



Motor equivalence and self-motion induced by different movement speeds

Journal:	<i>Experimental Brain Research</i>
Manuscript ID:	EBR-10-0507.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Scholz, John; University of Delaware, Department of Physical Therapy; University of Delaware, Biomechanics and Movement Science Program Dwight-Higgin, Tyesha; University of Delaware, Physical Therapy Lynch, Jennifer; University of Delaware, Biological Sciences Tseng, Yaweng; University of Delaware, Physical Therapy; University of Delaware, Biomechanics and Movement Science Program Martin, Valere; Ruhr-Universität, Institut für Neuroinformatik Schöner, Gregor; Ruhr-Universität, Institut für Neuroinformatik
Keywords:	reaching, movement velocity, motor control, motor equivalence

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Motor equivalence and self-motion induced by different movement speeds

^{1,2}Scholz JP, ¹Dwight TD, ³Lynch JE, ^{1,2}Tseng Y, ⁴Martin V, ⁴Schöner G

¹Physical Therapy Department, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716

²Biomechanics and Movement Science Program, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716

³Department of Biology, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716

⁴Lehrstuhl Theoretische Biologie, Institut für Neuroinformatik, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 44780

Bochum, Germany

Corresponding Author:

John P. Scholz, PhD, PT

Department of Physical Therapy

Biomechanics and Movement Science Program

307 McKinly Laboratory

University of Delaware

Newark, DE 1971

jpscholz@udel.edu

Key Words: Reaching, Motor Control, Motor equivalence, Movement velocity

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by NINDS Grant R01-NS050880, awarded to

John Scholz.

Abstract

This study investigated pointing movements in 3D with 10 joint degrees of freedom asking two questions: (1) Is goal-directed reaching accompanied by self-motion, a component of the joint velocity vector that leaves the hand's movement unaffected? (2) Are differences in the terminal joint configurations among different speeds of reaching **motor equivalent (i.e., terminal joint configurations differ more in directions of joint space that do not produce different pointer-tip positions than in directions that do) or non-motor-equivalent (i.e., terminal joint configurations differ equally or more in directions of joint space that lead to different pointer-tip positions than in directions that do not affect the pointer-tip position)**. Subjects reached from an identical starting joint configuration and pointer-tip location to targets at slow, moderate and fast speeds. Ten degrees of freedom of joint motion of the arm were recorded. The relationship between changes in the joint configuration and the three-dimensional pointer-tip position was expressed by a standard kinematic model and the range- and null subspaces were computed from the associated Jacobian matrix. (1) **The joint velocity vector and (2) the difference vector between terminal joint configurations from pairs of speed conditions were projected into the two subspaces. The relative length of the two components were used to quantify the amount of self-motion and the presence of motor equivalence, respectively.**

Results revealed that reaches were accompanied by a significant amount of self-motion at all reaching speeds. Self-motion scaled with movement speed. **In addition, the difference in the terminal joint configuration between pairs of different reaching speeds revealed motor equivalence.** The results are consistent with a control system that takes advantage of motor redundancy, allowing for flexibility in the face of perturbations, here induced by different movement speeds.

Introduction

A long standing question in the study of motor control is what variables the central nervous system (CNS) uses to plan movements given that the motor system is kinematically and dynamically redundant for most functional tasks (Bernstein 1967). Some have suggested that planning of targeted reaching involves specifying a sequence of joint postures (Rosenbaum et al. 1999), or the terminal joint configuration (Tillery et al. 1995; Desmurget et al. 1998; Gréa et al. 2000). If so, relatively invariant terminal joint configurations could be expected when reaching repetitively from a fixed initial hand location and arm configuration to the same target location. Multivariate statistical procedures have been used previously to investigate this question (Tillery et al. 1995; Desmurget et al. 1998; Gréa et al. 2000). Those results were used to argue that a specific terminal joint configuration is planned for the reaching movement. However, results of other studies of reaching tasks provided equivocal evidence for movement planning based on terminal joint postures (Cruse et al. 1993). ***Pointing movements to the same targets from different starting positions lead to different terminal configurations*** (Soechting et al. 1995). ***On the other hand, investigations of arm movements at different speeds did not reveal differences in the resulting spatial 3D trajectories of the movement plane of the arm or 3D path curvature*** (Nishikawa et al. 1999). ***Similarly, monkeys learning an obstacle avoidance task varied movement speed, but kept their spatial trajectories relatively constant*** (Torres and Andersen 2006). Recent investigations that used a formal model to map joint variance across repetitive reaches onto end-effector variance suggest that a family of equivalent joint postures are used when reaching repetitively under identical task conditions (Scholz et al. 2000b; Tseng et al. 2002; Tseng et al. 2003; Tseng and Scholz 2005; Yang and Scholz 2005).

In this study we vary the speed of pointing movements and ask if either the terminal joint configuration or the terminal pointer-tip position or both are invariant across movement speeds. As with variance measures, judgements of differences in terminal joint configuration or pointer-tip position across conditions require a theoretical

1
2
3 *basis. For instance, differences in terminal pointer-tip position that lie within the size of*
4 *the reaching target may be considered irrelevant for task success. On the other hand, the*
5 *direct comparison of differences in pointer-tip position and differences in joint*
6 *configuration is impossible as these differences have different units and dimensions. A*
7 *theoretically grounded comparison of these two variables can be based on the concept*
8 *of the uncontrolled manifold (Scholz and Schoner 1999). If the terminal joint*
9 *configurations across different movement speeds differ significantly primarily in those*
10 *directions in joint space that have no effect on the pointer-tip position (that is, along the*
11 *null-space of the pointer-tip Jacobian), then the terminal joint configurations may be*
12 *considered motor equivalent solutions of the task. If, in contrast, the differences between*
13 *the terminal joint configurations of pairs of speed conditions lie equally or more in*
14 *directions of joint space that leads to different pointer-tip positions than in directions*
15 *that do not affect the pointer-tip position, then the terminal joint configurations at*
16 *different speeds cannot be considered motor-equivalent: The differences do not reflect a*
17 *particular pattern of coordination that preferentially keeps the task of pointing invariant*
18 *across speeds of reaching. We apply this approach to determine if different movement*
19 *speeds lead to significantly different terminal joint configurations that are motor*
20 *equivalent solutions to the pointing task.*
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Planning for the entire temporal sequence of joint configurations for a given desired
41 hand trajectory could presumably simplify trajectory control. This is because differences in
42 movement velocity could be achieved by simply scaling the transition time between the planned
43 sequence of joint postures without significantly affecting the postures themselves (Hollerbach
44 and Flash 1982; Rosenbaum et al. 1999). ***A three-dimensional reaching model based on the***
45 ***separation of planning for geometric features versus dynamic features of the movement***
46 ***has been suggested*** (Torres and Zipser 2002), ***and experimental evidence in support of***
47 ***that independence has been provided*** (Torres and Zipser 2004). Rosenbaum et al. (1999)
48 proposed a formal model of reaching that hypothesized the planning of a predetermined
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sequence of joint postures to achieve the goal. The model weighs a variety costs, depending on
4 the movement context, to identify an optimal sequence of joint postures for a given task.
5

6
7 Although not addressed by this model or its subsequent iterations (Rosenbaum et al. 2001a;
8 Rosenbaum et al. 2001b; Rosenbaum et al. 2009), one could expect that the joint velocity
9 vector at each time point during a reach would contribute primarily to end-effector motion, with
10 little or no self-motion. Self-motion refers to a component of the joint velocity vector that does
11 not affect the end-effector's motion (Murray et al. 1994). For example, if the arm is redundant, it
12 is possible to raise the elbow to flick a light switch while transporting the hand forward in space
13 without that motion affecting the hand's motion. Joint motions contributing to flicking the light
14 switch represent self-motion relative to hand motion. However, there is no a priori reason to
15 expect a significant amount of self-motion when there is no explicit secondary task as in the
16 current study.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 A second goal of this study, therefore, was to investigate how much of the joint velocity
29 vector acts to transport the hand versus being a reflection of self-motion. According to theories
30 of Rosenbaum (1999) and Hollerbach and Flash (1982), we could expect minimum amount of
31 self-motion. Such a control strategy would presumably simplify control by making the same
32 purported inverse-dynamics computation valid for all movements by a simple scaling of the
33 required torques. Then, most of the joint velocity should be directed toward transporting the
34 hand. In contrast, a recent study of Martin et al. (2009) proposed a process model of the control
35 of a redundant motor system in which neural dynamics determines the time course of a vector
36 of muscle-joint equilibrium positions (*see Discussion for more detail*). This model predicts a
37 considerable amount of self-motion, a prediction that was confirmed with empirical data
38 obtained when participants made planar reaches involving four kinematic degrees of freedom
39 (DOFs). If confirmed here, this finding would raise doubts about planning for a fixed sequence of
40 postural states. To our knowledge, the question of how much self-motion accompanies goal-
41 directed movements has not been thoroughly addressed in the context of three-dimensional arm
42 reaching tasks (See Scholz et al. 2007 for an example from a postural task).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In the current study, subjects performed reaches at different speeds to induce perturbations by changing movement dynamics. Although invariance of kinematic features have been reported previously when reaching under different speed conditions (Soechting and Lacquaniti 1981; Atkeson and Hollerbach 1985; Nishikawa et al. 1999; Torres and Zipser 2004), conclusions from many of those studies were based on relatively qualitative analyses of movement trajectories (Soechting and Lacquaniti 1981; Atkeson and Hollerbach 1985; Nishikawa et al. 1999). Moreover, a study of targeted reaching at different speeds by Thomas et al. (2003) found that subjects had significantly larger excursions of the thigh, pelvis, humerus, and forearm during faster reaches compared to reaching at their comfortable speed. Thus, the segmental kinematics were not simply scaled in time.

Methods and Materials

Subjects

Two male and four female right-handed, healthy volunteers (20.5 ± 1.26 years of age) were paid \$25 each for their participation. A consent form approved by the Institutional Review Board at University of Delaware was completed and signed by all subjects. All subjects had normal or corrected to normal vision.

Experimental Setup and Procedures:

Hardware and subject setup

Subjects sat in a height-adjustable chair so that their left forearm rested on a table top in 90° of elbow flexion with a vertical upper arm in the starting position. Trunk motion was eliminated by positioning the front of the torso tightly against the edge of the table and by strapping the trunk with harness to the chair back. Thus reaching involved only motion of the clavicle-scapula complex and arm joints. Left arm and scapula movement was recorded at 120-Hz with a six camera VICON™ motion capture system. The cameras formed a semicircle

1
2
3 around the subjects, from slightly behind and to the left to slightly forward on the right side, to
4 ensure that all markers could be observed by at least three cameras during performance.
5

6
7 Reaching was performed with the non-dominant left arm because it was expected to be more
8 influenced by the higher interaction torques generated by the higher speed reaches (Sainburg
9 and Kalakanis 2000). Before each experiment, the cameras were calibrated to the
10 measurement volume.
11
12
13
14

15 Spherical reflective markers were placed over the skin using hypoallergenic tape at the
16 sternoclavicular (SC) joint, just inferior and lateral to the acromion process of the shoulder, on
17 the lateral and medial epicondyles of the elbow (which defined the elbow axis), and on the
18 ulna and radius styloid processes. Four rigid bodies made of plastic orthoplast™ shells were
19 fitted to contour the superior part of the upper trunk (i.e., above the clavicle and scapula), the
20 lateral part of the upper arm, the dorsum of the forearm and the posterior surface of the hand.
21 Each shell had four reflective markers that formed rigid bodies used to compute 3D joint
22 angles. The hand shell had an extended pointer with a reflective marker at its tip that subjects
23 used to point to the targets. The position of the reflective marker was positioned at the tip of
24 the index finger when in its fully extended position. The shells were kept in place by elastic
25 wraps and double-sided tape (hand shell).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Two flat, circular targets (4.76-cm in diameter) were placed at 90% of the subjects' arm
39 length (defined as the distance from the lateral aspect of the acromion process of the shoulder
40 to the proximal inter-phalangeal joint of the index finger), at a 30° angle to the right and left of
41 an imaginary line pointing straight ahead from the acromion process. Target height was three
42 inches above the height of the subjects' left shoulder, measured while sitting at the table. The
43 starting location of the pointer was marked on the table so that it could be aligned with this
44 mark before each trial. The configuration of the joints was kept constant in the starting position
45 of each trial by placing alignment marks on the table.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Movement time was measured directly with a Lafayette™ Instrument Timer.

55
56 Microswitches were mounted on the table below the hand in the starting position and behind
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the center of each target. Lifting of the hand released the switch, starting the timer. Hitting the
4 target depressed that switch and stopped the timer. The resulting movement time (MT) for
5 each trial was shown on an LED display to provide subjects feedback about their MT after
6 every trial. Trials that did not fall within ± 50 ms of the fast and moderate velocity conditions or
7 within ± 100 ms of the slow condition were repeated (see below).
8
9
10
11
12

13 14 15 Calibration of subject position:

16
17 A static calibration of subjects' upper extremity including the scapula was performed as
18 a basis for later joint angle computations. In the calibration position, the arm was held at 90°
19 of shoulder flexion with the elbow fully extended, the forearm in neutral pronation-supination,
20 and the wrist in a neutral position between flexion-extension and abduction-adduction, thumb
21 pointing upward (Tseng et al. 2003, Figure 1). The reflective marker positions were captured
22 in this position at the beginning of each experimental session. All joint angles were defined
23 as zero degrees in this static calibration position.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Instructions:

35
36 Subjects were given several practice trials to ensure the consistency of their MT across
37 trials. The number of trials depended on the subject's ability to achieve a consistent MT. The
38 investigator ensured that the subject attained the same starting joint configuration and pointer
39 tip position before each trial. The investigator started each trial with a "ready" command, at
40 which point the start of data collection was initiated. This was followed by a "go" command that
41 signaled to the subject to reach and depress the target switch with the pointer when they were
42 ready. Pretrial instructions emphasized that this was not a reaction time task. Subjects were
43 instructed to reach in one continuous motion and ***try to touch the center of the designated***
44 ***target within the required movement time***. Once the target was reached, the subject was
45 instructed to wait for the investigator's "back" command to return to the starting position. A 1-
46 sec pause was provided between the "ready" and "go" command, and between reaching the
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 target and the “back” command. Rest periods were given to subjects when needed throughout
4 the experiment. No subject reported fatigue during or after the experiment.
5
6
7

8 9 Experimental conditions:

10 Three different speed conditions were defined by movement time. (1) Fast: 400-ms \pm
11 50-ms; (2) Moderate: 700-ms \pm 50-ms; and (3) Slow: 1100-ms \pm 100-ms. Twenty-five
12 acceptable trials were completed at each of the three speeds of reaching at each of the two
13 target locations. The trials were randomized in blocks of five, first by target location and
14 second by speed.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 *Data Processing*

23
24
25
26 Marker coordinates were filtered before all calculations using a recursive, 5-Hz lowpass
27 Butterworth filter. Three-dimensional pointer-tip marker coordinates then were rotated into a
28 local coordinate system, with origin at the pointer tip’s starting position and the local x-axis
29 pointing from the starting position to the calibrated target center. Thus, movement along the x-
30 dimension represented movement extent, while movement along the y-axis and z-axis
31 represented deviations from that path, or movement direction. The velocity of the pointer-tip was
32 obtained using a central-difference algorithm in Matlab™. Movement onset and termination
33 were determined as the sample values where the local-x component of pointer-tip velocity rose
34 above or returned to, respectively, values equal to 5% peak velocity.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Joint Angle Computation

47
48 Joint angles were derived using local coordinate systems defined at each joint based on
49 the subject calibration position, where the local axes were aligned with the global system,
50 except for the elbow axis (see Tseng et al. 2002). All joint angles were defined as zero degrees
51 in the static calibration posture. The method of Söderkvist and Wedin (1993) was used to define
52 the rotation matrices required to take a given rigid body from its position at each sample of the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reaching trials to its position in the subject calibration trial. The product of rotation matrices for
4 adjacent limb segments were then used to extract the joint angles in a Z-X-Y order. Details of
5 the approach as well as our approach to modeling clavicular-scapula complex motions are
6 described elsewhere (Scholz et al. 2000a; Tseng et al. 2002). Joint angles measured during the
7 pointing task were scapular (1) abduction-adduction (Z-axis); (2) elevation-depression (X-axis);
8 (3) upward-downward rotation (Y-axis); glenohumeral (4) horizontal abduction-adduction (Z-
9 axis); (5) flexion-extension (X-axis); (6) internal-external rotation (Y-axis); elbow (7) flexion-
10 extension (about a skewed axis based on rotation to the axis formed by a line between the
11 medial and lateral humeral epicondyle markers using Rodriguez formula; Belongie 1999); (8)
12 forearm pronation-supination (Y-axis); wrist (9) flexion-extension (Z-axis); and (10) radial-ulnar
13 deviation (X-axis). The data were then time-normalized to 100% based on movement onset and
14 termination (see above) using a cubic spline algorithm in Matlab™.

30 Movement time

31
32 The mean, standard deviation (SD) and coefficient of variation (CV) of the movement
33 times (MT) produced by subjects were computed to confirm that subjects followed the speed
34 instruction and the existence of distinct velocities of movement.
35
36

40 Pointer-tip path deviation

41
42 To estimate path curvature, we computed the path deviation at each point in the
43 movement from a straight line to the target (local-x coordinate). Path deviation was determined
44 by computing the geometric mean of the pointer-tip's local y- and z-coordinates (off-direction) at
45 each sample value and then summed across samples. These coordinate values would be zero
46 if the hand followed a perfectly straight path to the target along the local-x axis. We also
47 computed the arithmetic mean of the y- and z-axis deviations.
48
49
50
51
52
53

56 Terminal pointer-tip position

1
2
3 The position of the pointer-tip after reaching the target was obtained from the filtered
4 data on all trials of each condition, before time-normalization. ***It occurred when the target***
5 ***switch was fully depressed, when the resultant distance of the pointer-tip position from***
6 ***the calibrated target center was smallest.*** These coordinates were used to examine
7 differences in the terminal pointer-tip position across the three velocities of reaching.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 Self-motion analysis

16
17 The uncontrolled manifold (UCM) approach (Schöner 1995) provides a framework for
18 investigating the extent to which motor abundance (Gelfand and Latash 1998) is used by the
19 CNS in the control of multi-DOF tasks. Abundance, commonly referred to as redundancy, is the
20 availability of more degrees of freedom than minimally required to achieve a particular kinematic
21 goal. According to the theory underlying the UCM approach (Latash et al. 2007; Martin et al.
22 2009), control is organized around a subspace in the space of the motor elements, referred to
23 as the UCM, within which variations of those elements have no effect on the values of variables
24 most directly related to task success. In the context of controlling the hand's spatial position
25 during reaching, variations of the joint angles within the UCM subspace have no effect on the
26 hand's current position. Thus, in principle, the CNS only needs to restrict joint variation outside
27 of the UCM subspace, but not within the UCM, depending on the presence of other task
28 constraints. Previous studies based on this hypothesis have focused on how the variance of
29 joint angles or muscle EMG patterns across repetitions of a given condition are structured to
30 stabilize task-relevant variables, such as the hand's path.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 This same framework was used to investigate how the joint velocities contribute to the
47 velocity of the pointer-tip along its path to a target. Self-motion refers to joint velocities that have
48 no effect on motion of an end-effector, here the hand or the rigidly attached pointer-tip. It occurs
49 within the null-space of joint space, which is a linear approximation to the Uncontrolled Manifold
50 (Scholz and Schöner 1999). The null-space vectors are estimated mathematically in Matlab™
51 from the Jacobian matrix, which can be used to relate small changes in joint velocities to
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 changes in the end-effector velocity (Murray et al. 1994). During a reaching movement, the
4 vector of joint velocities is related to the hand's velocity through a geometric model such that the
5 hand's velocity is of the correct magnitude and direction. If the velocity of one or several joints
6 point in the wrong direction or have an inappropriate magnitude, the hand's movement course
7 will be altered unless other joint velocities compensate. Such compensation should lead to an
8 increase in the component of the joint velocity vector lying within the null-space, or the UCM. In
9 addition, self-motion can be used to accomplish other tasks simultaneously with the primary
10 task.
11
12

13
14 The method of computing appropriate UCMs based on the geometric model has been
15 described in detail elsewhere (Scholz and Schoner 1999; Scholz et al. 2000b; Reisman and
16 Scholz 2003). Self-motion was computed in the current study as follows (see Appendix for a
17 simple illustration): (1) the geometric model relating changes in the three-dimensional (3D)
18 hand/pointer-tip position to changes in the 10 joint angles was computed; (2) The Jacobian
19 matrix was determined as the partial derivatives of the three coordinates of the hand's position
20 with respect to each of the ten joint angles from the geometric model; (3) For each trial,
21 numerical values of the Jacobian Matrix were computed from the instantaneous joint
22 configuration; (4) The null-space of this Jacobian at each time point was obtained using the null
23 function in Matlab™. The null-space is defined by 7 basis vectors in the 10-DOF joint space (10
24 - 3 task dimensions), and linearly approximates the UCM; (5) The 10-dimensional vector of joint
25 velocities at each time point was projected into the null-space and into its complementary
26 space, and the length of projection in each subspace was computed. The length of projection
27 into the UCM represents the magnitude of the joint velocity vector (i.e., self-motion) that has no
28 effect on the task variable, here 3D hand motion. The complementary projection represents the
29 magnitude of the joint velocity vector that causes hand motion (i.e., range-space motion). Steps
30 (4) and (5) were performed at each sample of the reach trajectory for each trial. The mean of
31 the two components of the velocity vector was computed across four equal periods of each trial
32 (1-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, and 76-100%) and then averaged across trials for each target, speed
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 condition and subject for statistical analyses. Mathematical details of the method are available
4
5 elsewhere (Scholz et al. 2000).
6

7
8 Because the goal of the task is to move the hand to the target, one can expect range-
9
10 space motion to be larger than self-motion; that is, joint velocities should move the hand in the
11
12 planned direction. Then, self-motion could be expected to be minimal from the standpoint of
13
14 optimizing energy cost (this may be wasted motion) or minimizing joint excursions, especially
15
16 because there was no explicit secondary task in this experiment. Because the subspace of the
17
18 UCM within which self-motion occurs has seven dimensions while the dimension of the range-
19
20 space equals that of the task space (i.e., three dimensions), the lengths of projection of the
21
22 velocity vector were normalized by the square root of the number of dimensions of their
23
24 subspace. ***Also, because range-space motion is directly related to the planned movement***
25
26 ***(i.e. component of the joint velocity vector that moves the pointer-tip), it is expected to***
27
28 ***increase with speed. Self-motion, however, may or may not increase with speed because,***
29
30 ***by definition, it is unrelated to pointer-tip movement.***
31
32

33 34 Motor Equivalence

35
36 ***This analysis investigated whether differences found in the terminal joint***
37
38 ***configuration induced by different reaching speeds were structured to preferentially keep***
39
40 ***task-level performance (i.e., the pointer-tip position) invariant. Motor equivalence was***
41
42 ***detected when significant differences between terminal joint configurations lay***
43
44 ***significantly more within the null-space of the pointer-tip Jacobian than within its range-***
45
46 ***space. Non-motor-equivalence was detected when significant differences between***
47
48 ***terminal joint configurations either lay equally in both subspaces or when these***
49
50 ***differences lay significantly more in the range-space than the null-space of the pointer-tip***
51
52 ***Jacobian.***
53

54
55 ***In this analysis, the terminal joint configuration was estimated as the joint***
56
57 ***configuration obtained at the smallest resultant distance between the pointer-tip and the***
58
59
60

1
2
3 **calibrated target position, which occurred when the target switch was completely**
4
5 **depressed.**
6

7 At this terminal position, the following analysis steps were performed separately for each
8 target location: (1) The mean, across reaches, terminal joint configuration was obtained for each
9 speed condition; (2) The norm of the difference between each pair of mean terminal joint
10 configurations was then computed as a Joint Difference Vector, i.e.,
11
12
13
14

$$15 \quad JDV_{i,j} = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{10} (\bar{\theta}_{i,k} - \bar{\theta}_{j,k})^2}$$

16 where $JDV_{i,j}$ is the normed difference of the 10 element ($k=\{1,\dots,10\}$) mean terminal joint
17 configurations, $\bar{\theta}_{i,k}$ and $\bar{\theta}_{j,k}$, between pairs of speed conditions, i and j ; $i,j = \{\text{slow, moderate,}$
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 fast}; (3) The norm of the vector of standard deviations of terminal joint configurations across
30 trials of reaching for each speed condition was computed, i.e.,
31
32

$$33 \quad \sigma_i^{norm} = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{10} (\sigma_{\theta_{i,k}}^2)}$$

34
35
36
37
38
39 The latter measure represents naturally occurring differences in terminal joint configurations
40 across trials of a given speed condition. (4) $JDV_{i,j}$ was then compared to σ_i^{norm} to determine
41 whether the joint configurations of the two speed conditions were statistically different. For
42 example, when comparing the slow and moderate speed conditions, if $JDV_{s,m}$ does not differ
43 significantly from σ_s^{norm} or σ_m^{norm} , then we would conclude that the terminal joint configurations
44 for these two speeds were not different, i.e., that they lie within the natural variability of each
45 individual speed condition. If, on the other hand, $JDV_{s,m}$ differed significantly from the σ
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 Even if the terminal joint configurations for different speed conditions differed, however,
4
5 this could be because of differences in the terminal pointer-tip positions of the two speed
6
7 conditions. Assessing this possibility is not trivial because even though the mean terminal
8
9 pointer-tip position might differ slightly between speed conditions, all (or even most) of the
10
11 differences in joint configuration might not be the result of these differences in pointer-tip
12
13 position. That is, some of the joint configuration difference might reflect motor equivalence,
14
15 related to the motor system's attempt to preserve a consistent terminal pointer position. This
16
17 question was addressed by using a modification of the UCM approach (Scholz and Schoner
18
19 1999). The mean joint configurations for each speed condition were obtained at the terminal
20
21 pointer-tip position as above. For each condition, the null-space of its mean terminal
22
23 configuration was obtained, which is a linear approximation of that subspace in joint space
24
25 where all inclusive joint configurations are equivalent to the mean configuration and would
26
27 produce the same pointer-tip position. The vector differences in the terminal joint configurations
28
29 for each pair of speed conditions were then obtained (i.e., $\bar{\theta}_i - \bar{\theta}_j$) and projected onto the null-
30
31 space estimated for each speed condition and into the orthogonal subspace (range-space). If
32
33 the length of projection was significantly larger within the null-space, or UCM, for a given speed
34
35 condition than in the range-space, then we concluded that most of the difference in joint
36
37 configurations between speed conditions was not due to a difference in terminal pointer-tip
38
39 position.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Statistical Analyses*

49 The effects of the factors target location and speed of reaching on the values of most
50
51 experimental variables were tested using repeated measures analyses of variance (ANOVA).
52
53 Analyses of the ratio of self-motion to range-space motion or that included self-motion and
54
55 range-space motion individually were performed separately for each of the four equal phases of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reaching (see above). The analysis of differences between the projection of the terminal joint
4 configuration from pairs of speed conditions onto the null-space and the range-space also
5 included subspace type as a factor in the ANOVA. For the comparison of the $nJDV_{i,j}$ and σ_i^{norm} ,
6
7 t-tests were performed. All analysis accepted $p < 0.05$ as the significance value.
8
9

10 11 12 13 Results

14 Movement time (MT)

15
16
17 **Insert Table 1 about here**
18
19

20
21 The data reported in Table 1, **which were averaged across target locations**, indicate
22 that the speed instruction was followed, on average. MT for the speed conditions differed
23 significantly ($F_{2,10} = 2780.0$, $p < 0.01$). There was no effect of target location ($p = 0.55$) or an
24 interaction ($p < 0.19$) with target location. Moreover, MT of each speed condition was well beyond
25 the 95% confidence interval of each other condition.
26
27

28
29 The standard deviation of MT (SD_{MT}) was smaller for the faster movements, as expected
30 ($F_{2,10} = 75.6$, $p < 0.01$). The relative variability (coefficient of variation or CV_{MT}) did not differ
31 among the speed conditions ($F_{2,10} = 2.6$, $p = 0.12$), however. There was an effect of the target,
32 however. Reaching away from the midline toward the left target resulted in slightly higher
33 absolute ($F_{1,5} = 6.6$, $p < 0.05$) and relative ($F_{1,5} = 11.2$, $p < 0.05$) MT variability than did reaching to
34 the right target.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Pointer-tip path deviation

46
47 Figure 1 presents the pointer-tip path for all trials of reaching of the three speed
48 conditions for one representative subject. Although this subject appeared to have different
49 trajectories for the fast (blue dashed line) compared to the other conditions, deviation of the
50 pointer-tip path from a straight line for all subjects to the target was not affected significantly by
51 either movement speed ($p = 0.64$) or the target location ($p = 0.16$) alone. There was, however, a
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 significant interaction between speed and target location ($F_{2,10} = 6.1$, $p < 0.05$). When reaching
4 ipsilaterally, away from the body's midline, the hand path deviation was largest for the slowest
5 MT (slow: 0.031 ± 0.005 -m; moderate: 0.024 ± 0.002 -m; fast: 0.025 ± 0.003 -m). In contrast,
6
7 when reaching toward the body midline, hand path deviation increased with movement speed
8 (slow: 0.015 ± 0.005 -m; moderate: 0.017 ± 0.005 -m; fast: 0.020 ± 0.008 -m). Variability of hand
9 path deviation did not differ between speed conditions ($p = 0.54$) or target locations ($p = 0.59$), and
10 there were no interaction effects ($p = 0.78$).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18
19
20 **Insert Figure 1 about here**
21

22 Terminal pointer-tip position

23
24 Main effects of target were not of interest because they were expected to differ in the x-
25 dimension, as they did ($F_{1,5} = 894.7$, $p < 0.01$), but not in the y-dimension ($p = 0.66$) or the z-
26 dimension ($p = 0.95$). The medial-lateral pointer-tip position did not differ among the speed
27 conditions ($p = 0.94$), nor was there an interaction between the target location and speed
28 ($p = 0.98$). Speed also did not affect significantly the y-dimension ($p = 0.07$), nor was there a target
29 by speed interaction ($p = 0.85$). However, the effect of speed was significant for the z-dimension
30 ($F_{2,10} = 5.43$, $p < 0.05$). There also was an interaction with target location ($F_{2,10} = 6.24$, $p < 0.05$).
31 These resulted from a tendency for the pointer-tip to end lower on the target for the faster
32 velocity movements, although this difference was present for the slow and fast conditions only
33 for the left ($0.406 \pm 0.002 \rightarrow 0.401 \pm 0.002 \rightarrow 0.398 \pm 0.002$ m) but not the right target ($0.407 \pm$
34 $0.002 \rightarrow 0.406 \pm 0.002 \rightarrow 0.397 \pm 0.003$ m).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Self-motion

50
51 **Figure 2 presents the average self-motion and range-space motion across trials**
52 **for three speeds of reaching for two subjects. Subject CH exhibited the smallest amount**
53 **of self-motion of all subjects. Self-motion typically was substantial for most subjects,**
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **generally amounting to over 50% of the amount of range-space motion (Figure 3).**

4
5 **Although an increase range-space motion is expected at faster movement speeds, the**
6
7 **proportional increase in self-motion with increasing reaching speed observed in this**
8
9 **experiment is not necessary because self-motion has no effect on the hand's motion, by**
10
11 **definition.**

12
13 **Insert Figure 2 about here**

14
15
16
17
18 Figure 3 presents the average across subjects self-motion and range-space motion, \pm
19 standard error of the means (SEM) for each target location. Both self-motion and range-space
20 motion increased with movement speed, although not always proportionally as seen in the
21 figure. Required movement speed affected significantly combined self-motion and range-space
22 motion for all four phases of the reach ($F_{2,10} = 27.9$, $p < 0.0001$; $F_{2,10} = 52.6$, $p < 0.0001$; $F_{2,10} =$
23 235.8 , $p < 0.0001$; $F_{2,10} = 84.6$, $p < 0.0001$), as expected. However, there was a significant
24 interaction between speed and projection component of the joint velocity vector (i.e., self-motion
25 and range-space motion components) for the last three phases of reaching ($F_{2,10} = 7.1$, $p < 0.01$;
26 $F_{2,10} = 49.5$, $p < 0.0001$; $F_{2,10} = 34.4$, $p < 0.0001$) but not for the first phase ($p = 0.647$), independent
27 of the target location. This was because the increase in range space motion was proportionally
28 greater with increasing reaching speed than the increase in self-motion. We quantified this
29 difference by computing the slope of the change in range-space motion or self-motion with
30 required reaching speed (in seconds) for each subject and comparing the slopes with a
31 repeated measures ANOVA. A decrease in slope (K) of the change in the vector component with
32 speed (negative because movement time decreases with speed) was greater for range-space
33 motion compared to self-motion for the second ($K_{SM} = -1.02 \pm 0.16$ vs. $K_{RSP} = -1.65 \pm 0.25$; $F_{1,5} =$
34 7.97 , $p < 0.05$), third ($K_{SM} = -1.18 \pm 0.15$ vs. $K_{RSP} = -2.30 \pm 0.12$; $F_{1,5} = 53.0$, $p < 0.001$) and fourth
35 phases ($K_{SM} = -0.76 \pm 0.11$ vs. $K_{RSP} = -1.55 \pm 0.17$; $F_{1,5} = 37.1$, $p < 0.01$) of the reach trajectory.

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
There were no significant interactions that involved both target location and required
reaching speed for any of the phases of reaching. Target location did interact with the projection

1
2
3 component for the third phase of reaching only ($F_{1,5} = 14.5$, $p < 0.01$). This occurred because the
4 amount of self-motion was slightly less when reaching to the right target (0.856 ± 0.11 rad/sec)
5 compared to the left target (1.00 ± 0.76 rad/sec) while range-space motion was larger when
6 reaching to the right target (1.77 ± 0.096 rad/sec) versus the left target (1.58 ± 0.046 rad/sec).
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 **Insert Figure 3 about here**
14
15

16 Motor Equivalence

17
18 Comparisons of normalized joint difference vectors (nJDV) between pairs of speed
19 conditions to σ_i^{norm} computed across trials of each individual speed condition are presented in
20 Table 2. Results are provided separately for each target location.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Insert Table 2 about here**
29
30
31

32 For the left target, $\text{nJDV}_{s,m}$ was not significantly different from σ_s^{norm} or σ_m^{norm} ; $\text{nJDV}_{m,f}$
33 was also not significantly different from σ_m^{norm} or σ_f^{norm} . However, $\text{nJDV}_{s,f}$ was significantly
34 different from both σ_s^{norm} and σ_f^{norm} , indicating a significant difference between the joint
35 configurations of the slow and fast speed conditions. For the right target, $\text{nJDV}_{s,m}$ did not differ
36 from σ_s^{norm} or σ_m^{norm} , but $\text{nJDV}_{i,j}$ did differ significantly from σ_i^{norm} and σ_j^{norm} when comparing
37 slow to fast and moderate to fast speeds (Table 2). Thus, the terminal joint configuration for the
38 fast condition differed from those for both the slow and moderate speed conditions.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The next step was to estimate how much of the identified differences in terminal joint
47 configurations were related to differences in the terminal pointer-tip position, which differed
48 slightly in the vertical dimension among speed conditions (see above).
49
50
51

52 Figure 4 presents the results of the analysis that projected the difference in the terminal
53 joint configurations from pairs of speed conditions onto UCMs that were estimated from the
54 mean terminal joint configurations of individual speed conditions. All results were normalized for
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the dimension of each subspace. If the difference in terminal joint configurations from pairs of
4 speed conditions was due primarily to differences in terminal pointer tip position, then most of
5 the projection length should lie in the range-space and not in the subspace defined by the UCM.
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Insert Figure 4 about here**
12
13
14

15
16 The only factor in the ANOVA that reached significance was the comparison between
17 the null-space (i.e., linear approximation of the UCM) and range-space projections. As can be
18 seen from Figure 4, the projection onto the UCM was significantly and substantially larger than
19 the projection onto the range-space ($F_{1,5} = 32.3$, $p < 0.01$). There was no effect of the target
20 location. The speed comparison was close to but did not reach significance ($p = 0.062$). The
21 results of comparisons between the UCM and range-space projections for individual pairs of
22 speed conditions are shown in the figure above each pair of bars.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Discussion**

32
33 This study investigated two related questions about the control of multi-DOF
34 movements. First, we were interested in determining whether the transport of the pointer-tip to
35 the targets was accompanied by a significant amount of self-motion, that is, joint motion that did
36 not propel the pointer-tip. **Second, we investigated whether the terminal joint postures were**
37 **invariant across reaches at different movement speeds** (Desmurget et al. 1995; Desmurget
38 and Prablanc 1997; Desmurget et al. 1998; Gréa et al. 2000), **and if not, whether differences**
39 **in terminal joint postures between speed conditions were associated with motor**
40 **equivalence, that is, were structured to keep pointer-tip position more invariant across**
41 **reaching speeds than to produce different pointer-tip position.**
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Regarding the first question, a significant amount of self-motion accompanied this
54 redundant, three-dimensional reaching task. Except for one subject who showed a limited effect
55 (Figure 2, left panel), self-motion cannot be considered simply a residual effect because the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 absolute amount of self-motion scaled with the velocity of movement (Figure 3). When
4
5 accounting for differences in the number of dimensions of each subspace, self-motion was
6
7 typically about half of the amount of range-space motion. That self-motion was smaller than
8
9 range-space motion is not surprising. If anything, it is surprising that self-motion was as large as
10
11 it was, given that there was no explicit secondary task constraint in these experiments. During
12
13 the earliest portion of the reach the amount of self-motion was equal to range-space motion.
14
15 This result may reflect the effect of initial adjustments of the joint configuration during the
16
17 transition from the fixed initial posture to transport of the hand toward the targets. **Although the**
18
19 **amount of self-motion and range-space motion were larger for higher speed reaches,**
20
21 **these increases were relatively proportional except during the period including the initial**
22
23 **deceleration of the reach (51-75%). Thus, when examining the relative amount of self-**
24
25 **motion (i.e., its ratio to range-space motion), the results generally agree with previous**
26
27 **studies showing little effect of reaching speed on kinematics** (Soechting and Lacquaniti
28
29 1981; Nishikawa et al. 1999; Torres and Zipser 2004). **The difference in the ratio for the**
30
31 **fastest reaches during the deceleration phase is an exception, however. This result may**
32
33 **be due to higher interaction torques during this phase for the fastest reaches, although**
34
35 **we did not specifically measure torques in this study.**

36
37
38 To our knowledge, this is the first study of human reaching that has investigated self-
39
40 motion without artificially constraining joint motion, although similar issues have been addressed
41
42 during natural movements by other investigators. A recent study of a throwing task, performed at
43
44 a preferred movement speed and without a specified terminal hand position, also reported a
45
46 significant amount of self-motion particularly early and late in the hand's trajectory (Yang and
47
48 Scholz 2005).

49
50 What accounts for this significant amount of self-motion without an additional task
51
52 requirement? **One possible interpretation is that this finding reflects the design of a**
53
54 **control system that uses motor abundance to perform additional tasks without**
55
56 **disturbing the primary task, or when compensating for unexpected perturbations.** The
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 self-motion results are consistent with a recent model of the control of reaching in which a
4 neuronal dynamics is used to generate a virtual joint trajectory (Martin et al. 2009). Within this
5 dynamics, virtual joint velocity vectors that move the end-effector are dynamically decoupled
6 from velocity vectors that have no effect on the end-effector. Because sensory information about
7 the real joint configuration is coupled back into this neuronal dynamics, the virtual trajectory is
8 updated by task-equivalent deviations from the dynamic movement plan. This back-coupling
9 was found to be essential to correctly approximate empirically measured self-motion during
10 planar reaching when motion was limited to four joints. Considered within the framework of this
11 model, changes of the joint configuration with faster reaches in the current experiment would be
12 resisted by the control system insofar as they would alter the pointer-tip path. In contrast,
13 deviations of the joint configuration from the planned configuration that do not affect the hand's
14 path would not be resisted, but would result in updating the plan to the current joint
15 configuration. The simulations of Martin et al. (2009) also showed that models in which an
16 inverse dynamics cancels interaction torques predict too little self-motion and end-effector paths
17 that were too straight compared to typical paths. Thus, the presence of self-motion provides an
18 important constraint on models of motor tasks such as reaching.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The classical idea of the pseudo-inverse postulates that in a redundant effector system, a given end-effector velocity is achieved by minimizing the total amount of joint motion (Klein and Huang 1983; Mussa-Ivaldi and Hogan 1991). The principle of the pseudo-inverse predicts, therefore, zero self-motion. Imperfect control may lead to deviations of the real from the planned joint trajectory which may partly lie in the null-space of the end-effector Jacobian. The observation of non-negligible self-motion does not, therefore, categorically rule out the optimality principle of the pseudo-inverse. Quantitative modeling has suggested, however, that self-motion induced solely by imperfect control is not sufficient to account for the large proportion of self-motion observed here (see below; Martin et al. 2009). Other optimality principles such as minimum effort (Todorov 2004) or minimum torque change (Uno et al. 1989) do not exclude that movement plans may include self-motion. The amount of self-motion identified in the current

1
2
3 experiments also question the posture-based model of Rosenbaum (Rosenbaum et al. 1999).
4
5 The use of multiple cost factors to identify an optimal path of joint motion should, under identical
6
7 initial posture and target conditions, lead to relatively little self-motion.
8
9

10 ***The second question investigated here was whether the CNS generally plans for***
11 ***a specific terminal joint configuration, not only a terminal end-effector position. The***
12 ***nervous system certainly is capable of specifying a particular joint configuration, for***
13 ***example, during artistic or athletic performances. However, is this typically the case for***
14 ***everyday activities such as reaching?*** It is possible that the self-motion measured during this
15
16 experiment was a reflection of adjustments needed to achieve a specific joint configuration. The
17
18 question of whether the terminal joint configuration is specified in a redundant motor system has
19
20 received considerable attention. We contribute to this discussion by asking whether the
21
22 difference between joint configurations for pairs of speed conditions was greater than the
23
24 variability of the joint configurations of the individual speed conditions. If the difference between
25
26 joint configurations for two speed conditions was greater statistically than the joint configuration
27
28 variability of a given speed condition, we concluded that the terminal arm postures achieved in
29
30 the two speed conditions were different. The results indicate that the joint configuration for the
31
32 fast condition was consistently different from those of either the moderate or slow reaching
33
34 conditions. Could this difference be due primarily to differences in the terminal pointer-tip
35
36 position between reaching speeds? Analysis of the terminal pointer-tip position revealed
37
38 differences among the speed conditions along the vertical dimension of the target, so this
39
40 account cannot be rejected off hand.
41
42
43
44
45

46 To investigate this question, we employed another modification of the UCM method
47
48 (Scholz and Schoner 1999). The geometric model that describes how changes in the joint
49
50 configuration affects the pointer-tip position first was used to define the Jacobian based on the
51
52 average terminal joint configuration of a reference target speed condition. The null-space, or
53
54 estimated UCM, of that Jacobian was then computed. To review, the UCM represents the
55
56 subspace of joint space within which deviations of the joint configuration away from the average
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 joint configuration for the reference speed condition would still produce the same pointer-tip
4 position obtained with the reference joint configuration. Then, deviations in the complementary
5 subspace, or range-space, would lead to different pointer-tip positions. Once the null-space and
6 complementary subspace of a given speed condition was obtained, the difference between the
7 average terminal joint configuration of that speed and each of the other speed conditions was
8 obtained and projected onto the null and range spaces of the reference joint configuration. If the
9 difference in terminal joint configurations between pairs of speed conditions was due primarily to
10 differences in the terminal pointer-tip position, then the length of projection should be
11 substantially larger in the range-space compared to the null-space. Instead, the results showed
12 that the projection into the null-space was significantly larger regardless of which speed
13 conditions were compared. This result indicates that the terminal pointer-tip position was
14 affected less than the terminal joint configuration as the speed of reaching increased, with most
15 of the change in joint configuration with speed lying in the null-space of the reference condition's
16 joint configuration. Thus, differences in the terminal joint configuration across speed conditions
17 cannot be attributed to systematic differences in terminal pointer-tip position. They instead
18 reflect a substantial degree of motor equivalence.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 In conclusion, the first question of this investigation was answered affirmatively.
37 Significant differences existed among the speed conditions in the terminal joint configuration
38 that were related to motor equivalence, i.e., disturbances induced by higher movement speeds
39 were compensated by adjustments in joint coordination, tending to stabilize the pointer-tip
40 position. Thus, a fixed terminal joint configuration does not appear to be planned by the CNS for
41 typical movement tasks such as reaching and pointing, although the specification of particular
42 patterns of joint configuration over time may be used by the nervous system when controlling
43 other tasks, such as artistic endeavors or athletic performances. The answer to our second
44 question was also affirmative. Reaching to targets in different parts of the arm's workspace was
45 accompanied by a significant amount of self-motion that scaled with movement speed. The
46 results are consistent with a control system that takes advantage of available motor abundance,
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

allowing for flexibility in the face of perturbations (Kelso et al. 1984; Cole and Abbs 1986; Cole and Abbs 1987), induced here by different speeds of reaching.

Bibliography

- 1
2
3
4
5 Atkeson CG, Hollerbach JM (1985) Kinematic features of unrestrained vertical arm movements.
6
7 The Journal of Neuroscience 5: 2318-2330
8
- 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Belongie S (1999) Rodrigues' Rotation Formula. In: Weisstein EW (ed). MathWorld--A Wolfram
Web Resource
- Bernstein N (1967) The co-ordination and regulation of movements. Pergamon Press, Oxford
- Cole KJ, Abbs JH (1986) Coordination of three-joint digit movements for rapid finger-thumb
grasp. J Neurophysiol 55: 1407-1423
- Cole KJ, Abbs JH (1987) Kinematic and electromyographic responses to perturbation of a rapid
grasp. J Neurophysiol 57: 1498-1510
- Cruse H, Bruwer M, Dean J (1993) Control of Three- and Four-Joint Arm Movement: Strategies
for a Manipulator With Redundant Degrees of Freedom. J Mot Behav 25: 131-139
- Desmurget M, Gréa H, Prablanc C (1998) Final posture of the upper limb depends on the initial
position of the hand during prehension movements. Experimental Brain Research 119:
511-516
- Desmurget M, Prablanc C (1997) Postural control of three-dimensional prehension movements.
J Neurophysiol 77: 452-464
- Desmurget M, Prablanc C, Rossetti Y, Arzi M, Paulignan Y, Urquizar C, Mignot JC (1995)
Postural and synergic control for three-dimensional movements of reaching and
grasping. Journal of Neurophysiology 74: 905-910
- Gelfand IM, Latash ML (1998) On the problem of adequate language in motor control. Motor
Control 2: 306-313
- Gréa H, Desmurget M, Prablanc C (2000) Postural invariance in three-dimensional reaching
and grasping movements. Experimental Brain Research 134: 155-162
- Hollerbach JM, Flash T (1982) Dynamic interactions between limb segments during planar arm
movement. Biol Cybern 44: 67-77

- 1
2
3 Kelso JA, Tuller B, Vatikiotis-Bateson E, Fowler CA (1984) Functionally specific articulatory
4 cooperation following jaw perturbations during speech: evidence for coordinative
5 structures. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform* 10: 812-832
6
7
8
9 Klein CA, Huang C (1983) Review of pseudoinverse control for use with kinematically redundant
10 manipulators. *IEEE Trans Syst Man Cybern* 13: 245-250
11
12
13 Latash ML, Scholz JP, Schoner G (2007) Toward a new theory of motor synergies. *Motor*
14 *Control* 11: 276-308
15
16
17 Martin V, Scholz JP, Schöner G (2009) Redundancy, self-motion, and motor control. *Neural*
18 *Computation* 21: 1371-1414
19
20
21 Murray R, Li Z, Sastry SS (1994) A mathematical introduction to robotic manipulation. CRC
22 Press, Boca Raton
23
24
25 Mussa-Ivaldi FA, Hogan N (1991) Integrable solutions of kinematic redundancy via impedance
26 control. *The International Journal of Robotics Research* 10: 481-491
27
28
29 Nishikawa KC, Murray ST, Flanders M (1999) Do arm postures vary with the speed of
30 reaching? *Journal of Neurophysiology* 81: 2582–2586
31
32
33 Reisman DS, Scholz JP (2003) Aspects of joint coordination are preserved during pointing in
34 persons with post-stroke hemiparesis. *Brain* 126: 2510-2527
35
36
37 Rosenbaum DA, Cohen RG, Dawson AM, Jax SA, Meulenbroek RG, van der Wel R, Vaughan J
38 (2009) The posture-based motion planning framework: new findings related to object
39 manipulation, moving around obstacles, moving in three spatial dimensions, and haptic
40 tracking. *Adv Exp Med Biol* 629: 485-497
41
42
43 Rosenbaum DA, Meulenbroek RG, Vaughan J (2001a) Planning reaching and grasping
44 movements: theoretical premises and practical implications. *Motor Control* 5: 99-115
45
46
47 Rosenbaum DA, Meulenbroek RGJ, Vaughan J (1999) Remembered positions: stored locations
48 or stored postures? *Experimental Brain Research* 124: 503-512
49
50
51 Rosenbaum DA, Meulenbroek RJ, Vaughan J, Jansen C (2001b) Posture-based motion
52 planning: applications to grasping. *Psychol Rev* 108: 709-734
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sainburg RL, Kalakanis D (2000) Differences in control of limb dynamics during dominant and
4 nondominant arm reaching. *J Neurophysiol* 83: 2661-2675
5
6
7 Scholz JP, Schoner G (1999) The uncontrolled manifold concept: identifying control variables for
8 a functional task. *Exp Brain Res* 126: 289-306
9
10
11 Scholz JP, Schöner G, Hsu WL, Jeka JJ, Horak FB, Martin V (2007) Motor equivalent control of
12 the center of mass in response to support surface perturbations. *Experimental Brain*
13 *Research* 180: 163-179
14
15
16
17 Scholz JP, Schoner G, Latash ML (2000a) Identifying the control structure of multijoint
18 coordination during pistol shooting. *Exp Brain Res* 135: 382-404
19
20
21 Scholz JP, Schöner G, Latash ML (2000b) Identifying the control structure of multijoint
22 coordination during pistol shooting. *Exp Brain Res* 135: 382-404
23
24
25
26 Schöner G (1995) Recent developments and problems in human movement science and their
27 conceptual implications. *Ecological Psychology* 7: 291-314
28
29
30 Soderkvist I, Wedin PA (1993) Determining the movements of the skeleton using well-configured
31 markers. *J Biomech* 26: 1473-1477
32
33
34 Soechting JF, Buneo CA, Herrmann U, Flanders M (1995) Moving effortlessly in three
35 dimensions: does Donders' law apply to arm movement? *Journal of Neuroscience* 15:
36 6271-6280
37
38
39
40 Soechting JF, Lacquaniti F (1981) Invariant characteristics of a pointing movement in man. *J*
41 *Neurosci* 1: 710-720
42
43
44 Thomas JS, Corcos DM, Hasan Z (2003) Effect of movement speed on limb segment motions
45 for reaching from a standing position. *Experimental Brain Research* 148: 377-387
46
47
48 Tillery SI, Ebner TJ, Soechting JF (1995) Task dependence of primate arm postures.
49 *Experimental Brain Research* 104: 1-11
50
51
52 Todorov E (2004) Optimality principles in sensorimotor control. *Nat Neurosci* 7: 907-915
53
54
55 Torres EB, Andersen R (2006) Space-time separation during obstacle-avoidance learning in
56 monkeys. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 96: 2613-2632
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Torres EB, Zipser D (2002) Reaching to grasp with a multi-jointed arm. I. A computational
4 model. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 88: 1–13
5
6
7 Torres EB, Zipser D (2004) Simultaneous control of hand displacements and rotations in
8 orientation-matching experiments. *Journal of Applied Physiology* 96: 1978-1987
9
10
11 Tseng Y, Scholz JP (2005) The effect of workspace on the use of motor abundance. *Motor*
12 *Control* 9
13
14
15 Tseng Y, Scholz JP, Schöner G (2002) Goal-equivalent joint coordination in pointing: effect of
16 vision and arm dominance. *Motor Control* 6: 183-207
17
18
19 Tseng Y, Scholz JP, Schöner G, Hotchkiss L (2003) Effect of accuracy constraint on joint
20 coordination during pointing movements. *Exp Brain Res* 149: 276-288
21
22
23 Uno Y, Kawato M, Suzuki R (1989) Formation and control of optimal trajectory in human
24 multijoint arm movement. Minimum torque-change model. *Biol Cybern* 61: 89-101
25
26
27 Yang JF, Scholz JP (2005) Learning a throwing task is associated with differential changes in
28 the use of motor abundance. *Exp Brain Res* 163: 137-158
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Self-motion related to the three-dimensional movement of the hand refers to a component of the joint velocity vector that does not affect hand motion (Murray, Li & Sastry 1994). Self-motion is only possible if joint motions are redundant. Although self-motion could be considered wasted motion with respect to movement efficiency, the ability to produce self-motion is crucial for the performance of multiple tasks simultaneously. For example, the redundancy of angular motion of arm joints allows one to flip a light switch with the elbow while carrying and stabilizing a tray of drinks, i.e., without negatively impacting the hand's movement. Thus, the component of the joint velocities linked to flipping the switch is self-motion when viewed with respect to hand movement. In principle, without a specific secondary task as was the case in the current experiment, one could expect self-motion to be minimal, most of the joint velocity vector acting to move the hand in space.

The conceptual framework of the method used here to differentiate between the component of the joint velocity vector that leads to hand movement, referred to by its technical term range-space motion (Murray, Li & Sastry 1994), and the self-motion component is based on the Uncontrolled Manifold (UCM) variance analysis (Scholz & Schöner 1999) in the current study. However, this analysis does not examine variances. The method can be illustrated by a simple example. Consider pointing with the hand in the horizontal plane where only three joint angles are available to transport the hand, shoulder horizontal flexion-extension, elbow flexion-extension, and wrist flexion-extension. To reach a target requires at least two DOFs of joint motion, equivalent to the required two-dimensional hand position. Thus, there is one free joint DOF in this redundant system. That is, there exists a one-dimensional subspace (Figure A1) within the space of the three arm joint motions within which a set of different combinations of shoulder, elbow and wrist angles lead to an identical two-dimensional hand position. This subspace has been referred to as the uncontrolled manifold (UCM; Scholz & Schöner 1999) and a different UCM exists at each time point due to changing arm geometry. Thus, the first step in the self-motion analysis, like UCM analysis, was to estimate the UCM subspace at each data

sample. First, the geometric model relating joint motion to hand motion is obtained as follows for the illustration:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} l_{arm} * \cos(\theta_{shoulder}) + l_{forearm} * \cos(\theta_{shoulder} + \theta_{elbow}) + l_{hand} * \cos(\theta_{shoulder} + \theta_{elbow} + \theta_{wrist}) \\ l_{arm} * \sin(\theta_{shoulder}) + l_{forearm} * \sin(\theta_{shoulder} + \theta_{elbow}) + l_{hand} * \sin(\theta_{shoulder} + \theta_{elbow} + \theta_{wrist}) \end{bmatrix}$$

The Jacobian (J) of the geometric model is then computed using each instantaneous joint configuration 'i', $\{\theta_{shoulder}^i, \theta_{elbow}^i, \theta_{wrist}^i\}$, of each trial. The Jacobian is defined as the matrix of partial derivatives of the hand coordinates relative to the joint angles,

$$J(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \partial x / \partial \theta_{shoulder} & \partial x / \partial \theta_{elbow} & \partial x / \partial \theta_{wrist} \\ \partial y / \partial \theta_{shoulder} & \partial y / \partial \theta_{elbow} & \partial y / \partial \theta_{wrist} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The Jacobian is used to transform changes in joint angles, or angular velocities, into hand, or more generally end-effector, velocities, i.e., $dr/dt = J(\theta) * d\theta/dt$.

The null-space of the Jacobian is then computed by singular value decomposition of the Jacobian in Matlab™, $[u, s, v] = \text{svd}(J^T)$, where 'T' is the transpose of the Jacobian, 'u' is a matrix of eigenvectors and 's' is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues. The first two columns of u are the range-space vectors and the last column is the null-space vector in this 3D example.

The final step in the self-motion analysis is to project the instantaneous joint velocity vector $\{d\theta_{shoulder}^i/dt, d\theta_{elbow}^i/dt, d\theta_{wrist}^i/dt\}$ into the range-space and null-space and then compute the lengths of projection.

Figure A1 provides a cartoon illustration of the results of this procedure. In the figure, three hypothetical one-dimensional UCMs representing three consecutive time points are illustrated. The solid filled circles lying on each UCM represent joint angle combinations, or joint configurations, for a given trial at each time point. Note that given the definition of the UCM, combinations of joints lying anywhere along each line would produce the same 2D hand position (but a different hand position for each UCM). Thus, movement of the hand can be conceived of

1
2
3 as a transition among sequences of UCMs. The heavy dashed line in each panel represents the
4 change in joint configuration, or the joint velocity vector. If most of the joint velocity vector acts to
5 move the hand in space, then this vector should be relatively perpendicular to the UCMs. If,
6 instead, there is a significant amount of self-motion, then the vector will form a more acute angle
7 with the UCMs. The upper panel is an illustration of the later situation. The lower panel
8 represents a hand movement accompanied by little self-motion. The different situations are
9 estimated by the lengths of projection of the joint velocity vector into each subspace, i.e., the
10 null-space (self-motion) and its complement (range-space motion). These projection lengths are
11 also illustrated in the figure.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Movement Time Variables			95% Confidence Interval	
Speed Condition	Mean (sec)	SEM	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Slow	1.185	0.0097	1.16	1.21
Moderate	0.77	0.0059	0.754	0.785
Fast	0.474	0.0032	0.466	0.482
	SD _{MT}	SEM	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Slow	0.0678	0.0039	0.058	0.078
Moderate	0.037	0.0015	0.033	0.041
Fast	0.0256	0.0015	0.022	0.03
	CV _{MT}	SEM	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Slow	5.712	0.308	4.921	6.503
Moderate	4.811	0.195	4.309	5.313
Fast	5.413	0.353	4.506	6.32

Target	Speed	nJDV _{i,j} (radians)	σ_i^{norm} (radians)	t-value (df = 11)	p-value
Left	Slow versus Mod	0.1405 ± 0.0578	0.1341 ± 0.0414	0.688	0.522
			0.1246 ± 0.0240	0.836	0.441
	Slow versus Fast	0.2147 ± 0.0628	0.1341 ± 0.0414	3.376	0.05
			0.1180 ± 0.0318	4.287	0.01
	Mod versus Fast	0.1565 ± 0.0566	0.1246 ± 0.0240	1.646	0.161
			0.1180 ± 0.0318	1.594	0.172
Right	Slow versus Mod	0.1240 ± 0.6437	0.1370 ± 0.3507	-0.679	0.527
			0.1268 ± 0.1405	-0.146	0.809
	Slow versus Fast	0.2000 ± 0.0602	0.1370 ± 0.3507	2.581	0.05
			0.1214 ± 0.0167	3.571	0.05
	Mod versus Fast	0.1874 ± 0.0548	0.1268 ± 0.1405	3.661	0.05
			0.1214 ± 0.0167	3.793	0.01

Table 2. Comparison of normed difference between terminal joint configurations for different speed conditions (nJDV_{i,j}) versus the standard deviation of the joint configuration for each speed condition (σ_i^{norm}).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Sample hand paths for all trials of one representative subject for slow (solid), moderate (dashed) and fast (dotted) reaching to the left and right targets.




Figure 2: Self-motion (thin lines) and range-space motion (thick lines) per subspace dimension (see text) for slow, moderate and fast reaching speeds (top to bottom) performed to two target locations. Dashed lines represent across trials standard deviation. Subject CH showed the smallest amount of self-motion of all subjects. Results were averaged across trials of relatively equal movement time for each subject.




Figure 3: Self-motion (patterned bars) and range-space motion (solid bars) per dimension (see text) for three speeds of reaching at each of four phases of the reach trajectory (thick lines). Results for each phase were computed separately for each subject and then averaged across subjects. Results are presented for reaching to the left and right targets, with error bars indicating standard error of the means.





Figure 4. Projection of the difference in the terminal joint configurations for pairs of speed conditions (x-axis) onto the UCM, estimated from the terminal joint configuration of each individual speed condition, and the range-space. Projections of the joint configuration differences onto the UCMs estimated from the terminal joint configuration of either speed making up that pair did not differ significantly. Therefore, the mean values are presented here.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

θ_{shoulder}

θ_{elbow}

θ_{wrist}



θ_{shoulder}

θ_{elbow}

θ_{wrist}

