Responses to Task-Irrelevant Visual Features by Primate Prefrontal Neurons
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Lauwereyns, Johan, Masamichi Sakagami, Ken-Ichiro Tsutsui, Shunsuke Kobayashi, Masashi Koizumi, and Okihide Hikosaka. Responses to task-irrelevant visual features by primate prefrontal neurons. J Neurophysiol 86: 2001–2010, 2001. The primate brain is equipped with prefrontal circuits for interpreting visual information, but how these circuits deal with competing stimulus-response (S-R) associations remains unknown. Here we show different types of responses to task-irrelevant visual features in three functionally dissociated groups of primate prefrontal neurons. Two Japanese macaques participated in a go/no-go task in which they had to discriminate either the color or the motion direction of a visual target to make a correct manual response. Prior to the experiment, the monkeys had been trained extensively so that they acquired fixed associations between visual features and required responses (e.g., “green = go”; “downward motion = no-go”). In this design, the monkey was confronted with a visual target from which it had to extract relevant information (e.g., color in the color-discrimination condition) while ignoring irrelevant information (e.g., motion direction in the color-discrimination condition). We recorded from 436 task-related prefrontal neurons while the monkey performed the multidimensional go/no-go task: 139 (32%) neurons showed go/no-go discrimination based on color as well as motion direction (“integration cells”); 192 neurons (44%) showed go/no-go discrimination only based on color (“color-feature cells”); and 105 neurons (24%) showed go/no-go discrimination only based on motion direction (“motion-feature cells”). Overall, however, 162 neurons (37%) were influenced by irrelevant information (e.g., color in the color-discrimination condition). We found that task-related prefrontal neurons are strongly activated by the stimulus relevant to the task at hand. The monkey had been trained extensively prior to the experiment to acquire fixed associations between stimulus features and required responses (e.g., “purple = go”; “rightward motion = no-go”). In this design, as shown in Fig. 1A, the monkey was confronted with a visual target from which it had to extract relevant information (e.g., color in the color-discrimination condition, henceforth “color condition”) while ignoring another feature. The costs of publication of this article were defrayed in part by the payment of page charges. The article must therefore be hereby marked “advertisement” in accordance with 18 U.S.C. Section 1734 solely to indicate this fact.

INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that primate prefrontal cortex is involved in the executive control of behavior (Fuster 1997; Goldman-Rakic 1987; Passingham 1993). A large body of evidence from single-unit studies indicates that prefrontal neurons interpret visual information to determine the correct hand movement (Hoshi et al. 2000; Niki 1974; Rainer et al. 1998; Sakagami and Niki 1994a; Sakagami and Tsutsui 1999; Sakagami et al. 2001; Watanabe 1986; White and Wise 1999) or eye movement (Asaad et al. 1998, 2000; Funahashi et al. 1993; Hanes and Schall 1996; Kim and Shadlen 1999; Schall et al. 1995a). However, it remains unknown how such prefrontal neurons behave when they are presented with conflicting relevant and irrelevant visual information.

Recent evidence from an electrical-stimulation study in frontal eye field (Gold and Shadlen 2000) suggests that the brain’s decision-making process to determine the required action consists of a gradual commitment toward a choice based on the accumulation of sensory evidence (see also Sakagami and Tsutsui 1999; Schall and Thompson 1999). In line with this view, it is possible that conflicting sensory evidence disturbs the development of a prefrontal neuronal code favoring one action over another. To investigate this prediction, we devised a conflict paradigm in which the monkey should discriminate one visual feature while ignoring another to make the appropriate behavioral response.

Depending on the discrimination condition, the monkey had to interpret either the color or the motion direction of the visual target. The monkey had been trained extensively prior to the experiment to acquire fixed associations between stimulus features and required responses (e.g., “purple = go”; “rightward motion = no-go”). In this design, as shown in Fig. 1A, the monkey was confronted with a visual target from which it had to extract relevant information (e.g., color in the color-discrimination condition, henceforth “color condition”) while ignoring
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In a previous behavioral study with a reaction-time version
of this task, we found that the monkeys’ manual responses
were slower and less accurate when the irrelevant feature
primed a different response than the relevant feature as com-
pared with when both features primed the same response (Lauwereyns et al. 2000). The data suggested that irrelevant
target information automatically activates hard-wired but pres-
ently inappropriate S-R associations. If this is true, such inap-
appropriate S-R associations could be represented in prefrontal
neuronal activity. To test this hypothesis, we conducted a
single-unit study in prefrontal cortex while the monkey per-
formed the same type of visual multidimensional discrimin-
ation. We opted for a nonspeeded version of the task, introduc-
ing a delay between target presentation and manual response to
prevent confounding with motor processes in the single-unit
activity.

METHODS
Behavioral paradigm

The monkey was required to discriminate either the color or the
motion direction of a visual target to make a correct go or no-go
manual response. The behavioral meaning (go or no-go) of each target
feature was fixed for each monkey during both training and exper-
iments but could be either relevant or irrelevant depending on the
discrimination condition. The color of the fixation spot indicated
which of the target features the monkey should discriminate. Through-
out a block of trials, the monkey had to select the appropriate behavior
based on the same visual dimension (i.e., the color of the fixation spot
remained constant). The correct response to a particular multidimen-
sional target depended on only the relevant stimulus feature and so
could vary across discrimination conditions (see Fig. 1A). Throughout
an experimental block, we used one of two stimulus sets on which the
monkey had been trained separately: set 1, the colors purple/yellow
and the motion directions left/right; set 2, the colors red/green and the
motion directions up/down.
With this design, in each trial irrelevant stimulus information could
be either congruent or incongruent with the required response. Using
a speeded version of the discrimination task, we confirmed that this
paradigm leads to interference effects in the behavior of the two
monkeys used in the present study with longer response times and
increased error rates when the irrelevant feature was incongruent with
the required response (Lauwereyns et al. 2000).

To prevent confounding between go/no-go discrimination and mo-
tor execution processes in the neuronal activity, we introduced a delay
period between stimulus and response in the discrimination task for
the neurophysiological recordings. In all other respects, the task and
stimuli were exactly the same as for the behavioral test. In the
paradigm with the delay period, the sequence of events in each trial
was as follows (see Fig. 1B). The monkey initiated each trial with a
lever press. The fixation spot (0.3° diam) appeared in the center of the
CRT. After a variable period (1–2 s), the target stimulus was pre-
vented from the fixation spot, and the monkey then had to release the lever as soon as
possible on dimming of the fixation spot. In a no-go trial, the monkey had to refrain
from releasing the lever until the fixation spot became bright again after the
dim period. The vertical lines indicate the time windows used in the
following figures of single-unit activity.

A schematic illustration of the experimental design. In set 1, the
color purple and the leftward motion direction are associated with the go
response (go), while the color yellow and the rightward motion direction are
associated with the no-go response (ng). In set 2, the color green and the
upward motion direction are associated with the go response (go), while the
color red and the downward motion direction are associated with the no-go
response (ng). The stimuli were exactly the same in both discrimination
conditions, and so the irrelevant stimulus feature could be either congruent
(CO) or incongruent (IN) with the required response. B: the sequence of events
in a go trial (left) and in a no-go trial (right). The monkey initiated a trial by
pressing the lever. In both types of trial, the monkey had to keep the lever
pressed throughout target presentation and during a delay period of variable
length. In a go trial, the monkey then had to release the lever as soon as
possible on dimming of the fixation spot. In a no-go trial, the monkey had to
refrain from releasing the lever until the fixation spot became bright again after the
dim period. The vertical lines indicate the time windows used in the
following figures of single-unit activity. C: the electrode penetrations in the
right hemisphere of monkey EC. Left, middle, and right: in the same hemi-
sphere, the distributions of, respectively, color-feature cells, motion-feature
cells, and integration cells. The distributions are a good representation of the
overall pattern of results with the 4 explored hemispheres. A red dot indicates
a penetration in which we encountered at least 1 neuron that was unaffected by
the irrelevant feature, whereas a blue circle represents a penetration in which we
found at least 1 neuron that was influenced by the irrelevant feature; a blue
circle superimposed on a red dot indicates a penetration in which we observed
both types of neurons. PS, principal sulcus; AS, arcuate sulcus.
in accordance with the Guidelines for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animal Care and Use Committees at Juntendo University and were stored on computer at 1-kHz sampling rate. For potentials were identified using a dual-voltage, time-window discrimination (motion-feature cells), or both (integration cells). Cells were considered a statistically reliable main effect. The largest differential response. Specifically, we selected cells that produced a statistically reliable main effect (P < 0.05) of color in the color condition (color-feature cells), or of motion in the motion condition (motion-feature cells), or both (integration cells). Cells were considered to show interference from an irrelevant feature (e.g., motion direction in the color condition) if there was a significant main effect of the irrelevant feature or if there was a significant two-way interaction effect between the relevant and irrelevant feature. Post hoc tests consisted of two-tailed t-tests.

To characterize the direction of the neuronal responses, we compared the discrimination of one type of visual information (e.g., color) when the monkey was required to process this information (e.g., color in the color condition) versus when the monkey was required to ignore this information (e.g., color in the motion condition). This comparison allows us to evaluate the similarity between the neuronal representation of relevant and irrelevant information. We calculated a relevant color index based on data from the color condition as follows

\[ RC = \frac{C_{go} - C_{ng}}{C_{go} + C_{ng}} \]

RC refers to relevant color index; \(C_{go}\) refers to the average spike rate from 100 to 400 ms after target onset in case of a go-indicating color; \(C_{ng}\) refers to the average in case of a no-go-indicating color. Similarly, we computed an irrelevant color index (IC) based on data from the motion condition

\[ IC = \frac{C_{m} - C_{M}}{C_{go} + C_{ng}} \]

Data analysis

Trials in which the monkey made an incorrect manual go or no-go response were eliminated from analyses. To analyze cell activity, two-factor ANOVA (color \times motion direction) was applied to the responses of each neuron (100- to 400-ms period from target onset) separately for each discrimination condition. This time window was chosen as it showed the highest discrimination between go and no-go trials for the entire population of recorded neurons; the limit of 400 ms also ensured that the neuronal responses were not confounded with eye movement or retinal eccentricity (as the monkey’s gaze was restricted to the fixation point up to 500 ms after target onset).

Based on the ANOVA results, we selected cells that could discriminate between go and no-go targets based on the relevant feature in at least one discrimination condition. If the neuron was recorded with both stimulus sets, we used the set to which the neuron showed the largest differential response. Specifically, we selected cells that produced a statistically reliable main effect (P < 0.05) of color in the color condition (color-feature cells), of motion in the motion condition (motion-feature cells), or both (integration cells). Cells were considered to show interference from an irrelevant feature (e.g., motion direction in the color condition) if there was a significant main effect of the irrelevant feature or if there was a significant two-way interaction effect between the relevant and irrelevant feature. Post hoc tests consisted of two-tailed t-tests.

To characterize the direction of the neuronal responses, we compared the discrimination of one type of visual information (e.g., color) when the monkey was required to process this information (e.g., color in the color condition) versus when it was required to ignore this information (e.g., color in the motion condition). This comparison allows us to evaluate the similarity between the neuronal representa-
Database of neurons

We explored the lateral part of prefrontal cortex (see Fig. 1C for indications of electrode penetrations in one hemisphere). A total of 436 neurons discriminated reliably \((P < 0.05, \text{ANOVA})\) between go- and no-go-indicating targets based on color or motion direction or both. Among these, 162 neurons (37.2\%) were influenced by irrelevant information, as indicated by a significant main effect of, or interaction with, the target feature that the monkey should ignore (see METHODS). That is to say, “irrelevant information” refers to the color feature in the motion condition, and the motion feature in the color condition.

Specifically, 139 neurons (31.9\% of the total population) showed go/no-go discrimination in both discrimination conditions (integration cells); among these, 53 neurons (38.1\%) were influenced by irrelevant information. There were 192 neurons (44.0\% of the total population) that showed go/no-go discrimination only based on color (color-feature cells); among these, 71 neurons (37.0\%) were influenced by irrelevant information. There were 105 neurons (24.1\% of the total population) that showed go/no-go discrimination only based on motion direction (motion-feature cells); among these, 38 neurons (36.2\%) were influenced by irrelevant information.

Thus irrelevant target information is processed quite extensively in lateral prefrontal cortex even though the monkey succeeds in making correct go or no-go responses. The effects of irrelevant target information, however, are different for the three functionally dissociated groups of prefrontal neurons. In this article, we aim to characterize these different neuronal responses to irrelevant visual features.

Congruency effect from irrelevant information in integration cells

Integration cells are able to interpret information from different visual dimensions. Figure 2 presents histograms and rasters of two prefrontal neurons that were classified as integration cells because they showed reliable differential responses to go- and no-go-indicating stimuli in both discrimination conditions. The cell shown at the top (Fig. 2A) is a good representation of the majority \((n = 86)\) of integration cells, firing differentially for go- and no-go-indicating stimuli in the color condition (main effect of color, \(P < 0.01\)) as well as in the motion condition (main effect of motion, \(P < 0.01\)) without reliable effects from the irrelevant feature. Looking more closely at the firing rates especially in go trials, however, there did appear a tendency for stronger activity in congruent go trials than in incongruent go trials \((P < 0.10)\).

Figure 2B presents an integration cell in which the influence from irrelevant information was much more pronounced \((n = 53)\). Overall, this unit discriminated reliably between go and no-go trials in the color condition (main effect of color, \(P < 0.05\)) as well as in the motion condition (main effect of motion, \(P < 0.05\)), but the unit was influenced also by the congruency of the irrelevant feature. In the color condition, there was a significant main effect of the irrelevant motion feature \((P < 0.01)\); in the motion condition, color caused a nonsignificant trend \((P < 0.10)\).

The neuron’s activity was observed while the monkey succeeded in making a correct manual response in each trial regardless of the irrelevant information. Yet, in both conditions, the neuronal go/no-go discrimination was degraded in case the two target features were incongruent. Thus the activity of this unit shows a blurred or suboptimal discrimination in case of conflict between the required response and the response primed by the irrelevant feature. As such, the direction of the influence from irrelevant information on the visual activity of this neuron reflects a general tendency of the population of neurons (see the population analyses in the following text).

Nonadaptive responses to one visual dimension in feature cells

In addition to integration cells, we found many neurons that were able to distinguish between go- and no-go-indicating
stimuli in only one discrimination condition (color- and motion-feature cells). As with integration cells, the majority of color- and motion-feature cells showed no significant response to irrelevant information. Figure 3A, for instance, shows a motion-feature cell that discriminated reliably between go and no-go trials in the motion condition (main effect of motion, \( P < 0.01 \)) but not in the color condition (no effect of color; \( F < 1 \)). The irrelevant target features did not lead to significant effects in the \( 2 \times 2 \) ANOVA, neither in the color nor in the motion condition (we observed 67 cells of this type).

Although this motion-feature cell generally transmitted task-relevant information about motion, there was a small trend of influence from irrelevant information in its firing rate in the color condition (trend toward a main effect of motion, \( P < 0.10 \)). Specifically, the firing rate in congruent go trials was slightly higher than in incongruent no-go trials (\( P < 0.05 \)). Thus the motion-feature cell did not remain entirely neutral in the color condition, leaking some information pertaining to a task-irrelevant visual dimension. Such leakage of irrelevant information led to significant effects of irrelevant information in about one-third of the population of motion-feature cells.

Figure 3B presents an example of a motion-feature cell influenced by irrelevant information (\( n = 38 \)). The cell fired differentially for go- and no-go targets in the motion condition (main effect of motion, \( P < 0.01 \)), but not in the color condition (no effect of color; \( F < 1 \)). In the color condition, however, the firing rate of this neuron was still determined by the motion direction of the target (main effect of motion, \( P < 0.01 \)), even though the monkey successfully disregarded the motion direction to make the appropriate manual response. This neuron, then, seems to encode the target’s motion direction regardless of the discrimination condition and so fails to adapt to the requirements of the task.

Similarly, Fig. 4, A and B, shows color-feature cells that are unable to fully adapt to the task requirements. Both cells reliably discriminated color (main effects of color, \( P < 0.01 \)) in the color condition but also in the motion condition. We observed 71 cells of this type, whereas 121 color-feature cells respond to color information only when the monkey was required to interpret color. The cells illustrate very well the large range of irrelevant responses we found in color-feature cells.

Specifically, the cell in Fig. 4A showed some task-dependent modulation. In the color condition, this cell fired for yellow targets regardless of the motion direction (i.e., no reliable difference between ng IN and ng CO trials), whereas in the motion condition this cell fired more (\( P < 0.05 \)) for yellow rightward moving targets (ng CO trials) than for yellow leftward moving targets (ng IN trials). Thus in the motion condition this cell suppressed its activity for yellow in case the irrelevant color-based S-R association (yellow = no-go) primed a different response than the relevant motion-based S-R association (leftward motion = go; ng IN trials in the motion condition). The fact that this cell changed its behavior depending on the task is further underscored by its activity in the waiting period right before the appearance of the target: the cell had a stronger anticipatory or background firing rate in the color condition than in the motion condition (\( P < 0.01 \)). Subtle condition-dependent changes in background activity were quite common (25–30% of task-related neurons) (see also Sakagami and Niki 1994a). Typically, such cells changed their background activity slightly when the task required discriminating the preferred visual dimension. The cell shown in Fig. 4B, on the other hand, fired phasically for a yellow color, regardless of the discrimination condition, and without any changes in the background activity.

**FIG. 3.** A: the activity pattern of a motion-feature cell, showing reliable go/no-go discrimination when motion is relevant (in the motion condition) but not when motion is irrelevant (in the color condition). The presentation format is the same as in Fig. 2. B: the activity pattern of a motion-feature cell with a nonadaptive response to motion, both when motion is relevant (in the motion condition) and when motion is irrelevant (in the color condition).

**Direction of the responses to irrelevant information**

The effects of irrelevant information in the neurons shown in Figs. 2B, 3B, and 4, A and B, exhibit a common direction. The neurons’ firing rate to a particular irrelevant feature shows the same go/no-go preference as when that feature is relevant to the monkey’s task. Specifically, the neurons shown in Figs. 2B and 3B delivered more spikes in response to a go- than to a no-go-indicating motion direction (i.e., “go preference”) when motion was relevant (in the motion condition) but also when motion was irrelevant (in the color condition). The neurons...
There was a positive correlation between RC and IC for color-feature cells ($r^2 = 0.244$; significantly different from 0, $P < 0.01$; Fig. 5, top left), confirming that the effect of irrelevant color on the neurons’ activity showed the same direction as the effect of color when it was the relevant dimension. There was also a significant positive correlation between RC and IC with integration cells ($r^2 = 0.200$; significantly different from 0, $P < 0.01$; Fig. 5, top right) but not with motion-feature cells ($r^2 = 0.057$; not different from 0; Fig. 5, top middle).

In the same way as for color, Fig. 5, bottom, presents the motion indices (RM and IM) for the three populations of cells. There was a positive correlation between RM and IM for motion-feature cells ($r^2 = 0.337$; significantly different from 0, $P < 0.01$; Fig. 5, bottom middle), confirming once again that the effect of the irrelevant feature on the neurons’ activity showed the same direction as the effect of the same feature when it was relevant. There was also a significant positive correlation between RM and IM with Integration cells ($r^2 = 0.348$; significantly different from 0, $P < 0.01$; Fig. 5, bottom right), and, be it less pronounced, with color-feature cells ($r^2 = 0.142$; significantly different from 0, $P < 0.01$; Fig. 5, bottom left).

Together, these positive correlations indicate that responses to irrelevant information can be characterized as a residual of S-R associations from a different context. In other words, the influence seems to be due to the neurons’ inability to entirely suppress their go/no-go preference of features that are presently irrelevant to the monkey’s task.

**Temporal properties of responses to irrelevant information**

To understand how the responses to irrelevant information develop over time, we made sliding population histograms, separately for different types of cells. The histograms are based on the running population average of irrelevant-discrimination indices (see METHODS).

Figure 6, top, shows the histograms of color discrimination when it is irrelevant, that is, in the motion condition. The histograms are shown for the two populations of cells that are responsive to color information, that is, color-feature cells and integration cells. Color-feature cells show a relatively sharp and fast discrimination, with a latency of 80 ms after target onset and a peak between 150 and 250 ms after target onset, followed by a gradual dissipation of the response. The curve of the irrelevant discrimination of integration cells, on the other hand, shows a slower and generally smaller response, with an onset latency of 90 ms after target onset and with no discernable peak in the response.

Similarly, Fig. 6, bottom, shows the histograms of responses to irrelevant motion in the color condition. The curve of the irrelevant responses of motion-feature cells appears relatively phasic, with an onset latency of 120 ms after target onset and a peak at 170 ms after target onset, followed by a gradual dissipation of the response. And again, the curve of the Integration cells shows a slower and smaller response, with an onset latency of 130 ms after target onset and with no discernable peak in the response.
Anatomical locations of different types of cells

Figure 1C indicates the locations of electrode penetrations in the primate prefrontal cortex (example from the left hemisphere of monkey EC; similar distributions were obtained in the other hemispheres, not shown here). Considering cells that are unaffected by irrelevant information (red dots), we found an anatomical segregation: color-feature cells appeared mainly ventral to the principal sulcus in areas 46 and the upper part of area 12, whereas motion-feature cells tended to be located dorsal to the principal sulcus in areas 46 and 8A. These results are consistent with anatomical data on the connections between color-sensitive areas in inferotemporal cortex and ventrolateral prefrontal cortex (Barbas 1988; Ungerleider et al. 1989) and the connections between motion-sensitive areas in parietal cortex and peri-arcuate prefrontal cortex (Andersen et al. 1990; Schall et al. 1995b). Integration cells appeared in area 8A, both in the dorsal and ventral sectors, as well as ventral to the principal sulcus.

Considering cells that are affected by irrelevant information (blue circles), it appears that the same anatomical segregation holds true for color-feature cells and for integration cells. With motion-feature cells, the segregation was less clear.

DISCUSSION

Our data are the first to show prefrontal representations of irrelevant information in a feature-discrimination task. Using a manual go/no-go task with two Japanese monkeys, we found many prefrontal neurons that were able to code the behavioral meaning of targets based on color and/or motion direction. More than one-third of these neurons, however, also coded S-R associations with presently irrelevant information even though the monkey successfully ignored the irrelevant information in its behavior.

Typically, the responses to irrelevant information appeared as the neuron’s inability to completely adapt to the changed requirements of the task. For instance, color-feature cells (see Fig. 4, A and B) were able to discriminate between go and no-go targets in the color condition, but tended still to leak information about color even when this feature was irrelevant, that is, in the motion condition. Thus relevant and irrelevant S-R features appear to run in parallel in the brain even up to the stage of decision making, for which prefrontal cortex is presumed to be responsible (Kim and Shadlen 1999; Sakagami and Tsutsui 1999).

Among the neurons that were influenced by irrelevant information, the effects ranged from complete interaction between relevant and irrelevant information (such as with the neuron shown in Fig. 2B) to nonadaptive responses to only one visual dimension, regardless of whether this dimension is relevant to the monkey’s discrimination task (such as with the neurons shown in Figs. 3B and 4B). These different types of neuronal activity may reflect distinct stages of visual interpretation.
Specifically, nonadaptive responsiveness to one visual dimension seems to be derived from a purely sensory neural code and so could reflect the input from extrastriate and/or association visual areas such as V4 and IT for color information and MT and MST for motion direction. The interaction between relevant and irrelevant information in integration cells, on the other hand, can be characterized as a congruency effect toward the output side of the decision-making process.

Sequential mode of information processing in prefrontal cortex

The conceptual scheme in Fig. 7 shows how responses to irrelevant features could be gated through prefrontal cortex. We propose that the conversion of visual information into appropriate behavior is a hierarchically organized decision-making process (Sakagami and Tsutsui 1999), in which feature-selective cells (i.e., color- and motion-feature cells) generate behavioral significance based on specific sensory properties and send their output to integration cells, which in turn encode the appropriate behavioral action. This process is represented in Fig. 7 with information flowing from independent sensory modules through feature units toward integration units, which in turn influence motor preparation.

In this scheme, it is presumed that long-term training enables fixed or automatic associations between representations in independent visual modules and feature-selective representations of behavioral meaning. By this interpretation, experience with the task leads to automation of stimulus-response associations (Logan 1988). The notion that experience can alter visual processing in prefrontal cortex was established already in visual-interpretation tasks to guide manual behavior (Niki et al. 1990; Rainer and Miller 2000) or oculomotor behavior (Bichot and Schall 1999; Bichot et al. 1996). Such training effects can explain why feature-selective cells respond to one visual dimension (e.g., color) even when it is presently irrelevant to the task. As a consequence, these learning mechanisms would lead to a competition between relevant and irrelevant S-R associations.
Depending on the attentional demands, we assume that information processing is selectively enhanced for only the relevant visual pathway (e.g., in Fig. 7, the color pathway). Through the fixed associations, however, both relevant and irrelevant information travels from the feature modules to the integration module. Because of the attentional modulation (either enhancement or suppression), relevant information on average outweighs the irrelevant information. In this way, prefrontal circuits appear to be organized so that they can filter out irrelevant information during the decision-making process, leading to smaller responses to irrelevant features in the later than in the earlier stages of decision making (i.e., smaller irrelevant responses by integration cells, see Fig. 6). Yet the irrelevant information influences even integration cells to some extent, leading to less efficient discrimination when the irrelevant feature primes a different answer than the relevant feature (bottom) as compared with when both features prime the same answer (top).

The notion that decision-making in prefrontal cortex is indeed organized hierarchically finds support in the anatomical segregation of different types of cells (Fig. 1C) as well as the temporal differences between color- and motion-feature cells on the one hand and integration cells on the other hand (Fig. 6). Color- and motion-feature cells showed a more phasic and slightly faster response to the irrelevant feature, consistent with their presumed function toward the perceptual or input side of the decision-making process, whereas integration cells showed a more sustained and slower response, consistent with their presumed function toward the motor-preparation or output side of the decision-making process (see also Sakagami and Tsutsui 1999).

Another finding that supports the notion of a hierarchical organization is that integration cells show a high consistency in their preference for either go- or no-go-indicating features across both visual dimensions: Out of 139 integration cells, 75 cells (53.9%) consistently preferred go-indicating stimuli; 51 cells (36.7%) consistently preferred no-go-indicating stimuli; and only 13 cells (9.4%) showed a different preference in the color than in the motion dimension. This observation suggests that integration cells do indeed integrate behaviorally relevant information from multiple dimensions rather than showing a random combination of tuning curves to independent sensory features.

In sum, the activity of the neural population as a whole includes both sensory-derived input and behaviorally relevant output signals as should be expected from a neural substrate of decision making (Kim and Shadlen 1999; Leon and Shadlen 1998; Zhang et al. 1997). In this population, however, irrelevant stimulus representations compete with relevant representations throughout the entire decision-making process. Even toward the output side of this process, the irrelevant stimulus representations are still strong enough to influence the activity of Integration cells. Thus the cells showing partial responses to irrelevant features appear to be part of a network that takes sensory input and turns it into a decision output. As such, these cells could be merely intermediate in the computation process—that is, they could be hidden units in a multilayer neural network. Alternatively, the partial responses to irrelevant features could represent interference, which in turn may disturb the monkey’s decision-making behavior.

In this regard, further research is needed to investigate to what extent the representations of irrelevant information in prefrontal neuronal codes cause interference on behavioral performance. The two monkeys in the present study showed clear interference effects in their behavioral reaction times in a speeded version of the task with otherwise exactly the same experimental set-up, whereas with the delayed version of the task we found interference effects in the error rates in the motion condition but not in the color condition. Reaction times are a more sensitive behavioral measure of interference effects than error rates because they can be related to the decision process rather than the decision outcome (MacLeod 1991). Given that the present study establishes that there exist responses to irrelevant features in prefrontal cortex at a cognitive stage dissociable from motor control, the next step in this research should be to estimate the influence of such irrelevant prefrontal neuronal codes on behavior. This can be done, for instance, by recording single-cell activity during a speeded discrimination task (Lauwereyns et al. 2000) so that trial-by-trial neuronal signals can be correlated to behavioral reaction times.

A related matter is the question of the relationship of the prefrontal neuronal code to different types of motor control. We used fixed one-to-one mapping between visual features and manual responses in the present task. Consequently, we cannot indicate whether the irrelevant neuronal activity pertains to the behavioral meaning of the visual features (go or no-go) or whether the irrelevant activity is more tightly linked to the response dimension (manual lever release). To tease apart these two possibilities, future research should examine the influence of irrelevant features on neuronal activity in situations with variable instead of fixed stimulus-response mapping. This issue can be resolved, for instance, by comparing the perceptual decision-making process of the same neurons in manual versus oculomotor tasks. In this respect, it is interesting to note that the present manual go/no-go task revealed neurons with multidimensional discriminative activity that could not be reduced to oculomotor activity in the frontal eye field. Our data, which were obtained while the monkey gazed at a fixation spot, suggest that the process of perceptual decision-making could be more independent from motor control than has been suggested recently (Gold and Shadlen 2000).

**Partial prefrontal activation by irrelevant features**

Partial activation by task-irrelevant information in prefrontal cortex might simply be regarded as the corollary of the notion that there are prefrontal representations of relevant information in tasks with complex stimuli (e.g., Asaad et al. 2000; Bichot and Schall 1999; Hoshi et al. 2000; Rainer et al. 1998, 1999; Sakagami and Niki 1994a; White and Wise 1999). However, in previous studies, which were not designed to study responses to task-irrelevant features, decision-making was performed in situations where there was no irrelevant visual dimension that could imply an alternative S-R association. For instance, the study by Bichot and Schall (1999) showed history effects from previous S-R associations in a situation where the monkey performed a conjunction task, for which it had to consider both the color and the shape of the target. The partial activation by a previous S-R association, then, was derived from a task-relevant visual dimension. In other studies, there were no competing S-R associations from different dimensions. For instance, in the study by Asaad et al. (2000), the monkey performed different tasks such as a spatial task and an object task, but the stimuli changed with the task as well so that the
monkey was presented with simple dots in the spatial task (with no possibility of interference from object information) or with a reference object at the center of the screen (with no possibility of interference from spatial information). Hoshi et al. (2000) used a similar design.

One intriguing study by White and Wise (1999) did show partial activation of irrelevant features in a conflict situation between two rules. Yet one of the two rules involved spatial information, which may not be ideal as a task-irrelevant dimension, especially when the monkey has to process visual information at the same position in space. Specifically, under the conditional rule in the White and Wise study, the monkey was required to identify an object at a particular position, while the same position implied an alternative behavioral meaning. It could be argued that the monkey had to allocate attention to the object’s position to be able to identify the object, implying that spatial information was not entirely irrelevant to the monkey’s task even under the conditional rule. The same argument can be applied to Sakagami and Niki (1994a) or to the interference effects observed with the anti-saccade paradigm (e.g., Funahashi et al. 1993).

In contrast, in the present study, the monkey was required to discriminate one of two visual dimensions, either color or motion, while ignoring the alternative visual dimension because it carried an alternative S-R association. Thus we could examine how prefrontal cortex responds to visual information that was clearly task-irrelevant but could prime the same or a different manual response than the task-relevant information. We found phenomenally different responses to irrelevant information in three functionally segregated groups of prefrontal neurons. These responses could all be characterized as residuals of S-R associations from the alternative discrimination condition (Fig. 5). Color-feature cells leaked information about color in the motion condition, whereas motion-feature cells still responded to motion in the color condition. In integration cells, relevant and irrelevant input from different visual dimensions appeared to be combined, leading to a congruency effect in the go/no-go discrimination.
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