-dependent noise, thereby allowing the formation of a more precise motor representation

617 (Manohar et al., 2015). This noise reduction process arguably requires additional neural
618 computational power, which could be achieved through neuronal desynchronization. Indeed, β -
619 ERD has been proposed as a mechanism allowing to increase the entropy of neuronal firing
620 rates, resulting in an increase in their information coding capacity (Hanslmayr et al., 2012;
621 Brittain and Brown, 2014). Beyond explaining the present results, the proposition of β -ERD as
622 a marker of the allocation of neural resources unifies several lines of evidence. First, reward
623 expectation is accompanied by an increase in β -ERD (Meyniel and Pessiglione, 2014; Savoie
624 et al., 2019; Chen and Kwak, 2022). Given that reward is known to shift the speed-accuracy
625 tradeoff of movements by increasing speed without penalizing accuracy (Manohar et al., 2015;
626 Summerside et al., 2018), the greater β -ERD might reflect the allocation of additional neural
627 resources to support the increase in speed. In this framework, the attenuation of beta-ERD
628 observed in PD might be linked to a deficit in action valuation. This is supported by evidence
629 of an alteration of effort-based decision-making and apathy in PD (Le Bouc et al, 2016).
630 Second, motor learning has been associated with reduced sensorimotor activation over the
631 course of practice, interpreted as a decrease in the mobilization of neural resources due to
632 increased neural efficiency in the network (Karni et al., 1995; Kelly and Garavan, 2005). The
633 amplitude of β -ERD has been shown to decrease with practice accordingly (Pollok et al., 2014;
634 Gehringer et al., 2018). Third, this hypothesis also fits with the mounting evidence of β activity
635 being modulated as a function of existing priors about stimuli and actions (Betti et al., 2021)
636 because it may reflect the endogenous reactivation of these priors (Spitzer and Haegens, 2017).
637 β -ERD might be attenuated when preparing movements at habitual speeds because of a stronger
638 prior, which echoes the decrease in the amplitude of β -ERD found with learning.

639 The present results also offer a potential explanation for the cost of time implemented
640 in models of action cost. Indeed, while the cost associated with fast movements can easily be
641 justified by an increase of the net metabolic rate of movements with speed (Shadmehr et al.,

2016), what makes slow movements effortful is less clear (Berret and Jean, 2016). Nonetheless, action selection can hardly be predicted from an energy minimization principle alone: behavioral work has shown that movement duration impacts action choices independently from changes in energy expenditure (Morel et al., 2017; Berret and Baud-Bovy, 2022). This influence of movement duration on action selection has mostly been interpreted as the temporal discounting of the rewarding value associated with the motor goal (Shadmehr et al., 2010; Choi et al., 2014). Still, a temporal discounting of reward appears unlikely in the present task, given that the reward consisted in reaching the speed criterion and was therefore intrinsically associated with the slowing of movements. Furthermore, the positive correlation often reported between the amplitude of β -ERD and expected reward (Meyniel and Pessiglione, 2014; Savoie et al., 2019; Chen and Kwak, 2022) is inconsistent with a reduction of expected reward with movement slowing in the present results. β -ERD amplitude at low speed was indeed significantly greater than for medium speed, but not significantly different than for high speed. Alternatively, in relation to the previous paragraph, this cost of time could be due to increased neurocomputational demands or “neural effort” to perform slow movements. Indeed, slowing down movements has been associated with an accumulation of constant noise (van Beers, 2008). Conversely, slow movements could be more costly simply because they are less often performed. Movements at preferred speeds could be seen as a habitual form of control, which is associated with lower computational cost due to an increased contribution of lower-order brain regions (Schneider and Chein, 2003; Jahanshahi et al., 2015). In support, the motor cortex has been shown to be less involved in habitual actions due to a preponderant role of the basal ganglia (Kawai et al., 2015; Dhawale et al., 2021). Therefore, the magnitude of β -ERD could be attenuated when preparing movements at preferred speeds because they require less neocortical resources to be produced. This is consistent with evidence of spontaneous choices of muscle coordination patterns favoring habits or less information encoding at the expense of

667 muscular effort or movement accuracy (de Ruyg et al., 2012; Dounskaia and Shimansky, 2016).
668 However, preferred speeds were only approximated from distributions of speed values in the
669 present experiment because specific speed instructions were used in order to dissociate
670 movement speed from action cost. Additional studies measuring individualized preferred
671 speeds in a context of self-paced movements will be needed to confirm the existence of specific
672 modulation of β -ERD as a function of action cost.

673 In summary, the present results reconcile discrepancies concerning the relationship
674 between β -ERD and movement speed, and suggest that reducing β power facilitates the
675 preparation and execution of both fast and slow movements, by enhancing motor flexibility
676 through the allocation of additional neural resources. This encourages to explore the impact of
677 β power reduction in PD not only on movement speed, but also on action selection.

678

679 References

680 Baraduc P, Thobois S, Gan J, Broussolle E, Desmurget M (2013). A common
681 optimization principle for motor execution in healthy subjects and parkinsonian patients. *J*
682 *Neurosci* **33**:665–677.

683 Berke JD (2018). What does dopamine mean?. *Nat Neurosci* **21**:787–793.

684 Berret B, Baud-Bovy G (2022). Evidence for a cost of time in the invigoration of
685 isometric reaching movements. *J Neurophysiol* **127**:689-701.

686 Berret B, Jean F (2016). Why Don't We Move Slower? The Value of Time in the
687 Neural Control of Action. *J Neurosci* **36**:1056–1070.

688 Betti V, Della Penna S, de Pasquale F, Corbetta M (2021). Spontaneous Beta Band
689 Rhythms in the Predictive Coding of Natural Stimuli. *Neuroscientist* **27**:184-201.

690 Bloem BR, Okun MS, Klein C (2021). Parkinson's disease. *Lancet* **397**:2284–2303.

691 Bologna M, Guerra A, Paparella G, Giordo L, Alunni Fegatelli D, Vestri AR,
692 Rothwell JC, Berardelli A (2018). Neurophysiological correlates of bradykinesia in
693 Parkinson's disease. *Brain* **141**:2432–2444.

694 Brittain JS, Brown P (2014). Oscillations and the basal ganglia: motor control and
695 beyond. *Neuroimage* **85**:637–647.

696 Brittain JS, Sharott A, Brown P (2014). The highs and lows of beta activity in cortico-
697 basal ganglia loops. *Eur J Neurosci* **39**:1951-9.

698 Chen XJ, Kwak Y (2022). Contribution of the sensorimotor beta oscillations and the
699 cortico-basal ganglia-thalamic circuitry during value-based decision making: A simultaneous
700 EEG-fMRI investigation. *Neuroimage* **257**:119300.

701 Choi JE, Vaswani PA, Shadmehr R (2014). Vigor of movements and the cost of time
702 in decision making. *J Neurosci* **34**:1212–1223.

703 Cools R (2019). Chemistry of the Adaptive Mind: Lessons from
704 Dopamine. *Neuron* **104**:113–131.

705 Delorme A, Makeig S (2004). EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of
706 single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. *J Neurosci*
707 *Methods* **134**:9–21.

708 de Rugy A, Loeb GE, Carroll TJ (2012). Muscle coordination is habitual rather than
709 optimal. *J Neurosci* **32**:7384–7391.

710 Dhawale AK, Wolff S, Ko R, Ölveczky BP (2021). The basal ganglia control the
711 detailed kinematics of learned motor skills. *Nat Neurosci* **24**:1256–1269.

712 Dounskaia N, Shimansky Y (2016). Strategy of arm movement control is determined
713 by minimization of neural effort for joint coordination. *Exp Brain Res* **234**:1335–1350.

714 Engel AK, Fries P (2010). Beta-band oscillations--signalling the status quo?. *Curr*
715 *Opin Neurobiol* **20**:156–165.

716 Fischer AG, Nigbur R, Klein TA, Danielmeier C, Ullsperger M (2018). Cortical beta
717 power reflects decision dynamics and uncovers multiple facets of post-error adaptation. *Nat*
718 *Commun* **9**:5038.

719 Fischer P, Pogosyan A, Green AL, Aziz TZ, Hyam J, Foltynie T, Limousin P, Zrinzo
720 L, Samuel M, Ashkan K, Da Lio M, De Cecco M, Fornaser A, Brown P, Tan H (2019). Beta
721 synchrony in the cortico-basal ganglia network during regulation of force control on and off
722 dopamine. *Neurobiol Dis* **127**:253–263.

723 Flash T, Hogan N (1985). The coordination of arm movements: an experimentally
724 confirmed mathematical model. *J Neurosci* **5**:1688–1703.

725 Fries P (2015). Rhythms for Cognition: Communication through Coherence. *Neuron*
726 **88**:220-35.

727 Gehringer JE, Arpin DJ, Heinrichs-Graham E, Wilson TW, Kurz MJ (2018).
728 Neurophysiological changes in the visuomotor network after practicing a motor task. *J*
729 *Neurophysiol* **120**:239–249.

730 Gordon J, Ghilardi MF, Cooper SE, Ghez C (1994). Accuracy of planar reaching
731 movements. II. Systematic extent errors resulting from inertial anisotropy. *Exp Brain Res*
732 **99**:112–130.

733 Gottlieb GL, Corcos DM, Agarwal GC (1989). Organizing principles for single-joint
734 movements. I. A speed-insensitive strategy. *J Neurophysiol* **62**:342–357.

735 Grent-'t-Jong T, Oostenveld R, Jensen O, Medendorp WP, Praamstra P (2013).
736 Oscillatory dynamics of response competition in human sensorimotor cortex. *Neuroimage*
737 **83**:27-34.

738 Haddix C, Al-Bakri AF, Sunderam S (2021). Prediction of isometric handgrip force
739 from graded event-related desynchronization of the sensorimotor rhythm. *J Neural Eng* **18**:
740 10.1088/1741-2552/ac23c0.

741 Hamid AA, Pettibone JR, Mabrouk OS, Hetrick VL, Schmidt R, Vander Weele CM,
742 Kennedy RT, Aragona BJ, Berke JD (2016). Mesolimbic dopamine signals the value of
743 work. *Nat Neurosci* **19**:117–126.

744 Hanslmayr S, Staudigl T, Fellner MC (2012). Oscillatory power decreases and long-
745 term memory: the information via desynchronization hypothesis. *Front Hum Neurosci* **6**:74.

746 Heinrichs-Graham E, Wilson TW, Santamaria PM, Heithoff SK, Torres-Russotto D,
747 Hutter-Saunders JA, Estes KA, Meza JL, Mosley RL, Gendelman HE (2014). Neuromagnetic
748 evidence of abnormal movement-related beta desynchronization in Parkinson's disease. *Cereb*
749 *Cortex* **24**:2669–2678.

750 Jahanshahi M, Obeso I, Rothwell JC, Obeso JA (2015). A fronto-striato-subthalamic-
751 pallidal network for goal-directed and habitual inhibition. *Nat Rev Neurosci* **16**:719–732.

752 Jenkinson N, Brown P (2011). New insights into the relationship between dopamine,
753 beta oscillations and motor function. *Trends Neurosci* **34**:611–618.

754 Jung TP, Makeig S, Humphries C, Lee TW, McKeown MJ, Iragui V, Sejnowski TJ
755 (2000). Removing electroencephalographic artifacts by blind source
756 separation. *Psychophysiology* **37**:163–178.

757 Karni A, Meyer G, Jezzard P, Adams MM, Turner R, Ungerleider LG (1995).
758 Functional MRI evidence for adult motor cortex plasticity during motor skill
759 learning. *Nature* **377**:155–158.

760 Kawai R, Markman T, Poddar R, Ko R, Fantana AL, Dhawale AK, Kampff AR,
761 Ölveczky BP (2015). Motor cortex is required for learning but not for executing a motor
762 skill. *Neuron* **86**:800–812.

763 Kelly AM, Garavan H (2005). Human functional neuroimaging of brain changes
764 associated with practice. *Cereb Cortex* **15**:1089–1102.

765 Kilavik BE, Zaepffel M, Brovelli A, MacKay WA, Riehle A (2013). The ups and
766 downs of β oscillations in sensorimotor cortex. *Exp Neurol* **245**:15–26.

767 Kühn AA, Kupsch A, Schneider GH, Brown P (2006). Reduction in subthalamic 8-35
768 Hz oscillatory activity correlates with clinical improvement in Parkinson's disease. *Eur J*
769 *Neurosci* **23**:1956–1960.

770 Le Bouc R, Rigoux L, Schmidt L, Degos B, Welter ML, Vidailhet M, Daunizeau J,
771 Pessiglione M (2016). Computational Dissection of Dopamine Motor and Motivational
772 Functions in Humans. *J Neurosci* **36**:6623-33.

773 Manohar SG, Chong TT, Apps MA, Batla A, Stamelou M, Jarman PR, Bhatia KP,
774 Husain M (2015). Reward Pays the Cost of Noise Reduction in Motor and Cognitive
775 Control. *Curr Biol* **25**:1707–1716.

776 McAllister CJ, Rönqvist KC, Stanford IM, Woodhall GL, Furlong PL, Hall SD
777 (2013). Oscillatory beta activity mediates neuroplastic effects of motor cortex stimulation in
778 humans. *J Neurosci* **33**:7919–7927.

779 Meyniel F, Pessiglione M (2014). Better get back to work: a role for motor beta
780 desynchronization in incentive motivation. *J Neurosci* **34**:1–9.

781 Morel P, Ulbrich P, Gail A (2017). What makes a reach movement effortful? Physical
782 effort discounting supports common minimization principles in decision making and motor
783 control. *PLoS Biol* **15**:e2001323.

784 Oostenveld R, Fries P, Maris E, Schoffelen JM (2011). FieldTrip: Open source
785 software for advanced analysis of MEG, EEG, and invasive electrophysiological
786 data. *Comput Intell Neurosci* **2011**:156869.

787 Pfurtscheller G, Lopes da Silva FH (1999). Event-related EEG/MEG synchronization
788 and desynchronization: basic principles. *Clin Neurophysiol* **110**:1842–1857.

789 Pogosyan A, Gaynor LD, Eusebio A, Brown, P (2009). Boosting cortical activity at
790 Beta-band frequencies slows movement in humans. *Curr Biol* **19**:1637–1641.

791 Pollok B, Latz D, Krause V, Butz M, Schnitzler A (2014). Changes of motor-cortical
792 oscillations associated with motor learning. *Neuroscience* **275**:47–53.

793 Ray NJ, Jenkinson N, Wang S, Holland P, Brittain JS, Joint C, Stein JF, Aziz T
794 (2008). Local field potential beta activity in the subthalamic nucleus of patients with
795 Parkinson's disease is associated with improvements in bradykinesia after dopamine and deep
796 brain stimulation. *Exp Neurol* **213**:108–113.

797 Rossiter HE, Davis EM, Clark EV, Boudrias MH, Ward NS (2014). Beta oscillations
798 reflect changes in motor cortex inhibition in healthy ageing. *Neuroimage* **91**:360–365.

799 Savoie FA, Hamel R, Lacroix A, Thénault F, Whittingstall K, Bernier PM (2019).
800 Luring the Motor System: Impact of Performance-Contingent Incentives on Pre-Movement
801 Beta-Band Activity and Motor Performance. *J Neurosci* **39**:2903–2914.

802 Schneider W, Chein JM (2003). Controlled & automatic processing: behavior, theory,
803 and biological mechanisms. *Cogn Sci* **27**:525-559.

804 Scrivener CL, Reader AT (2022). Variability of EEG electrode positions and their
805 underlying brain regions: visualizing gel artifacts from a simultaneous EEG-fMRI
806 dataset. *Brain Behav* **12**:e2476.

807 Shadmehr R, Huang HJ, Ahmed AA (2016). A Representation of Effort in Decision-
808 Making and Motor Control. *Curr Biol* **26**:1929–1934.

809 Shadmehr R, Orban de Xivry JJ, Xu-Wilson M, Shih TY (2010). Temporal
810 discounting of reward and the cost of time in motor control. *J Neurosci* **30**:10507–10516.

811 Sorrentino P, Rucco R, Baselice F, De Micco R, Tessitore A, Hillebrand A, Mandolesi
812 L, Breakspear M, Gollo LL, Sorrentino G (2021). Flexible brain dynamics underpins complex
813 behaviours as observed in Parkinson's disease. *Sci Rep* **11**(1):4051.

814 Spitzer B, Haegens S (2017). Beyond the Status Quo: A Role for Beta Oscillations in
815 Endogenous Content (Re)Activation. *eNeuro* **4**:ENEURO.0170-17.2017.

816 Stancák A Jr, Pfurtscheller G (1995). Desynchronization and recovery of beta rhythms
817 during brisk and slow self-paced finger movements in man. *Neurosci Lett* **196**:21-4.

818 Summerside EM, Shadmehr R, Ahmed AA (2018). Vigor of reaching movements:
819 reward discounts the cost of effort. *J Neurophysiol* **119**:2347–2357.

820 Takemi M, Masakado Y, Liu M, Ushiba J (2013). Event-related desynchronization
821 reflects downregulation of intracortical inhibition in human primary motor cortex. *J*
822 *Neurophysiol* **110**:1158-66.

823 Tan H, Pogosyan A, Ashkan K, Cheeran B, FitzGerald JJ, Green AL, Aziz T, Foltynief
824 T, Limousin P, Zrinzo L, Brown P (2015). Subthalamic nucleus local field potential activity
825 helps encode motor effort rather than force in parkinsonism. *J Neurosci* **35**:5941–5949.

826 van Beers RJ (2008). Saccadic eye movements minimize the consequences of motor
827 noise. *PLoS One* **3**:e2070.


828 Wach C, Krause V, Moliadze V, Paulus W, Schnitzler A, Pollok B (2013). Effects of
829 10 Hz and 20 Hz transcranial alternating current stimulation (tACS) on motor functions and
830 motor cortical excitability. *Behav Brain Res* **241**:1-6.

831 Wiesman AI, Koshy SM, Heinrichs-Graham E, Wilson TW (2020). Beta and gamma
832 oscillations index cognitive interference effects across a distributed motor network.
833 *Neuroimage* **213**:116747.

834 Young SJ, Pratt J, Chau T (2009). Target-directed movements at a comfortable pace:
835 movement duration and Fitts's law. *J Mot Behav* **41**:339–346.

836 Yuan H, Liu T, Szarkowski R, Rios C, Ashe J, He B (2010). Negative covariation
837 between task-related responses in alpha/beta-band activity and BOLD in human sensorimotor
838 cortex: an EEG and fMRI study of motor imagery and movements. *Neuroimage* **49**:2596-606.

839 Zhang X, Li H, Xie T, Liu Y, Chen J, Long J (2020). Movement speed effects on beta-
840 band oscillations in sensorimotor cortex during voluntary activity. *J Neurophysiol* **124**:352-
841 359.



842 **Figure 1. Methods.** **A:** Schematic representation of a trial timeline. The content of each dark
 843 grey rectangle illustrates stimuli that were displayed on the screen in front of participants. The
 844 trial started with the appearance of a white fixation cross at the center of the screen and the
 845 starting base (light grey circle; bottom rectangle). Once participants had kept the cursor (white
 846 circle) inside of the starting base for 2 s, the target (blue circle) and the gauge appeared on the
 847 screen. Participants were asked to reach the target once they heard the go cue, which occurred
 848 2 s after the appearance of the gauge and the target on the screen. Once the target was hit, it
 849 turned green. Written feedback was then given to participants about whether their movement
 850 reached the speed criterion. **B:** Summary of the speed criteria across conditions. The table
 851 indicates the intervals of peak velocities (PV) that participants were asked to reach according
 852 to the position of the presented target (columns) and the filling level of the gauge (rows). **C:**
 853 Working hypotheses of what patterns of β -ERD across conditions could be expected from
 854 modulations of movement speed. Conditions including movements directed to Rt are
 855 represented in red and conditions including movements toward Lt are in blue.






Figure 2. Behavioral results. Red and blue lines/dots refer to Rt and Lt respectively. **A:** Average normalized velocity profiles across conditions. Solid lines refer to High, large dotted lines to Med and small dotted lines to Low conditions. **B, C, D:** Average peak velocities, MTs and RTs across conditions. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals around the mean.

*** $p < 0.001$




856 **Figure 3. Modulations of β power across conditions.** **A:** Illustration of the results from
 857 cluster-based permutation tests. Each topographical plot represents the average difference in β
 858 power between conditions requiring the slowest (LowLt) and the fastest (HighRt) movements
 859 in 500-ms windows, time-locked to the occurrence of the go cue. Hot colors indicate an increase
 860 and cold colors a decrease in β power. White dots indicate electrodes belonging to a significant
 861 cluster. **B:** Time course of average β power change from baseline throughout a trial. **C:** Average
 862 β -ERD amplitude during the delay period (2 s preceding go cue). Red and blue lines/dots
 863 indicate results from movements directed to Rt and Lt respectively. **D:** Similar representations
 864 to C, with β power averaged in 500-ms windows encompassing the delay period. Error bars
 865 indicate 95% confidence intervals around the mean. ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$



866 **Figure 4. Peak velocity distributions and probability density functions across participants.**

867 **A:** Peak velocity distributions. Red histograms represent peak velocities of movements toward
 868 Rt, and blue histograms peak velocities of movements toward Lt. Each histogram represents
 869 data from one participant. Y-axis indicates the normalized proportion of trials (from 0 to 1) and
 870 x-axis the peak velocities. The solid black curve represents an estimate of the probability
 871 density function of each distribution. **B:** Comparison of the average estimated preferred peak
 872 velocity (PrefRt and PrefLt; determined using the maximum of probability density functions
 873 illustrated in A) to the average peak velocities of the different experimental conditions. Red and
 874 blue dots refer to Rt and Lt respectively. Error bars indicate 95 % confidence intervals around
 875 the mean. *** $p < 0.001$



876 **Figure 5. Results from the modeling of action cost.** **A:** Representations of the estimated cost
 877 computed by the model as a function of peak velocities (top panels) and MT (bottom panels).
 878 The cost of movements directed to Rt is illustrated with red curves (left panels) and the cost of
 879 movements directed to Lt with blue curves (right panels). **B:** Estimated costs of movements
 880 directed to Rt (red) and Lt (blue) across speed conditions. **C:** Representation of the correlation
 881 between β -ERD amplitude and normalized estimated cost (left panel) and peak velocity (right
 882 panel) based on the estimated marginal means computed by the GLMM. Error bars (B) or
 883 shaded areas (C) indicate 95 % confidence intervals. ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Time window (relative to go cue)	Contrast	T-statistic	P-value (Bonferroni- corrected)	Effect size (Cohen's d)
[-2 to -1.5 s]	Low vs Med	2.2	0.462	0.39
	Low vs High	0.8	1.0	0.14
	Med vs High	-1.9	0.798	-0.34
[-1.5 to -1 s]	Low vs Med	3.8	0.007	0.69
	Low vs High	-1.6	1.0	-0.29
	Med vs High	-3.5	0.017	-0.63
[-1 to -0.5 s]	Low vs Med	2.9	0.092	0.51
	Low vs High	-1.2	1.0	-0.22
	Med vs High	-3.7	0.01	-0.67
[-0.5 to 0 s]	Low vs Med	2.8	0.119	0.49
	Low vs High	1.0	1.0	0.18
	Med vs High	-3.3	0.031	-0.59

884 **Table 1. Results from post-hoc analysis on β power across speed conditions and time**

885 **bins.** P-values inferior to 0.05 are in bold.