

Subcortical correlates of consciousness with human single neuron recordings

Reviewed Preprint

v2 • April 23, 2025

Revised by authors

Reviewed Preprint

v1 • April 4, 2024

Michael Pereira , Nathan Faivre, Fosco Bernasconi, Nicholas Brandmeir, Jacob Suffridge, Kaylee Tran, Shuo Wang, Victor Finomore, Peter Konrad, Ali Rezai, Olaf Blanke

Laboratory of Cognitive Neuroscience, Neuro-X Institute & Brain Mind Institute, Faculty of Life Sciences, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFL), Geneva, Switzerland • Department of Neurosciences, WVU Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, Morgantown, United States • University Grenoble Alpes, Inserm U1216, CHU Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble Institut Neurosciences, Grenoble, France • University Grenoble Alpes, University Savoie Mont Blanc, CNRS, LPNC, Grenoble, France • Departments of Neurosurgery, WVU Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, Morgantown, United States • Department of Computer Science and Electrical Engineering, West Virginia University, Morgantown, United States • Department of Radiology, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, United States • Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University Hospital Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_access

 Copyright information

eLife Assessment

This **important** study reports human single-neuron recordings in subcortical structures while participants performed a tactile detection task around the perceptual threshold. The study and the analyses are well conducted and provide **convincing** evidence that the thalamus and the subthalamic nucleus contain neurons whose activity correlates with the task, with stimulus presentation, and even with whether the stimulation is consciously detected or not. The study will be relevant for researchers interested in the role of subcortical structures in tactile perception and the neural correlates of consciousness.

<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.95272.2.sa5>

Abstract

Subcortical brain structures such as the subthalamic nucleus or the thalamus are involved in regulating motor and cognitive behavior. However, their contribution to perceptual consciousness is still unclear, due to the inherent difficulties of recording subcortical neuronal activity in humans. Here, we asked neurological patients undergoing surgery for deep brain stimulation to detect weak vibrotactile stimuli applied on their hand while recording single neuron activity from the tip of a microelectrode. We isolated putative single neurons in the subthalamic nucleus and thalamus. A significant proportion of neurons modulated their activity while participants were expecting a stimulus. We found that the firing rate of 23% of these neurons differed between detected and undetected stimuli. Our results provide direct neurophysiological evidence of the involvement of the subthalamic nucleus and the thalamus for the detection of vibrotactile stimuli, thereby calling for a less cortico-centric view of the neural correlates of consciousness.

Introduction

Current methods to investigate the *neural correlates of consciousness* aim at contrasting the neural activity associated with different percepts under constant sensory stimulation to identify the minimal set of neuronal events sufficient for a specific conscious percept to occur (Koch et al., 2016 [↗](#); Seth & Bayne, 2022 [↗](#)). Typically, this involves asking participants to report whether a stimulus with an intensity around detection threshold is present or not. Taking advantage of the wealth of invasive electrophysiology recordings available, researchers have documented such correlates with detection tasks in rodents (Schmack et al., 2021 [↗](#)), birds (Nieder et al., 2020 [↗](#)) and non-human primates Shepherd (de Lafuente & Romo, 2006 [↗](#)). However, the use of animal models to study consciousness raises specific ethical concerns (Mazor et al., 2023 [↗](#)), and requires interpreting behavioral responses with caution (Birch et al., 2022 [↗](#)). Research into the neural correlates of consciousness in human volunteers is enriched by the analysis of fine-grained subjective reports to rule out various confounds (e.g attention, memory, report), but suffers from less spatially and temporally resolved physiological measurements. Indeed, only very few studies have found such correlates at the single neuron level (Fried et al., 1997 [↗](#); Gelbard-Sagiv et al., 2018 [↗](#); Pereira et al., 2021 [↗](#); Quiroga et al., 2008 [↗](#); Reber et al., 2017 [↗](#)) and only in cortical regions. The role of subcortical structures for perceptual consciousness is theoretically relevant (Aru et al., 2020 [↗](#); Dehaene & Changeux, 2011 [↗](#); Schiff, 2008 [↗](#); Seth & Bayne, 2022 [↗](#); Ward, 2013 [↗](#)) with some empirical support from detection studies in non-human primates (Haegens et al., 2014 [↗](#); Tauste Campo et al., 2019 [↗](#); Vazquez et al., 2012 [↗](#), 2013 [↗](#)), as well as functional imaging or local field potentials in humans (Kronemer et al., 2022 [↗](#); Levinson et al., 2021 [↗](#)). Nonetheless, it remains unknown how the firing rate of subcortical neurons changes when a stimulus is consciously perceived. Single-unit recordings provide a much higher temporal resolution than functional imaging, which helps assess how the neural correlates of consciousness unfold over time. Contrary to local field potentials, single-unit recordings can expose the variety of functional roles of neurons within subcortical regions, thereby offering a potential for a better mechanistic understanding of perceptual consciousness. Here, we recorded individual neurons from the subthalamic nucleus (STN) and thalamus of human participants during 36 deep brain stimulation surgeries. Participants detected vibrotactile stimuli provided at the perceptual threshold and we tested how neurons in both subcortical structures were modulated by the task, the onset of the stimulus or the detection or not of the stimulus.

Results

Task and behavior

Deep brain stimulation surgeries provide a unique opportunity to record the activity of single neurons in subcortical structures of the human brain. Microelectrode recordings are performed routinely after patients are awakened from anesthesia, to allow electrophysiologists and neurosurgeons to identify the target brain structure along the planned trajectory (**Figures 1B** [↗](#), **S1**). During this procedure, we attached a vibrotactile stimulator to the palm of the hand contralateral to the microelectrode recordings and estimated the stimulus intensity corresponding to participants' individual tactile detection threshold. Once stable neuronal activity could be recorded in the target brain region (STN or thalamus), we proceeded to the main experiment, which comprised one or two sessions of 71 trials (total: 48 sessions). Each trial started with an audio “go” cue, followed by a vibrotactile stimulus applied at any time between 0.5 s and 2.5 s after the end of the cue (i.e. stimulation window), except for 20% of catch trials in which no stimulus was applied (**Figure 1A** [↗](#)). After a random delay ranging from 0.5 to 1 s, a “respond” cue was played, prompting participants to verbally report whether they felt a vibration or not. Therefore,

none of the reported analyses are confounded by motor responses. Using a staircase procedure, the stimulus intensity was kept around the detection threshold over the whole experiment. When possible, participants were trained to perform the task prior to the surgery.

When analyzing tactile perception, we ensured that our results were not contaminated by fluctuating attention and arousal due to the surgical procedure. Based on objective criteria, we excluded specific series of trials from analyses and focused on trials where hits and misses occurred in commensurate proportions (see methods). This procedure led us to keep 36 sessions out of 48 with a mean of 24.0 [95% confidence interval = 22.0, 25.9] hit trials and 22.7 [20.8, 24.5] miss trials. Permutation tests at the single-participant level indicated that detected and missed stimuli were of similar intensity except in 5 sessions for which the intensity of detected stimuli was higher on average. Likewise, detected and missed stimuli had similar onsets, except in 1 session for whom stimuli with late onsets were predominantly missed, and in 2 sessions for whom stimuli with early onsets were predominantly missed. The hit rate was comparable between participants with Parkinson's disease (0.51 [0.49, 0.53]) and essential tremor (0.52 [0.51, 0.53], Wilcoxon rank sum test: $W = 114.5$, $p = 0.45$; **Figure 1C**). Catch trials were separated into 9.1 [8.1–10.1] correct rejections and 2.1 [1.7, 2.6] false alarms, with an equivalent false alarm rate between participants with Parkinson's disease (0.24 [0.19, 0.28]) and essential tremor (0.24 [0.18, 0.30], Wilcoxon rank sum test: $W = 145$, $p = 0.76$). Intraoperative behavior was similar to the behavior observed during the training session (Figure S2) and similar to what we found recently in a cohort of healthy participants using the same task (Pereira et al., 2021).

Neuronal firing was modulated by the task

We performed a total of 48 (STN: 25, Thal: 23) successful microelectrode recording sessions during 36 surgeries for deep brain stimulation electrode implantation. We isolated 50 putative single neurons (STN: 26, Thal: 24) according to spike sorting metrics (Figure S3A–G). We ensured that all neurons showed stable spike amplitudes during the recording (Figure S3H–J). We also ensured that for every analysis, a minimum of 20 trials per condition were kept after removing artifacts. First, we looked for cue-selective neurons that modulate their firing rate during the 500 ms delay following the end of the “go” cue, compared to a 500 ms pre-cue baseline period. There were 8 / 44 (18 %) cue-selective neurons (**Figure 2A**; 6 neurons were removed from the analysis due to an insufficient number of trials). We confirmed that these 8 cue-selective neurons could not have been obtained by chance by comparing this number to a null distribution obtained by permuting the sign of the trial-wise differences 1000 times (sign permutation test: $p < 0.001$). The proportion of cue-selective neurons was not significantly different in the STN (21%) and thalamus (15%; difference: $p = 0.31$, sign permutation test) and 6 out of 8 neurons showed a decrease in firing rate compared to the pre-cue baseline.

Next, we investigated how many neurons showed task-selective modulations by comparing firing rates during the 2 s stimulation window to the 500 ms pre-cue baseline, indicating a modulation of their firing rate when a stimulus is expected. There were 9 / 44 (20 %) task-selective neurons (sign permutation test: $p = 0.003$ with a similar proportion in the STN (21 %) and thalamus (20 %; **Figure 2B–D**). Interestingly, 8 out of 9 neurons decreased their firing rate relative to the pre-cue baseline. In both regions, a significant proportion (44 %; sign permutation test: $p < 0.001$) of the task-selective neurons were also cue-selective, modulating their firing rate before any sensory stimulation necessary for a decision occurred. Therefore, these cue- and task-selective neurons are unlikely to be involved in decision-related action selection or cancellation (Bastin et al., 2014; Mosher et al., 2021) but should be involved in the detection task *per se*.

Neuronal firing was modulated by the stimulus

We then searched for neurons that modulate their firing rate after the stimulus onset compared to a 300 ms pre-stimulus baseline while correcting for possible drifts in the firing rate during the trial (see methods). We found 8 / 37 such stimulus-selective neurons (22%, sign permutation test: $p =$




Figure 1.

Task and behavior.

A. Task timeline. Each trial started with an auditory start cue, followed by a 0.5 s delay. Next, the stimulus could occur anytime during a 2 s stimulation window. After a variable 0.5 to 1 s delay, a response cue prompted patients to answer whether or not they detected the stimulus. **B.** Two example sets of 1 s long microelectrode recordings along the surgical tract showing specific firing for the subthalamic nucleus (left) and the motor thalamus (right). The depth at which the research data was collected is represented as a red dot (see Figure S1 for anatomical correspondence). **C.** Number of hits, misses, correct rejections (C.R.), and false alarms (F.A.) collected during the main experiment. **D.** Averages of the absolute vibrotactile intensity in hits and misses in arbitrary units (values cannot be compared between participants). In panels C and D, each small dot represents a participant with Parkinson's Disease (PD, in green) or essential tremor (ET, in orange). Big dots represent averages; error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 2.

Representative cue- and task-responsive neurons in distinct patients.

A-C. Upper panels: firing rates time-locked to the onset of a trial (300 ms long auditory cue; vertical purple shade), compared to a 500 ms pre-cue baseline ("B"). Two significance windows were tested: the post-cue window (500 ms after cue offset; grey horizontal bar; cue-selective neurons) or the stimulation window (800 ms to 2800 ms postcue; black horizontal bar; task-selective neurons). Asterisks represent statistical significance ($p < 0.05$). Shaded areas indicate bootstrapped standard errors. Inset: corresponding action potentials (shaded area indicates standard deviation; vertical bar corresponds to 100 μ V, duration: 2.5 ms). Lower panels: raster plot with trials sorted by stimulus onset (dashed lines) and type: hits (blue), misses (red), correct rejections (C.R.; green), and false alarms (F.A.; black). **A.** Cue-selective neuron in the thalamus. **B.** Cue- and task-selective neurons in the STN. **C.** Task-selective neuron in the thalamus. **D.** Sagittal view of recording locations for thalamic (squares) and subthalamic (circles) targets (see Figure S4A for a coronal view) for patients for which we could obtain anatomical images. Filled circles or squares are cue/task-selective neurons. Legend: VL: ventral lateral thalamus, VPlm: ventral posterior lateral and medial thalamus, VPi: ventral posterior inferior thalamus, STN: subthalamic nucleus, SN: substantia nigra, GPi/e: globus pallidus internalis / externalis,

0.011; **Figure 3A-D**; 13 neurons were removed due to an insufficient number of trials), with 29% in the STN and 15% in the thalamus. These differences occurred $211 \text{ ms} \pm 34$ after the stimulus onset, lasted for an average of $126 \text{ ms} \pm 28$, and 6 out of 8 neurons showed a decrease in firing rate after the stimulus onset. These results show that subthalamic and thalamic neurons are modulated by stimulus onset, irrespective of whether it was reported or not, even though no immediate motor response was required.

Neuronal firing was modulated by tactile perception

Having identified subcortical neurons that were cue-, task- or stimulus-selective, we next sought to assess the role of these structures in conscious detection by comparing firing rates time-locked to detected vs missed stimuli. Of the 50 neurons recorded, 35 were associated with periods of high-quality behavior, allowing us to assume tactile stimulation at the perceptual threshold. We found 8 neurons (23 %) showing a significant difference between hits and misses after stimulus onset (trial permutation test: $p = 0.0060$; **Figure 4A-D**, S5). Each neuron was found in a different participant. The proportion of these perception-selective neurons was similar in the STN (27 %) and the thalamus (20 %; difference: $p = 0.529$; trial permutation test). These differences in firing rates occurred on average $160 \text{ ms} \pm 36$ after the stimulus onset and lasted for an average of $100 \text{ ms} \pm 10$. We note that the timings of sensory and perception effects in **Figures 3** and **4** showed a bimodal distribution with an early cluster (149 ms for sensory neurons; 121 ms for perception neurons; c.f. methods) and a later cluster (330 ms for sensory neurons; 315 ms for perception neurons; **Figure 5**). We note that, 6 out of 8 neurons had higher firing rates for missed trials than hit trials. None of the aforementioned neurons showed sustained differences between the highest and lowest stimulus amplitudes nor between early and late stimulus onset within the 2 s stimulus window (Figure S6). Our control analyses confirm that our results do not stem from slight differences in stimulus amplitudes due to the staircase procedure or spurious differences induced by the start or response cues. Qualitatively, we found little overlap between task-, stimulus- and perception-selective neurons (one neuron selective for all three categories, one task- and perception-selective neuron, two stimulus- and perception-selective neurons and one task- and perception-selective neuron; Figure S7). This result suggests that these two subcortical structures display neurons with several different functional roles. We also found no clear indication that neurons with a beta-band oscillatory component were more or less selective.

Discussion

The importance of cortico-subcortical loops for physiological and cognitive functions is well-established (Shepherd & Yamawaki, 2021). Yet, while the role of subcortical structures in perceptual consciousness is largely acknowledged (Aru et al., 2020; Dehaene & Changeux, 2011; Koch et al., 2016; Shepherd & Yamawaki, 2021; Ward, 2013), it remains poorly described in humans. This limit is likely due to the difficulty of recording subcortical activity in awake humans capable of providing conscious reports under controlled experimental conditions. We report the first intraoperative recordings of subcortical neurons in awake individuals during a detection task. By imposing a delay between the end of the tactile stimulation window and the subjective report, we ensured that neuronal responses reflected stimulus detection and not mere motor responses. In addition, because stimuli were applied on the palm, we asked participants to provide detection responses orally to avoid confounding neural activity related to sensory and motor processes of the upper limb. Our main result is that the activity of subcortical neurons co-varies with subjective reports following the presentation of detected vs missed tactile stimuli. This result confirms that the neuronal underpinnings of tactile detection can be observed at the scale of single neurons in humans (Fried et al., 1997; Gelbard-Sagiv et al., 2018; Pereira et al., 2021; Quiroga et al., 2008; Reber et al., 2017) but also shows for the first time that they are not limited to the cortex.




Figure 3.

Representative stimulus-responsive neurons in distinct patients.

A-C. Upper panels: firing rate time-locked to the onset of the stimulus (100 ms vibrotactile stimulation; blue sinusoid) for all trials. Green trace represents corresponding activity for catch trials. Thick horizontal black segments show significant time windows. Shaded areas indicate bootstrapped standard errors. Inset: corresponding action potentials (shaded area indicates standard deviation; vertical bar corresponds to 100 μ V, duration: 2.5 ms). Lower panels: raster plot. The 300 ms pre-stimulus baseline was used only for statistics. **D.** Sagittal view of recording locations for thalamic (squares) and subthalamic (circles) targets (see Figure S4B for a coronal view) for patients for which we could obtain anatomical images. Filled circles or squares are sensory-selective neurons. Legend: VL: ventral lateral thalamus, VPlm: ventral posterior lateral and medial thalamus, VPi: ventral posterior inferior thalamus, STN: subthalamic nucleus, SN: substantia nigra, GPi/e: globus pallidus internalis / externalis,

Figure 4.

Representative perception-selective neurons in distinct patients.

A-C Upper panels: firing rate time-locked to the onset of the stimulus (100 ms vibrotactile stimulation; blue sinusoid) for hits (light blue) and misses (red). Thick horizontal black segments show significant time windows. Shaded areas indicate bootstrapped standard errors. Inset: corresponding action potentials (shaded area indicates standard deviation; vertical bar corresponds to 100 μ V, duration: 2.5 ms). Lower panels: raster plot for hits (light blue) and misses (red). See Figure S5 for all neurons that are perception- or sensory-selective. **D**. Sagittal view of recording locations for thalamic (squares) and subthalamic (circles) targets (see Figure S4C for a coronal view) for patients for which we could obtain anatomical images. Filled circles or squares are perception-selective neurons. Legend: VL: ventral lateral thalamus, VPlm: ventral posterior lateral and medial thalamus, VPi: ventral posterior inferior thalamus, STN: subthalamic nucleus, SN: substantia nigra, GPi: globus pallidus internus / externus.





Figure 5.

Number of neurons with a significant effect over time for sensory-selective neurons (green) and perception-selective neurons (red). Arrows show the corresponding early and late cluster centroids (green for sensory; red for perception).



Our findings that neurons in the thalamus modulate their activity according to tactile detection adds to the existing evidence in favor of the role of the thalamus for perceptual consciousness. Indeed, thalamic activity and more precisely thalamocortical loops are often considered key to gate sensory stimuli to conscious access (Ward, 2013). In non-human primates, for example, oscillatory thalamic activity predicts tactile detection (Haegens et al., 2014), and functional interactions between the somatosensory thalamus and the cortex increase when a tactile stimulus is detected (Tauste Campo et al., 2019). In humans, thalamic local field potentials and fMRI activity were higher for seen vs unseen stimuli (Kronemer et al., 2022; Levinson et al., 2021) and causal effects of thalamic stimulation on the levels of consciousness have been found (Schiff et al., 2007). Future studies with higher neuronal yields will be helpful in assessing the contribution of distinct thalamic territories to tactile consciousness, focusing notably on the ventral caudal part, which contains neurons with tactile receptive fields. Moreover, given the prominent role of the thalamus in multisensory processing (Yang et al., 2025), it will be interesting to assess if it is specifically involved in tactile consciousness or if it has a supramodal contribution, akin to what is found in the cortex (Filimonov et al., 2022; Noel et al., 2018; Sanchez et al., 2020).

Concerning the subthalamic nucleus, a possibility is that perception-selective neurons determine stimulus detection through the regulation of decisional processes. Indeed, previous studies reported a modulatory role of subthalamic activity on decisional processes, notably by elevating the decisional threshold on accumulated sensory evidence (Bogacz & Gurney, 2007; Cavanagh et al., 2011; Green et al., 2013; Herz et al., 2016). In a recent study in which we measured the activity of cortical neurons in a similar task, we showed that evidence accumulation is also at play during conscious detection (Pereira et al., 2021). Based on this finding, we proposed that percepts fade in and out of consciousness when evidence accumulated by cortical neurons passes a given threshold (Pereira et al., 2022). The present results, therefore, indicate that the contribution of subthalamic neurons to decisional processes is not limited to discrimination tasks or motor planning, but may also regulate the threshold at which accumulated evidence gives rise to a conscious percept. Considering the inhibitory role of the subthalamic nucleus on the cortex (Mink, 1996), the fact that many of the perception-selective neurons we found had higher firing rate for misses than for hits suggests a role in elevating that threshold, similar to what is found in decision tasks manipulating conflict or cautiousness and requiring immediate responses (Bastin et al., 2014; Cavanagh et al., 2011; Frank et al., 2007; Herz et al., 2016; Mosher et al., 2021). Thus, our results suggest that the STN plays an important role in a subcortical network gating conscious access, although it might not encode conscious content *per se* (Aru et al., 2012).

Apart from perception-selective neurons, we also found a distinct population of neurons in both the STN and thalamus that modulated their firing rate both after the cue and during the task, and therefore much before the stimulus onset. These neurons cannot be involved in detection-related processes but could instead be involved in task switching (Hikosaka & Isoda, 2010; Laquitaine et al., 2024). Micro-electrode recordings could therefore reconcile the multiple roles ascribed to subcortical structures by exposing the variety of functional roles of the neurons inside those regions. We also found neurons that modulated their firing rates after the stimulus onset, irrespective of detection, similar to animal works in the STN (Al Tannir et al., 2023; Coizet et al., 2009) and thalamus (Tauste Campo et al., 2019; Vazquez et al., 2012). Our results should be taken with caution as they are based on a small number of neurons due to the high complexity of intraoperative recordings, and because the number of trials we could collect was not sufficient to test the computational mechanisms underlying the neuronal activity we recorded. Interestingly, we found that both sensory and perception effects could be grouped into an early and late cluster. The early cluster's average timing around 150 ms post-stimulus corresponds to the onset of a putative cortical correlate of tactile consciousness, the somatosensory awareness negativity (Dembski et al., 2021). Similar electroencephalographic markers are found in the visual and auditory modality. It is unclear, however, whether these markers are related to perceptual consciousness or selective attention (Dembski et al., 2021). The later cluster is centered around

300 ms and could correspond to a well-known electroencephalographic marker, the P3b (Polich, 2007) whose association with perceptual consciousness has been questioned (Dembski et al., 2021; Pitts et al., 2014) although brain activity related to consciousness has been observed at similar timing even in the absence of report demands (Sergent et al., 2021; Stockart et al., 2024). It is also important to note that these clusters contain neurons with both increased and decreased firing rates following stimulus onset, similar to what was observed previously in the posterior parietal cortex (Pereira et al., 2021). Future studies ruling out the presence of motor preparation triggered by perceived stimuli (Bennur & Gold, 2011; Fang et al., 2024; Twomey et al., 2016) and verifying that similar neuronal activity occurs in the absence of task-demands (no-reports; Tsuchiya et al., 2015) or attention (Wyart & Tallon-Baudry, 2008) will be useful to support that subcortical neurons contribute specifically to perceptual consciousness.

In sum, our study provides neurophysiological evidence from single neurons in humans that subcortical structures play a significant role in tactile detection either by themselves (Ward, 2013) or through their numerous connections with the cortex (Dehaene & Changeux, 2011). A comprehensive account of the neural correlates of consciousness should, therefore, not be cortico-centric but also consider subcortical contributions.

Methods

Participants

We recorded high impedance electrophysiological signals from microelectrodes inserted intraoperatively in the subthalamic nucleus of 32 participants with Parkinson disease or essential tremor undergoing deep brain stimulation electrode implantation surgeries (N = 36; 4 participants had two surgeries, one for each side). For individuals with Parkinson's disease, the age at the time of the recording was 60.4 ± 2.7 years and the average UPDRS III score was 40.6 ± 3.0 prior to surgery and was reduced to 20.8 ± 2.8 after the surgery ($p = 0.0015$, $z = 3.18$). We also recorded intraoperatively in the thalamus of individuals with essential tremor undergoing deep brain stimulation surgeries. The age at the time of the recording was 68.9 ± 3.2 years and the average TETRA motor score was 20.1 ± 2.9 prior to surgery. The study was approved by the institutional review board of the West Virginia University Hospital (WVU02HSC17; #1709745061) and all participants provided written informed consent prior to any data collection.

Experimental procedure

Participants performed a tactile detection task programmed in Matlab using the Psychophysics toolbox (Brainard, 1997; Kleiner, s. d.; Pelli, 1997). When possible, participants were trained a few days before the surgery (N = 18 / 36 surgeries). Participants sat in a reclining chair in a quiet room (training session) or were lying in the operating room (main session). Every trial started with a 300 ms long auditory “go” cue delivered through an external loudspeaker placed near the participants. Following the end of the go cue and a delay of 500 ms, a 100 ms vibrotactile stimulus could be delivered at any time during a two second stimulation window (i.e., uniform distribution between 0.8 and 2.8 s after the onset of the go cue; **Figure 1A**) on the lateral palm contralateral to the deep brain implant. Stimuli were applied using a MMC3 Haptuator vibrotactile device from TactileLabs Inc. (Montréal, Canada) driven by a 230 Hz sinusoid audio signal. Participants reported orally whether they felt the stimulus or not and whether they were confident in their answer or not after an auditory “respond” cue played one second after the end of the stimulation window. The participants responses could thus consist in “yes, sure”, “yes, unsure”, “no, sure” and “no, unsure”. The task was stopped after two sessions of 71 trials, or before in case of discomfort or other clinical constraints. As –upon waking from anesthesia– most participants did not use both confidence levels, confidence data was therefore not analyzed.

To keep the vibrotactile stimulus intensity around the detection threshold, we first conducted a rough threshold search by presenting a series of stimuli whose intensity decreased by steps of 5% until participants reported not feeling them anymore. Then we presented series of low intensity stimuli whose intensities increased by step of 5% until participants reported feeling them again. These procedures were repeated until the experimenter deemed the results satisfying. We took the average between the thresholds obtained during these procedures as a seed for the main task. During the main task, a 1up/1down adaptive staircase procedure (Levitt, 1971 [↗](#)) ensured that the intensity was kept around the perceptual threshold by increasing the intensity by 5% after miss trial and decreasing the intensity by 5% after a hit trial. Of note, the absolute stimulus intensity is not informative and cannot be compared across patients and sessions, as it varied according to different factors (e.g. the length of the cable or the manner with which the tactile stimulator was strapped onto the palm).

Surgical procedure

STN or thalamus targets and trajectories were defined preoperatively using CranialSuite (Neurotargeting Inc., Nashville, US) based on MRI scans. Both targets were then defined with respect to the AC-PC (commissural) line using standard atlas-based methods and refined based on individual anatomy. The entry point was chosen approximately 2 to 3 cm from the midline and 1 cm anterior from the coronal suture and adjusted to individual anatomy in order to avoid traversing brain sulci, lateral ventricles or the medial bridging veins. Scalp incisions and burr-hole drilling were performed under local (lidocaine) and general (propofol) anesthesia and a microelectrode (FHC, Maine, US) was inserted through a guide cannula using a microdrive placed either on a Leksell frame (N = 13 surgeries) or a 3D printed mould (N = 23 surgeries).

Electrophysiology

Once the microelectrode reached the target brain structure (STN or thalamus), the speed of the microdrive was reduced and neuronal activity was streamed to a loudspeaker, allowing the electrophysiologist to verify the depth of the preplanned trajectory. The main research task was initiated when a neuron showed stable activity for a few tens of seconds and the anatomical localization was confirmed by the electrophysiologist. Recording depths were saved and used offline to define the anatomical localization (see Anatomical localization section). Electrophysiological data were recorded from the 5 mm tip of the microelectrode, referenced to the guide cannula and an adaptive line noise canceller was applied. Data were digitized either using a Guideline 4000 LP+ amplifier (FHC, Maine, US) at 30 kHz (N = 21 surgeries), or using a Guideline 5 amplifier (FHC, Maine, US) at 32 kHz and resampled offline to 30 kHz (N = 14 surgeries).

Anatomical localization

For 34 / 50 neurons, preoperative MRI and postoperative CT scans (co-registered in patient native space using CranialSuite) were available to precisely reconstruct surgical trajectories and recording locations (for the remaining 16 neurons, localizations were based on neurosurgical planning and confirmed by electrophysiological recordings at various depths). Recording depths were inspected along the trajectories in patient native space, projected to an MNI-coordinate space and compared against the Ilinsky atlas (Ilinsky et al., 2018 [↗](#)) which delineates distinct thalamic sub-territories based on a marker of ψ -aminobutyric acid on sections post-mortem human brains.

Behavioral analyses

We used R 4.1.2 (Team R, 2020) and the tidyverse (Wickham et al., 2019 [↗](#)) package to analyze behavioral data. Permutation tests were performed by permuting hit and miss trials over 1000 iterations for each participant. Non-parametric p-values were estimated by counting the permutations for which the difference between hits and misses was higher in the observed compared to the shuffled data.

As titrating and keeping the vibrotactile stimulation intensity to the perceptual level after anesthesia was a challenging task, we took great care in keeping only the highest quality recordings. We estimated the trial-by-trial hit-rate using a sliding window of 11 trials (for the first and last 5 trials, we mirrored trials to avoid border effects). Any trial with a hit-rate out of the]25, 75[% range were removed from further analysis comparing hit to miss trials. If less than 10 hit and 10 miss trials were kept by this procedure, the session (and its corresponding neurons) was removed from subsequent analyses (13 / 48 sessions; 27 %).

Spike sorting and firing rate estimation

Each microelectrode recording was filtered between 300 and 3000 Hz and visually inspected. Artifacts such as cross-talk from the participants' vocal responses were marked and replaced by noise with a standard deviation matching the second pre- and post-artifact. We performed this procedure to avoid spuriously lowering the thresholds for neuronal spike detection. The timing of these artifactual epochs were saved in order to reject affected trials in later analyses. Neuronal spikes were detected and clustered using an online semi-automatic spike sorting algorithm (Osort) (Rutishauser et al., 2006 [↗](#)). Each resulting cluster of neurons was inspected based on common metrics such as spike waveform, percentage of inter-spike interval below 3 ms, signal-to-noise ratio and power spectral densities and possibly merged with other clusters. Finally, the resulting curated neurons were labeled as *putative single neuron* or *multiunit*, depending on the spike waveforms, peak amplitude distribution and the percentage of inter-spike interval below 3 ms. Electrophysiological signals were realigned either to the onset of the “go” cue (Figures 2 [↗](#)) or to the onset of the stimulus (Figures 3 [↗](#)–4 [↗](#)), which was precisely obtained by applying a matched filter to a copy of the audio signal used to drive the vibrotactile stimulator we simultaneously recorded with the electrophysiological data. We estimated instantaneous firing rates using a sliding Gaussian kernel with a standard deviation of 40 ms and 1 ms steps. When displaying the resulting average firing rates over time, we estimated the standard error of the mean using a bootstrap procedure with 1000 resamplings.

Identification of selective neurons

To deal with possibly non-parametric distributions, we used Wilcoxon rank sum test or sign test instead of t-tests to test differences between distributions. We used permutation tests instead of Binomial tests to test whether a reported number of neurons could have been obtained by chance. For each analysis, we verified that the reported number of neurons could not have been obtained by chance by comparing this number to a null distribution using permutation tests (Maris & Oostenveld, 2007 [↗](#)). For paired tests with respect to a baseline, we randomly flipped the sign of the difference between the firing rate during the trial and during the baseline (*sign permutation test* in the main text) and for unpaired tests, we randomly shuffled the conditions (i.e. a hit trial could be randomly assigned to a hit or a miss trial; *trial permutation test* in the main text). To obtain a p-value, we compared the number of selective neurons to a null distribution obtained by randomly permuting the data 1000 times. This procedure allowed us to show that the number of selective neurons could not have been obtained by chance while controlling for multiple comparisons over time. Similarly, to test whether the proportion of neurons was different in the STN compared to the thalamus, we compared the absolute difference in the proportion of neurons in each anatomical location to a null distribution obtained by random permutations.

To identify cue-selective neurons we compared the number of spikes in a 500 ms baseline preceding the “go” cue to the number of spikes in a 500 ms period following the offset of the “go cue” using a two-tailed non-parametric sign test. Similarly, we identified task-responsive neurons by comparing the mean number of spikes in a 500 ms baseline preceding the “go” cue to the mean number of spikes during the 2 s stimulation window and performing a permutation test. We compared the differences in the proportion of selective neurons in the STN and thalamus, to the

same differences observed in the shuffled data to assess its significance. Finally, we also compared the number of cue- and task-selective neurons to the same number observed in the shuffled data to assess whether the overlap was significant.

To identify sensory-selective neurons, we assumed that subcortical signatures of stimulus detection ought to be found early following its onset and looked for differences in the firing rates during the first 400 ms post-stimulus onset compared to a 300 ms pre-stimulus baseline. To correct for possible drifts occurring during the trial, we subtracted the average cue-locked activity from catch trials to the cue-locked activity of each stimulus-present trials before realigning to stimulus onset. We defined a cluster as a set of adjacent time points for which the firing rates were significantly different between hits and misses, as assessed by a non-parametric sign rank test. A putative neuron was considered sensory-selective when the length of a cluster was above 80 ms, corresponding to twice the standard deviation of the smoothing kernel used to compute the firing rate. Whether for the shuffled data or the observed data, if more than one cluster was obtained, we discarded all but the longest cluster. This permutation test allowed us to control for multiple comparisons across time and participants.

For perception-selective neurons, we looked for differences in the firing rates between hit and miss trials during the first 400 ms post-stimulus onset. We defined a cluster as a set of adjacent time points for which the firing rates were significantly different between hits and misses as assessed by a non-parametric Wilcoxon rank sum test. As for sensory-selective neurons, a putative neuron was considered perception-selective when the length of a cluster was above 80 ms, corresponding to twice the standard deviation of the smoothing kernel used to compute the firing rate and we discarded all but the longest cluster.

To measure bimodal timings of effect latencies, we fitted a two-component Gaussian mixture distribution to the data in **Figure 5** [by](#) minimizing the mean square error with an interior-point method. We took the best of 20 runs with random initialization points and verified that the resulting mean square error was markedly (> 4 times) better than using a single component.

Data and code availability

Data and code necessary to replicate our results are available online (<https://gitlab.com/michael.pereira/subcortical-ncc> [↗](#)).

Further information and requests should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the lead contact, Michael Pereira (michael.pereira@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr).

Acknowledgements

MP was supported by two Postdoc.Mobility fellowships from the Swiss National Science Foundation (P2ELP3_187974; P400PM_199251). NF has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement no. 803122). OB is supported by the Bertarelli Foundation, the Swiss National Science Foundation, and the European Science Foundation.

Additional files

Supplementary Information [↗](#)

References

- Al Tannir R., Pautrat A., Baufreton J., Overton P. G., Coizet V. (2023) **The Subthalamic Nucleus : A Hub for Sensory Control via Short Three-Lateral Loop Connections with the Brainstem?** *Current Neuropharmacology* **21**:22–30 <https://doi.org/10.2174/1570159X20666220718113548>
- Aru J., Bachmann T., Singer W., Melloni L. (2012) **Distilling the neural correlates of consciousness** *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* **36**:737–746 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.12.003>
- Aru J., Suzuki M., Larkum M. E. (2020) **Cellular Mechanisms of Conscious Processing** *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **24**:814–825 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.07.006>
- Bastin J., Polosan M., Benis D., Goetz L., Bhattacharjee M., Piallat B., Krainik A., Bougerol T., Chabardès S., David O. (2014) **Inhibitory control and error monitoring by human subthalamic neurons** *Translational Psychiatry* **4**:e439–e439 <https://doi.org/10.1038/tp.2014.73>
- Bennur S., Gold J. I. (2011) **Distinct Representations of a Perceptual Decision and the Associated Oculomotor Plan in the Monkey Lateral Intraparietal Area** *Journal of Neuroscience* **31**:913–921 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4417-10.2011>
- Birch J., Broom D. M., Browning H., Crump A., Ginsburg S., Halina M., Harrison D., Jablonka E., Lee A. Y., Kammerer F., Klein C., Lamme V., Michel M., Wemelsfelder F., Zacks O. (2022) **How Should We Study Animal Consciousness Scientifically?** *Journal of Consciousness Studies* **29**:8–28 <https://doi.org/10.53765/20512201.29.3.008>
- Bogacz R., Gurney K. (2007) **The Basal Ganglia and Cortex Implement Optimal Decision Making Between Alternative Actions** *Neural Computation* **19**:442–477 <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.2007.19.2.442>
- Brainard D. H. (1997) **The Psychophysics Toolbox** *Spatial Vision* **10**:433–436 <https://doi.org/10.1163/156856897X00357>
- Cavanagh J. F., Wiecki T. V., Cohen M. X., Figueroa C. M., Samanta J., Sherman S. J., Frank M. J. (2011) **Subthalamic nucleus stimulation reverses mediofrontal influence over decision threshold** *Nature Neuroscience* **14**:1462–1467 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2925>
- Coizet V., Graham J. H., Moss J., Bolam J. P., Savasta M., McHaffie J. G., Redgrave P., Overton P. G. (2009) **Short-Latency Visual Input to the Subthalamic Nucleus Is Provided by the Midbrain Superior Colliculus** *The Journal of Neuroscience* **29**:5701–5709 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0247-09.2009>
- Dehaene S., Changeux J.-P. (2011) **Experimental and Theoretical Approaches to Conscious Processing** *Neuron* **70**:200–227 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.03.018>
- de Lafuente V., Romo R. (2006) **Neural correlate of subjective sensory experience gradually builds up across cortical areas** *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **103**:14266–14271 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0605826103>

- Dembski C., Koch C., Pitts M. (2021) **Perceptual awareness negativity : A physiological correlate of sensory consciousness** *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **25**:660–670 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.05.009>
- Fang Z., Dang Y., Ling Z., Han Y., Zhao H., Xu X., Zhang M. (2024) **The involvement of the human prefrontal cortex in the emergence of visual awareness** *eLife* **12**:RP89076 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.89076>
- Filimonov D., Railo H., Revonsuo A., Koivisto M. (2022) **Modality-specific and modality-general electrophysiological correlates of visual and auditory awareness : Evidence from a bimodal ERP experiment** *Neuropsychologia* **166**:108154 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2022.108154>
- Frank M. J., Samanta J., Moustafa A. A., Sherman S. J. (2007) **Hold Your Horses : Impulsivity, Deep Brain Stimulation, and Medication in Parkinsonism** *Science* **318**:1309–1312 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1146157>
- Fried I., MacDonald K. A., Wilson C. L. (1997) **Single Neuron Activity in Human Hippocampus and Amygdala during Recognition of Faces and Objects** *Neuron* **18**:753–765 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273\(00\)80315-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(00)80315-3)
- Gelbard-Sagiv H., Mudrik L., Hill M. R., Koch C., Fried I. (2018) **Human single neuron activity precedes emergence of conscious perception** *Nature Communications* **9**:2057 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-03749-0>
- Green N., Bogacz R., Huebl J., Beyer A.-K., Kühn A. A., Heekeren H. R. (2013) **Reduction of Influence of Task Difficulty on Perceptual Decision Making by STN Deep Brain Stimulation** *Current Biology* **23**:1681–1684 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2013.07.001>
- Haegens S., Vazquez Y., Zainos A., Alvarez M., Jensen O., Romo R. (2014) **Thalamocortical rhythms during a vibrotactile detection task** *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **111**:E1797–E1805 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1405516111>
- Herz D. M., Zavala B. A., Bogacz R., Brown P. (2016) **Neural Correlates of Decision Thresholds in the Human Subthalamic Nucleus** *Current Biology* **26**:916–920 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.01.051>
- Hikosaka O., Isoda M. (2010) **Switching from automatic to controlled behavior : Cortico-basal ganglia mechanisms** *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **14**:154–161 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.01.006>
- Ilinsky I., Horn A., Paul-Gilloteaux P., Gressens P., Verney C., Kultas-Ilinsky K. (2018) **Human Motor Thalamus Reconstructed in 3D from Continuous Sagittal Sections with Identified Subcortical Afferent Territories** *Eneuro* **5**:ENEURO.0060-18.2018 <https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0060-18.2018>
- Kleiner M. (no date) **What’s new in Psychtoolbox-3? 89**
- Koch C., Massimini M., Boly M., Tononi G. (2016) **Neural correlates of consciousness : Progress and problems** *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **17**:307–321 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn.2016.22>
- Kronemer S. I., Aksen M., Ding J. Z., Ryu J. H., Xin Q., Ding Z., Prince J. S., Kwon H., Khalaf A., Forman S., Jin D. S., Wang K., Chen K., Hu C., Agarwal A., Saberski E., Wafa S. M. A., Morgan O.

- P., Wu J., ..., Blumenfeld H. (2022) **Human visual consciousness involves large scale cortical and subcortical networks independent of task report and eye movement activity** *Nature Communications* **13**:7342 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-35117-4>
- Laquitaine M., Polosan M., Kahane P., Chabardes S., Yelnik J., Fernandez-Vidal S., Domenech P., Bastin J. (2024) **Optimal level of human intracranial theta activity for behavioral switching in the subthalamo-medio-prefrontal circuit** *Nature Communications* **15**:7827 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-52290-w>
- Levinson M., Podvalny E., Baete S. H., He B. J. (2021) **Cortical and subcortical signatures of conscious object recognition** *Nature Communications* **12**:2930 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-23266-x>
- Levitt H. (1971) **Transformed Up-Down Methods in Psychoacoustics** *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* **49**:467–477 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1912375>
- Maris E., Oostenveld R. (2007) **Nonparametric statistical testing of EEG-and MEG-data** *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* **164**:177–190 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2007.03.024>
- Mazor M., Brown S., Ciaunica A., Demertzi A., Fahrenfort J., Faivre N., Francken J. C., Lamy D., Lenggenhager B., Moutoussis M., Nizzi M.-C., Salomon R., Soto D., Stein T., Lubianiker N. (2023) **The Scientific Study of Consciousness Cannot and Should Not Be Morally Neutral** *Perspectives on Psychological Science* **18**:535–543 <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916221110222>
- Mink J. W. (1996) **The Basal Ganglia : Focused Selection and Inhibition of Competing Motor Programs** *Progress in Neurobiology* **50**:381–425 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-0082\(96\)00042-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-0082(96)00042-1)
- Mosher C. P., Mamelak A. N., Malekmohammadi M., Pouratian N., Rutishauser U. (2021) **Distinct roles of dorsal and ventral subthalamic neurons in action selection and cancellation** *Neuron* **109**:869–881 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2020.12.025>
- Nieder A., Wagener L., Rinnert P. (2020) **A neural correlate of sensory consciousness in a corvid bird** *Science* **369**:1626–1629 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb1447>
- Noel J.-P., Simon D., Thelen A., Maier A., Blake R., Wallace M. T. (2018) **Probing Electrophysiological Indices of Perceptual Awareness across Unisensory and Multisensory Modalities** *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* **30**:814–828 https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01247
- Pelli D. G. (1997) **The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics : Transforming numbers into movies** *Spatial Vision* **10**:437–442
- Pereira M., Megevand P., Tan M. X., Chang W., Wang S., Rezai A., Seeck M., Corniola M., Momjian S., Bernasconi F., Blanke O., Faivre N. (2021) **Evidence accumulation relates to perceptual consciousness and monitoring** *Nature Communications* **12**:3261 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-23540-y>
- Pereira M., Perrin D., Faivre N. (2022) **A leaky evidence accumulation process for perceptual experience** *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* :S1364661322000614 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2022.03.003>
- Pitts M. A., Padwal J., Fennelly D., Martínez A., Hillyard S. A. (2014) **Gamma band activity and the P3 reflect post-perceptual processes, not visual awareness** *NeuroImage* **101**:337–350 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.07.024>

- Polich J. (2007) **Updating P300 : An integrative theory of P3a and P3b** *Clinical Neurophysiology* **118**:2128–2148 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2007.04.019>
- Quiroga R. Q., Mukamel R., Isham E. A., Malach R., Fried I. (2008) **Human single-neuron responses at the threshold of conscious recognition** *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105**:3599–3604 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0707043105>
- Reber T. P., Faber J., Niediek J., Boström J., Elger C. E., Mormann F. (2017) **Single-Neuron Correlates of Conscious Perception in the Human Medial Temporal Lobe** *Current Biology* **27**:2991–2998 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2017.08.025>
- Rutishauser U., Schuman E. M., Mamelak A. N. (2006) **Online detection and sorting of extracellularly recorded action potentials in human medial temporal lobe recordings, in vivo** *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* **154**:204–224 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2005.12.033>
- Sanchez G., Hartmann T., Fuscà M., Demarchi G., Weisz N. (2020) **Decoding across sensory modalities reveals common supramodal signatures of conscious perception** *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**:7437–7446 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1912584117>
- Schiff N. D. (2008) **Central Thalamic Contributions to Arousal Regulation and Neurological Disorders of Consciousness** *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1129**:105–118 <https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1417.029>
- Schiff N. D., Giacino J. T., Kalmar K., Victor J. D., Baker K., Gerber M., Fritz B., Eisenberg B., O'Connor J., Kobylarz E. J., Farris S., Machado A., McCagg C., Plum F., Fins J. J., Rezaei A. R. (2007) **Behavioural improvements with thalamic stimulation after severe traumatic brain injury** *Nature* **448**:600–603 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06041>
- Schmack K., Bosc M., Ott T., Sturgill J. F., Kepecs A. (2021) **Striatal dopamine mediates hallucination-like perception in mice** *Science* **372**:eabf4740 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abf4740>
- Sergent C., Corazzol M., Labouret G., Stockart F., Wexler M., King J.-R., Meyniel F., Pressnitzer D. (2021) **Bifurcation in brain dynamics reveals a signature of conscious processing independent of report** *Nature Communications* **12**:1149 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21393-z>
- Seth A. K., Bayne T. (2022) **Theories of consciousness** *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **23**:439–452 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-022-00587-4>
- Shepherd G. M. G., Yamawaki N. (2021) **Untangling the cortico-thalamo-cortical loop : Cellular pieces of a knotty circuit puzzle** *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **22**:389–406 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-021-00459-3>
- Stockart F., Msheik R., Robin A., Jurkovicová L., Goueytes D., Rouy M., Marecek R., Hoffmann D., Mudrik L., Roman R., Brázdil M., Minotti L., Kahane P., Pereira M., Faivre N. (2024) **Cortical evidence accumulation for perceptual experience occurs irrespective of reports** *bioRxiv* <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.20.585198>
- Tauste Campo A., Vázquez Y., Álvarez M., Zainos A., Rossi-Pool R., Deco G., Romo R. (2019) **Feed-forward information and zero-lag synchronization in the sensory thalamocortical circuit are modulated during stimulus perception** *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**:7513–7522 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1819095116>

- Tsuchiya N., Wilke M., Frässle S., Lamme V. A. F. (2015) **No-Report Paradigms : Extracting the True Neural Correlates of Consciousness** *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **19**:757–770 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.10.002>
- Twomey D. M., Kelly S. P., O’Connell R. G. (2016) **Abstract and Effector-Selective Decision Signals Exhibit Qualitatively Distinct Dynamics before Delayed Perceptual Reports** *Journal of Neuroscience* **36**:7346–7352 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4162-15.2016>
- Vazquez Y., Salinas E., Romo R. (2013) **Transformation of the neural code for tactile detection from thalamus to cortex** *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**:E2635–E2644 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1309728110>
- Vazquez Y., Zainos A., Alvarez M., Salinas E., Romo R. (2012) **Neural coding and perceptual detection in the primate somatosensory thalamus** *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109**:15006–15011 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1212535109>
- Ward L. M. (2013) **The thalamus : Gateway to the mind: Gateway to the mind** *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science* **4**:609–622 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1256>
- Wickham H., Averick M., Bryan J., Chang W., McGowan L., François R., Golemund G., Hayes A., Henry L., Hester J., Kuhn M., Pedersen T., Miller E., Bache S., Müller K., Ooms J., Robinson D., Seidel D., Spinu V., ..., Yutani H. (2019) **Welcome to the Tidyverse** *Journal of Open Source Software* **4**:1686 <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>
- Wyart V., Tallon-Baudry C. (2008) **Neural Dissociation between Visual Awareness and Spatial Attention** *The Journal of Neuroscience* **28**:2667–2679 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4748-07.2008>
- Yang M., Keller D., Dobolyi A., Valtcheva S. (2025) **The lateral thalamus : A bridge between multisensory processing and naturalistic behaviors** *Trends in Neurosciences* **48**:33–46 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2024.11.005>

Author information

Michael Pereira^{*}

Laboratory of Cognitive Neuroscience, Neuro-X Institute & Brain Mind Institute, Faculty of Life Sciences, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFL), Geneva, Switzerland, Department of Neurosciences, WVU Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, Morgantown, United States, University Grenoble Alpes, Inserm U1216, CHU Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble Institut Neurosciences, Grenoble, France
ORCID iD: [0000-0003-0778-674X](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0778-674X)

For correspondence: michael.pereira@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

^{*}equal contribution

Nathan Faivre^{*}

Laboratory of Cognitive Neuroscience, Neuro-X Institute & Brain Mind Institute, Faculty of Life Sciences, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFL), Geneva, Switzerland, University Grenoble Alpes, University Savoie Mont Blanc, CNRS, LPNC, Grenoble, France

ORCID iD: [0000-0001-6011-4921](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6011-4921)

*equal contribution

Fosco Bernasconi*

Laboratory of Cognitive Neuroscience, Neuro-X Institute & Brain Mind Institute, Faculty of Life Sciences, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFL), Geneva, Switzerland

ORCID iD: [0000-0002-7835-6598](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7835-6598)

*equal contribution

Nicholas Brandmeir

Departments of Neurosurgery, WVU Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, Morgantown, United States

ORCID iD: [0000-0002-1854-5856](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1854-5856)

Jacob Suffridge

Department of Neurosciences, WVU Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, Morgantown, United States, Department of Computer Science and Electrical Engineering, West Virginia University, Morgantown, United States

Kaylee Tran

Department of Neurosciences, WVU Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, Morgantown, United States

Shuo Wang

Department of Neurosciences, WVU Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, Morgantown, United States, Department of Computer Science and Electrical Engineering, West Virginia University, Morgantown, United States, Department of Radiology, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, United States

ORCID iD: [0000-0003-2562-0225](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2562-0225)

Victor Finomore

Department of Neurosciences, WVU Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, Morgantown, United States

ORCID iD: [0000-0002-9884-1152](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9884-1152)

Peter Konrad

Departments of Neurosurgery, WVU Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, Morgantown, United States

ORCID iD: [0000-0003-4223-0819](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4223-0819)

Ali Rezai*

Department of Neurosciences, WVU Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, Morgantown, United States, Departments of Neurosurgery, WVU Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, Morgantown, United States

*equal contribution

Olaf Blanke*

Laboratory of Cognitive Neuroscience, Neuro-X Institute & Brain Mind Institute, Faculty of Life Sciences, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFL), Geneva, Switzerland, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University Hospital Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

*equal contribution

Editors

Reviewing Editor

Marius Peelen

Radboud University Nijmegen, Nijmegen, Netherlands

Senior Editor

Tamar Makin

University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

Reviewer #1 (Public review):

Summary:

A cortico-centric view is dominant in the study for the neural mechanisms of consciousness. This investigation represents the growing interest to understand how subcortical regions are involved in conscious perception. To achieve this, the authors engaged an ambitious and rare procedure in humans of directly recording from neurons in the subthalamic nucleus and thalamus. While participants were in surgery for the placement of deep brain stimulation devices for the treatment of essential tremor and Parkinson's disease, they were awakened and completed a perceptual-threshold tactile detection task. The authors identified individual neurons and analyzed single-unit activity corresponding with the task phases and tactile detection/perception. Among the neurons that were perception-responsive, the authors report changes in firing rate beginning ~150 milliseconds from the onset of the tactile stimulation. Curiously, the majority of the perception-responsive neurons had a higher firing rate for missed/not perceived trials. In summary, this investigation is a valuable addition to the growing literature on the role of subcortical regions in conscious perception.

Strengths:

The authors achieve the challenging task of recording human single-unit activity while participants performed a tactile perception task. The methods and statistics are clearly explained and rigorous, particularly for managing false positives and non-normal distributions. The results offer new detail at the level of individual neurons in the emerging recognition for the role of subcortical regions in conscious perception. Also, this study highlights the timing of neural activity linked to conscious perception (approximately 150 millisecond).

Weaknesses:

Due to constraints of testing with this patient population, a standard report-based detection task was administered. This type of task cannot fully exclude motor preparatory and post-perceptual processing as a factor that contributes to distinguishing between perceived versus not perceived stimuli. The authors show sensitivity to this issue by identifying task-selective neurons and their discussion of the results that refers to the confound of post-perceptual processing. Despite this limitation, the results are valuable for contributing to a growing body of literature on the subcortical neural mechanisms of consciousness.

Reviewer #2 (Public review):

The authors have examined subpopulations of individual neurons recorded in the thalamus and subthalamic nucleus (STN) of awake humans performing a simple cognitive task. They have carefully designed their task structure to minimize motor components that could confound their analyses in these subcortical structures, particularly given that the data was collected from patients with Parkinson's disease (PD) and essential tremor (ET). The recorded data represents a valuable contribution to the field. Pereira et al. conclude that their single-neuron recordings indicate task-related activity that is purportedly distinct from previously identified sensory signals.

Despite the significance of the dataset, important limitations arise due to the small number of recorded neurons relative to the high number of participants. That raises concerns about the generalizability of the conclusions drawn from the study.

(1) While I support the work conducted by the authors and their efforts to improve the manuscript, the number of significant neurons is considerably lower than the number of participants studied—approximately 8 neurons, compared to 32 participants. This low number of neurons involved in encoding raises concerns about the strength of the conclusions drawn.

(2) Additionally, the authors state that participants do not need to perform a motor execution, yet they are required to communicate their response verbally. This presents a contradiction, as speech involves the activation of facial muscles, and previous studies have shown that neuronal activity in the ventral premotor cortex can encode such movements in humans (Willet et al., Nature 2023). Clarifying this point would strengthen the argument and ensure consistency in the interpretation of results.

(3) One way to improve the study is to analyze the local field potentials (LFPs) recorded alongside the spikes. By examining different LFP components, particularly the beta band (Haegens et al., PNAS 2011), it may be possible to identify consistent modulation across the 32 recorded participants. This approach could provide additional support for the study's conclusions and help clarify the role of neural activity in the observed phenomena.

<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.95272.2.sa3>

Reviewer #3 (Public review):**Summary:**

This important study relies on a rare dataset: intracranial recordings within the thalamus and the subthalamic nucleus in awake humans, while they were performing a tactile detection task. This procedure allowed the authors to identify a small but significant proportion of individual neurons, in both structures, whose activity correlated with the task (e.g. their firing rate changed following the audio cue signalling the start of a trial) and/or with the stimulus presentation (change in firing rate around 200 ms following tactile stimulation) and/or with participant's reported subjective perception of the stimulus (difference between hits and misses around 200 ms following tactile stimulation). Whereas most studies interested in the neural underpinnings of conscious perception focus on cortical areas, these results suggest that subcortical structures might also play a role in conscious perception, notably tactile detection.

Strengths:

There are two strongly valuable aspects in this study that make the evidence convincing and even compelling. First, these type of data are exceptional, the authors could have access to subcortical recordings in awake and behaving humans during surgery. Additionally, the methods are solid. The behavioral study meets the best standards of the domain, with a careful calibration of the stimulation levels (staircase) to maintain them around detection threshold, and additional selection of time intervals where the behavior was stable. The authors also checked that stimulus intensity was the same on average for hits and misses within these selected periods, which warrants that the effects of detection that are observed here are not confounded by stimulus intensity. The neural data analysis is also very sound and well conducted. The statistical approach complies to current best practices, although I found that, on some instances, it was not entirely clear which type of permutations had been performed, and I would advocate for more clarity in these instances. Globally, the figures are nice, clear and well presented. I appreciated the fact that the precise anatomical location of the neurons was directly shown in each figure.

Weaknesses:

The results rely on a small number of neurons; it is only the beginning of this exploration! Figure S5 is important for observing the variety of ways the neurons' activity correlated with either stimulus presence, or perception, or both. Interpretations are still very open on these different profiles.

<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.95272.2.sa2>

Author response:

The following is the authors' response to the original reviews

Public Reviews:

Reviewer #1 (Public Review):

Summary:

A cortico-centric view is dominant in the study of the neural mechanisms of consciousness. This investigation represents the growing interest in understanding how subcortical regions are involved in conscious perception. To achieve this, the authors engaged in an ambitious and rare procedure in humans of directly recording from neurons in the subthalamic nucleus and thalamus. While participants were in surgery for the placement of deep brain stimulation devices for the treatment of essential tremor and Parkinson's disease, they were awakened and completed a perceptual-threshold tactile detection task. The authors identified individual neurons and analyzed single-unit activity corresponding with the task phases and tactile detection/perception. Among the neurons that were perception-responsive, the authors report changes in firing rate beginning ~150 milliseconds from the onset of the tactile stimulation. Curiously, the majority of the perception-responsive neurons had a higher firing rate for missed/not perceived trials. In summary, this investigation is a valuable addition to the growing literature on the role of subcortical regions in conscious perception.

Strengths:

The authors achieved the challenging task of recording human single-unit activity while participants performed a tactile perception task. The methods and statistics are clearly explained and rigorous, particularly for managing false positives and non-normal

distributions. The results offer new detail at the level of individual neurons in the emerging recognition of the role of subcortical regions in conscious perception.

We thank the reviewer for their positive comments.

Weaknesses:

"Nonetheless, it remains unknown how the firing rate of subcortical neurons changes when a stimulus is consciously perceived." (lines 76-77) The authors could be more specific about what exactly single-unit recordings offer for interrogating the role of subcortical regions in conscious perception that is unique from alternative neural activity recordings (e.g., local field potential) or recordings that are used as proxies of neural activity (e.g., fMRI).

We agree with the reviewer that the contribution of micro-electrode recordings was not sufficiently put forward in our manuscript. We added the following sentences to the discussion, when discussing the multiple types of neurons we found:

Single-unit recordings provide a much higher temporal resolution than functional imaging, which helps assess how the neural correlates of consciousness unfold over time. Contrary to local field potentials, single-unit recordings can expose the variety of functional roles of neurons within subcortical regions, thereby offering a potential for a better mechanistic understanding of perceptual consciousness.

Related comment for the following excerpts:

"After a random delay ranging from 0.5 to 1 s, a "respond" cue was played, prompting participants to verbally report whether they felt a vibration or not. Therefore, none of the reported analyses are confounded by motor responses." (lines 97-99).

"These results show that subthalamic and thalamic neurons are modulated by stimulus onset, irrespective of whether it was reported or not, even though no immediate motor response was required." (lines 188-190).

"By imposing a delay between the end of the tactile stimulation window and the subjective report, we ensured that neuronal responses reflected stimulus detection and not mere motor responses." (lines 245-247).

It is a valuable feature of the paradigm that the reporting period was initiated hundreds of milliseconds after the stimulus presentation so that the neural responses should not represent "mere motor responses". However, verbal report of having perceived or not perceived a stimulus is a motor response and because the participants anticipate having to make these reports before the onset of the response period, there may be motor preparatory activity from the time of the perceived stimulus that is absent for the not perceived stimulus. The authors show sensitivity to this issue by identifying task-selective neurons and their discussion of the results that refer to the confound of post-perceptual processing. Still, direct treatment of this possible confound would help the rigor of the interpretation of the results.

We agree with the reviewer that direct treatment would have provided the best control. One way to avoid motor preparation is to only provide the stimulus-effector mapping after the stimulus presentation (Bennur & Gold, 2011; Twomey et al., 2016; Fang et al., 2024). Other controls to avoid post-perceptual processing used in consciousness research consist of using no-report paradigms (Tsuchiya et al., 2015) as we did in previous studies (Pereira et al., 2021; Stockart et al., 2024). Unfortunately, neither of these procedures was feasible during the 10 minutes allotted for the research task in an intraoperative setting with auditory cues and

vocal responses. We would like to highlight nonetheless that the effects we report are shortlived and incompatible with sustained motor preparation activity.

We added the following sentence to the discussion:

Future studies ruling out the presence of motor preparation triggered by perceived stimuli (Bennur & Gold, 2011; Fang et al., 2024; Twomey et al., 2016) and verifying that similar neuronal activity occurs in the absence of task-demands (no-reports; Tsuchiya et al., 2015) or attention (Wyart & Tallon-Baudry, 2008) will be useful to support that subcortical neurons contribute specifically to perceptual consciousness.

"When analyzing tactile perception, we ensured that our results were not contaminated with spurious behavior (e.g. fluctuation of attention and arousal due to the surgical procedure)." (lines 118-117).

Confidence in the results would be improved if the authors clarified exactly what behaviors were considered as contaminating the results (e.g., eye closure, saccades, and bodily movements) and how they were determined.

This sentence was indeed unclear. It introduced the trial selection procedure we used to compensate for drifts in the perceptual threshold, which can result from fluctuations in attention or arousal. We modified the sentence, which now reads:

When analyzing tactile perception, we ensured that our results were not contaminated by fluctuating attention and arousal due to the surgical procedure. Based on objective criteria, we excluded specific series of trials from analyses and focused on time windows for which hits and misses occurred in commensurate proportions (see methods).

During the recordings, the experimenter stood next to the patients and monitored their bodily movements, ensuring they did not close their eyes or produce any other bodily movements synchronous with stimulus presentation.

The authors' discussion of the thalamic neurons could be more precise. The authors show that only certain areas of the thalamus were recorded (in or near the ventral lateral nucleus, according to Figure S3C). The ventral lateral nucleus has a unique relationship to tactile and motor systems, so do the authors hypothesize these same perception-selective neurons would be active in the same way for visual, auditory, olfactory, and taste perception? Moreover, the authors minimally interpret the location of the task, sensory, and perception-responsive neurons. Figure S3 suggests these neurons are overlapping. Did the authors expect this overlap and what does it mean for the functional organization of the ventral lateral nucleus and subthalamic nucleus in conscious perception?

These are excellent questions, the answers to which we can only speculate. In rodents, the LT is known as a hub for multisensory processing, as over 90% of LT neurons respond to at least two sensory modalities (for a review, see Yang et al., 2024). Yet, no study has compared how LT neurons in rodents encode perceived and nonperceived stimuli across modalities. Evidence in humans is scarce, with only a few studies documenting supramodal neural correlates of consciousness at the cortical level with noninvasive methods (Noel et al., 2018; Sanchez et al., 2020; Filimonov et al., 2022). We now refer to these studies in the revised discussion: Moreover, given the prominent role of the thalamus in multisensory processing, it will be interesting to assess if it is specifically involved in tactile consciousness or if it has a supramodal contribution, akin to what is found in the cortex (Noel et al., 2018; Sanchez et al., 2020; Filimonov et al., 2022).

Concerning the anatomical overlap of neurons, we could not reconstruct the exact locations of the DBS tracts for all participants. Because of the limited number of recorded neurons, we preferred to refrain from drawing strong conclusions about the functional organization of the ventral lateral nucleus.

"We note that, 6 out of 8 neurons had higher firing rates for missed trials than hit trials, although this proportion was not significant (binomial test: $p = 0.145$)." (lines 215-216).

It appears that in the three example neurons shown in Figure 4, 2 out of 3 (#001 and #068) show a change in firing rate predominantly for the missed stimulations. Meanwhile, #034 shows a clear hit response (although there is an early missed response - decreased firing rate - around 150 ms that is not statistically significant). This is a counterintuitive finding when compared to previous results from the thalamus (e.g., local field potentials and fMRI) that show the opposite response profile (i.e., missed/not perceived trials display no change or reduced response relative to hit/perceived trials). The discussion of the results should address this, including if these seemingly competing findings can be rectified.

We thank the reviewer for pointing out this limitation of the discussion. We avoided putting too much emphasis on these aspects due to the limited number of perception-selective neurons. Although subcortical connectivity models would predict that neurons in the thalamus should increase their firing rate for perceived stimuli, we were not surprised to see this heterogeneity as we had previously found neurons decreasing their firing rates for missed stimuli in the posterior parietal cortex (Pereira et al., 2021). We answer these points in response to the reviewer's last comment below on the latencies of the effects.

The authors report 8 perception-responsive neurons, but there are only 5 recording sites highlighted (i.e., filled-in squares and circles) in Figures S3C and 4D. Was this an omission or were three neurons removed from the perception-responsive analysis?

Unfortunately, we could not obtain anatomical images for all participants. This information was present in the methods section, although not clearly enough:

For 34 / 50 neurons, preoperative MRI and postoperative CT scans (co-registered in patient native space using CranialSuite) were available to precisely reconstruct surgical trajectories and recording locations (for the remaining 16 neurons, localizations were based on neurosurgical planning and confirmed by electrophysiological recordings at various depths).

Therefore, we added the following sentence in Figures 2, 3, 4 and S3.

[...] for patients for which we could obtain anatomical images.

Could the authors speak to the timing of the responses reported in Figure 4? The statistically significant intervals suggested both early (~160-200ms) to late responses (~300ms). Some have hypothesized that subcortical regions are early - ahead of cortical activation that may be linked with conscious perception. Do these results say anything about this temporal model for when subcortical regions are active in conscious perception?

We agree that response timing could have been better described. We performed a new analysis of the latencies at which our main effects were observed. This analysis revealed the existence of the two clusters mentioned by the reviewer very clearly. We now include this analysis in a new Figure 5 in the revised manuscript.

We also performed a new analysis to support the existence of bimodal distributions and quantified the latencies. We added this text to the result section:

We note that the timings of sensory and perception effects in Figures 3 and 4 showed a bimodal distribution with an early cluster (149 ms for sensory neurons; 121 ms for perception neurons; c.f. methods) and a later cluster (330 ms for sensory neurons; 315 ms for perception neurons; Figure 5). and this section to the methods:

To measure bimodal timings of effect latencies, we fitted a two-component Gaussian mixture distribution to the data in Figure 5 by minimizing the mean square error with an interior-point method. We took the best of 20 runs with random initialization points and verified that the resulting mean square error was markedly (> 4 times) better than using a single component.

We updated the discussion, including the points made in the comment about higher activity for missed stimuli (above):

The early cluster's average timing around 150 ms post-stimulus corresponds to the onset of a putative cortical correlate of tactile consciousness, the somatosensory awareness negativity (Dembski et al., 2021). Similar electroencephalographic markers are found in the visual and auditory modality. It is unclear, however, whether these markers are related to perceptual consciousness or selective attention (Dembski et al., 2021). The later cluster is centered around 300 ms and could correspond to a well known electroencephalographic marker, the P3b (Polich, 2007) whose association with perceptual consciousness has been questioned (Pitts et al., 2014; Dembski et al., 2021) although brain activity related to consciousness has been observed at similar timing even in the absence of report demands (Sergent et al., 2021; Stockart et al., 2024). It is also important to note that these clusters contain neurons with both increased and decreased firing rates following stimulus onset, similar to what was observed previously in the posterior parietal cortex (Pereira et al., 2021).

Reviewer #2 (Public Review):

The authors have studied subpopulations of individual neurons recorded in the thalamus and subthalamic nucleus (STN) of awake humans performing a simple cognitive task. They have carefully designed their task structure to eliminate motor components that could confound their analyses in these subcortical structures, given that the data was recorded in patients with Parkinson's Disease (PD) and diagnosed with an Essential Tremor (ET). The recorded data represents a promising addition to the field. The analyses that the authors have applied can serve as a strong starting point for exploring the kinds of complex signals that can emerge within a single neuron's activity. Pereira et. al conclude that their results from single neurons indicate that task-related activity occurs, purportedly separate from previously identified sensory signals. These conclusions are a promising and novel perspective for how the field thinks about the emergence of decisions and sensory perception across the entire brain as a unit.

We thank the reviewer for these positive comments.

Despite the strength of the data that was obtained and the relevant nature of the conclusions that were drawn, there are certain limitations that must be taken into consideration:

(1) The authors make several claims that their findings are direct representations of consciousness identifiable in subcortical structures. The current context for consciousness does not sufficiently define how the consciousness is related to the perceptual task.

This is indeed a complex issue in all studies concerned with perceptual consciousness and we were careful not to make such “direct” claims. Instead, we used the state-of-the-art tools available to study consciousness (see below) and only interpreted our findings with respect to consciousness in the discussion. For example, in the abstract, our claim is that “Our results provide direct neurophysiological evidence of the involvement of the subthalamic nucleus and the thalamus for the detection of vibrotactile stimuli, thereby calling for a less cortico-centric view of the neural correlates of consciousness.”

In brief, first, we used near-threshold stimuli which allowed us to contrast reported vs. unreported trials while keeping the physical properties of the stimulus comparable. Second, we used subjective reports without incentive for participants to be more conservative or liberal in their response (e.g. through reward). Third, we introduced a random delay before the responses to limit confounding effects due to the report. We also acknowledged that “... it will be important in future studies to examine if similar subcortical responses are obtained when stimuli are unattended (Wyart & Tallon-Baudry, 2008), task-irrelevant (Shafto & Pitts, 2015), or when participants passively experience stimuli without the instruction to report them (i.e., no-report paradigms) (Tsuchiya et al., 2015)”. This last sentence now reads (to address a point made by Reviewer 1 about motor preparation):

Future studies ruling out the presence of motor preparation triggered by perceived stimuli (Bennur & Gold, 2011; Fang et al., 2024; Twomey et al., 2016) and verifying that similar neuronal activity occurs in the absence of task-demands (no-reports; Tsuchiya et al., 2015) or attention (Wyart & Tallon-Baudry, 2008) will be useful to support that subcortical neurons contribute specifically to perceptual consciousness.

(2) The current work would benefit greatly from a description and clarification of what all the neurons that have been recorded are doing. The authors' criteria for selecting subpopulations with task-relevant activity are appropriate, but understanding the heterogeneity in a population of single neurons is important for broader considerations that are being studied within the field.

We followed the reviewer’s suggestions and added new results regarding the latencies of the reported effects (new Figure 5). We also now show firing rates for hits, misses and overall sensory activity (hits and misses combined) for all perception-selective or sensory-selective (when behavior was good enough; Figure S5). Although a more detailed characterization of the heterogeneity of the neurons identified would have been relevant, it seems beyond the scope of the present study, especially given the relatively small number of neurons we identified, as well as the relative simplicity of the paradigm imposed by the clinical context in which we worked.

(3) The authors have omitted a proper set of controls for comparison against the active trials, for example, where a response was not necessary. Please explain why this choice was made and what implications are necessary to consider.

We had mentioned this limitation in the discussion: Nevertheless, it will be important in future studies to examine if similar subcortical responses are obtained when stimuli are unattended (Wyart & Tallon-Baudry, 2008), task-irrelevant (Shafto & Pitts, 2015), or when participants passively experience stimuli without the instruction to report them (i.e., no-report paradigms) (Tsuchiya et al., 2015). We agree that such a control would have been relevant, but this was not feasible during the 10 minutes allotted for the research task in an intraoperative setting. These constraints are both clinical, to minimize discomfort for patients and practical, as is difficult to track neurons in an intraoperative setting for more than 10 minutes.

We added a sentence to this effect in the discussion.

Reviewer #3 (Public Review):

Summary:

This important study relies on a rare dataset: intracranial recordings within the thalamus and the subthalamic nucleus in awake humans, while they were performing a tactile detection task. This procedure allowed the authors to identify a small but significant proportion of individual neurons, in both structures, whose activity correlated with the task (e.g. their firing rate changed following the audio cue signalling the start of a trial) and/or with the stimulus presentation (change in firing rate around 200 ms following tactile stimulation) and/or with participant's reported subjective perception of the stimulus (difference between hits and misses around 200 ms following tactile stimulation). Whereas most studies interested in the neural underpinnings of conscious perception focus on cortical areas, these results suggest that subcortical structures might also play a role in conscious perception, notably tactile detection.

Strengths:

There are two strongly valuable aspects in this study that make the evidence convincing and even compelling. First, these types of data are exceptional, the authors could have access to subcortical recordings in awake and behaving humans during surgery. Additionally, the methods are solid. The behavioral study meets the best standards of the domain, with a careful calibration of the stimulation levels (staircase) to maintain them around the detection threshold, and an additional selection of time intervals where the behavior was stable. The authors also checked that stimulus intensity was the same on average for hits and misses within these selected periods, which warrants that the effects of detection that are observed here are not confounded by stimulus intensity. The neural data analysis is also very sound and well-conducted. The statistical approach complies with current best practices, although I found that, in some instances, it was not entirely clear which type of permutations had been performed, and I would advocate for more clarity in these instances. Globally the figures are nice, clear, and well presented. I appreciated the fact that the precise anatomical location of the neurons was directly shown in each figure.

We thank the reviewer for this positive evaluation.

Weaknesses:

Some clarification is needed for interpreting Figure 3, top rows: in my understanding the black curve is already the result of a subtraction between stimulus present trials and catch trials, to remove potential drifts; if so, it does not make sense to compare it with the firing rate recorded for catch trials.

The black curve represents the firing rate without any subtraction. We only subtracted the firing rates of catch trials in the statistical procedure, as the reviewer noted, to remove potential drift. We added (before baseline correction) to the legend of Figure 3.

I also think that the article could benefit from a more thorough presentation of the data and that this could help refine the interpretation which seems to be a bit incomplete in the current version. There are 8 stimulus-responsive neurons and 8 perception-selective neurons, with only one showing both effects, resulting in a total of 15 individual neurons being in either category or 13 neurons if we exclude those in which the behavior is not good enough for the hit versus miss analysis (Figure S4A). In my opinion, it should be

feasible to show the data for all of them (either in a main figure, or at least in supplementary), but in the present version, we get to see the data for only 3 neurons for each analysis. This very small selection includes the only neuron that shows both effects (neuron #001; which is also cue selective), but this is not highlighted in the text. It would be interesting to see both the stimulus-response data and the hit versus miss data for all 13 neurons as it could help develop the interpretation of exactly how these neurons might be involved in stimulus processing and conscious perception. This should give rise to distinct interpretations for the three possible categories. Neurons that are stimulus-responsive but not perception-selective should show the same response for both hits and misses and hence carry out indifferently conscious and unconscious responses. The fact that some neurons show the opposite pattern is particularly intriguing and might give rise to a very specific interpretation: if the neuron really doesn't tend to respond to the stimulus when hits and misses are put together, it might be a neuron that does not directly respond to the stimulus, but whose spontaneous fluctuations across trials affect how the stimulus is perceived when they occur in a specific time window after the stimulus. Finally, neuron #001 responds with what looks like a real burst of evoked activity to stimulation and also shows a difference between hits and misses, but intriguingly, the response is strongest for misses. In the discussion, the interesting interpretation in terms of a specific gating of information by subcortical structures seems to apply well to this last example, but not necessarily to the other categories.

We now provide a supplementary Figure showing firing rates for hits, misses and the combination of both. The reviewer's analysis about whether a perception-selective neuron also has to respond to the stimulus to be involved in gating is interesting. With more data, a finer characterization of these neurons would have been possible. In our study, it is possible that more neurons have similar characteristics as #001 (e.g. #032, #062, #068) but do not show a significant difference with respect to baseline when both hits and misses are considered. We now avoid interpreting null effects, especially considering the low number of trials with near-threshold detection behavior we could collect in 10 minutes.

We also realized that we had not updated Figure S7 after the last revision in which we had corrected for possible drifts to obtain sensory-selective neurons. The corrected panel A is provided below.

Recommendations for the authors:

Reviewer #1 (Recommendations For The Authors):

It appears that the correct rejection was low for most participants. It would improve interpretation of the behavioral results if correct rejection was shown as a rate (i.e., # of correct rejection trials / total number of no stimulus/blank trials) rather than or in addition to reporting the number of correct rejection trials (Figure 1C).

We added the following figure to the supplementary information.

The axis tick marks in Figure 5A late versus early are incorrect (appears the axis was duplicated).

Thank you for spotting this, it has been corrected.

Reviewer #2 (Recommendations For The Authors):

We would like to congratulate the authors on this strongly supported contribution to the field. The manuscript is well-written, although a little bit too concise in sections. See the following comments for the methods that could benefit the present conclusions:

Thank you for these suggestions that we believe improved our interpretations.

Major Points

(1) The subpopulations of neurons that are considered are small, but it is not a confounding issue for the conclusions drawn. However, the behavior of the neurons that were excluded should be considered by calculating the percentage of neurons that are selective for the distinct parameters, as a function of time. This would greatly strengthen the understanding of what can be observed in the two subcortical structures.

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We performed a new analysis of the latencies at which our main effects were observed. This analysis revealed the existence of two clusters, as shown in the new Figure 5 copied below

We also performed a new analysis to support the existence of bimodal distributions and quantified the latencies. We added this text to the result section:

We note that the timings of sensory and perception effects in Figures 3 and 4 showed a bimodal distribution with an early cluster (149 ms for sensory neurons; 121 ms for perception neurons; c.f. methods) and a later cluster (330 ms for sensory neurons; 315 ms for perception neurons; Figure 5). and this section to the methods:

To measure bimodal timings of effect latencies, we fitted a two-component Gaussian mixture distribution to the data in Figure 5 by minimizing the mean square error with an interior-point method. We took the best of 20 runs with random initialization points and verified that the resulting mean square error was markedly (> 4 times) better than using a single component.

We also updated the discussion:

The early cluster's average timing around 150 ms post-stimulus corresponds to the onset of a putative cortical correlate of tactile consciousness, the somatosensory awareness negativity (Dembski et al., 2021). Similar electroencephalographic markers are found in the visual and auditory modality. It is unclear, however, whether these markers are related to perceptual consciousness or selective attention (Dembski et al., 2021). The later cluster is centered around 300 ms and could correspond to a well known electroencephalographic marker, the P3b (Polich, 2007) whose association with perceptual consciousness has been questioned (Pitts et al., 2014; Dembski et al., 2021) although brain activity related to consciousness has been observed at similar timing even in the absence of report demands (Sergent et al., 2021; Stockart et al., 2024). It is also important to note that these clusters contain neurons with both increased and decreased firing rates following stimulus onset, similar to what was observed previously in the posterior parietal cortex (Pereira et al., 2021).

(2) We highly recommend that the authors consider employing some analysis that decodes therepresentations observable in the activity of individual neurons as a function of time (e.g. Shannon's Mutual Information). This would reinforce and emphasize the most relevant conclusions.

We thank the reviewers for this suggestion. Unfortunately, such methods would require many more trials than what we were able to collect in the 10-minute slots available in the operating room.

(3) Although there are small populations recorded in each of the two subcortical structures, they are sufficient to attempt a study using population dynamics (primarily, PCA can still work with smaller populations). Given the broad range of dynamics that are

observed in a population of single units typically involved in decision-making, it would be interesting to consider whether heterogeneity is a hallmark of decision-making, and trying to summarize the variance in the activity of the entire population should provide a certain understanding of the cue-selective versus the perception-selective qualities, as an example.

We now present all 13 neurons that were sensory- or perception-selective for which we had good enough behavior to show hit vs. miss differences in Supplementary Figure S5. Although population-level analyses would be relevant, they are not compatible with the number of neurons we identified.

(4) A stronger presentation of what the expectations are for the results would also benefit the interpretability of the manuscript when added to the introduction and discussion sections.

Due to the scarcity of single-neuron data related to perceptual consciousness, especially in the subcortical structures we explored, our prior expectations did not exceed finding perception-selective neurons. We would prefer to avoid refining these expectations post-hoc.

Minor Comments

(1) Add the shared overlap between differently selective neurons explicitly in the manuscript.

We added this information at the end of the results section.

(2) Add a consideration in the methods of why the Wilcoxon test or permutation test was selected for separate uses. How do the results compare?

Sorry for this misunderstanding. We clarified this in revised methods:

To deal with possibly non-parametric distributions, we used Wilcoxon rank sum test or sign test instead of t-tests to test differences between distributions. We used permutation tests instead of Binomial tests to test whether a reported number of neurons could have been obtained by chance.

Reviewer #3 (Recommendations For The Authors):

Suggestions for improved or additional experiments, data or analysis:

As suggested already in the public review, it might be worth showing all 13 neurons with either stimulus responsive or perception-selective behaviour and, based on that, deepen the potential interpretation of the results for the different categories.

We agree that this information improves the understanding of the underlying data and this addition was also proposed by reviewer 2. We added it in a new supplementary Figure S5.

Recommendations for improving the writing and presentation

As mentioned in the public review, I think Figure 3 needs clarification. I found that, in some instances, it was not entirely clear which type of analyses or permutation tests had been performed, and I would advocate for more clarity in these instances. For example:

Page 6 line 146 "permuting trial labels 1000 times": do you mean randomly attributing a trial to a neuron? Or something else?

We agree that this was somewhat unclear. We modified the sentence to:

permuting the sign of the trial-wise differences

We now define a sign permutation test for paired tests and a trial permutation test for two-sample tests in the methods and specify which test was used in the maintext.

Page 7, neurons which have their firing rate modulated by the stimulus: I think you ought to be more explicit about the analysis so that we grasp it on the first read. To understand what is shown in Figure 3 I had to go back and forth between the main text and the method, and I am still not sure I completely understood. You compare the firing rate in sliding windows following stimulus onset with the mean firing rate during the 300ms baseline. Sliding windows are between 0 and 400 ms post-stim (according to methods ?) and a neuron is deemed responsive if you find at least one temporal cluster that shows a significant difference with baseline activity (using cluster permutation). Is that correct? Either way, I would recommend being a bit more precise about the analysis that was carried out in the main text, so that we only need to refer to methods when we need specialized information.

We agree that the methods section was unclear. We re-wrote the following two paragraphs:

To identify sensory-selective neurons, we assumed that subcortical signatures of stimulus detection ought to be found early following its onset and looked for differences in the firing rates during the first 400 ms post-stimulus onset compared to a 300 ms pre-stimulus baseline. To correct for possible drifts occurring during the trial, we subtracted the average cue-locked activity from catch trials to the cue-locked activity of each stimulus-present trials before realigning to stimulus onset. We defined a cluster as a set of adjacent time points for which the firing rates were significantly different between hits and misses, as assessed by a non-parametric sign rank test. A putative neuron was considered sensory-selective when the length of a cluster was above 80 ms, corresponding to twice the standard deviation of the smoothing kernel used to compute the firing rate. Whether for the shuffled data or the observed data, if more than one cluster was obtained, we discarded all but the longest cluster. This permutation test allowed us to control for multiple comparisons across time and participants.

For perception-selective neurons, we looked for differences in the firing rates between hit and miss trials during the first 400 ms post-stimulus onset. We defined a cluster as a set of adjacent time points for which the firing rates were significantly different between hits and misses as assessed by a nonparametric Wilcoxon rank sum test. As for sensory-selective neurons, a putative neuron was considered perception-selective when the length of a cluster was above 80 ms, corresponding to twice the standard deviation of the smoothing kernel used to compute the firing rate and we discarded all but the longest cluster.

Minor points:

Figure 3: inset showing action potentials, please also provide the time scale (in the legend for example), so that it's clear that it is not commensurate with the firing rate curve below, but rather corresponds to the dots of the raster plot.

We added the text "[...], duration: 2.5 ms" in Figures 2, 3, and 4.

*Line 210: I recommend: "we found 8 neurons [...] showing a significant difference *between hits and misses* after stimulus onset."*

We made the change.

Top of page 9, the following sentence is misleading “This result suggests that neurons in these two subcortical structures have mostly different functional roles ; this could read as meaning that functional roles are different between the two structures. Probably what you mean is rather something along this line : “these two subcortical structures both contain neurons displaying several different functional roles”

Changed.

Line 329: remove double “when”

We made the change, thank you for spotting this.

<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.95272.2.sa0>