

This is a repository copy of *The effect of locomotion on early visual contrast processing in humans*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/126452/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Benjamin, Alex Victoria, Wailes-Newson, Kirstie Holly, Ma-Wyatt, Anna et al. (2 more authors) (2018) The effect of locomotion on early visual contrast processing in humans. *Journal of neuroscience*. pp. 3050-3059. ISSN: 1529-2401

<https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1428-17.2017>

---

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# Title: The effect of locomotion on early visual contrast processing in humans

---

**Abbreviated title:** No effect of locomotion on human surround suppression

**Authors:**

*Benjamin, A.V.* <sup>\*1</sup>

*Wailes-Newson, K* <sup>\*1</sup>

*Ma-Wyatt, A* <sup>2</sup>

*Baker, D.H.* <sup>1</sup>

*Wade, A.R.* <sup>1</sup>

**Affiliations:**

1: University of York, UK

2: University of Adelaide, Australia

\* Both authors contributed equally to this work

**Number of pages: 25**

**Number of figures: 7**

**Abstract: 248 words**

**Introduction: 513 words**

**Discussion: 1094 words**

**No conflict of interest**

**Acknowledgements:** The work was funded by the European Research Council and the BBSRC

1

## 2 **ABSTRACT**

3 Most of our knowledge about vision comes from experiments in which stimuli are  
4 presented to immobile human subjects or animals. In the case of human subjects,  
5 movement during psychophysical, electrophysiological or neuroimaging experiments  
6 is considered to be a source of noise to be eliminated. Animals used in visual  
7 neuroscience experiments are typically restrained and, in many cases, anaesthetized.

8 In reality however, vision is often used to guide the motion of awake, ambulating  
9 organisms. Recent work in mice has shown that locomotion elevates visual neuronal  
10 response amplitudes (Erisken et al., 2014; Fu et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2014; Mineault et  
11 al., 2016; Niell and Stryker, 2010) and reduces long-range gain control (Ayaz et al.,  
12 2013). Here we use both psychophysics and steady-state electrophysiology to ask  
13 whether similar effects of locomotion on early visual processing can be measured in  
14 humans.

15  
16 Our psychophysical results show that brisk walking has little effect on subjects'  
17 ability to detect briefly-presented contrast changes and that co-oriented flankers are, if  
18 anything, more effective masks when subjects are walking. Our electrophysiological  
19 data were consistent with the psychophysics, indicating no increase in stimulus-driven  
20 neuronal responses whilst walking and no reduction in surround suppression.

21 In summary we find evidence that early contrast processing is altered by locomotion  
22 in humans but in a manner that differs from that reported in mice. The effects of  
23 locomotion on very low-level visual processing may differ on a species-by-species  
24 basis and may reflect important differences in the levels of arousal associated with  
25 locomotion.

26

## Significance Statement

Mice are the current model of choice for studying low-level visual processing. Recent studies have shown that mouse visual cortex is modulated by behavioural state: V1 neurons in locomoting mice tend to be more sensitive and less influenced by long-range gain control. Here we test these effects in humans by measuring psychophysical detection thresholds and EEG responses while subjects walk on a treadmill. We find no evidence of increased contrast sensitivity or reduced surround suppression in walking humans. Our data show that fundamental measurements of early visual processing differ between humans and mice and have important implications for recent work on the link between arousal, behaviour and vision in these two species.

## 1 Introduction

2 Recent work in head-fixed mouse models has demonstrated that locomotion is linked  
3 with changes in early visual processing. Many labs report that locomoting mice  
4 exhibit increased responsivity in primary visual cortex (Fu et al., 2014; Niell and  
5 Stryker, 2010; Polack et al., 2013) while there is also evidence for a locomotion-  
6 associated reduction in surround suppression (Ayaz et al., 2013) and locomotion-  
7 dependent visual plasticity (Kaneko et al., 2017; Kaneko and Stryker, 2014). These  
8 measurements are broadly consistent with the more general observations that sensory  
9 neuronal responses are dependent not just on stimulus strength but also on  
10 behavioural state, arousal and attention (Haider et al., 2013; Harris and Thiele, 2011;  
11 Lauritzen et al., 2010; McGinley et al., 2015; Motter, 1993; Posner and Petersen,  
12 1990; Reimer et al., 2014). However, the underlying mechanisms linking locomotion  
13 to visual sensitivity in mice are unclear, as are the implications for human vision.  
14 Some labs do report modulations of early human visual processing during periods of  
15 acute exercise changes but these are at the level of featural tuning (Bullock et al.,  
16 2016) while the effects on low-level contrast sensitivity are more ambiguous (Bullock  
17 et al., 2015). Moreover, these effects are observed not during locomotion *per se* but  
18 during intense bouts of exercise on a stationary bicycle. To our knowledge, the most  
19 striking effect of true locomotion on human vision to date has been the observation of  
20 a locomotion-related motion aftereffect whose cause has never been fully explained  
21 (Pelach and Barlow, 1996) but which must act at a level above simple contrast  
22 processing in V1.

23  
24 If locomotion alters early contrast representations in humans it would have profound  
25 implications for our understanding of natural scene processing. Orientation-selective  
26 surround suppression (Cavanaugh et al., 2002; DeAngelis et al., 1994; Nelson and  
27 Frost, 1978) has been hypothesized to play a critical role in scene segmentation by  
28 increasing neuronal responses at the boundaries of different texture patches (Knierim  
29 and van Essen, 1992; Lamme, 1995; Nothdurft et al., 2000; Rossi et al., 2001). The  
30 discovery of a significant reduction in surround suppression during locomotion would  
31 therefore raise the possibility that scene segmentation is altered (and potentially  
32 impaired) while subjects are navigating their environment. Similarly, a locomotion  
33 driven change in neuronal gain would reshape or reposition the contrast sensitivity  
34 function with implications for the discrimination of both low- and high-contrast edges  
35 as well as the computation of speed which is known to be contrast-dependent (Stocker  
36 and Simoncelli, 2006; Thompson, 1982).

37  
38 Here we measure two aspects of early contrast processing (neuronal sensitivity and  
39 surround suppression) in locomoting humans. These measurements are made using  
40 two sensitive and complementary methods: psychophysical contrast discrimination  
41 and steady-state EEG to provide both perceptual and direct neuronal measures of  
42 contrast processing. The locomotion of the participants (on a treadmill) was varied  
43 across repetitions of the experiment. We then asked if we were able to measure  
44 changes in either responsivity or orientation-dependent surround suppression between  
45 the locomotion and static conditions. We compare our findings with those from the  
46 mouse literature with particular reference to the interaction between arousal and  
47 locomotion states in humans and mice.

# 1   **Methods**

## 2   *General experimental design*

3   We performed behavioral and electrophysiological (SSVEP) experiments to measure  
4   neuronal response amplitude and long-range, spatially-tuned gain control in human  
5   subjects. 13 subjects (4 female, mean age 26) took part in the behavioural experiment,  
6   13 subjects (10 female, mean age 24) took part in the SSVEP experiments and 12  
7   subjects (8 female, mean age 24) took part in the pupilometry experiment. Nine  
8   subjects took part in all experiments. All experimental protocols were approved by the  
9   ethics committee of the University of York Psychology Department.

10  
11   All measurements were collected under two conditions: A '*locomotion*' or '*walking*'  
12   condition (while subjects walked on a motorized treadmill) and a '*static*' condition  
13   while they straddled the moving treadmill belt (width=60cm). Psychophysical  
14   subjects also participated in a third '*target moves*' condition to test the potential  
15   effects of retinal motion.

16  
17   The same treadmill (Confidence Fitness, 'GTR Power Pro') was used in all  
18   experiments and ran constantly at a preset speed of 5Km/h which is equivalent to a  
19   brisk walk.

## 20   *Experiment 1 – Psychophysics*

21   Stimuli were presented on a Multisync CRT monitor (Mitsubishi Corp, Tokyo)  
22   running at 100Hz under the control of an OSX 10.9 computer (Apple Inc, Cupertino)  
23   running Psykinematix V1.4 (Kybervision, Japan). The monitor was positioned at a  
24   distance of 110cm from the subjects and centered vertically at face level. Spectral and  
25   gamma calibration was performed using a Spyder4 colorimeter, cross checked with a  
26   fiber-optic photospectrometer (Jaz, Oceanoptics, Dumoulin, FL). All stimuli were  
27   presented on a mean-gray background with luminance of 94 cd/m<sup>2</sup>. Responses were  
28   registered using an OSX-compatible USB gamepad (Logitech, Lausanne) fixed to the  
29   handle of the treadmill.

30  
31   Subjects performed a set of contrast discrimination/detection judgements using  
32   stimuli similar to those described in Wade (Wade, 2009) and Petrov, Carandini and  
33   McKee (Petrov et al., 2005). A pair of 'probe' Gabor patches ( $\sigma = 1.5^\circ$ , spatial  
34   frequency = 2cpd) were presented simultaneously for 200ms,  $5^\circ$  to the left and right  
35   of a fixation marker. One of the probes had a 'pedestal' contrast  $C$ , the other had a  
36   contrast  $C + \Delta C$  and the subject's task was to indicate which probe (left or right) had  
37   the higher contrast. For each pedestal level (0, 1, 2, 5 and 10%), the magnitude of  $\Delta C$   
38   was determined using a Bayesian adaptive staircase procedure (Kontsevich and Tyler,  
39   1999) to obtain a threshold at 78% correct. Staircases for all pedestal levels were  
40   interleaved and six repetitions of each threshold were obtained for each subject.  
41   Motion conditions (walking / stationary / target moves) were interleaved at random  
42   and each condition lasted around nine minutes.

43  
44   To eliminate uncertainty about the spatial location of the probes (Petrov et al., 2006) a  
45   thin gray circle was present around the probe locations throughout the experiment.  
46   Similarly, to eliminate uncertainty about the temporal location of the stimuli, their

onset was cued by a subtle change in the shape of the fixation point 200ms before stimulus onset. Subjects received audio feedback (high or low tones to indicate correct or incorrect responses) throughout the experiments.

To measure the effects of surround suppression, we measured thresholds for isolated probes and also for probes placed in the center of annular ‘surrounds’ containing high contrast (90%) gratings. A gap of one grating wavelength ( $1\lambda$ ) was present between the probe and the surround to minimize the contribution of isotropic precortical ‘overlay masking’ (Petrov et al., 2005) and the outer radius of the annulus was  $6^\circ$ . Because cortical surround suppression is tuned for orientation, we measured the effects of surround gratings in two configurations: collinear and orthogonal with the probe Gabor.




Figure 1 Stimulus configurations (a) No mask, (b) Orthogonal mask, (c) Collinear mask. Stimuli were presented in a spatial 2AFC paradigm at  $\pm 5^\circ$  from fixation for 200ms at a time (d). Subjects indicated the position of the central probe with the highest contrast while either standing on a powered treadmill (e) or straddling the active treadmill belt.

In addition to the ‘locomoting’ and ‘static’ conditions, a third ‘static/target moving’ or ‘s/tm’ condition was generated in an attempt to simulate the effects of locomotion on retinal image position. In this ‘s/tm’ condition, both sets of probe+surround drifted rapidly ( $30^\circ/\text{s}$ ) in the same, randomly-chosen direction for the duration of the 200ms presentation. We included this condition as a conservative test of the effect of retinal image motion and blurring. In total, we measured discrimination/detection thresholds for 15 different combinations of surround type (3) and contrast (5) for each of three locomotion

conditions.

## Experiment 2 – Steady State Visually Evoked Potentials




Figure 2 Example stimuli, photograph of experimental set-up, and example Fourier spectrum. (a) shows the matrix of target stimuli, which were rotated about the central fixation by a random amount on each trial. (b) shows the target stimuli with an orthogonal surround mask. (c) shows the target stimuli with a collinear surround mask. The phase alignment between target and mask is arbitrary, as the drifting mask meant that the relative phases of the two stimuli changed over time. (d) is a photograph of the experimental set-up, including the treadmill and a participant wearing an EEG cap. (e) shows an example Fourier spectrum taken from the stationary condition for the highest target contrast tested with no mask. A strong, well-isolated response is evident at the target frequency of 7Hz.

1 The stimuli used in the steady-state visually evoked potential (SSVEP) experiment  
2 were conceptually similar to those used in Experiment 1 but modified to optimize the  
3 evoked neuronal signal. Stimuli were generated in using the Psychophysics toolbox  
4 running on an OSX 10.10 computer (Apple Inc, Cupertino) and displayed on a



1 calibrated ViewPixx monitor (VPixx Technologies, Montreal) running at a framerate  
2 of 120Hz with a mean background luminance of 84 cd/m<sup>2</sup>.

3  
4 The ‘probe’ Gabors had a spatial frequency of 2cpd and a diameter of 1.2°, windowed  
5 by a raised cosine envelope. These frequency tagged probes were presented at a range  
6 of fixed contrast levels with three types of surround (no surround, collinear surround  
7 and orthogonal surrounds). The probes appeared and disappeared (‘on/off’) at a fixed  
8 frequency (7Hz sinusoidal flicker) and therefore generated a phase-locked response at  
9 7Hz in the EEG record over visual cortex with additional second harmonic transients  
10 at 14Hz. When present, the high-contrast sine wave grating surround (96% contrast,  
11 2cpd) drifted at a speed of 3 degrees per second. Drifting gratings are effective  
12 surround masks (Xiao and Wade, 2010) but do not generate a coherent frequency-  
13 locked response in SSVEP (Norcia et al., 2015).

14  
15 To maximize the EEG response, multiple probe patches (N=20) were present on  
16 screen at any moment, arranged in a hexagonal grid with a diameter of 20° (Figure  
17 2a). Absolute stimulus orientation was randomised on each trial to avoid local  
18 adaptation aftereffects, but the relative orientation of target and surround was  
19 controlled according to condition (collinear or orthogonal). The offset between the  
20 edge of the target gratings and the inner edge of the mask was one full grating cycle  
21 (0.5°).

22  
23 EEG data were recorded at 1kHz using an ANT Neuroscan EEG system with a 64-  
24 channel Waveguard cap. Stimulus onset was recorded on the EEG trace using low-  
25 latency digital triggers sent over a parallel cable from the ViewPixx device. The first  
26 1s of each 11s trial was discarded to remove onset transients, and a fast Fourier  
27 transform was taken of the EEG trace from the remaining 10s, giving a frequency  
28 resolution of 0.1Hz. We performed coherent averaging across trials within a condition  
29 for each participant, and then averaged the absolute amplitude values across  
30 participants. To calculate signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) we averaged the amplitudes in  
31 the 10 frequency bins adjacent to the signal frequency (from 6.5-6.9Hz and from 7.1-  
32 7.5Hz in 0.1Hz steps) and divided the amplitude in the signal bin by this average.

33  
34 As in the psychophysical experiments, responses were recorded under two  
35 randomized, interleaved conditions: ‘static’ and ‘locomoting’ (brisk walking at 5  
36 km/h) in blocks of approximately 9 minutes.

### Experiment 3 – Pupillometry

Systemic arousal in both humans and mice can be correlated with both neurophysiological and behavioural changes (Bradley et al., 2008; McGinley et al., 2015; Murphy et al., 2011). To measure the effects of treadmill walking on arousal we used a head-mounted, infra-red illuminated, video-based eyetracker (Pupil Labs AG, Berlin) to measure pupil sizes in subjects (N=12) performing the psychophysical task in both stationary and walking conditions in a randomized order using room illumination conditions identical to those in Experiment 1. The eye tracker software ‘Pupil Capture’ collected 10 minutes of samples at 120Hz and pupil size and confidence measures for both left and right eye were recorded. Data from the first half of each measurement block were discarded to remove artefacts due to residual light adaptation and mechanical ‘settling’ of the eyetracker on the head. A separate measurement was conducted to measure maximum pupil size in perceptual darkness (with infra-red pupil illuminations) to ensure that the pupil was not fully-dilated in the psychophysics task under dim illumination.

Measurements were analyzed off-line using Matlab (Mathworks, Natick, MA) and R (R Development Core Team, 2008) and only pupil diameters with a confidence rating greater than .95 (Max=1) were retained. Because the absolute mean pupil size depends on many factors including the angle of the eye-tracking camera and the proximity to the head, we present all data in units of screen pixels and assess the difference between walking and stationary conditions. We performed within-subjects t-tests on raw pupil diameter measures from left and right eyes independently and a paired t-test on the entire group.

### Statistical analyses

We fit our psychophysical and neurophysiological data assuming an underlying neuronal response function that has the form of a hyperbolic ratio function (see Eq 3) (Albrecht and Geisler, 1991).

$$R = R_0 \frac{c^n}{(c^n + \sigma)} \quad [E1]$$

In the case of our psychophysical data, we assumed that the thresholds were proportional to the first derivative of this hyperbolic ratio function which we computed analytically. This model is common in the psychophysical literature and rests on the assumption that detection or discrimination is limited by a single, late noise source (Boynton et al., 1999; Itti et al., 2000; Nachmias and Sansbury, 1974). In the case of the neuronal data we fit the parameters of the hyperbolic ratio function directly.

To obtain error bounds for our fits and avoid the use of parametric statistics, we used permutation methods to bootstrap the model parameters by resampling data points from our 13 subjects with replacement and re-computing model fits a total of 10,000 times (Efron and Tibshirani, 1993) using the Matlab function *bootci*. The error bounds shown in Figure 3 and 6 are derived from these bootstraps and indicate the 95% confidence intervals. Similarly, in Figures 4 and 7, the boxplots show the range of the bootstrapped parameters with the notches indicating the 95% confidence intervals.

## 1 *Sample sizes*

2 Niell and Stryker (Niell and Stryker, 2010) reported that motion increased population  
3 activity by approximately 300% - both for spontaneous gamma power and for  
4 measures of individual stimulus-driven neuronal responses (spikes/second). If such  
5 large effects were present in our EEG data (where we also measure neuronal  
6 responses to high contrast gratings) then we would expect to measure significant  
7 ( $p < .001$ ) walking-driven SNR differences for the high contrast, unmasked probes with  
8 a sample size of no more than three subjects – even assuming a two-fold increase in  
9 overall noise (Lenth, 2001; Rosner, 2011). Ayaz et al report a more modest reduction  
10 in the amount of surround suppression that they measure in locomoting animals (Ayaz  
11 et al., 2013). Their population average suppression index (defined as the normalized  
12 difference in response between an optimal stimulus and one suppressed by the  
13 surround) decreased by a factor of around 40% (from 38% to 23%) when their mice  
14 were locomoting.

15  
16 We acknowledge that the relationship between population average responses of  
17 neuronal activity as measured by single units and scalp-level EEG is not direct – but  
18 nevertheless we observe that our EEG measurements of  $R_{\max}$  are reduced by  
19 approximately 25% between static/unmasked and static/suppressed suggesting that  
20 our baseline suppression index would be comparable to that seen in the Ayaz paper.  
21 Again, using realistic estimates of noise we calculated that we would require no more  
22 than four subjects to detect this level of change at the  $p < .001$  level and we estimate  
23 that our actual sample sizes (13 subjects) had enough power to identify effects less  
24 than half the size of the magnitudes reported in the single unit literature.

25


2 **Results**3 **Experiment 1 - Psychophysics**

Figure 3 Detection/discrimination thresholds measured at five different pedestal levels. Orthogonal masks (b) generate almost no change in threshold compared to the unmasked condition (a) while collinear masks (c) raise thresholds significantly. Notably, collinear masking is significantly higher in the walking (green) condition. Unmasked / stationary thresholds are replotted as dashed black line in (b) and (c) for comparison.

Figure 3 shows threshold data for all combinations of locomotion condition and surround type. Thresholds for the unmasked condition are shown in 3a. These exhibit a classic ‘dipper’ shape (Foley and Legge, 1981; Nachmias and Sansbury, 1974) with the lowest threshold occurring at a pedestal level of approximately half the detection threshold. Thresholds in the stationary condition (red line) are slightly lower than the other two conditions - for example, probe detection thresholds (zero pedestal) in the ‘No mask’ condition increase from 3.8% to 4.2% ( $p < .001$ ) when subjects are walking. However, in general, unmasked thresholds for ‘stationary’, ‘walking’ and ‘stimulus moves’ conditions are strikingly similar suggesting that subjects are able to perform the task well under all conditions, that walking *per se* does not impose a significant attentional or fixational penalty and that in this experiment, subjects can compensate for relatively large amounts of retinal motion (Westheimer and McKee, 1975). Walking also does not appear to *increase* sensitivity to unmasked targets which might be expected to lead to reduced thresholds or a leftward shift in the curve.

Panel 3b shows thresholds measured for the ‘orthogonal mask’ condition. The unmasked, stationary thresholds are replotted as a dotted line for reference. Thresholds are slightly elevated in this condition but the effects are small and consistent with those seen in other studies of surround suppression (e.g. (Petrov et al., 2005)).

Panel 3c shows thresholds measured in the ‘collinear mask’ condition where targets are suppressed by a co-oriented annular surround. These thresholds are significantly higher than those measured in either the ‘no

mask' or 'orthogonal mask' conditions - consistent with the idea that we are measuring a suppressive, long-range, orientation-tuned (and therefore cortical) phenomenon.

Notably, Detection / discrimination thresholds measured during the collinear locomotion condition (3b, green line) are *higher*, not lower than those measured when subjects are either stationary or viewing moving targets (red, blue lines). In brief, walking appears to increase, not decrease psychophysical surround suppression. While unmasked thresholds are also slightly higher in the 'locomoting' condition, surround suppression is also increased significantly by walking when the effect is computed as a multiple of the unmasked threshold contrast.




Figure 4 Bootstrapped parameters for hyperbolic ratio functions fitted to psychophysical data.

Locomotion causes a significant increase in both the semisaturation constant ( $C_{50}$ ) and a small but still significant increase in the predicted maximum response rate ( $R_{max}$ ). Notches indicate 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 4 shows the bootstrapped parameter fits for  $c_{50}$  (the semi-saturation constant) and  $R_{max}$  (the maximum amplitude) under different surround and locomotion conditions. Interestingly, estimates of both parameters are significantly larger for the *walking* collinear condition than for the *stationary*- or *target moves* collinear conditions. This indicates that while the suppressive effects of contrast gain control appear to be, if anything, amplified in the walking condition ( $c_{50}$  is larger, implying that sensitivity is reduced), response gain (as measured by  $R_{max}$ ) may also be altered

- 1 in a manner that increases the maximum response level of the neuronal population at
- 2 the highest contrast levels.
- 3

## 1 Experiment 2 - SSVEP

2




Figure 5 Grand average responses at the first harmonic of the stimulus modulation rate for isolated (unmasked) probes. Panels a) and b) show the raw amplitude at the tag frequency  $F1$  while panels c) and d) show the ratio of  $F1$  to the average amplitude of the local side bins (SNR). Although raw amplitude is higher in the locomotion condition, this is due to an increase in broadband noise and not an increase isolated to the SSVEP signal frequency.




Figure 6 Signal to noise (SNR) ratios as a function of stimulus contrast under different mask conditions. Surrounds cause a reduction in sensitivity (increase in  $C_{50}$ ) and maximum response level ( $R_{max}$ ) with the collinear surround generating the largest changes. SNR is lower overall in the walking condition due to an increase in broadband noise. Panel (d) shows a suppression index computed as the ratio of the SNRs in 'No mask' and 'Colinear mask' conditions. There is no evidence of an increase in raw signal SNR (panel a), and no evidence of a reduction in tuned surround suppression (panel c) in the locomoting condition (panel d).

3

1 Figure 5 shows the average response to unmasked probes combined across all  
2 subjects. As expected, the dominant response is centered on Oz consistent with a  
3 source in early visual cortex. Panels a) and b) show the raw response amplitudes in  
4 the stationary and locomotion conditions respectively. Amplitudes are higher overall  
5 in the locomotion condition but this could reflect either a higher neuronal response  
6 restricted to the stimulus frequency or a generally increased response in the EEG  
7 signal due to broadband noise. Panels c) and d) show SNR rather than raw amplitude  
8 and confirm that SNR drops in the locomoting condition compared to the stationary  
9 condition. There is therefore no evidence that active walking increases neuronal  
10 responses to the frequency-tagged probe.

11  
12 Figure 6 shows hyperbolic contrast response functions of the form described in E1  
13 fitted to the population SNR data from all 13 subjects with bootstrapped 95% error  
14 bounds. Consistent with the data from Figure 5, overall SNR is lower in the  
15 locomoting condition (quantified in the fits below). Both conditions show evidence of  
16 orientation tuned surround suppression: the lines in (6c) tend to lie to the right and  
17 below of the corresponding lines in (6a). There is no overt reduction in the size of the  
18 surround suppression during the locomoting condition – if anything the suppression  
19 index (computed as the ratio of SNRs in the unmasked and collinear mask conditions)  
20 is higher for walking than for stationary observers on average (6d).  
21



1 This is confirmed by examining the distribution of the bootstrapped fit parameters  
2 (Figure 7): The semisaturation constant ' $c_{50}$ ' for unmasked probes is very similar to  
3 that computed for psychophysical data – around 10% suggesting that our EEG  
4 measurements provide a reliable estimate of behavioral sensitivity. It is not possible to  
5 compare  $R_{max}$  values in the psychophysical and SSVEP experiments directly due to  
6 the change in measurement units. Evidence of orientation-tuned surround suppression  
7 is provided by the fact that  $c_{50}$  for collinear surrounds is reliably higher than for the




Figure 7. Parameter fits for SSVEP contrast response functions. In the stationary condition, orientation-tuned surround suppression increases  $c_{50}$  (reducing sensitivity). In the walking condition this effect is increased. Overall,  $R_{max}$  is reduced slightly in the walking/locomotion condition.

unmasked stimulus or orthogonally-masked stimulus for both stationary and locomoting conditions. Consistent with the psychophysical data, collinear-masked  $c_{50}$  is *higher* in the locomoting condition than it is in the static condition ( $p < .001$ ), not lower as we would expect if surround suppression was reduced.  $R_{\max}$  also shows a statistically significant reduction overall ( $p < .001$ ) in the locomoting condition indicating that the SNR has not improved overall (see Discussion).

### Experiment 3 – Pupillometry




Figure 8 Pupil diameters measured in stationary (dark gray) and walking (light gray) conditions. Data from left and right eyes plotted separately in (a) and (b) and each row shows data from a different subject. All subjects had larger pupil diameters in the walking condition (mean diameter increase of 16%, area

Pupil sizes measured in both eyes were significantly larger (35% increase in area on average,  $p < .001$ ) in the walking compared to the stationary conditions (See Figure 8). This size increase was not an artefact of increased noise generated by head movement during locomotion: we explicitly chose only measurements from frames with a high confidence rating ( $>95\%$ ) indicating an error-free fit while visual inspection of individual frames showed no evidence of motion blur or distortion. Similarly, task difficulty (as assessed by raw unmasked detection thresholds) was not significantly greater in the walking compared to the stationary condition (See Figure 4).

## Discussion

We examined the effects of locomotion on long-range, orientation-tuned gain control using both behavioural and electrophysiological methods. The data from the locomotion condition clearly differed from those collected under static conditions but we saw no evidence for an increase in either spontaneous firing rate or sensitivity when walking. Instead, we measured very little effect of walking on detection/discrimination thresholds when targets are unmasked or surrounded by an orthogonal grating and significantly *increased* thresholds in the presence of a collinear surround. Our EEG data were equally clear: walking reduced the SNR of our responses slightly overall (possibly due to the introduction of broadband noise) and sensitivity (as measured by  $c_{50}$ ) decreased significantly for collinear-masked targets, and to some extent for targets with orthogonal masks while the responses to unmasked targets were essentially unchanged. Walking seemed to have little effect on

unmasked sensitivity and *increased*, rather than *decreased* surround suppression in both experiments.

Robust changes in cortical visual sensitivity linked to locomotion have been measured in mice (Ayaz et al., 2013; Fu et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2014; Niell and Stryker, 2010; Polack et al., 2013; Reimer et al., 2014; Saleem et al., 2013): While locomotion does not affect responses in the LGN or input layers (Niell and Stryker, 2010), neurons in layer 2/3 of mouse visual cortex are relatively depolarized during locomotion (Polack et al., 2013) leading to higher spontaneous firing rates and increased visual sensitivity. One potential mechanism is that locomotion acts in a top-down manner through a two-layer network regulating visual gain control: stimulating neurons that subsequently inhibit a second class of inhibitory interneurons (Fu et al., 2014; Pfeffer et al., 2013). The same mechanism may contribute to the finding that the suppressive effects of extraclassical receptive fields are also reduced in locomoting animals (Ayaz et al., 2013).

Recent work has also shown that locomotion and arousal are usually tightly coupled in mice: high levels of arousal in mice often induce running behavior and running mice tend to be highly aroused. When the physiological effects of arousal are isolated, it can be shown that arousal that leads to an increase in neuronal sensitivity (McGinley et al., 2015; Reimer et al., 2014) even in the absence of locomotion. In support of this, recent work by Vinck et al has shown specifically that sensitivity increases in mouse visual cortex due to arousal can be dissociated from an increase in baseline firing rate due to locomotion (Vinck et al., 2015).

Our failure to find robust increases in neuronal sensitivity in locomoting humans might be explained by the behavioural and cognitive differences between people and mice. Humans are not *necessarily* aroused by brisk walking and in our experiments walking speed was fixed by the treadmill rather than being determined by the arousal state of the subjects. We note that the effects of exercise on neuronal feature selectivity and intracortical excitability that have been reported to date (Bullock et al., 2015, 2016; Neva et al., 2017) required ‘somewhat hard’ acute pedaling exercise of a type that the subjects in our own paper did not engage in.

Perhaps surprisingly therefore, our pupillometry measurements suggest that brisk walking did generate some level of arousal in our subjects – the increase of approximately 34% in mean pupil area is almost identical to the increase caused by a transition from ‘rest’ to ‘low intensity exercise’ measured by Bullock *et al* in their 2016 paper (Bullock et al., 2016)– a change that the same group reports as causing a small but significant increase in mean P1 amplitude over occipital cortex in high-frequency non-target trials (Bullock et al., 2015). We note that Bullock *et al* reported the most significant behavioural and electrophysiological results when contrasting the ‘rest’ and ‘high intensity’ exercise conditions while most of the differences that they measure in pupil size occurred between the ‘rest’ and ‘low intensity’ conditions. It is possible therefore that pupil size is a highly non-linear measure of exercise-driven arousal. While the relatively gentle exercise that our subjects engaged in may have been sufficient to generate mild arousal as indexed by pupil size, it may not have been energetic enough to cause measureable increases in neuronal responses.

1 Humans and mice may also differ in the level of neuronal modulation that can be  
2 driven by attention. Desynchronized states observed during active behaviour in mouse  
3 visual cortex may be similar to attention-driven modulation in primates (Harris and  
4 Thiele, 2011) but it is possible that in our studies attentional drive was consistently  
5 high because subjects were able to direct their attention to the task regardless of the  
6 locomotion state. Could a constitutively high level of neuronal activity driven by  
7 attention have masked more subtle modulations linked to locomotion or arousal? We  
8 believe this is unlikely. The effects of attention on psychophysical contrast response  
9 functions are difficult to measure in humans (because attention is intrinsically linked  
10 to the psychophysical task) but when they are measured at a population level with  
11 EEG, early visual areas exhibit a moderate but significant increase in response but not  
12 contrast gain that is selective for neurons tuned to the stimulus (Lauritzen et al., 2010;  
13 Verghese et al., 2012). There would seem to be no reason why changes in sensitivity  
14 should be masked by such a modulation and, strikingly, we measured a significant  
15 *reduction* in SNR  $R_{\max}$  for the unmasked probe during our EEG locomotion condition  
16 indicating that we are able to measure a changes in this parameters but that these  
17 changes are not in the direction predicted by mouse studies. Similarly, we measured a  
18 significant increase in  $C_{50}$  for the collinear masking condition when subjects were  
19 walking, again showing that this parameter was unlikely to have been driven to  
20 saturation by attentional effects. Nevertheless, it is possible that attention was  
21 masking activity in a sub-population of neurons which would otherwise have been  
22 modulated by locomotion – further studies using EEG and a distractor task will be  
23 required to dissociate these effects fully.

24  
25 Not all animal work finds a correlation between alertness and contrast sensitivity.  
26 Cano *et al* (Cano et al., 2006) and Zhuang *et al* (Zhuang et al., 2014) for example,  
27 report a range of changes in layer 4 of the rabbit visual cortex correlated with  
28 alertness including an increase in response gain and neuronal firing reliability but no  
29 change in contrast sensitivity. While our stimuli were different to those used by this  
30 group (specifically, we used flickering rather than drifting gratings), our  
31 psychophysical model fits are consistent with their findings, suggesting a locomotion-  
32 driven increase in  $R_{\max}$ . Although our EEG data (which largely reflect activity in V1)  
33 do not show such an effect, it is nevertheless possible that the mouse visual system is  
34 modulated by locomotion or arousal in a manner that is simply different to that found  
35 in other mammals. We believe that it would be valuable to measure the effects of  
36 locomotion on some of the other parameters studied in rabbits – in particular  
37 orientation tuning for moving stimuli.

38  
39 Two other potential confounds relate to the motion of the head during the locomotion  
40 condition:

41  
42 First, it is possible that head motion generates retinal slip causing the images to move  
43 across the retina slightly during each presentation. There is some evidence that retinal  
44 ‘blur’ can degrade acuity at velocities above 3°/s (Westheimer and McKee, 1975).  
45 While the effect of retinal motion is more complex than a simple temporal integration  
46 (Burr, 1980), it is possible that center/surround stimuli are less well-segregated in  
47 locomoting subjects and therefore overlap to some degree. This, in turn, might  
48 introduce a second, largely precortical, and therefore untuned ‘overlay’ masking effect  
49 (Petrov et al., 2005). We tested for the effects of poor image stabilization in the  
50 psychophysical experiments by introducing a third condition in which the images

move rapidly during the 200ms that they are presented. Thresholds in this condition were not significantly elevated relative to the ‘static’ condition (Figure 3) and, most importantly, there was no significant increase in untuned masking from the orthogonal mask condition. This is likely to be a conservative test for retinal slip: The motion of the stimuli was both brief (and therefore untrackable) and random (and therefore unpredictable) while motion on the retina introduced by imperfect fixation while walking would have a predictable motion trajectory. We therefore believe that retinal slip is not responsible for the increase in tuned surround suppression that we observed in the locomoting condition.

Finally, head motion also contributed to broadband instrument noise in the EEG signal. Could this have masked a spectrally-localized increase in signal amplitude? Our data suggest not. Broadband noise increases the signal amplitude across all temporal frequencies but the effect is strongly mitigated in SSVEP recordings because of the high level of signal averaging: noise is phase randomized and therefore averages rapidly to zero across multiple presentations. In comparison, the signal generated by the flickering stimulus is phase locked and is therefore unaffected by averaging across time bins. In our data, the mean response at the tagged input frequency was  $0.47\mu\text{V}$  in the stationary condition and  $0.53\mu\text{V}$  in the walking condition – an increase in magnitude of approximately  $0.06\mu\text{V}$ . However, in comparison, the mean sideband amplitude increased from  $0.03$  to  $0.19\mu\text{V}$  – an increase of approximately  $0.13\mu\text{V}$ . We expect broadband noise to be approximately equal across neighbouring frequency bins. Our data therefore suggests that, if anything, the evoked signal amplitude *decreased* when subjects were locomoting and the increase in raw amplitude at 7Hz was due to broadband noise (hence the apparent decrease in SNR seen in Figure 6 and the corresponding decrease in  $R_{\text{max}}$  in Figure 7). Our results indicate that very low-level visual processing is not necessarily altered by locomotion in humans. But it is also clear that periods of treadmill running can recalibrate the perception of egomotion in humans (Pelach and Barlow, 1996) – presumably through a normalization mechanism that combines information about optic flow and motor function. The error-minimization mechanisms that drive this normalization must be activated immediately when visual information fails to match that expected from the locomotion state (as in our experiments) and experiments with flow-fields in more complex simulations have revealed signals relating to this sensory combination in mouse primary visual cortex (Keller et al., 2012; Saleem et al., 2013). We therefore hypothesise that it might be possible to measure large EEG signals relating to these errors in future experiments that present optic flow stimuli to locomoting subjects – ideally in a head-mounted display system that eliminated extraneous cues to egomotion.

## Bibliography

- Albrecht, D.G., Geisler, W.S., 1991. Motion selectivity and the contrast-response function of simple cells in the visual cortex. *Vis Neurosci* 7, 531–546.
- Ayaz, A., Saleem, A.B., Schölvink, M.L., Carandini, M., 2013. Locomotion controls spatial integration in mouse visual cortex. *Current biology* : CB 23, 890–4. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2013.04.012
- Boynton, G.M., Demb, J.B., Glover, G.H., Heeger, D.J., 1999. Neuronal basis of contrast discrimination. *Vision Res* 39, 257–269.

- 1 Bradley, M.M., Miccoli, L., Escrig, M.A., Lang, P.J., 2008. The pupil as a measure of  
2 emotional arousal and autonomic activation. *Psychophysiology* 45, 602–  
3 607. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8986.2008.00654.x
- 4 Bullock, T., Cecotti, H., Giesbrecht, B., 2015. Multiple stages of information  
5 processing are modulated during acute bouts of exercise. *Neuroscience*  
6 307, 138–150. doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2015.08.046
- 7 Bullock, T., Elliott, J.C., Serences, J.T., Giesbrecht, B., 2016. Acute Exercise  
8 Modulates Feature-selective Responses in Human Cortex. *Journal of*  
9 *Cognitive Neuroscience* 1–14. doi:10.1162/jocn\_a\_01082
- 10 Burr, D., 1980. Motion smear. *Nature* 284, 164–165. doi:10.1038/284164a0
- 11 Cano, M., Bezdudnaya, T., Swadlow, H.A., Jose-Manuel, A., 2006. Brain state and  
12 contrast sensitivity in the awake visual thalamus. *Nature neuroscience* 9,  
13 1240.
- 14 Cavanaugh, J.R., Bair, W., Movshon, J.A., 2002. Nature and Interaction of Signals  
15 From the Receptive Field Center and Surround in Macaque V1 Neurons.  
16 *Journal of Neurophysiology* 88, 2530–2546. doi:10.1152/jn.00692.2001
- 17 DeAngelis, G.C., Freeman, R.D., Ohzawa, I., 1994. Length and width tuning of  
18 neurons in the cat's primary visual cortex. *J Neurophysiol* 71, 347–374.
- 19 Efron, B., Tibshirani, R.J., 1993. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Chapman &  
20 Hall.
- 21 Eriskien, S., Vaiceliunaite, A., Jurjut, O., Fiorini, M., Katzner, S., Busse, L., 2014.  
22 Effects of locomotion extend throughout the mouse early visual system.  
23 *Curr. Biol.* 24, 2899–2907. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2014.10.045
- 24 Foley, J.M., Legge, G.E., 1981. Contrast detection and near-threshold  
25 discrimination in human vision. *Vision Res.* 21, 1041–1053.
- 26 Fu, Y., Tucciarone, J.M., Espinosa, J.S., Sheng, N., Darcy, D.P., Nicoll, R.A., Huang, Z.J.,  
27 Stryker, M.P., 2014. A cortical circuit for gain control by behavioral state.  
28 *Cell* 156, 1139–1152. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2014.01.050
- 29 Haider, B., Häusser, M., Carandini, M., 2013. Inhibition dominates sensory  
30 responses in the awake cortex. *Nature* 493, 97–100.  
31 doi:10.1038/nature11665
- 32 Harris, K.D., Thiele, A., 2011. Cortical state and attention. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 12,  
33 509–523. doi:10.1038/nrn3084
- 34 Itti, L., Koch, C., Braun, J., 2000. Revisiting spatial vision: toward a unifying model.  
35 *J Opt Soc Am A Opt Image Sci Vis* 17, 1899–1917.
- 36 Kaneko, M., Fu, Y., Stryker, M.P., 2017. Locomotion Induces Stimulus-Specific  
37 Response Enhancement in Adult Visual Cortex. *J. Neurosci.* 37, 3532–3543.  
38 doi:10.1523/jn.3760-16.2017
- 39 Kaneko, M., Stryker, M.P., 2014. Sensory experience during locomotion promotes  
40 recovery of function in adult visual cortex. *Elife* 3, e02798.
- 41 Keller, G.B., Bonhoeffer, T., Hübener, M., 2012. Sensorimotor mismatch signals in  
42 primary visual cortex of the behaving mouse. *Neuron* 74, 809–815.  
43 doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2012.03.040
- 44 Knierim, J.J., van Essen, D.C., 1992. Neuronal responses to static texture patterns  
45 in area V1 of the alert macaque monkey. *J. Neurophysiol.* 67, 961–980.
- 46 Kontsevich, L.L., Tyler, C.W., 1999. Bayesian adaptive estimation of psychometric  
47 slope and threshold. *Vision Res* 39, 2729–2737.
- 48 Lamme, V.A., 1995. The neurophysiology of figure-ground segregation in primary  
49 visual cortex. *J. Neurosci.* 15, 1605–1615.

- 1 Lauritzen, T.Z., Ales, J.M., Wade, A.R., 2010. The effects of visuospatial attention  
2 measured across visual cortex using source-imaged, steady-state EEG.  
3 *Journal of Vision* 10, 1–17. doi:10.1167/10.14.39
- 4 Lee, A.M., Hoy, J.L., Bonci, A., Willbrecht, L., Stryker, M.P., Niell, C.M., 2014.  
5 Identification of a brainstem circuit regulating visual cortical state in  
6 parallel with locomotion. *Neuron* 83, 455–466.  
7 doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2014.06.031
- 8 Lenth, R.V., 2001. Some Practical Guidelines for Effective Sample Size  
9 Determination. *The American Statistician* 55, 187–193.  
10 doi:10.1198/000313001317098149
- 11 McGinley, M.J., David, S.V., McCormick, D.A., 2015. Cortical Membrane Potential  
12 Signature of Optimal States for Sensory Signal Detection. *Neuron* 87, 179–  
13 192. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2015.05.038
- 14 Mineault, P.J., Tring, E., Trachtenberg, J.T., Ringach, D.L., 2016. Enhanced Spatial  
15 Resolution During Locomotion and Heightened Attention in Mouse  
16 Primary Visual Cortex. *J. Neurosci.* 36, 6382–6392. doi:10.1523/jn.0430-  
17 16.2016
- 18 Motter, B.C., 1993. Focal attention produces spatially selective processing in  
19 visual cortical areas V1, V2, and V4 in the presence of competing stimuli. *J.*  
20 *Neurophysiol.* 70, 909–919.
- 21 Murphy, P.R., Robertson, I.H., Balsters, J.H., O’connell, R.G., 2011. Pupillometry  
22 and P3 index the locus coeruleus-noradrenergic arousal function in  
23 humans. *Psychophysiology* 48, 1532–1543. doi:10.1111/j.1469-  
24 8986.2011.01226.x
- 25 Nachmias, J., Sansbury, R.V., 1974. Letter: Grating contrast: discrimination may  
26 be better than detection. *Vision Res.* 14, 1039–1042.
- 27 Nelson, J.I., Frost, B.J., 1978. Orientation-selective inhibition from beyond the  
28 classic visual receptive field. *Brain Res.* 139, 359–365.
- 29 Neva, J.L., Brown, K.E., Mang, C.S., Francisco, B.A., Boyd, L.A., 2017. An acute bout  
30 of exercise modulates both intracortical and interhemispheric excitability.  
31 *Eur J Neurosci* 1–13. doi:10.1111/ejn.13569
- 32 Niell, C.M., Stryker, M.P., 2010. Modulation of visual responses by behavioral  
33 state in mouse visual cortex. *Neuron* 65, 472–479.  
34 doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2010.01.033
- 35 Norcia, A.M., Appelbaum, L.G., Ales, J.M., Cottareau, B.R., Rossion, B., 2015. The  
36 steady-state visual evoked potential in vision research: A review. *J Vis* 15,  
37 4. doi:10.1167/15.6.4
- 38 Nothdurft, H.C., Gallant, J.L., Van Essen, D.C., 2000. Response profiles to texture  
39 border patterns in area V1. *Vis. Neurosci.* 17, 421–436.
- 40 Pelah, A., Barlow, H.B., 1996. Visual illusion from running. *Nature* 381, 283–283.
- 41 Petrov, Y., Carandini, M., McKee, S., 2005. Two distinct mechanisms of  
42 suppression in human vision. *J Neurosci* 25, 8704–8707.
- 43 Petrov, Y., Verghese, P., McKee, S., 2006. Collinear facilitation is largely  
44 uncertainty reduction. *Journal of Vision* 170–178.
- 45 Pfeffer, C.K., Xue, M., He, M., Huang, Z.J., Scanziani, M., 2013. Inhibition of  
46 inhibition in visual cortex: the logic of connections between molecularly  
47 distinct interneurons. *Nat Neurosci* 16, 1068–1076. doi:10.1038/nn.3446

- 1 Polack, P.-O., Friedman, J., Golshani, P., 2013. Cellular mechanisms of brain state-  
2 dependent gain modulation in visual cortex. *Nat. Neurosci.* 16, 1331–1339.  
3 doi:10.1038/nn.3464
- 4 Posner, M.I., Petersen, S.E., 1990. The attention system of the human brain. *Annu.*  
5 *Rev. Neurosci.* 13, 25–42. doi:10.1146/annurev.ne.13.030190.000325
- 6 R Development Core Team, 2008. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical  
7 Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 8 Reimer, J., Froudarakis, E., Cadwell, C.R., Yatsenko, D., Denfield, G.H., Tolias, A.S.,  
9 2014. Pupil fluctuations track fast switching of cortical states during quiet  
10 wakefulness. *Neuron* 84, 355–362. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2014.09.033
- 11 Rosner, B., 2011. Fundamentals of biostatistics. Brooks/Cole, Cengage Learning,  
12 Boston.
- 13 Rossi, A.F., Desimone, R., Ungerleider, L.G., 2001. Contextual modulation in  
14 primary visual cortex of macaques. *J. Neurosci.* 21, 1698–1709.
- 15 Saleem, A.B., Ayaz, A., Jeffery, K.J., Harris, K.D., Carandini, M., 2013. Integration of  
16 visual motion and locomotion in mouse visual cortex. *Nat. Neurosci.* 16,  
17 1864–1869. doi:10.1038/nn.3567
- 18 Stocker, A.A., Simoncelli, E.P., 2006. Noise characteristics and prior expectations  
19 in human visual speed perception. *Nat. Neurosci.* 9, 578–585.  
20 doi:10.1038/nn1669
- 21 Thompson, P., 1982. Perceived rate of movement depends on contrast. *Vision*  
22 *Res.* 22, 377–380.
- 23 Verghese, P., Kim, Y.-J., Wade, A.R., 2012. Attention selects informative neural  
24 populations in human V1. *J. Neurosci.* 32, 16379–16390.  
25 doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1174-12.2012
- 26 Vinck, M., Batista-Brito, R., Knoblich, U., Cardin, J.A., 2015. Arousal and  
27 locomotion make distinct contributions to cortical activity patterns and  
28 visual encoding. *Neuron* 86, 740–754. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2015.03.028
- 29 Wade, A.R., 2009. Long-range suppressive interactions between S-cone and  
30 luminance channels. *Vision Res* 49, 1554–1562.  
31 doi:10.1016/j.visres.2009.03.023
- 32 Westheimer, G., McKee, S.P., 1975. Visual acuity in the presence of retinal-image  
33 motion. *Journal of the Optical Society of America* 65, 847–850.
- 34 Xiao, B., Wade, A.R., 2010. Measurements of long-range suppression in human  
35 opponent S-cone and achromatic luminance channels. *Journal of Vision* 10,  
36 1–19. doi:10.1167/10.13.10
- 37 Zhuang, J., Bereshpolova, Y., Stoelzel, C.R., Huff, J.M., Hei, X., Alonso, J.-M.,  
38 Swadlow, H.A., 2014. Brain State Effects on Layer 4 of the Awake Visual  
39 Cortex. *J. Neurosci.* 34, 3888–3900. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4969-  
40 13.2014



1

## 2 Legends

3 Figure 1 Stimulus configurations (a) No mask, (b) Orthogonal mask, (c) Collinear  
4 mask. Stimuli were presented in a spatial 2AFC paradigm at  $\pm 5^\circ$  from fixation for  
5 200ms at a time (d). Subjects indicated the position of the central probe with the  
6 highest contrast while either standing on a powered treadmill (e) or straddling the  
7 active treadmill belt.

8

9 Figure 2 Example stimuli, photograph of experimental set-up, and example Fourier  
10 spectrum. (a) shows the matrix of target stimuli, which were rotated about the central  
11 fixation by a random amount on each trial. (b) shows the target stimuli with an  
12 orthogonal surround mask. (c) shows the target stimuli with a collinear surround  
13 mask. The phase alignment between target and mask is arbitrary, as the drifting mask  
14 meant that the relative phases of the two stimuli changed over time. (d) is a  
15 photograph of the experimental set-up, including the treadmill and a participant  
16 wearing an EEG cap. (e) shows an example Fourier spectrum taken from the  
17 stationary condition for the highest target contrast tested with no mask. A strong, well-  
18 isolated response is evident at the target frequency of 7Hz.

19

20 Figure 3 Detection/discrimination thresholds measured at five different pedestal  
21 levels. Orthogonal masks (b) generate almost no change in threshold compared to the  
22 unmasked condition (a) while collinear masks (c) raise thresholds significantly.  
23 Notably, colinear masking is significantly higher in the walking (green) condition.

24

25 Figure 4 Bootstrapped parameters for hyperbolic ratio functions fitted to  
26 psychophysical data. Locomotion causes a significant increase in both the  
27 semisaturation constant (C50) and a small but still significant increase in the predicted  
28 maximum response rate (Rmax).

29

30 Figure 5 Grand average responses at the first harmonic of the stimulus modulation  
31 rate for isolated (unmasked) probes. Panels a) and b) show the raw amplitude at the  
32 tag frequency F1 while panels c) and d) show the ratio of F1 to the average amplitude  
33 of the local side bins (SNR). Although raw amplitude is higher in the locomotion  
34 condition, this is due to an increase in broadband noise and not an increase isolated to  
35 the SSVEP signal frequency.

36

37 Figure 6 Signal to noise (SNR) ratios as a function of stimulus contrast under  
38 different mask conditions. Surrounds cause a reduction in sensitivity (increase in C50)  
39 and maximum response level (Rmax) with the collinear surround generating the  
40 largest changes. SNR is lower overall in the walking condition due to an increase in  
41 broadband noise. Panel (d) shows a suppression index computed as the ratio of the  
42 SNRs in 'No mask' and 'Collinear mask' conditions. There is no evidence of an  
43 increase in raw signal SNR (panel a), and no evidence of a reduction in tuned  
44 surround suppression (panel c) in the locomoting condition

45

46 Figure 7. Parameter fits for SSVEP contrast response functions. In the stationary  
47 condition, orientation-tuned surround suppression increases c50 (reducing sensitivity).

1 In the walking condition this effect is increased. Overall, Rmax is reduced slightly in  
2 the walking/locomotion condition.  
3  
4 Figure 8 Pupil diameters measured in stationary (dark gray) and walking (light gray)  
5 conditions. Data from left and right eyes plotted separately in (a) and (b) and each row  
6 shows data from a different subject. All subjects had larger pupil diameters in the  
7 walking condition (mean diameter increase of 16%, area increase of 34%,  $p < .001$ ).  
8