A Dual Integrator Model determines the When and What in perceptual decisions

Lluís Hernández-Navarro¹, Ainhoa Hermoso-Mendizabal¹, Daniel Duque Doncos¹, Jaime de la Rocha^{1,*} and Alex Hyafil^{2,*}



¹ Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer, Barcelona, Spain.² Center for Brain and Cognition, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain. * Co-supervisors.

Task

Introduction

Decisions in animals are not only grounded on current stimulus information, but **urgency** and **previous experiences** do also play an essential role in choices and reaction times (RTs) [Hermoso-Mendizábal et al., 2018]. However, the mechanisms that govern the decision process and shape the distribution of RTs are still unclear.

- Does the standard Drift-Diffusion Model capture rats' RTs?
- Are there other mechanisms besides stimulus integration (e.g. anticipation, urgency) **shaping RTs?**
- Does the **post-error slowing** arise from stimulus integration alone?
- How does trial index (i.e. tiredness and satiety) modulate RTs?



Methods

Rats (N=10) performed a reaction time two alternative forcedchoice (2AFC) acoustic discrimination task.

Response distribution on every frame (50 ms)

Acoustic stimulus



Stimulus evidence

Sum of two amplitudemodulated tones of high and low frequency (31 kHz and 6.5 kHz).







Instantaneous evidence

Longer responses [urgency (A) or stimulus (B) triggered] Express responses [urgency-triggered only]

RTs arise from two independent processes



Dual model predicts Fixation Breaks and RTs

The FB-RT distribution is governed by the first integrator (urgency integrator or stimulus integrator) that hits the threshold, on a trial-by-trial basis. Both processes are modelled as drift-diffusion processes.



Dual Model predicts RTs in silent trials task

Rats (N=3) also performed a lateral intensity discrimination task with 10% silent random catch trials (no stimulus) to test the Dual Model.

-200 -100 0 100 200 300 400 RT (ms)

100 200 300 400 -300 -200 -100 0 RT (ms)

The Dual Model predicts that silent trials' RTs only arise from the urgency integrator, which can be estimated from standard sound trials. The model predictions are **consistent with the experimental data**.

Post-error slowing is consistent with the combination of an **early temporal onset** and a **slower drift of integration**.

Trial index slows down the urgency integrator, probably due to rats' tiredness and satiety.

Conclusions

I. In reaction time perceptual task in rats, RTs arise from two distinct integration processes: a stimulus-independent urgency integrator anticipating stimulus onset, and a standard stimulus integrator accumulating evidence.

II. A second task with silent catch trials unveils the full RT distribution of the urgency integrator, which can be predicted from standard sound trials.

III. The urgency integrator strongly contributes to the post-error slowing effect by lowering its drift, which is also modulated by tiredness and satiety.

Funding: This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement PRIORS-683209.