

# "Renewed attention on the Pupil Light Reflex"

Paola Binda<sup>1</sup> and Paul D. Gamlin<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Translational Research on New Technologies in Medicine and Surgery,  
University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy

<sup>2</sup> Department of Ophthalmology, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama

Correspondence: [paola1binda@gmail.com](mailto:paola1binda@gmail.com) (Paola Binda) and [paulgamlin@uabmc.edu](mailto:paulgamlin@uabmc.edu) (Paul D. Gamlin).

## Keywords

Pupillary light reflex

Attention

Frontal Eye Fields

Prefrontal cortex

## Abstract

Ebitz and Moore [1] recently described that subthreshold electrical microstimulation of the macaque frontal eye fields (FEF) modulates the pupillary light reflex. This elegant study suggests that the influence of the FEF and prefrontal cortex on attentional modulation of cortical visual processing extends to the subcortical circuit that mediates a very basic reflex, the pupillary light reflex.

## Main text

While we are most familiar with the constriction of the pupil that occurs with light, the pupil modulates due to other factors. For example, many studies have documented that pupil dilation accompanies mental effort or increased attention, while pupils constrict during times when we are sleepy [2]. Further, pupil dilation as a signal of heightened vigilance and arousal has been suggested to increase attractiveness (hence the use during the Italian Renaissance of the plant, *Atropa belladonna* – beautiful woman – whose active agent atropine is a pupil dilator). And as an extreme case, Richard Gregory, a renowned vision scientist of the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, showed that

1  
2 the pupils of a talking parrot were modulated not by light, but during the attention required for  
3 vocalization or the recognition of known words from humans [3].  
4

5 Light- and arousal related pupil responses are counted among the most basic behaviors in the  
6 repertoire of many diverse species. Their neural pathways are known in some detail, and involve a  
7 circuit from the retina thorough the mesencephalon (Olivary Pretectal Nucleus [OPN] encoding  
8 retinal illumination) to the pupilloconstrictor preganglionic neurons of the Edinger-Westphal  
9 nucleus, and a sympathetic component responsible for arousal effects [2]. As Ebitz and Moore [1]  
10 point out, there has recently been a renewed interest in pupillary responses in non-human  
11 primates related to orienting responses and task conflict [4, 5]. In addition, three laboratories  
12 working with human participants have shown a new kind of attentionally driven pupil behavior:  
13 without any change of light level, covertly attending to a brighter region of the visual field is  
14 sufficient to drive a pupillary constriction [6, 7] and, when a light increment does occur, the  
15 evoked pupillary constriction is enhanced when the light stimulus is attended vs. ignored [8].  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 The neural substrates of this attentional modulation of the pupillary light response were  
30 completely unknown until Ebitz and Moore [1] identified a key component of the underlying  
31 circuit: the Frontal Eye Field (FEF), a prefrontal cortical area implicated in the control of eye  
32 movements and attention [9]. Their main finding is that the amplitude of a pupil response  
33 depends on the coincidence between the light stimulus and subthreshold FEF electrical  
34 microstimulation – precisely as it depends on the coincidence between stimulus and attention in  
35 the experiments on human participants. While monkeys maintained fixation, a peripheral light  
36 stimulus was presented either inside or outside the stimulated site’s movement field, as  
37 previously defined by suprathreshold microstimulation; the light always evoked pupillary  
38 constriction, but the constriction was stronger when the stimulus was inside the stimulated site’s  
39 movement field; it was weaker when the stimulus was 180° to, and at the same eccentricity as,  
40 the stimulated site’s movement field. Further, the FEF microstimulation was only effective when it  
41 preceded the visual probe by 40 ms, and not 80 or 160 ms.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Given the spatial and temporal specificity of this response modulation, these effects cannot be  
57 dismissed as dependent on cognitive load or arousal, nor explained by a change in sympathetic  
58 tone. There are other known cortical influences on pupil size, but these also fail to explain this  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 attentional modulation. For example, there is the “pupillary near response”, a pupillary  
2 constriction that accompanies the ocular convergence and change in focus required to view a near  
3 object, which involves pathways from regions of visual and frontal cortex to neurons in the  
4 midbrain near response region that then project to pupilloconstrictor neurons within the Edinger  
5 Westphal nucleus [2]. One might wonder if this response could explain the effects of attention or  
6 FEF stimulation, because both these manipulations might induce near viewing. However, if this  
7 were the case, FEF stimulation should induce pupil constriction irrespective of the presence or  
8 location of the light stimulus, which is not what Ebitz and Moore [1] found. Human data also  
9 suggest that the effect of attention cannot be explained by the pupillary near response. The key  
10 finding is that attention also enhances the pupillary dark response: increasing dilation in response  
11 to a luminance decrement [10].

12 Cortical input is also involved in another subtle, but consistent, pupil behavior: the transient pupil  
13 constriction at the onset of any equiluminant visual stimulus (i.e. stimuli that do not change  
14 luminance [2]). This “onset response” is likely included in all pupillary responses measured in  
15 attention studies as well as in Ebitz and Moore [1], and the neural circuits explaining the two  
16 effects are likely to be partially overlapping. Yet, again, the two are not identical: in humans, the  
17 effect of attention is not explained by adding an “onset” constriction component, but consists of a  
18 gain increase of the pupillary response to both light and dark: enhanced constriction in response  
19 to light increments and, symmetrically, enhanced pupillary dilation in response to light  
20 decrements [10]. Note that Ebitz and Moore [1] did not investigate whether FEF stimulation also  
21 enhances dilation in response to dark, as attention does; perhaps a future study will clarify this  
22 point.

23 How, then, could FEF activity affect the subcortical reflex circuit mediating the pupillary light  
24 response? To account for the enhancement of pupillary light response, it is necessary that FEF  
25 stimulation enhances a neural encoding of brightness that, in turn, drives pupillary constriction.  
26 Figure 1 shows two possible pathways. FEF stimulation could directly modulate the Olivary  
27 Pretectal Nucleus, which encodes retinal illumination and directly activates the pupillo-constrictor  
28 pathway (Figure 1, dashed blue line). Alternatively, or in addition, FEF might act indirectly through  
29 occipital visual cortical areas, whose visual response is modulated by FEF [9] and might participate  
30 in the PLR (Figure 1, continuous blue lines) by projecting to the mesencephalic Pupil Light Reflex  
31 circuit, either to the Olivary Pretectal Nucleus, or to pupilloconstrictor neurons within the EW).

1 Consistent with this former suggestion, Clarke and colleagues reported that some neurons in the  
2 macaque OPN receive apparent cortical inputs [2]. In a conceptually similar model, the role of  
3 occipital visual areas could be replaced or supplemented by the superior colliculus which and has  
4 all the necessary cortical and subcortical connectivity to modulate pupillary responses [5].  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 As should be evident from this overview and the recent report of Ebitz and Moore [1], far from  
10 being a simple light-evoked reflex, pupillary responses are modulated in a well-defined fashion by  
11 attention, fatigue, arousal, ocular convergence and accommodation, etc. We still know little of  
12 the central mechanisms that control these responses, but renewed attention to the pupil light  
13 reflex in both humans and non-human primates will hopefully lead to other important discoveries.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 Figure

27  
28  
29  
30 Cortical and subcortical structures that might be involved in the attentional modulation of the  
31 pupillary light response. Green lines show the retinal input and red lines the pupillomotor output.  
32  
33 Blue lines show hypothetical cortical projections. Luminance encoding elements are represented  
34 as white boxes. For simplicity, connections and projections are represented for one side only.  
35  
36 Abbreviations: EWpg – Edinger-Westphal preganglionic subdivision; FEF – Frontal Eye Fields; OPN  
37 – Olivary pretectal nucleus.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 Text Box - Pupil responses in blindsight

51  
52 Subthreshold FEF micro-stimulation as well as the actual execution of a saccade modulates pupil  
53 size. It is interesting to note, as Ebitz and Moore point out, that the dynamic of this response  
54 changes depending on the task and the stimulus set. Far from being just an artifact to be  
55 controlled for, peri-saccadic pupil modulations might represent a new and rich source of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 information for monitoring visual processing during saccade planning and execution – e.g. to  
2 understand the processing of intra-saccadic signals and their suppression from conscious  
3 awareness [11], following the seminal work of Sahraie and colleagues [12] who find that pupillary  
4 “onset responses” – objectively measured with relative ease – predict one of the most elusive  
5 phenomena: blindsight in patients with cortical lesions.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

#### 15 Acknowledgments

16 PB is supported by the European Research Council (n. 338866) and the MIUR “Futuro in Ricerca,”  
17 (n. RBF1332DJ). PDG is supported by NIH Grants RO1 EY025555, RO1 EY014263, P30 EY03039,  
18  
19 NSF Award #1539034, and Alabama EyeSight Foundation.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

#### 29 References (12 max)

- 30 1. Ebitz, R.B. and Moore, T. (2017) Selective Modulation of the Pupil Light Reflex by  
31 Microstimulation of Prefrontal Cortex. *J Neurosci* 37 (19), 5008-5018.
  - 32 2. McDougal, D.H. and Gamlin, P.D. (2015) Autonomic control of the eye. *Compr Physiol* 5 (1), 439-  
33 73.
  - 34 3. Gregory, R. and Hopkins, P. (1974) Pupils of a talking parrot. *Nature* 252 (5485), 637-8.
  - 35 4. Ebitz, R.B. and Platt, M.L. (2015) Neuronal activity in primate dorsal anterior cingulate cortex  
36 signals task conflict and predicts adjustments in pupil-linked arousal. *Neuron* 85 (3), 628-40.
  - 37 5. Wang, C.A. and Munoz, D.P. (2015) A circuit for pupil orienting responses: implications for  
38 cognitive modulation of pupil size. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 33, 134-40.
  - 39 6. Binda, P. et al. (2013) Attention to bright surfaces enhances the pupillary light reflex. *J Neurosci*  
40 33 (5), 2199-204.
  - 41 7. Mathôt, S. et al. (2013) The Pupillary Light Response Reveals the Focus of Covert Visual  
42 Attention. *PLoS ONE* 8 (10), e78168.
  - 43 8. Naber, M. et al. (2013) Tracking the allocation of attention using human pupillary oscillations.  
44 *Front Psychol* 4, 919.
  - 45 9. Noudoost, B. et al. (2010) Top-down control of visual attention. *Current Opinion in*  
46 *Neurobiology* 20 (2), 183-190.
  - 47 10. Binda, P. and Murray, S.O. (2015) Spatial attention increases the pupillary response to light  
48 changes. *J Vis* 15 (2), 1.
  - 49 11. Benedetto, A. and Binda, P. (2016) Dissociable saccadic suppression of pupillary and  
50 perceptual responses to light. *J Neurophysiol* 115 (3), 1243-51.
  - 51 12. Sahraie, A. et al. (2013) Pupil response as a predictor of blindsight in hemianopia. *Proc Natl*  
52 *Acad Sci U S A* 110 (45), 18333-8.
- 53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

