1 **Multiple brain sources are differentially engaged in the inhibition of**
2 **distinct action types**

3

4 Mario Hervault¹, Pier-Giorgio Zanone¹, Jean-Christophe Buisson², Raoul Huys¹

6 ¹ Centre de Recherche Cerveau et Cognition - UMR 5549 CNRS - Université
7 Toulouse 3 Paul Sabatier - 31000 Toulouse - France

8 ² Institut de Recherche en Informatique de Toulouse - UMR 5505 CNRS -
9 Université Toulouse 3 Paul Sabatier - 31000 Toulouse - France

10

11 **Corresponding author:**

12 Mario Hervault

13 CNRS CERCO UMR 5549, Pavillon Baudot CHU Purpan

14 BP 25202 - 31052 TOULOUSE CEDEX

15 mario.hervault@cnrs.fr

16

17 **Acknowledgements:**

18 All authors approved the final submitted version. The authors wish to thank
19 all participants in this research.

20 The authors declare no competing financial interests.

21 **Abstract**

22 Most studies contributing to identify the brain network for inhibitory control
23 have investigated the cancelation of prepared-discrete actions, thus focusing
24 on an isolated and short-lived chunk of human behavior. Aborting ongoing-
25 continuous actions is an equally crucial ability but remains little explored. Al-
26 though discrete and ongoing-continuous rhythmic actions are associated with
27 partially overlapping yet largely distinct brain activations, it is unknown
28 whether the inhibitory network operates similarly in both situations. Thus,
29 distinguishing between action types constitutes a powerful means to investi-
30 gate whether inhibition is a generic function. We, therefore, used indepen-
31 dent component analysis (ICA) of EEG data and show that canceling a dis-
32 crete action and aborting a rhythmic action rely on independent brain compo-
33 nents. The ICA showed that a Delta/Theta-power increase generically indexed
34 inhibitory activity, whereas N2 and P3 ERP waves did so in an action-specific
35 fashion. The action-specific components were generated by partially distinct
36 brain sources, which indicates that the inhibitory network is engaged differ-
37 ently when canceling a prepared-discrete action versus aborting an ongoing-
38 continuous action. In particular, increased activity was estimated in precen-
39 tral gyri and posterior parts of the cingulate cortex for action canceling,
40 whereas an enhanced activity was found in more frontal gyri and anterior
41 parts of the cingulate cortex for action aborting. Overall, the present findings
42 support the idea that inhibitory control is differentially implemented accord-
43 ing to the type of action to revise.

44 **Keywords** Response inhibition, cognitive control, motor control, EEG,
45 source separation

46 **Introduction**

47 The ability to stop planned or ongoing actions, crucial in everyday life,
48 depends on an inhibitory executive function. Research based on the stop-
49 signal paradigm (Logan & Cowan, 1984; Verbruggen et al., 2019) linked
50 action stopping to an "inhibitory network" including cortical areas, namely,
51 inferior frontal cortex (IFC), pre-supplementary motor area (pre-SMA) and
52 cingulate cortex, as well as subcortical structures. This inhibitory network
53 acts downstream on the brain "action network" that generates action through
54 cortical and subcortical activations (Apšvalka et al., 2020; Aron et al., 2016;
55 Bari & Robbins, 2013; Stinear et al., 2009). In the stop-signal paradigm, the
56 standard task used in the domain, this inhibitory network underlies the
57 successful cancelation of discrete action, as revealed by EEG evoked N2 and
58 P3 potentials and increasing power of Delta (1-3 Hz) and Theta (4-7 Hz)
59 oscillations (e.g., Huster et al., 2013; Hynd et al., 2021). These frontocentral
60 EEG patterns proved to correlate with action cancelation across various
61 inhibition situations (Dutra et al., 2018; Waller et al., 2019; Wessel & Aron,
62 2014).

63 Notwithstanding, the fundamental distinction between discrete and
64 continuous actions¹ may challenge a unitary apprehension of the inhibitory
65 network, for these action types rely on distinct action control processes (Huys
66 et al., 2008). Effectively, they constitute *homo sapiens'* main movement
67 primitives and are associated with distinct timing (explicit versus implicit for
68 discrete and rhythmic action, respectively) (Huys et al., 2008, 2010; Spencer

5 ¹ Discrete actions, such as grasping an object, are delimited by moments without
6 displacement (i.e., with zero velocity and acceleration). In contrast, continuous
7 actions, such as walking, lack such recognizable endpoints and are typically rhythmic
8 as they constitute (periodic) repetitions of particular events (Hogan & Sternad, 2007).

et al., 2003). Discrete actions entail wider brain activation, implicating both cortical (Lacoste et al., 2016; Schaal et al., 2004; Wiegel et al., 2020) and subcortical areas (Habas & Cabanis, 2008; Mink & Thach, 1991), than rhythmic actions. This distinction has been notably shown regarding activations within the primary motor cortex (M1), pre-SMA, cingulate and cerebellar cortices, as well as thalamus and globus pallidus. Part of this differentiated action network (pre-SMA, cingulate cortex) is engaged in generating the "brain's stopping signal" or is targeted (M1, thalamus and globus pallidus) by this signal through the indirect and hyperdirect cortico-basal pathways that implement the inhibitory activity (Aron et al., 2016; Diesburg & Wessel, 2021). These differences in neural implementation, identified as downstream targets of the inhibitory network, might require distinct inhibitory activity. Yet, most previous studies have focused on discrete action canceling, ignoring continuous action aborting, even though both actions are crucial to human adaptive behavior. Studying inhibitory control of both movement types thus constitutes a powerful strategy to examine the generality of executive control and has practical implications for human performances (Everitt et al., 2015).

In addition, the exclusive use of discrete actions in investigating action inhibition comes with some limitations. The statistical "horse-race model" on which the classic stop-signal paradigm relies (Logan & Cowan, 1984; Verbruggen et al., 2019) constraints the exploration of its neural underpinnings and their modulation in clinical disorders (Hervault et al., 2019; Morein-Zamir et al., 2006; Schultz et al., 2021). Several authors have proposed that continuous actions should be favored when investigating

94 action inhibition in clinical populations such as attention deficit hyperactivity
95 disorder (Leontyev & Yamauchi, 2019; Morein-Zamir et al., 2008) and
96 Parkinson's disease (Lofredi et al., 2021). Continuous movements also allow
97 for direct comparison of proactive and reactive inhibitory processes (Schultz
98 et al., 2021). However, although action inhibition can be investigated based
99 either on discrete or continuous actions, no study has directly compared the
100 brain mechanisms, hence sources, engaged in the inhibition of these
101 common types of actions. At least, a recent study of Lofredi et al. (2021)
102 showed that subthalamic nucleus (STN) deep brain stimulation impaired
103 ongoing-rhythmic movement abortion through potential modulation of the
104 activity within a "fronto-subthalamic inhibitory triangle" (i.e., connectivity
105 between IFC, pre-SMA and STN, identified from MRI connectome analysis).
106 This first neuroimaging study on aborting ongoing-continuous movement
107 suggests that the engaged brain structures could belong to the same broad
108 inhibitory network involved in discrete action canceling (Aron et al., 2016).
109 Still, whether the same activity is engaged within this network to inhibit
110 discrete and continuous action is a crucial question that remains unresolved.
111 Indeed, the different brain networks engaged in discrete and rhythmic action
112 might require different inhibition processes to be inhibited. In contrast,
113 independently of the network that produces the action, a unitary inhibition
114 process might suppress the corticospinal output for action inhibition.

115 The few studies investigating stopping enduring or continuous movements
116 have documented the implication of neural correlates of discrete-action
117 inhibition when aborting a sustained static contraction of the elbow (P3 ERP
118 wave, Hatta et al., 2003) or a continuous drawing action (N2 ERP wave,

119 Sosnik et al., 2015). Other research showed that ERP correlates of discrete-
120 action inhibition originate from the cingulate cortex in the inhibitory network
121 (Enriquez-Geppert et al., 2010; Huster et al., 2010), which is also engaged,
122 but distinctly so, in discrete and continuous actions (Habas & Cabanis, 2008;
123 Schaal et al., 2004). It is thus plausible that (some) EEG correlates of
124 inhibition would indicate a dissociation of the inhibitory network activity as a
125 function of the two action types.

126 In the present study, we investigated this issue using the inferential tool of
127 EEG independent component analysis, based on the "common independent
128 process identification" (CIPI) approach introduced by Wessel (2018). Blind
129 source separation procedures enable decomposing EEG data into
130 independent components that relate putatively to different psychological
131 processes (Onton et al., 2006). By examining whether stop signals for distinct
132 action types modulate similar brain components, we evaluated the
133 commonality of the inhibitory network activity in canceling prepared-discrete
134 actions and aborting ongoing-continuous (rhythmic) actions. This approach
135 has been previously used to probe inhibitory control (e.g., Castiglione et al.,
136 2019; Wessel et al., 2016) and is adopted here to disentangle the brain
137 sources involved in inhibiting the two types of action.

Methods

Participants

Fourteen healthy individuals (8 males, mean age 25 years, SD = 2.2) served as voluntary participants. As assessed by the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (Oldfield, 1971), all were right-handed and had a normal or corrected-to-normal vision. None of the participants reported a history of psychiatric or neurological disorders. The study was conducted according to the principles stated in the Declaration of Helsinki and the local research ethics committee approved the procedures (ID-RCB: 2020-A03215-34).

General procedure

Participants performed two experiments involving discrete or rhythmic movements execution. Both experiments were performed on the same WACOM Cintiq 15X tablet (1280×800-pixel resolution). As long as the stylus touched the tablet, the *x* and *y* coordinates of the performed movements were digitized at a sampling frequency of 143 Hz. The program controlling the tablet was custom-made.

Initial state

In the discrete experiment, at the beginning of each trial, participants adopted a static position (i.e., no movement), which consisted in keeping the stylus between two vertical yellow bands (1 mm wide, 10 mm distant) plotted at the center of the digitizing black screen. In the rhythmic experiment, participants were initially instructed to continuously oscillate at a spontaneous frequency (i.e., rhythmic movement) with the stylus between the two sides of the screen but with the oscillation's extrema falling outside the two centered vertical lines. In both experiments, the participant's arm

was fixed on the table to restrain the movement to the wrist articulation and avoid large muscular noise in the EEG signal due to intense contraction of the biceps and deltoid muscles.

Primary task

Primary-task stimuli were green or blue 50 ms flashes displayed on the whole tablet screen. In the discrete experiment, participants were instructed to reach with the stylus to the right versus left half-side of the tablet screen when a green versus blue flash appeared, respectively. As a reminder of the task, green and blue stickers were visible on the right and left sides of the tablet (**Fig.1**). The primary discrete task consisted of a two-choice reaction time involving a discrete-action response (GO_D condition). In the rhythmic experiment, the primary task was to pursue the rhythmic movement without interruption when the green and blue stimuli appeared (CONTINUE_R condition).

Secondary task

In 25 % of the trials, the primary-task stimulus was followed by a red 50 ms flash, which indicated the participants to suppress their primary-task response. Thus, the secondary task required either to cancel the prepared discrete movement (CANCEL_D condition) or to abort the ongoing rhythmic movement (ABORT_R condition). Following ABORT_R trials, a rhythmic GO_R trial was added to reengage participants in the rhythmic movement. In these GO_R trials, participants were instructed to transit from a static position to an oscillating movement as soon as the GO stimulus (green or blue) was presented. In the discrete experiment, the STOP-signal delay between the primary-task stimulus and the STOP signal (SSD), initially set to 200 ms, was

dynamically adjusted in 50 ms increments to achieve a probability of responding $p(\text{respond}|\text{signal})$ of .50. When the participant crossed a vertical line, the CANCEL_D trial was considered a cancel-failure and the SSD was shortened; when the participant kept the stylus between the two lines, the CANCEL_D trial was considered successful and the SSD was prolonged. In the rhythmic experiment, the SSD value was fixed at the value equivalent to the mean SSD obtained by each participant in the discrete experiment. All participants completed the discrete experiment one week prior to the rhythmic one.

In both experiments, the participants completed one practice block and 30 experimental blocks, each consisting of 20 trials. The discrete experiment was set up according to the standard guideline for STOP-signal experiments (Verbruggen et al., 2019). The rhythmic experiment design was close to the discrete one in terms of sensory stimulations and movement effector in order to limit the difference between the two experiments to the movement type involved in the main task (i.e., discrete or rhythmic).

EEG recording and preprocessing

EEG recordings were performed using an ActiveTwo system (BioSemi Instrumentation, 64 electrodes) with a sampling rate of 2048 Hz. The EEG electrodes were cautiously positioned based on four anatomical landmarks (i.e., nasion, inion, and preauricular points) in accordance with the 5 % 10/20 international system (TCT, 2012). The same experimenter positioned the EEG cap and electrodes, based on the same measures and landmarks, between the two experimental sessions of a single participant. Additional electrodes were placed below and above each eye. The data were online referenced to

213 the BioSemi CMS-DRL reference. All offsets from the reference were kept
214 below 15 mV. The EEG data were filtered online with a band-pass frequency
215 of 0.5-150 Hz. Continuous EEG data were imported and preprocessed in
216 bespoke scripts using functions from the EEGLAB Matlab plugin (Delorme &
217 Makeig, 2004). Visual inspection was used to remove channels with
218 prominent artifacts in the continuous EEG. The EEG data were then re-
219 referenced to a common average. The data were next partitioned into epochs
220 of 1.6 s (locked to the primary stimulus onset; -400 ms to 1200 ms). Epochs
221 containing values exceeding the average of the probability distribution of
222 values across the data segments by 5 SD were rejected.

Experimental design and statistical analysis

Behavioral analysis

In both experiments, STOP-signal reaction times (SSRT) were computed in CANCEL_D and ABORT_R conditions to assess the inhibitory performance. For the discrete experiment, the participant's SSRT_D was estimated using the integrative method (Verbruggen & Logan, 2009). This consisted in subtracting the mean SSD from the n^{th} reaction time (RT), where n equals the number of primary-stimulus RTs multiplied by the overall $p(\text{respond}|\text{signal})$. The main-stimulus RT in GO_D condition was calculated as the time between the stimulus onset and the response onset, the latter being defined as the moment the stylus motion had exceeded 5 % of the Euclidean distance between the initial and furthest (i.e., end) position of the discrete-movement response. In the rhythmic experiment, SSRT_R was computed in each ABORT_R trial using the rhythmic movement deviation method (Hervault et al., 2019). Briefly, SSRT_R was calculated as the latency between the STOP signal onset and the onset of the response adjustment. This time point was defined as the moment the ongoing trajectory in phase space (i.e., the space spanned by x and dx/dt) deviated relative to movements without a STOP signal according to statistical criteria based on a sample's position in phase space, and the angle and magnitude of its corresponding velocity vector.

Overall CIPI procedure

EEG analyses were performed to test whether the inhibitory activity triggered by the STOP signal for prepared-discrete action canceling and ongoing rhythmic movement aborting involved the same brain component. A Common Independent Process Identification (CIPI) approach (Wessel, 2018)

was carried out according to the following steps (**Fig. 1**). First, the preprocessed EEG data from the two experiments were concatenated and submitted to a single decomposition using the infomax algorithm (Bell & Sejnowski, 1995; Makeig et al., 1996) for each participant. In the original scalp 64-channel data, each row of the data matrix represents voltage, summed between source projections to one data channel. After decomposition (63 components), each row of the data matrix gives the time course of the activity of one component process spatially filtered from the channel data (Delorme & Makeig, 2004). Second, non-brain components were removed from the data, that is, components with less than 10 % chance to account for neural activity as detected by the ICLABEL algorithm (Pion-Tonachini et al., 2019). The remaining components were fitted with individual inverse dipole-solutions using the DIPFIT algorithm (Oostenveld & Oostendorp, 2002). Components with non-dipolar equivalent dipole solutions usually represent non-brain signals (as defined by a residual variance of their equivalent dipole solution being greater than 15 %, Delorme et al., 2012), and were also removed. Third, one component was selected for each participant (IC-D) as the component which best reflected the STOP-signal-related activity in the discrete experiment (see below). Fourth, the capacity of this IC-D to reflect the STOP-signal-related activity in the rhythmic experiment was tested (see below). Fifth, conversely, an IC-R was similarly identified in the rhythmic experiment for each participant and then tested in the discrete one.

ERP and ERSP computation

272 To later select the components of interest, component-level event-related
273 potentials (ERP) were computed for each participant in the two experiments'
274 primary and secondary tasks. Event-related spectral perturbations (ERSP)
275 were also computed. In the time-domain analysis, and for each of the 63
276 components, time-series locked to the primary stimulus onset were averaged
277 across trials, following the subtraction of a –200 to 0 ms pre-stimulus period
278 as baseline, to calculate ERP for GO_D and CONTINUE_R conditions. For CANCEL_D
279 and ABORT_R conditions, the ERP was re-aligned to the STOP-signal onset. For
280 the frequency-domain analysis, the 63 component time series were
281 convolved with complex 3-to-8 cycle-long Morlet's wavelets to compute the
282 ERSP. Spectral power was estimated for each condition (1 to 50 ± 0.5 Hz,
283 linearly spaced) as the absolute of the resulting coefficients for each
284 frequency (normalized with respect to a –200 to 0 ms pre-stimulus baseline
285 and transformed to decibel scale), and next averaged over trials. For the
286 CANCEL_D and ABORT_R conditions, the spectral power locked to the primary-
287 task stimulus was then subtracted from the spectral power in the GO_D and
288 CONTINUE_R conditions, respectively.

289 IC-D selection from CANCEL_D condition and testing in ABORT_R condition

290 One single component per participant, representing the inhibitory activity in
291 the discrete experiment, was chosen as the IC-D in order to disentangle this
292 activity from other neural and non-neural activities in the EEG. Whereas
293 multiple components could, in principle, relate to inhibitory activity, the first
294 component is most potent to investigate whether inhibitory activity in the
295 discrete experiment is similarly engaged in the rhythmic experiment, and
296 inversely. In addition, restricting the focus of investigation on one single

component significantly increases the signal-to-noise ratio of the underlying process of interest (Wessel, 2018; Wessel & Ullsperger, 2011). In order to select the component that best matched the inhibitory activity evoked by the STOP signal in the discrete experiment, we proceeded in three steps. First, since inhibitory processes are often discriminated by frontocentral activity over the scalp for both discrete (Huster et al., 2013) and continuous actions (Hervault et al., 2021; Sosnik et al., 2015), the topographical representation of the scalp-back projected IC had to reach its extrema at the frontocentral EEG electrodes (F1, Fz, F2, FC1, FCz, F2, C1, Cz or C2). Second, the IC-ERP had to show a significant difference between the successful CANCEL_D condition and the GO_D condition (e.g., Enriquez-Geppert et al., 2010), indicating its functional implication in discrete action canceling. The significance of the ERPs was assessed, for each single participant, by a permutation testing procedure (see below). Third, in the resulting components, IC-D was chosen as the component that maximized the difference between CANCEL_D and GO_D conditions IC-ERPs. To quantify the ERP difference between the two conditions, we took the maximal absolute difference between the two whole-epoch ERPs.

In order to evaluate the ability of the chosen IC-Ds to disentangle the CANCEL_D and GO_D conditions' ERPs at the group level, a permutation testing procedure was applied (see below). Then, to assess the functional significance of the IC-D in the rhythmic experiment, we similarly tested whether the IC-D activity could disentangle ABORT_R and CONTINUE_R conditions ERPs by a similar permutation analysis (see below).

Reciprocal analysis

The same procedure was applied reciprocally to test the ability of the IC-R, selected from ABORT_R versus CONTINUE_R conditions in the rhythmic experiment, to differentiate the EEG activity between CANCEL_D and GO_D conditions in the discrete experiment.

Statistical permutation testing

To compare components' activity between conditions at the group level, ERPs were subjected to a non-parametric permutation procedure (Maris & Oostenveld, 2007). The 14 participants' whole-epoch IC-ERPs were pooled over the two conditions (14 by conditions). Two sets of 14 ERPs each were then drawn randomly from this pool, and the differential grand-average ERP was computed between the two sets. This procedure was repeated 10 000 times, thus producing a distribution of these ERPs based on shuffled data under the null hypothesis. For each time point, a p -value was computed as the proportion of these pseudo-differential ERPs that exceeded the observed participants' average differential ERP. This p -value thus indicates at which time point the observed power distribution for the two conditions are more divergent than expected for random data ($p = .05$ threshold). To correct for multiple comparisons, we analyzed the resulting distributions of p -values to compute p -thresholds corresponding to the 2.5th percentile of the smallest, and the 97.5th percentile of the largest p -values distribution (Cohen, 2014). The same procedure was applied between trials of each participant in the IC selection procedure (see above). This permutation analysis was similarly applied to each time-frequency point to assess the ERSP significance in the different conditions.

Note that the CIPI approach has previously been used mainly to identify common neural mechanisms between task contexts (e.g., Castiglione et al., 2019; Wessel et al., 2016; Wessel & Aron, 2014), whereas here it was to show a disjunction between neural networks implicated in two different inhibition tasks. In this context, the disjunction approach requires appropriate precautions to avoid type-2 errors (Wessel, 2018). In order to show that a component related to one task is not involved in another, Wessel and Aron (2014) used a more liberal significance threshold of $p = .20$ to account for the type-2 error probability. Accordingly, we used a threshold of $p = .05$ to assess ERP significance when testing IC-D in the discrete task, whereas we used a threshold of $p = .20$ when testing IC-D in the rhythmic experiment and reciprocally for IC-R analysis.

Brain sources reconstruction

The CIPI procedure tests for the presence of IC-D activity in the rhythmic experiment and, inversely, for IC-R activity in the discrete one. Following this analysis, we compared the estimated brain areas recruited in the two experiments based on their corresponding representative ICs (i.e., IC-D for the CANCEL_D condition and IC-R for the ABORT_R one). For the source localization of the ICs, the inverse ICs weight projections onto the original EEG channels were exported to the sLORETA (standardized low-resolution brain electromagnetic tomography) data processing module (Pascual-Marqui, 2002). sLORETA provides a unique solution to the inverse problem (Marco-Pallarés et al., 2005; Pascual-Marqui, 2002; Sekihara et al., 2005). For sLORETA, the intracerebral volume is partitioned into 6239 voxels with a 5 mm spatial resolution. Then, the standardized current density at each voxel

371 has been calculated in a realistic head model (Fuchs et al., 2002) based on
372 the MNI152 template due to the unavailability of individual participants' MRI
373 scans.

374 **[Fig. 1]**

Results

Behavioral results

In the discrete experiment, basic requirements for the race-model application (Verbruggen et al., 2019) were fulfilled as main-stimulus (i.e., GO_D) RT was significantly longer for GO_D trials than for failed CANCEL_D trials (paired t-test, $t = 9.30$, $p < .001$) and the 14 participants' overall $p(\text{respond}|\text{signal})$ was not significantly different from .50 ($t = 1.85$, $p > .05$). These results validate the computation of SSRT_D ($M = 269$ ms, $SD = 45$ ms) in accordance with the model. In the rhythmic experiment, the spontaneous oscillation frequency was 1.62 Hz on average ($SD = 0.49$ Hz). To ensure that participants did not proactively anticipate the STOP signal occurrence, we tested whether the movement was slow down at the SSD latency (Schultz et al., 2021). Including all the ABORT_R trials of our participants, we compared the movement mean velocity of the 100 ms time window surrounding the STOP signal occurrence (-50 ms to + 50 ms) to the movement mean velocity of the 100 ms time window surrounding the CONTINUE stimulus occurrence. This comparison (paired t-test) failed to show a significant difference between the two time windows for both the x-velocity ($t_{(2004)} = 0.28$, $p > .70$) and y-velocity ($t_{(2004)} = 0.07$, $p > .90$), indicating that the participants did not adapt the movement, proactively, in either movement's dimension. Measured SSRT_R values ($M = 268$ ms, $SD = 24$ ms) did not differ from the SSRT_D estimates (one-way ANOVA, $F = .02$, $p > .05$). The inhibition times of both experiments were unrelated across the 14 participants (Pearson correlation, $r = .02$, $p > .05$).

IC-D selection in the discrete experiment

According to the above-described procedure, one component per participant was retained; the grand-average characteristics of these IC-D components are shown in **Fig.2**.

The differential ERSP (CANCEL_D minus GO_D trials) showed a significant post-STOP-signal increase in the Delta/Theta frequency range (**Fig.2 B**). The ERPs of the chosen IC-Ds demonstrated clear P3 wave evoked by the STOP signal, which significantly distinguish GO_D and CANCEL_D conditions in the 318 - 559 ms time window (permutation test, $p < .05$, corrected for multiple comparisons, **Fig.2. A**) but did not show any N2 activity. The differential ERP was further tested for correlation across participants with the behavioral inhibition latency. The P3 peak amplitude was computed by looking for the maximal value in the 250-550 ms time range. P3 onset latency was defined as the time when half of the P3 peak amplitude value was reached. Pearson correlation across the 14 participants showed a significant correlation between SSRT_D and both P3 peak amplitude ($r = -.79$, $p < .001$, **Fig.3. A**) and P3 onset latency ($r = .78$, $p < .001$, **Fig.3. B**), indicating that an extensive and early P3 wave was associated with a shorter SSRT_D. P3 peak amplitude was also positively correlated to the ERSP peak (maximal value of the ERSP map within the significant region; $r = .62$, $p < .05$), indicating that a large evoked P3 amplitude was associated with an evoked high power in the Delta/Theta frequency range.

In addition to the functional relevance of the chosen IC-D, assessed by the correlations between the IC-D ERP measures and SSRT_D, we investigated IC-D relevance at the scalp-channel level. First, the EEGLAB *pval* function indicated that IC-D was, on average, explaining 11.88 % (SD = 5.40 %) of the

total scalp (64-channel) variance in the 600ms following the STOP signal occurrence in the CANCEL_D condition and 54.48 % (SD = 15.20 %) when considering the frontocentral FCz site solely. Second, following Waller et al. (2019) logic, we compared the frontocentral channel-ERP (FCz site) between GO_D and CANCEL_D conditions after back-projecting all non-artifact ICs, IC-D solely, or all ICs but IC-D. The results (**Fig.4 A**) suggested that most of the scalp-frontocentral difference between the two conditions was accounted for by the IC-D.

[Fig. 2]

[Fig. 3]

IC-D testing in the rhythmic experiment

Each participant's chosen IC-D component was then analyzed in the rhythmic experiment, with the same statistical procedure. The grand-average characteristics of these IC-D components are also shown in **Fig.2**. The differential ERSP (ABORT_R minus CONTINUE_R trials) showed a significant increase in the Delta/Theta frequency band in a similar time range as in the discrete experiment (**Fig.2 C**). However, the IC-D ERP was unable to significantly disentangle CONTINUE_R and ABORT_R conditions (permutation test, $p > .20$, **Figure 2.D**), even at a liberal threshold of $p = .20$. Moreover, the differential ERP (ABORT_R minus CONTINUE_R condition) did not show any significant correlation between P3 measures and the 14 participant's SSRT_R (P3 onset latency: $r = -.38$, $p > .20$, peak amplitude: $r = .03$, $p > .90$) nor with time-frequency values (P3 peak amplitude - ERSP peak: $r = .05$, $p > .80$).

This indicates that the discrete IC-D activation was significantly related neither to the rhythmic SSRT_R nor to the Theta oscillations.

[Fig. 4]

IC-R selection in the rhythmic experiment

As for the discrete experiment, one component per participant was chosen in the rhythmic experiment according to the reciprocal procedure; the grand-average characteristics of these IC-R components are shown in **Fig.5**. The differential ERSP (ABORT_R minus CONTINUE_R trials) showed a significant post-STOP-signal increase in the Delta/Theta frequency range (**Fig.5 C**). The ERPs of the chosen IC-Rs showed both clear N2 and P3 waves evoked by the STOP signal, which significantly separated the ABORT_R and CONTINUE_R conditions in a 192 - 308 ms and a 406 - 556 ms time window, respectively (permutation test, $p < .05$, corrected for multiple comparisons, **Fig.5 D**). The differential ERP (ABORT_R minus CONTINUE_R trials) was further tested for correlation with behavioral inhibition latency. To this end, P3 peak amplitude and P3 onset latency were computed as previously described. N2 features were similarly computed, looking for the minimal value in a 150-350 ms time window. Pearson correlation across the 14 participants showed a significant relation between SSRT-R and P3 peak amplitude ($r = -.65$, $p < .01$, **Fig.3. C**), indicating that an extensive P3 wave was associated with a shorter SSRT_R. In contrast SSRT_R values did not correlate with P3 onset latency ($r = -.25$, $p > .30$) or N2 features ($|r| < .20$, $p > .30$). P3 peak amplitude was also positively correlated, across participants, to the ERSP peak value ($r = .60$, p

< .05), indicating that an evoked high P3 peak amplitude was associated with an evoked high power in the Delta/Theta frequency range. ERSP peak value did not correlate with N2 peak amplitude ($r = -.07, p > .80$).

As for IC-D, we investigated IC-R relevance at the scalp-channel level. IC-R was, on average, explaining 8.36 % (SD = 3.72 %) of the total scalp (64-channel) variance in the 600ms following the STOP signal occurrence in the ABORT_R condition and 32.00 % (SD = 16.51 %) when considering the frontocentral FCz site solely. Next, we compared the frontocentral channel-ERP (FCz site) between CONTINUE_R and ABORT_R conditions after back-projecting all non-artifact ICs, IC-R solely, or all ICs but IC-R. The results (**Fig.4 B**) suggested that most of the scalp-frontocentral difference between the conditions was accounted for by the IC-R.

[Fig. 5]

IC-R testing in the discrete experiment

Each participant's chosen IC-R component was next analyzed in the discrete experiment with the same statistical procedure. The grand-average characteristics of these IC-R components are shown in **Fig.5**. The differential ERSP (CANCEL_D minus GO_D condition) showed a significant increase in the Delta/Theta frequency band in a similar time range as in the rhythmic experiment (**Fig.5 B**). However, the IC-R ERP was unable to significantly disentangle GO_D and CANCEL_D conditions (permutation test, $p > .20$, **Fig.5 A**). Moreover, the differential ERP (CANCEL_D minus GO_D condition) did not show any significant correlation between ERP measures and SSRT_D (P3

498 measures: $|r| < .10$, $p > .80$; N2 measures: $|r| < .20$, $p > .60$) or time-
499 frequency values (P3 peak amplitude - ERSP peak: $r = .50$, $p = .07$; N2 peak
500 amplitude - ERSP peak: $r = .06$, $p > .80$). This indicates that the IC-R
501 activation was not significantly related to SSRT_D or Theta oscillations in the
502 discrete experiment.

Brain sources reconstruction

The voxel-based sLORETA images were compared across the two experimental tasks using voxel-wise randomization paired *t*-tests with 5000 permutations, based on statistical non-parametric mapping. Estimated voxels with significant differences ($p < .01$, corrected for multiple comparisons) between contrasted conditions were located in the MNI-brain. Differences between ICs-D and ICs-R on statistical maps of the source analyses are displayed in **Table 1** and **Fig.6**. These analyses revealed a significantly higher current density estimated for IC-D in the frontocentral region, including the midcingulate cortex (MCC) and the medial portion of the frontal gyrus, with maximum current source density estimate at MNI [(x,y,z) -10, 0, 40; $t = 3.66$]. In contrast, the IC-R showed higher activation in the insula, the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), and the anterior part of the frontal cortex (see **Table 1**).

[Fig. 6]

[Table 1]

Discussion

Prior work has established distinctive EEG patterns correlated to the activity of a brain inhibitory network when canceling a prepared discrete action. Here, we tested whether these EEG correlates indicate a similar inhibitory activity in the case of aborting an ongoing-continuous (rhythmic) action. We recorded EEG while participants performed two experiments calling either for discrete action canceling or for rhythmic action aborting. In both situations, behavioral inhibition latencies fell within the range observed in previously used stop-signal tasks (e.g., Castiglione et al., 2019; Enriquez-Geppert et al., 2010; Havas et al., 2020; Hervault et al., 2019). The SSRT values from the two experiments were not significantly correlated. Although our current sample size prohibits to firmly conclude the absence of a behavioral relation, this result replicates one previously reported in inhibitory tasks with a comparable design (Hervault et al., 2019). The CIPI analysis of the EEG data (Wessel, 2018) corroborated these results, as independent brain components engaged when canceling and aborting action revealed a partial dissociation in the brain sources engaged in the two experiments.

The component that best represented the inhibitory activity in the discrete experiment exhibited the by-now classic correlates of action inhibition, namely, increasing Delta/Theta power and a large evoked P3 wave. The relevance of this IC-D for inhibition was confirmed by the significant $SSRT_D/P3$ latency correlation across participants, in line with previous stop-signal task studies (Huster et al., 2020; Hynd et al., 2021; Wessel & Aron, 2015). Crucially, its inability to disentangle ERPs pertaining to the rhythmic $ABORT_R$ and $CONTINUE_R$ conditions revealed that the IC-D is functionally irrelevant in

546 aborting ongoing rhythmic movements. Thus, the brain component that was
547 most involved in discrete-action canceling turned out to be irrelevant for
548 rhythmic-action aborting. At the same time, the IC-R identified in the rhythmic
549 task also exhibited a stop-signal related Delta/Theta increase, as well as
550 N2 and P3 waves, but failed to separate the ERPs for discrete CANCEL_D and
551 GO_D conditions (in either N2 or P3 time ranges). Therefore, the brain component
552 that was most involved in (rhythmic) action stopping was irrelevant for
553 (discrete) action canceling. Based on the inferential logic of the CIPI analysis
554 (Wessel, 2018; Wessel & Aron, 2014), the present study thus demonstrates
555 that distinct brain components are involved in discrete-action canceling and
556 rhythmic-action aborting.

557 In terms of ERPs, both IC-D and IC-R contained a stop signal-related P3, which
558 correlated to their respective SSRT in the discrete and rhythmic experiments.
559 The absence of a significant P3 when evaluating the IC-D activity in the rhythmic
560 experiment or, inversely, the IC-R activity in the discrete one suggests
561 that the P3 signature is specific to the engaged inhibition brain component.
562 This pattern of findings indicates that P3 is a clear-cut neural marker of action
563 inhibition in the context of stop-signal reactions (Fine et al., 2020; Hynd et al.,
564 2021; Tatz et al., 2021; Wessel & Aron, 2015). In addition, an N2 wave was
565 exclusively evoked by the IC-R in the rhythmic ABORT_R but not in any other
566 condition. This N2 exclusivity allows for two interpretations. First, if N2 is considered
567 for indexing an inhibitory process (see Huster et al., 2013, 2020), it
568 sets apart discrete-action canceling and rhythmic-action aborting. Second, if
569 N2 is thought to reflect another cognitive process, such as the allocation of
570 attention or conflict detection, this process is differentially involved in the two

571 experiments. Regarding the time-frequency correlates of inhibition, the stop
572 signal-related Delta/Theta power increase pertained to the P3 amplitude of
573 both IC-D in the discrete task and IC-R in the rhythmic one. However, a sig-
574 nificant Delta/Theta power increase was also observed when testing IC-D in
575 the rhythmic experiment and, inversely, IC-R in the discrete one, corroborat-
576 ing the non-specificity of this power correlate. Similarly, a theta power en-
577 hancement is known to relate to the recruitment of cognitive control across
578 different types of conflicts in the stream of information processing (Nigbur et
579 al., 2011). Taken together, our EEG analyses suggest that stop signal-related
580 inhibitory activity is exerted by different brain components for discrete and
581 rhythmic actions, leading to distinct scalp activities (N2/P3 ERP complex) be-
582 tween the two situations.

583 The dissociation, at least partial, suggested by the CIPI analysis raises the
584 question of whether the brain sources involved in discrete-action canceling
585 and rhythmic-action aborting reflect a comparable engagement of the in-
586 hibitory network. Several studies have successfully localized the generators
587 underlying discrete-action inhibition EEG correlates. They identified N2 gener-
588 ators in the IFC and MCC regions (Bekker et al., 2005; Enriquez-Geppert et
589 al., 2010; Huster et al., 2010; Nieuwenhuis et al., 2003). P3 was also gener-
590 ated by a deep source in MCC, as well as by precentral and midfrontal gyri
591 (Huster et al., 2010; Kok et al., 2004; Ramautar et al., 2006). Theta power in-
592 crease could also originate, in several cognitive control tasks, from the frontal
593 lobe and MCC sources (Mitchell et al., 2008). Here, the significant differences
594 between IC-D and IC-R estimated neural sources tap well into the inhibition
595 generators commonly reported in EEG signatures, suggesting that the two sit-

uations might differ in how inhibition is implemented. Notably, IC-D showed higher activity in the precentral gyrus (BA 6, likely corresponding to the pre-SMA), while IC-R sources revealed higher ACC activity. These separately estimated activations in the inhibitory network echo previous fMRI dissociations found in the action network, with higher pre-SMA activations in discrete movements (Habas & Cabanis, 2008; Schaal et al., 2004) and specific ACC activation in continuous movements (Habas & Cabanis, 2008). One interpretation is that, rather than a clear-cut delineation of anatomical action and inhibition networks, action execution and inhibition are controlled by networks with partially identical brain areas. Consequently, these common denominators (the precentral gyrus versus ACC for discrete and rhythmic actions, respectively) are either engaged in a functionally different, context-dependent manner (action control, inhibition) or act as "final pathway" to exert the inhibitory control. Other parts of the inhibitory network showed higher activity related to either IC-D (in MCC) or IC-R (in anterior regions of the frontal gyri) brain sources. Taken together, these results suggest that distinct action types associated with distinct cognitive and cerebral activity require, to be inhibited, an action-specific engagement of the inhibitory network. To further delineate how the brain action network modulation has consequences in an action-dependent involvement of the inhibitory network and its EEG correlates, future investigations might combine EEG-fMRI acquisition of multiple action types.

In stop-signal tasks, conflict arises whenever infrequent stop responses must overcome the prepotency of frequent responses (Braver et al., 2001; Mirabella, 2014). Differences in N2, P3, and the underlying cingulate cortex

activity have been shown to reflect the level of conflict existing in distinct inhibitory contexts (Braver et al., 2001; Enriquez-Geppert et al., 2010). More specifically, the EEG correlates of inhibition were specifically evoked by a go stimulus, a no-go signal, and a stop signal, with underlying modulations in the MCC and the precentral cortices activity (Enriquez-Geppert et al., 2010; Huster et al., 2010). In our case, the finding that IC-R activity is higher in the anterior part of the cingulate cortex, whereas the IC-D activity is higher in its posterior part, may be linked to the exclusivity of the N2 occurrence in rhythmic-movement aborting. Indeed, the anterior region of the MCC has been identified as a major neural generator of N2, whereas its posterior part does so for P3 (Huster et al., 2010). Such modulations of the inhibitory network activity in discrete actions have been interpreted as differences in the conflict-related stages of the information processing (Enriquez-Geppert et al., 2010; Randall & Smith, 2011). In particular, the discrete and rhythmic actions have been associated with distinct control regimes, in an open-loop versus closed-loop fashion (Jeannerod, 1988) and based on explicit versus implicit time representations, respectively (Spencer et al., 2003). Thus, the two action types might engage distinct predictive brain activity regarding the expected sensory outcomes of the movement and, hence, influence the disruption related to an unexpected stop signal occurrence. This difference in the conflict induced by the stop signal might modulate the engagement of the inhibitory network. Further work manipulating both conflict level and action type is needed to clarify the functional relevance of inhibitory-sources dissociation in brain activity, for instance, by varying the requirement associated with the infrequent signal (i.e., ABORT, CONTINUE).

646 In addition, Schultz et al. (2021) have shown that proactive inhibitory control
647 in aborting a rhythmic action is associated with a slowdown of the movement
648 prior to the stop signal occurrence. We showed that it was not the case in our
649 continuous Abort-task, suggesting that our results suggest reactive inhibition
650 engagement. Still, further studies are necessary to establish how this proac-
651 tive inhibition is implemented in the brain activity when aborting a continu-
652 ous action and whether this activity is common to the brain activity related to
653 the proactive inhibition engaged in canceling a discrete action (Elchlepp et
654 al., 2016).

655 To conclude, the present findings showed that the inhibitory activity involved
656 in discrete action canceling and rhythmic action aborting rely on partially dis-
657 sociated brain sources. This dissociation suggests that the EEG patterns com-
658 monly related to stopping activity may reflect the involvement of distinct
659 brain sources, differentially enrolled in the inhibitory network depending on
660 the action type to revise. Therefore, assessing the commonality of inhibitory
661 control across multiple, fundamentally distinct action types appears instru-
662 mental in providing a complete (neural) model of inhibitory control.

References

- Apšvalka, D., Ferreira, C. S., Schmitz, T. W., Rowe, J. B., & Anderson, M. C. (2020). *Dynamic targeting enables domain-general inhibitory control over action and thought by the prefrontal cortex* [Preprint]. Neuroscience. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.22.350520>
- Aron, A. R., Herz, D. M., Brown, P., Forstmann, B. U., & Zaghoul, K. (2016). Frontosubthalamic Circuits for Control of Action and Cognition. *The Journal of Neuroscience: The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, 36(45), 11489–11495. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2348-16.2016>
- Bari, A., & Robbins, T. W. (2013). Inhibition and impulsivity: Behavioral and neural basis of response control. *Progress in Neurobiology*, 108, 44–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pneurobio.2013.06.005>
- Bekker, E. M., Kenemans, J. L., & Verbaten, M. N. (2005). Source analysis of the N2 in a cued Go/NoGo task. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 22(2), 221–231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2004.08.011>
- Bell, A. J., & Sejnowski, T. J. (1995). An information-maximization approach to blind separation and blind deconvolution. *Neural Computation*, 7(6), 1129–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1995.7.6.1129>
- Braver, T. S., Barch, D. M., Gray, J. R., Molfese, D. L., & Snyder, A. (2001). Anterior cingulate cortex and response conflict: Effects of frequency, inhibition and errors. *Cerebral Cortex (New York, N.Y.: 1991)*, 11(9), 825–836. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/11.9.825>
- Castiglione, A., Wagner, J., Anderson, M., & Aron, A. R. (2019). Preventing a Thought from Coming to Mind Elicits Increased Right Frontal Beta Just

688 as Stopping Action Does. *Cerebral Cortex*, 29(5), 2160–2172.
689 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhz017>

690 Cohen, M. X. (2014). *Analyzing Neural Time Series Data – Theory and Practice*
691 (1st ed.). MIT Press.

692 Delorme, A., & Makeig, S. (2004). EEGLAB: An open source toolbox for
693 analysis of single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component
694 analysis. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 134(1), 9–21.
695 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2003.10.009>

696 Delorme, A., Palmer, J., Onton, J., Oostenveld, R., & Makeig, S. (2012).
697 Independent EEG Sources Are Dipolar. *PLOS ONE*, 7(2), e30135.
698 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0030135>

699 Diesburg, D. A., & Wessel, J. R. (2021). The Pause-then-Cancel model of
700 human action-stopping: Theoretical considerations and empirical
701 evidence. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 129, 17–34.
702 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.07.019>

703 Dutra, I. C., Waller, D. A., & Wessel, J. R. (2018). Perceptual Surprise Improves
704 Action Stopping by Nonselectively Suppressing Motor Activity via a
705 Neural Mechanism for Motor Inhibition. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 38(6),
706 1482–1492. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3091-17.2017>

707 Elchlepp, H., Lavric, A., Chambers, C. D., & Verbruggen, F. (2016). Proactive
708 inhibitory control: A general biasing account. *Cognitive Psychology*, 86,
709 27–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2016.01.004>

710 Enriquez-Geppert, S., Konrad, C., Pantev, C., & Huster, R. J. (2010). Conflict
711 and inhibition differentially affect the N200/P300 complex in a

712 combined go/nogo and stop-signal task. *NeuroImage*, 51(2), 877–887.
713 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.02.043>

714 Everitt, J., Fletcher, S., & Caird-Daley, A. (2015). Task analysis of discrete and
715 continuous skills: A dual methodology approach to human skills
716 capture for automation. *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science*,
717 16(5), 513–532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1463922X.2015.1028508>

718 Fine, J. M., Fini, M. E., Mysore, A. S., Tyler, W. J., & Santello, M. (2020).
719 Response inhibition is driven by top-down network mechanisms and
720 enhanced with focused ultrasound. *BioRxiv*, 649665.
721 <https://doi.org/10.1101/649665>

722 Fuchs, M., Kastner, J., Wagner, M., Hawes, S., & Ebersole, J. S. (2002). A
723 standardized boundary element method volume conductor model.
724 *Clinical Neurophysiology: Official Journal of the International Federation*
725 *of Clinical Neurophysiology*, 113(5), 702–712.
726 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1388-2457\(02\)00030-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1388-2457(02)00030-5)

727 Habas, C., & Cabanis, E. A. (2008). Neural correlates of simple unimanual
728 discrete and continuous movements: A functional imaging study at 3 T.
729 *Neuroradiology*, 50(4), 367–375. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00234-007-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00234-007-0354-6)
730 0354-6

731 Hatta, A., Nishihira, Y., Kaneda, T., Wasaka, T., Kida, T., Kuroiwa, K., &
732 Akiyama, S. (2003). Somatosensory event-related potentials (ERPs)
733 associated with stopping ongoing movement. *Perceptual and Motor*
734 *Skills*, 97(3 Pt 1), 895–904. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.2003.97.3.895>

735 Havas, J. D., Ito, S., & Gomi, H. (2020). On stopping voluntary muscle
736 relaxations and contractions: Evidence for shared control mechanisms

737 and muscle state specific active breaking. *Journal of Neuroscience*.
738 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0002-20.2020>

739 Hervault, M., Huys, R., Farrer, C., Buisson, J. C., & Zanone, P. G. (2019).
740 Cancelling discrete and stopping ongoing rhythmic movements: Do
741 they involve the same process of motor inhibition? *Human Movement*
742 *Science*, 64, 296–306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2019.02.010>

743 Hervault, M., Zanone, P.-G., Buisson, J.-C., & Huys, R. (2021). *Hold your*
744 *horses: Differences in EEG correlates of inhibition in cancelling and*
745 *stopping an action*. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/ys9pd>

746 Hogan, N., & Sternad, D. (2007). On rhythmic and discrete movements:
747 Reflections, definitions and implications for motor control.
748 *Experimental Brain Research*, 181(1), 13–30.
749 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-007-0899-y>

750 Huster, R. J., Enriquez-Geppert, S., Lavallee, C. F., Falkenstein, M., &
751 Herrmann, C. S. (2013). Electroencephalography of response inhibition
752 tasks: Functional networks and cognitive contributions. *International*
753 *Journal of Psychophysiology: Official Journal of the International*
754 *Organization of Psychophysiology*, 87(3), 217–233.
755 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2012.08.001>

756 Huster, R. J., Messel, M. S., Thunberg, C., & Raud, L. (2020). The P300 as
757 marker of inhibitory control – Fact or fiction? *Cortex*.
758 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2020.05.021>

759 Huster, R. J., Westerhausen, R., Pantev, C., & Konrad, C. (2010). The role of
760 the cingulate cortex as neural generator of the N200 and P300 in a

tactile response inhibition task. *Human Brain Mapping*, 31(8), 1260–1271. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.20933>

Huys, R., Studenka, B. E., Rheaume, N. L., Zelaznik, H. N., & Jirsa, V. K. (2008). Distinct Timing Mechanisms Produce Discrete and Continuous Movements. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 4(4), e1000061. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000061>

Huys, R., Studenka, B. E., Zelaznik, H. N., & Jirsa, V. K. (2010). Distinct timing mechanisms are implicated in distinct circle drawing tasks. *Neuroscience Letters*, 472(1), 24–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2010.01.047>

Hynd, M., Soh, C., Rangel, B. O., & Wessel, J. R. (2021). Paired-pulse TMS and scalp EEG reveal systematic relationship between inhibitory GABA_A signaling in M1 and fronto-central cortical activity during action stopping. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 125(2), 648–660. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00571.2020>

Jeannerod, M. (1988). *The neural and behavioural organization of goal-directed movements* (pp. xii, 283). Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press.

Kok, A., Ramautar, J. R., De Ruiter, M. B., Band, G. P. H., & Ridderinkhof, K. R. (2004). ERP components associated with successful and unsuccessful stopping in a stop-signal task. *Psychophysiology*, 41(1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1469-8986.2003.00127.x>

Lacoste, E., Bause, J., Lohmann, G., Scheffler, K., Schaal, S., & Sternad, D. (2016). *Neural Control of Discrete and Rhythmic Movements*. 53–54.

785 [https://pure.mpg.de/pubman/faces/ViewItemOverviewPage.jsp?](https://pure.mpg.de/pubman/faces/ViewItemOverviewPage.jsp?itemId=item_2547327)
786 [itemId=item_2547327](https://pure.mpg.de/pubman/faces/ViewItemOverviewPage.jsp?itemId=item_2547327)

787 Leontyev, A., & Yamauchi, T. (2019). Mouse movement measures enhance
788 the stop-signal task in adult ADHD assessment. *PLOS ONE*, *14*(11),
789 e0225437. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0225437>

790 Lofredi, R., Auernig, G. C., Irmen, F., Nieweler, J., Neumann, W.-J., Horn, A.,
791 Schneider, G.-H., & Kühn, A. A. (2021). Subthalamic stimulation impairs
792 stopping of ongoing movements. *Brain*, *144*(1), 44–52.
793 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awaa341>

794 Logan, G. D., & Cowan, W. B. (1984). On the ability to inhibit thought and
795 action: A theory of an act of control. *Psychological Review*, *91*(3), 295–
796 327. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.91.3.295>

797 Makeig, S., Bell, A., Jung, T. P., & Sejnowski, T. J. (1996). Independent
798 component analysis of electroencephalographic data. *Advances in*
799 *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 145–151.

800 Marco-Pallarés, J., Grau, C., & Ruffini, G. (2005). Combined ICA-LORETA
801 analysis of mismatch negativity. *NeuroImage*, *25*(2), 471–477.
802 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.11.028>

803 Maris, E., & Oostenveld, R. (2007). Nonparametric statistical testing of EEG-
804 and MEG-data. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, *164*(1), 177–190.
805 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2007.03.024>

806 Mink, J. W., & Thach, W. T. (1991). Basal ganglia motor control. I.
807 Nonexclusive relation of pallidal discharge to five movement modes.
808 *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *65*(2), 273–300.
809 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.1991.65.2.273>

810 Mirabella, G. (2014). Should I stay or should I go? Conceptual underpinnings
811 of goal-directed actions. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, 8, 6.
812 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnsys.2014.00206>

813 Mitchell, D. J., McNaughton, N., Flanagan, D., & Kirk, I. J. (2008). Frontal-
814 midline theta from the perspective of hippocampal "theta." *Progress in*
815 *Neurobiology*, 86(3), 156–185.
816 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pneurobio.2008.09.005>

817 Morein-Zamir, S., Chua, R., Franks, I., Nagelkerke, P., & Kingstone, A. (2006).
818 Measuring online volitional response control with a continuous tracking
819 task. *Behavior Research Methods*, 38(4), 638–647.
820 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193896>

821 Morein-Zamir, S., Hommersen, P., Johnston, C., & Kingstone, A. (2008). Novel
822 measures of response performance and inhibition in children with
823 ADHD. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 36(8), 1199–1210.
824 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-008-9243-7>

825 Nieuwenhuis, S., Yeung, N., van den Wildenberg, W., & Ridderinkhof, K. R.
826 (2003). Electrophysiological correlates of anterior cingulate function in
827 a go/no-go task: Effects of response conflict and trial type frequency.
828 *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 3(1), 17–26.
829 <https://doi.org/10.3758/cabn.3.1.17>

830 Nigbur, R., Ivanova, G., & Stürmer, B. (2011). Theta power as a marker for
831 cognitive interference. *Clinical Neurophysiology: Official Journal of the*
832 *International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology*, 122(11), 2185–
833 2194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2011.03.030>

834 Oldfield, R. C. (1971). The assessment and analysis of handedness: The
835 Edinburgh inventory. *Neuropsychologia*, 9(1), 97–113.
836 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932\(71\)90067-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932(71)90067-4)

837 Onton, J., Westerfield, M., Townsend, J., & Makeig, S. (2006). Imaging human
838 EEG dynamics using independent component analysis. *Neuroscience*
839 *and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 30(6), 808–822.
840 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2006.06.007>

841 Oostenveld, R., & Oostendorp, T. F. (2002). Validating the boundary element
842 method for forward and inverse EEG computations in the presence of a
843 hole in the skull. *Human Brain Mapping*, 17(3), 179–192.
844 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.10061>

845 Pascual-Marqui, R. D. (2002). Standardized low-resolution brain
846 electromagnetic tomography (sLORETA): Technical details. *Methods*
847 *and Findings in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology*, 24 Suppl D,
848 5–12.

849 Pion-Tonachini, L., Kreutz-Delgado, K., & Makeig, S. (2019). ICLabel: An
850 automated electroencephalographic independent component classifier,
851 dataset, and website. *NeuroImage*, 198, 181–197.
852 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.05.026>

853 Ramautar, J. R., Kok, A., & Ridderinkhof, K. R. (2006). Effects of stop-signal
854 modality on the N2/P3 complex elicited in the stop-signal paradigm.
855 *Biological Psychology*, 72(1), 96–109.
856 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2005.08.001>

857 Randall, W. M., & Smith, J. L. (2011). Conflict and inhibition in the
858 cued-Go/NoGo task. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 122(12), 2400–2407.
859 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2011.05.012>

860 Schaal, S., Sternad, D., Osu, R., & Kawato, M. (2004). Rhythmic arm
861 movement is not discrete. *Nature Neuroscience*, 7(10), 1136–1143.
862 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1322>

863 Schultz, K. E., Denning, D., Hufnagel, V., & Swann, N. (2021). Stopping a
864 Continuous Movement: A Novel Approach to Investigating Motor
865 Control. *BioRxiv*, 2021.04.08.439070.
866 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.08.439070>

867 Sekihara, K., Sahani, M., & Nagarajan, S. S. (2005). Localization bias and
868 spatial resolution of adaptive and non-adaptive spatial filters for MEG
869 source reconstruction. *NeuroImage*, 25(4), 1056–1067.
870 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.11.051>

871 Sosnik, R., Chaim, E., & Flash, T. (2015). Stopping is not an option: The
872 evolution of unstoppable motion elements (primitives). *Journal of*
873 *Neurophysiology*, 114(2), 846–856.
874 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00341.2015>

875 Spencer, R. M. C., Zelaznik, H. N., Diedrichsen, J., & Ivry, R. B. (2003).
876 Disrupted timing of discontinuous but not continuous movements by
877 cerebellar lesions. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 300(5624), 1437–1439.
878 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1083661>

879 Stinear, C. M., Coxon, J. P., & Byblow, W. D. (2009). Primary motor cortex and
880 movement prevention: Where Stop meets Go. *Neuroscience &*

881 *Biobehavioral Reviews*, 33(5), 662–673.
882 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.08.013>

883 Tatz, J. R., Soh, C., & Wessel, J. R. (2021). Common and unique inhibitory
884 control signatures of action-stopping and attentional capture suggest
885 that actions are stopped in two stages. *Journal of Neuroscience*.
886 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1105-21.2021>

887 Trans Cranial Technologies. (2012). *10/20 System Positioning Manual*.
888 https://www.trans-cranial.com/docs/10_20_pos_man_v1_0_pdf.pdf

889 Verbruggen, F., Aron, A. R., Band, G. P., Beste, C., Bissett, P. G., Brockett, A.
890 T., Brown, J. W., Chamberlain, S. R., Chambers, C. D., Colonius, H.,
891 Colzato, L. S., Corneil, B. D., Coxon, J. P., Dupuis, A., Eagle, D. M.,
892 Garavan, H., Greenhouse, I., Heathcote, A., Huster, R. J., ... Boehler, C.
893 N. (2019). A consensus guide to capturing the ability to inhibit actions
894 and impulsive behaviors in the stop-signal task. *ELife*, 8, e46323.
895 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.46323>

896 Verbruggen, F., & Logan, G. D. (2009). Models of response inhibition in the
897 stop-signal and stop-change paradigms. *Neuroscience and*
898 *Biobehavioral Reviews*, 33(5), 647–661.
899 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.08.014>

900 Waller, D. A., Hazeltine, E., & Wessel, J. R. (2019). Common neural processes
901 during action-stopping and infrequent stimulus detection: The
902 frontocentral P3 as an index of generic motor inhibition. *International*
903 *Journal of Psychophysiology*.
904 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2019.01.004>

905 Wessel, J. R. (2018). Testing Multiple Psychological Processes for Common
 906 Neural Mechanisms Using EEG and Independent Component Analysis.
 907 *Brain Topography*, 31(1), 90–100. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-016-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-016-0483-5)
 908 0483-5

909 Wessel, J. R., & Aron, A. R. (2014). Inhibitory motor control based on complex
 910 stopping goals relies on the same brain network as simple stopping.
 911 *NeuroImage*, 103, 225–234.
 912 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.09.048>

913 Wessel, J. R., & Aron, A. R. (2015). It's not too late: The onset of the
 914 frontocentral P3 indexes successful response inhibition in the stop-
 915 signal paradigm. *Psychophysiology*, 52(4), 472–480.
 916 <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12374>

917 Wessel, J. R., Jenkinson, N., Brittain, J.-S., Voets, S. H. E. M., Aziz, T. Z., &
 918 Aron, A. R. (2016). Surprise disrupts cognition via a fronto-basal
 919 ganglia suppressive mechanism. *Nature Communications*, 7(1), 11195.
 920 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11195>

921 Wessel, J. R., & Ullsperger, M. (2011). Selection of independent components
 922 representing event-related brain potentials: A data-driven approach for
 923 greater objectivity. *NeuroImage*, 54(3), 2105–2115.
 924 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.10.033>

925 Wiegel, P., Kurz, A., & Leukel, C. (2020). Evidence that distinct human
 926 primary motor cortex circuits control discrete and rhythmic
 927 movements. *The Journal of Physiology*, 598(6), 1235–1251.
 928 <https://doi.org/10.1113/JP278779>
 929

Fig.1: EEG CIPI analysis overview

The concatenated EEG from the discrete and rhythmic experiments were subjected to ICA. One IC that represented the process underlying inhibition in the discrete experiment was selected on a single participant basis. Subsequently, the capacity of that component to disentangle ABORT_R versus CONTINUE_R conditions in the rhythmic experiment was assessed. Reciprocally, ICs underlying rhythmic inhibition were selected and then tested in the discrete experiment to disentangle CANCEL_D versus GO_D conditions.

931

Fig.2: Discrete chosen component (IC-D) analysis

Panel A: IC-D ERP (grand-average) in the discrete experiment, showing the difference between GO_D and CANCEL_D conditions. **Panel D:** IC-D ERP (grand-average) in the rhythmic experiment, showing difference between CONTINUE_R and ABORT_R conditions. CANCEL_D and ABORT_R conditions topographical maps of the IC-D components were computed in the channel space at the P3 peak latency. Equivalent current dipole model of the participants' IC-Ds is also portrayed.

Panel B-C: IC-D ERSP maps computed in the discrete CANCEL_D (B) and rhythmic ABORT_R (C) conditions. Red line: STOP signal occurrence. Black contour line: region of significant activation ($p < .05$, corrected for multiple comparisons).

Fig.3: IC ERPs - Behavior correlations

Panel A: IC-D P3 peak amplitude correlation with SSRT_D. **Panel B:** IC-D P3 peak amplitude correlation with SSRT_D. **Panel C:** IC-R P3 peak amplitude correlation with SSRT_R.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Fig.4: IC-D and IC-R back-projection at the frontocentral channel level

Panel A: Scalp FCz STOP-signal locked ERP in the discrete GO_D and CANCEL_D conditions after back-projecting all non-artefact ICs, IC-D solely, or all ICs but IC-D. The two conditions differed significantly (non-parametric permutation procedure, $p < .05$, corrected for multiple comparisons) for the All-ICs projection (304 to 551 ms), the IC-D solely (275 to 572 ms) and the remaining ICs (331 to 386 ms) projections.

Panel B: Scalp FCz STOP-signal locked ERP in the rhythmic CONTINUE_R and ABORT_R conditions after back-projecting all non-artefact ICs, IC-R solely, or all ICs but IC-R. The two conditions differed significantly (non-parametric permutation procedure, $p < .05$, corrected for multiple comparisons) for the All-ICs projection (276 to 323 ms, 372 to 449 ms), the IC-R solely (291 to 307 ms, 356 to 454 ms) and the remaining ICs (290 to 331 ms) projections.

Fig.5: Rhythmic chosen component (IC-R) analysis

Panel A: IC-R ERP (grand-average) in the discrete experiment, showing difference between GO_D and $CANCEL_D$ conditions. **Panel D:** IC-R ERP (grand-average) in the rhythmic experiment, showing difference between $CONTINUE_R$ and $ABORT_R$ conditions. $CANCEL_D$ and $ABORT_R$ conditions topographical maps of the IC-R components were computed in the channel space at the N2 peak latency. Equivalent current model of the participants' IC-Rs is also portrayed.

Panel B-C: IC-R ERSP maps computed in the discrete $CANCEL_D$ (B) and rhythmic $ABORT_R$ (C) conditions. Red line: STOP signal latency. Black line: region of significant activation ($p < .05$, corrected for multiple comparisons).

937 **Fig.6: Source localization analysis: IC-D versus IC-R**
 The estimated sLORETA images showing statistical differences (t-values, two-tailed) between IC-D and IC-R for three orthogonal brain slices (horizontal, sagittal, coronal). Maximum current source density voxels are represented with greater IC-D values in yellow and greater IC-R values in blue. Only the voxels that passed the p value threshold ($p < .01$, corrected for multiple comparison) are shown in color.

Table.1: Summary of significant results from whole-brain sLORETA estimation comparisons between IC-D and IC-R

Lobe	Region		BA	X	Y	Z
Discrete experiment						
Limbic	Cingulate Gyrus		24	-10	0	40
	Cingulate Gyrus		32	-15	5	45
Frontal	Medial	Frontal	6	-10	5	55
	Gyrus					
	Superior	Frontal	6	-10	5	60
Rhythmic experiment						
Sub-lobar	Insula		13	-35	-25	5
Frontal	Middle	Frontal	9	55	15	30
	Gyrus					
	Medial	Frontal	10	-5	60	5
Limbic	Gyrus					
	Anterior	cingu-	24	5	30	-5
	late					
	Anterior	cingu-	32	5	35	0
	late					