

PONT: A Protocol for Online Neuropsychological Testing

William Saban & Richard B. Ivry

Department of Psychology and Helen Wills Neuroscience Institute, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.

Abstract

A major challenge for neuropsychological research arises from the fact that we are dealing with a limited resource: The patients. Not only is it difficult to identify and recruit these individuals, but their ability to participate in research projects can be limited by their medical condition. As such, sample sizes are small and considerable time (e.g., 2 yrs) is required to complete a study. To address limitations inherent to lab-based neuropsychological research, we developed a protocol for online neuropsychological testing (PONT). We describe the implementation of PONT and provide the required information and materials for recruiting participants, conducting remote neurological evaluations, and testing patients in an automated, self-administered manner. The protocol can be easily tailored to target a broad range of patient groups, especially those that can be contacted via support groups or multi-site collaborations. To highlight the operation of PONT and describe some of the unique challenges that arise in on-line neuropsychological research, we summarize our experience using PONT in a research program involving individuals with Parkinson's disease and spinocerebellar ataxia. In a 10-month period, by contacting 646 support group coordinators, we were able to assemble a participant pool with over 100 patients in each group from across the United States. Moreover, we completed six experiments ($n > 300$) exploring their performance on a range of tasks examining motor and cognitive abilities. The efficiency of PONT in terms of data collection, combined with the convenience it offers the participants, promises a new approach that can increase the impact of neuropsychological research.

1

25 Key words: Neuropsychological studies, Online Protocol, Crowdsourcing, Subcortical regions,
26 Parkinson's disease, Ataxia, Basal Ganglia, Cerebellum, Sequence Learning.

27

28

29

30 **Introduction**

31 Understanding the functional organization of the brain requires the use of converging methods of
32 exploration. The spatial resolution of functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and
33 temporal resolution of electroencephalography (EEG) can reveal the dynamics of computations
34 in local regions, as well as coordination of activity across neural networks. A limitation with
35 these methods is that they are fundamentally correlational, revealing the relationship between
36 cognitive events and brain regions. Traditionally, perturbation methods such as optogenetics or
37 lesion studies, have been seen as approaches that provide stronger tests of causality. Lesion
38 studies, such as neuropsychological studies on patients with focal brain pathology, could provide
39 us with causal evidence for the potential role of a specific brain region in a cognitive function.

40 Empirical investigations on patients with brain pathology have been central in the
41 emergence of behavioral neurology as an area of specialization, and, with its more theoretical
42 focus, cognitive neuroscience. Information obtained through neuropsychological testing has
43 been fundamental in advancing our understanding of the nature of brain-behavior relations
44 (Luria, 1966) with important clinical implications (Lezak, 2000). Neuropsychological testing is
45 not only important in evaluating the cognitive changes associated with focal and degenerative
46 disorders of specific brain regions but has also been an essential tool in determining the
47 contribution of targeted brain regions and particular cognitive operations. For example,

48 neuropsychological observations from the 19th century led to the classic “Broca-Wernicke-
49 Lichtheim-Geschwind” model of language function (Geschwind, 1970; Poeppel, 2014).

50

51 **Challenges with neuropsychological testing**

52 While neuropsychological research has been a cornerstone for cognitive neuroscience, its relative
53 importance to the field has diminished over the past generation with the emergence of new
54 technologies. This point is made salient when scanning the table of contents of the journals of the
55 field: Papers using fMRI and EEG dominate the publications, with only an occasional issue
56 including a study involving work with neurological patients. For example, in PubMed searches
57 restricted to papers since 2011, the key word “fMRI” yielded 409,310 hits, whereas the key word
58 “neuropsychological” yielded only 72,835 hits.

59 There are several methodological issues that constrain the availability and utility of
60 neuropsychological research. First, the studies require access to patients who have relatively
61 homogenous neurological pathology. This is quite challenging when drawing on patients with
62 focal insults from stroke or tumor, or when studying rare degenerative disorders. As such, the
63 sample size in neuropsychological research tends to be small, such as 8 participants (Casini &
64 Ivry, 1999). Often, researchers have very limited access to these hard-to-reach populations,
65 especially with rare disorders such as spinocerebellar ataxia (SCA). Second, given that the
66 recruitment is usually from a clinic or local community, the sample may not be representative of
67 the population; for example, samples may be skewed if based on patients who are active in
68 support groups. Third, given their neurological condition, the patients may have limited time and
69 energy. Their disabilities make it challenging to recruit the participants to come to the lab, and
70 for those that do, the experiments have to be tailored to avoid taxing the participants’ mental

71 capacity. As a result, it can take quite a bit of time to complete a single experiment, let alone a
72 package of studies that might make for a comprehensive story. Hence, the progress and
73 efficiency of each study can be very restricted.

74

75 **Addressing the challenges with neuropsychological testing**

76 One solution that we have pursued in our research on the cerebellum has been to take the lab into
77 the field, setting up a testing room at the annual meeting of the National Ataxia Foundation. This
78 conference is patient-focused, providing people with ataxia a snapshot of the latest findings in
79 basic research and clinical interventions, and an opportunity to share their experiences with their
80 peer group. For the past decade, we have set up a testing room at the conference and, over a 3-
81 day period, been able to test about 15 people, a much more efficient way to complete a single
82 study compared to the more traditional approach of enlisting ataxia patients in the Berkeley
83 community to come to the lab. However, this approach is not ideal for multi-experiment projects,
84 and entails considerable cost to send a team of researchers required to recruit the participants and
85 coordinate the testing schedule. Conferences in which researchers are reaching out to patients are
86 still a slow and expensive solution.

87 An alternative and simpler solution might come from the use of the internet. In recent
88 years, behavioral researchers in different domains of studies have developed online protocols to
89 reach larger (Adjerid & Kelley, 2018) and more diverse (Casler, Bickel, & Hackett, 2013)
90 populations than feasible with lab-based methods. Within psychology, platforms such as
91 Amazon Mechanical Turk have been used to efficiently collect behavioral data (Crump, 2013). A
92 number of studies have shown that the data obtained in online testing is as reliable and valid as
93 in-person testing (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Casler, Bickel, & Hackett, 2013;

94 Chandler & Shapiro, 2016). Clinical psychology (Chandler & Shapiro, 2016) and developmental
95 studies (Tran, Cabral, Patel, & Cusack, 2017), which have more limited in-person access to their
96 research population than other domains, have particularly benefited because of the unique
97 challenges that can arise in recruiting these populations to the lab.

98 To date, online protocols have been used in a limited manner in medical (Ranard et al.,
99 2014) and neuropsychological research, with the focus on collecting survey data (e.g., Gong et
100 al., 2020) or patient recruitment (Hurvitz, Gross, Gannotti, Bailes, & Horn, 2020). Here we
101 report an online protocol designed to recruit participants and administer behavioral tests for
102 neuropsychological research. While we developed this protocol to facilitate our research program
103 involving patients with subcortical degenerative disorders, the protocol can be readily adopted
104 for different populations. As such, it provides a valuable and efficient new approach to conduct
105 neuropsychological research and, we hope, will contribute to the neurology, neuropsychology,
106 and cognitive neuroscience communities.

107

108 **PONT**

109 We call the new protocol PONT, an acronym for Protocol for Online Neuropsychological
110 Testing. The PONT protocol entails a comprehensive package that addresses challenges involved
111 in recruitment, neuropsychological evaluation, behavioral testing, and administration to support
112 neuropsychological research. In the initial ten-month period, we contacted 646 support group
113 coordinators to recruit large samples of individuals with degenerative disorders of the cerebellum
114 (SCA) or basal ganglia (Parkinson's disease (PD)). We established a workflow for online
115 recruitment, neuropsychological assessment, behavioral testing, and follow-up. During this ten-

116 month period, we have completed six experiments testing motor and cognitive abilities, and
117 report one of these studies in this paper.

118

119 **Methods**

120 **How does PONT work?**

121 PONT entails five primary steps (Figure 1): 1) Contacting support group leaders to advertise the
122 project; 2) Having interested individuals initiate contact with us, a requirement set by our IRB
123 protocol; 3) Conducting interactive, remote neuropsychological assessments; 4) Automated
124 administration of the experimental tasks; 5) Obtaining feedback and providing payment. A
125 detailed, step-by-step, description of the protocol is available at this [online PONT-general
126 workflow link](#) (full URL address is provided in the Appendix). The protocol was approved by
127 the institutional review board at the University of California, Berkeley.

128

129

130

131

132

133

134


135

136

137

138

139



140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162

Figure 1. General PONT workflow.

1. Working through support group leaders.

Our IRB recruitment rules do not allow UC Berkeley researchers to directly contact potential participants; rather, we can provide descriptive materials with information indicating how interested individuals can contact us. Given this constraint, we sent emails to 646 contact address of support groups across the USA. This information was available on the National Ataxia Foundation website and the Parkinson and Movement Disorder Alliance website. The initial email provides a description of PONT and provides text that the support group administrators can pass along to their group members. Although we don't explicitly request a response from the administrators, our experience is that those who pass along our recruitment information inform us of this in a return email. The response rate is modest: Following our initial email and a follow-up two weeks later to those who haven't responded, we estimate that approximately 15% of the support groups forward our information to their members. While this number is low, it does mean that our recruitment information has reached the membership of around 100 support groups.

163 This procedure is a variant of snowball sampling (Goodman, 1961), a method that has
164 been employed to recruit patients and other hard-to-reach groups for clinical studies. Here we
165 modify this procedure to enlist participants via support groups and, cascading from there, word
166 of mouth for our behavioral studies. The materials used in this phase of the recruitment process
167 can be found at this [online Outreach Forms link](#) (Step #1; full URL address is provided in the
168 Appendix). These can be readily adopted by any research group that is targeting a population
169 associated with support organizations and web-based groups, or when the sample might be
170 enlisted as part of a multi-lab collaborations.

171

172 *2. Enrollment of the participants.*

173 In the second step, individuals who received our flyer via their support group leaders and wished
174 to participate could register for the study either by emailing the lab or filling out this [online](#)
175 [Registration Form link](#) (full URL address is provided in the Appendix). In this way, the
176 participant-initiated contact with the research team, a requirement set forth in our IRB contact
177 guidelines. Between November 2019 and October 2020, 103 individuals with SCA (age range:
178 24 to 88) and 133 individuals with PD (age range: 48 to 83) enrolled in the project. Reflecting
179 the distribution of the support groups, this sample included individuals that are currently residing
180 in 30 states, such as Hawaii, Kentucky, Ohio, California and more. Thus, our sample for PONT
181 is much more geographically diverse than would occur in a typical laboratory-based study.

182 Control participants were recruited via advertisements posted on the Craigslist website.
183 The advertisement instructed interested individuals to complete our online form. The
184 advertisement indicated that participation was restricted to individuals between the ages of 35
185 and 80. Over a 9-month period, we have enrolled 159 individuals in the control group.

186

187 *3. Online Interview: Demographics, Neuropsychological Assessment, and Medical Evaluation.*

188 The third step in PONT involved an online video interview that included a neurological and
189 neuropsychological evaluation. The materials used in our interview and evaluation are provided
190 at this [online Participant Interview link](#) (full URL address is provided in the Appendix). While
191 the relevant instruments will vary depending on the interests of a research group, these
192 documents demonstrate some of the modifications we adopted over the course of pilot work with
193 PONT (see below).

194 Registered individuals were contacted by email to invite them to participate in an online,
195 live interview with an experimenter. This session provided an opportunity to describe the overall
196 objective of the project, confirm basic demographic information, perform a short assessment of
197 cognitive status, and for the individuals with PD or SCA, obtain a medical history and
198 abbreviated neurological exam. The invitation email indicated that the session would require that
199 the participant enlist another individual (e.g., caregiver, family member) to join in for part of the
200 session to assist with test administration and video recording. It also indicated that participation
201 in the project would require the ability to use a computer and respond unassisted on a computer
202 keyboard.

203 Approximately 240 individuals were invited for the on-line interview. If no response was
204 received, a follow-up email was sent approximately 14 days later. We have received 125
205 affirmative responses over the past nine months. To date, 118 interviews have been conducted
206 (60 PD, 18 SCA, 40 Controls).

207 At the start of the on-line session, the experimenter provided an overview of the mission
208 of our PONT project and the goals of the interview. This introduction provided an opportunity to

209 emphasize orally that participation is voluntary and involves a research project that will not
210 impact the participant’s clinical care nor provide any direct clinical benefit. After providing
211 informed consent, the participant completed a demographic questionnaire. The experimenter then
212 administered the Montreal Cognitive Assessment test (MoCA, Nasreddine et al., 2005) as a brief
213 evaluation of cognitive status. For control participants, the session ended with the completion of
214 the MoCA.

215 The PD and SCA participants continued on to the medical evaluation phase. First, the
216 experimenter obtained the participant’s medical history, asking questions about age at diagnosis,
217 medication and other relevant information (e.g., DBS for PD; genetic subtype if known for
218 SCA), and a screening for other neurological or psychiatric conditions. Second, the experimenter
219 administered a modified version of the motor section of the Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating
220 Scale, (UPDRS; Goetz, 2003) to the PD participants and the Scale for Assessment and Rating of
221 Ataxia (SARA, (Schmitz-Hübisch et al., 2006) to the SCA participants.

222 Modifications were made to these assessment instruments to make them more appropriate
223 for online testing. For the MoCA test, we eliminated “Alternating Trail Making” since this would
224 require that we provide a paper copy of the task. For the UPDRS and SARA, we modified items
225 that require the presence of a trained individual to ensure safe administration. We eliminated the
226 “Postural Stability task” from the UPDRS since it requires that the experimenter apply an abrupt
227 pull on the shoulders of the participant. We modified three items on the UPDRS (“Arising from
228 Chair”, “Posture”, and “Gait”), obtaining self-reports from the participant rather than the
229 standard evaluation by the experimenter. Similarly, we obtained self-reports of stance and gait
230 for the SARA rather than observe the participant on these items. For the self-reports, we
231 provided the scale options to the participant (e.g., on the SARA item for gait, 0, normal/no

232 difficulty, to 8, unable to walk even supported). The scores for the MoCA and UPDRS batteries
233 were adjusted to reflect these modifications. For the online MoCA, the observed score was
234 divided by 29 (the maximum online score), and then multiplied by 30 (the maximum score on
235 the standard test). Hence, if a participant obtained a score of 26, the adjusted score will be
236 $(26/29)*30$, or 26.9. The same adjustment procedure was performed for the UPDRS. No
237 adjustment was required for the SARA.

238 The interview took around 30 minutes for the control participants and 40-60 minutes for
239 the PD and SCA participants.

240

241 *4. Completion of Online Experiments.*

242 The experiments were programmed in Gorilla Experiment Builder (Anwyl-Irvine, Massonnié,
243 Flitton, Kirkham & Evershed, 2018). For a given experiment, the participant was emailed an
244 individual link that assigned a unique participant ID, providing a means to ensure that the data
245 were stored in anonymized and confidential manner (see template at this [online Experiment](#)
246 [Invite link](#), Step #4; full URL address is provided in the Appendix). This email also included a
247 brief overview of the experimental task (e.g., a study about how PD impacts finger movements
248 or a study looking at mathematical skills in SCA). The email clearly stated that the participant
249 should click on the link when they are ready to complete the experimental task, allowing
250 sufficient time to complete the study (30 to 60 minutes depending on the experiment). In this
251 manner, administration of the experimental task was entirely automated, with the participant
252 having complete flexibility in terms of scheduling.

253 To date, we have run six experiments with the PONT protocol, with the studies looking at
254 various questions related to the involvement of the basal ganglia and/or cerebellum in motor

255 learning, language, and mathematics. For the experiments involving both patient groups, we set a
256 recruitment goal of 20 individuals/group (including controls), although the exact numbers vary
257 given that recruitment is done in batches of approximately 70 emails/group. The response rate to
258 a given batch is approximately 15% and follow-up emails are sent after about two weeks to
259 repeat the invitation. As such, it takes approximately four to eight weeks to complete a single
260 experiment.

261

262 *5. Participant Feedback and Payment*

263 After completing the online experiment, the participant is sent an automated thank you note and
264 a short online form for providing feedback about the task (e.g., rate difficulty, level of
265 engagement, see Table 2). In addition, we sent the participant an email with information about
266 payment (see template at this [online Feedback Form](#), Step #5). Reimbursement is at \$20/hour
267 and the participant can opt to be paid by check sent via regular mail, Paypal, or with an Amazon
268 gift card. We also reimburse for the online, live interview session to further reinforce that this is
269 a research project unrelated to their medical care. The experimenter monitors the feedback
270 reports and, when appropriate, sends an email response to the participant.

271 The participant's data is downloaded from the Gorilla protocol to a secure laboratory
272 computer. Within this secure, local environment, we have the ability to link the unique
273 participant ID code used to access the experiment with personal information. This allows us to
274 build a database to track the involvement of each individual in PONT, as well as make
275 comparisons across experiments.

276

277 **PONT in action: Sequence learning in PD and SCA**

278 To demonstrate the feasibility and efficiency of PONT, we report the results from an experiment
279 on motor sequence learning in which we used the discrete sequence production (DSP) task. On
280 each trial, the participant produces a sequence of four keypresses in response to a visual display.
281 We chose to use a motor sequence learning task for two reasons. First, there exists a large
282 literature on the involvement of the BG and the cerebellum in sequence learning (Debas et al.,
283 2010; Doyon et al., 2002; Jouen, 2013), including studies specifically on PD and SCA (Gamble
284 et al., 2014; Roy, Saint-Cyr, Taylor, & Lang, 1993; Ruitenberg et al., 2016; Shin & Ivry, 2003a;
285 R. M C Spencer & Ivry, 2009; Tremblay et al., 2010). Thus, we can compare the results from our
286 online study with published work from traditional, in-person studies. Second, the requirement
287 that a trial consist of four, sequential responses makes this a relatively hard task in terms of
288 response demands compared to tasks requiring a single response (e.g., 2-choice RT). As such, we
289 can evaluate the performance of our code across the range of hardware protocols used by the
290 participants, as well as evaluate participants' performance on a relatively demanding motor task.

291 Skill acquisition has been associated with two prominent processes: 1) Memory retrieval
292 that becomes enhanced with practice (Logan, 1988) and 2) improved efficiency in the execution
293 of algorithmic operations (Tenison & Anderson, 2016). We modified the DSP task to look at
294 how degeneration of the BG or cerebellum impact these two learning processes. We compared
295 practice benefits for repeated items (memory-based learning) with practice benefits for non-
296 repeated items (algorithm-based learning). While we expected the PD and SCA groups would be
297 slower than the controls overall, we expected sequence execution time would become faster over
298 the experimental session for all three groups. Our primary focus was to make group comparisons
299 of the learning benefits for the repetition and non-repetition conditions, providing assays of
300 memory-based and algorithm-based learning, respectively.

301

302 *Participants*

303 Drawing on the PONT participant pool, email invitations were initially sent to 85, 66, and 89
304 individuals in the Control, SCA, and PD groups, respectively, with the differences reflecting the
305 pool size for each group at the time of the email. The overall response rate to this first email was
306 around 20%. Follow-up emails were sent every few weeks, and after a few rounds, we reached
307 our goal of a minimum of 20 participants per group. Of those who initiated the study, we
308 excluded the data of three participants (one per group) who failed to respond correctly to the
309 attention probes (see below), and four participants (1 Control, 2 SCA, 1 PD) who failed to
310 complete the experiment (either aborting the program or a loss of internet connectivity during the
311 session). The final sample of participants included in the analyses reported below was composed
312 of 62 participants, 22 Control, 17 SCA, and 23 PD.

313 Table 1 provides demographic information for the three groups, as well as the adjusted
314 MoCA, SARA (SCA), and UPDRS (PD) scores. The SCA group was composed of 12
315 individuals with a known genetic subtype and 5 individuals with an unknown etiology
316 (idiopathic ataxia). The mean duration since diagnosis for the SCA group was 5.9 years (SE=1.8)
317 and the mean SARA score was 9.1 (SE=.9, range: 2 - 14.5). The mean duration since diagnosis
318 for the PD group was 6.5 years (SE=.9) and mean score on the motor section of the UPDRS was
319 16.2 (SE=.9, range: 9.7-24.8). None of the individuals in the PD group had undergone surgical
320 intervention as part of their treatment (e.g., DBS) and all were tested while on their current
321 medication regimen.

322

323 Table 1. Demographic and neuropsychological summary of all groups.

| | Years of Education | # of Females | Age | MoCA | Motor assessment |
|----------------|---------------------|--------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Control | 17.7, [.4], (14-20) | 12 | 63.6, [2.3], (40-78) | 27.8, [.4], (21-30) | |
| SCA | 17.1, [.8], (12-22) | 12 | 56.3, [2.6], (34-80) | 25.8, [.6], (22-29) | 9.1, [.9], (2-14.5) |
| PD | 17.2, [.5], (12-22) | 12 | 65.3, [1.5], (50-79) | 26.8, [.5], (23-30) | 16.2, [.9], (9.7-24.8) |

324 Mean, [SE], and (Range) for each demographic and neuropsychological variable. The scores of
325 the MoCA and UPDRS are adjusted for online administration.

326

327

328

329 *Procedure*

330 The participant used their home computer and keyboard to perform the experiment. Given this
331 and the fact that we did not control for viewing distance, the size of the stimuli varied across
332 individuals. All of the instructions were provided on the monitor in an automated manner, with
333 the program advancing under the participant's control.

334 The participant was instructed to place his or her fingers (thumbs excluded) on the
335 keyboard, using the keys “z”, “x”, “c”, “v” for the left hand and the keys “m”, “<”, “>”, and “?”
336 for the right hand. Eight placeholders were displayed on the screen, with each placeholder
337 corresponding to one of the keys of the keyboard in a spatially compatible manner (Figure 2).

338 At the start of each trial, a black fixation cross appeared in the middle of a white
339 background. After 500 ms, the fixation cross was replaced by a stimulus display that consisted of
340 the numbers, “1”, “2”, “3” and “4”, with each number positioned over one of the placeholders.
341 The numbers specified the required sequence for that trial. In the example shown in Figure 2, the
342 correct sequence required sequential key presses with the left index finger, right pinky, right
343 index finger, and left pinky. The instructions emphasized that the sequence of responses should

344 be performed as quickly and accurately as possible. If a keypress was not detected within 3000
345 ms for each element of a given sequence, the phrase “Respond faster” appeared for 200 ms. If a
346 single response was not detected within 4000 ms or the wrong key was pressed, the trial was
347 aborted. In the case of an erroneous keypress, a red “X” was presented above the placeholders.
348 When the entire sequence was executed successfully, a green “√” appeared above the
349 placeholders. The feedback screen remained visible for 500 ms, after which a fixation cross
350 appeared for 500 ms indicating the start of the inter-trial interval.

351 To test memory-based and algorithm-based learning, we created two nonoverlapping
352 categories of sequences. For memory-based learning, a set of repeating sequences was created,
353 composed of eight 4-element sequences. For algorithm-based learning, a set of novel sequences
354 was created, composed of 192, 4-element unique sequences. The sequences for each condition
355 were determined randomly for each participant with the constraints that each sequence required
356 at least one key press from each hand. In addition, in each sequence, a finger should not press a
357 key more than once.

358 The experimental block was composed of 384 trials, divided into 24 blocks of 16 trials
359 each. Each block included one presentation of each of the eight sequences in the repetition
360 condition and eight of the unique sequences, with the order of the 16 sequences determined
361 randomly within each block. A minimum one-minute break was provided after each run of four
362 blocks, with the participant pressing the “v” key when ready to continue the experiment.

363 To ensure that participants remained attentive, we included five “attention probes” on the
364 instruction pages that appeared in the start of the experiment or during the experimental block.
365 For example, an attention probe might instruct the participant to press a specific key rather than
366 selecting the “next” button on the screen to advance the experiment (e.g., “Do not press the

367 “next” button. Press the letter ‘A’ to continue”). If the participant failed to respond as instructed
368 on these probes, the experiment continued, but the participant’s results were not included in the
369 analysis.

370 The experiment took approximately 45 minutes to complete.


371

372

373

Screen display

374



375

376


377

378

379

380

381



382 Figure 2. Each line on the screen corresponded to a finger position in a spatially compatible
383 manner. The numbers indicate the order of the keypresses for the current trial. In this
384 example, the participant should press left index (“v”), right pinky (“/”), right index (“m”),
385 and left pinky (“z”).

386

387

Results

388 Accuracy rates were 80%, 78%, and 78% for the Control, SCA, and PD groups, respectively
389 (F(2,59)=.198, $p=.821$; one-way ANOVA). Most of the errors involved an erroneous keypress
390 (16% of all trials), and the remaining errors were due to a failure to make one of the keypresses
391 within 4 s (5% of all trials). We excluded trials in which participants failed to complete the full
392 sequence within 4 s (3% of the remaining trials).

393 Our primary dependent variable of interest was execution time (ET), the time from the
394 first key press to the time of the last key press. Before turning to these data, we considered
395 potential trade-offs in performance. First, to determine if there was a speed-accuracy trade-off,

395 we looked at the correlation between ET and accuracy for each group. These correlations were
396 all negative (Control=-.14, SCA=-.69, PD=-.20), indicating that participants who made the most
397 errors also tended to be the slowest in completing the sequence, the opposite pattern of a speed-
398 accuracy trade-off. Second, we were concerned that participants might vary in the degree to
399 which they prepared the series of responses prior to initiating the first movement. For example, a
400 participant might opt to preplan the full sequence prior to making the first keypress or plan the
401 responses in some sort of sequential manner. To look at possible trade-offs between pre-planning
402 and execution time, we computed the correlation between RT (time to first keypress) and ET
403 (which starts at the time of the first keypress). These correlations were all positive (Control=.75,
404 SCA=.57, PD=.51), indicating no ET-preplanning tradeoff.

405 Figure 3 shows ET as a function of cycle of learning and group, with separate functions
406 for the no-repetition and repetition conditions. Across all conditions, the SCA group was 362.8
407 ms slower than the Control group in executing the sequences (SE=164.2, $p=.031$). The PD group
408 was 167.6 ms slower than the Control group, but this effect was not significant (SE=151.6,
409 $p=.274$). To statistically evaluate learning, we employed a linear mixed-effect model with the
410 factors Group, Repetition Condition, and Cycle, and participant as a random factor (R software,
411 lme4 library, Bates, Mächler, Bolker, & Walker, 2015). For the Cycle variable, we averaged
412 across pairs of blocks to collapse the 24 blocks into 12 cycles. We also included years of
413 education, age, and MoCA score as covariates in the model.

414 The control participants got faster over the experimental session with an overall slope
415 of -35.8 ms/cycle (SE=1.9, $p<.0001$). These participants showed significant learning in both the
416 no-repetition condition (-29.4 ms/cycle, SE=2.8, $p<.0001$) and the repetition condition (-41.5
417 ms/cycle, SE=2.5, $p<.0001$). Similar to what has been observed with the DSP task in young

418 adults (Jouen, 2013). the improvement was more pronounced for the repetition condition than for
419 the no-repetition condition (difference in slope: -11.8 ms/cycle, SE=3.7, $p=.001$).

420 The patient groups also got faster over the experimental session with an overall slope of
421 -29.2 ms/cycle for the PD group (SE=1.9, $p<.0001$) and -13.1 ms/cycle for the SCA group
422 (SE=2.3, $p<.0001$). The improvement was significant in both the no-repetition condition (PD: -
423 20.5 ms/cycle, SE=2.7, $p<.0001$; SCA: -7.8 ms/cycle, SE=3.3, $p=.019$) and repetition condition
424 (PD: -37.1 ms/cycle, SE=2.6, $p<.0001$; SCA: -18.4 ms/cycle, SE=3.0, $p<.0001$). Similar to the
425 control participants, this magnitude of the improvement was more pronounced for the repetition
426 condition than for the no-repetition condition (difference in slope: PD=-16.8 ms/cycle, SE=3.7,
427 $p=.001$; SCA=-10.3 ms/cycle, SE=4.5, $p=.023$).

428 We next compared the learning effects for each patient group to the Control group.
429 Both patient groups showed less improvement than the controls in the no-repetition condition,
430 (SCA vs. Control: difference in slope: 21.6 ms/cycle, SE=4.19, $p<.0001$; PD vs. Control:
431 difference in slope: 9.1 ms/cycle, SE=3.8, $p=.017$). However, only the SCA group was impaired
432 in the repetition condition, showing less improvement than the Control group (23.2 ms/cycle,
433 SE=4.1, $p<.0001$); the comparison between the Control and PD groups was not significant (4.1
434 ms/cycle, SE=3.7, $p=.275$). In a comparison of the two patient groups, the SCA group showed
435 less improvement than the PD group on the no-repetition condition (12.6 ms/cycle, SE=4.23,
436 $p=.002$) and repetition condition (18.7 ms/cycle, SE=3.94, $p<.001$). In terms of the covariates,
437 there were no significant effects of education (18.5 ms/year, SE=67.9, $p=.786$), age (114.2/year,
438 SE=71.1, $p=.113$), or MoCA score (-122.6/point, SE=74.2, $p=.104$).

439 Taken together, the results demonstrate the viability of using an automated, online
440 protocol to examine sequence learning in neurological populations. As expected, the two patient

441 groups were slower than the Control group overall, although this effect was only significant for
442 the SCA group. More importantly, the results show sequence learning impairments in both
443 groups, similar to what has been observed in laboratory studies (Gamble et al., 2014; Molinari et
444 al., 1997; Roy et al., 1993; Ruitenbergh, Duthoo, Santens, Notebaert, & Abrahamse, 2015;
445 Ruitenbergh et al., 2016; Shin & Ivry, 2003b; R. M C Spencer & Ivry, 2009; Tremblay et al.,
446 2010). Interestingly, the SCA group was impaired in both the repetition and the no repetition
447 conditions, a pattern suggestive of impairment in both memory-based and algorithm-based
448 learning. In contrast, the PD group was only significantly impaired in the no repetition condition,
449 a pattern suggestive of impairment in algorithm-based learning.

450 Sequence production and learning has been the focus of many previous studies involving
451 both of these patient groups. We are unaware of any studies with either patient group using the
452 DSP task with repetition versus no repetition manipulation, precluding direct, cross-experiment
453 comparisons. Most of the prior work has been done with the serial reaction time task (SRTT;
454 (Muslimović, Post, Speelman, & Schmand, 2007; Shin & Ivry, 2003a; Tremblay et al., 2010)), a
455 method in which sequence learning is assessed by comparing blocks of trials in which a
456 sequence of length n repeats in a cyclic manner (e.g., $n=8$ and a block involves 10 cycles) to
457 blocks in which the stimuli are selected at random. As such, sequence learning is operationalized
458 as reductions in reaction time for a repeating sequence relative to improvements on the random
459 blocks.

460 Using this measure, individuals with cerebellar pathology, either from degeneration or
461 focal lesions, consistently exhibit a pronounced learning deficit (Molinari et al., 1997; Tzvi et al.,
462 2017), one that within the present framework, would be attributed to memory-based learning.
463 One exception is a study (Spencer & Ivry, 2009) that observed normal learning when the

464 responses were made directly to the stimulus positions. It may be that these “direct” cues either
465 support the formation of distinct memory associations not impacted by cerebellar pathology
466 (e.g., direct stimulus-response mappings, not requiring an intermediary mapping operation), or
467 that the direct cues provide a boost to memory formation. One could consider the random blocks
468 as a long “non-repeating” sequence. For example, it was demonstrated that individuals with SCA
469 showed reduced practice benefits on both sequence and random blocks (Tzvi et al., 2017),
470 similar to the deficits we observed for both repeating and non-repeating sequences, respectively.

471 Note that the literature on motor sequence learning in PD is not unequivocal: While the
472 majority of studies indicate impaired sequencing skill in PD, a group of studies still opposes this
473 conclusion (for a review see (Ruitenberget al., 2015)). Previous studies have produced mixed
474 results which may suggest that the involvement of the BG is selective and depends on the
475 specific learning conditions (Ruitenberget al., 2015, 2016; Shin & Ivry, 2003b). For example, in
476 studies utilizing a modified version of the SRTT, PD patients were less efficient in learning
477 random non-repeating sequences, but had no impairment in learning repeated sequences
478 (Muslimović et al., 2007; Ruitenberget al., 2016; Tremblay et al., 2010). Thus, in line with our
479 results, while we observed deficits in the algorithm-based learning, memory-based learning may
480 be spared in PD.

481

482

483

484


485

486

487

488

489



508 1 for Figure 3. (a) ET as a function of cycle of learning, repetition condition, and group.
 509 online separately. (b) The effect of cycle of learning in each group for each repetition condition.
 510 neurop Error bars = 95% confidence level.

511 psychological testing. PONT was designed to take advantage of features that have motivated
 24

512 many experimental psychologists to move to on-line studies over the past decade, yet it is
513 tailored to address the unique demands of patient-based research. The main focus of this paper
514 was to outline the key steps required for this approach, with our report of the results from a
515 sequence learning included to provide a concrete example of the application of PONT.

516 PONT was developed to address five main challenges facing researchers who conduct
517 neuropsychological studies. Perhaps the most profound limiting factor that this valuable
518 approach addresses is access to a targeted population (see Figure 4), be it a disorder with a
519 relatively high prevalence rate in the population (e.g., 0.3% for PD) or one that is rare (e.g.,
520 0.04% for SCA). Not only can it be difficult to recruit these individuals, but the patients
521 themselves may have limited time and energy given their neurological condition. As a result, it
522 can take a long time to complete a single experiment (e.g., 1-2 years), a problem that is
523 magnified for a project requiring multiple experiments. Indeed, neuropsychological papers tend
524 to involve just a single patient group and single experiment. PONT provides a protocol that
525 makes data collection extremely efficient. In the first 10 months following the launch of PONT,
526 we were able to complete six experiments, with each having around 20 participants per group.
527 Moreover, as our patient participant pool grows, we should be in a position to run studies with
528 much larger sample sizes, something that is relatively rare in the cognitive neuroscience
529 literature but desirable for looking at factors underlying heterogeneity in performance within a
530 particular group (e.g., due to genetic subtype, pattern of pathology).

531 Second, recruitment for laboratory-based experiments usually comes from a local
532 community. As such, the sample may be small and not representative of the population (see
533 Figure 4). For example, our PD sample from the Berkeley community tend to be highly educated
534 compared to the general PD population in the USA. In addition, if the study requires a relatively


535 homogenous pathology or genetic subtype (e.g., a particular variant of SCA), the sample size
536 likely to be small (e.g., 8 participants). By casting the recruitment net across the entire country
537 (or, as we envision, internationally), PONT will be ideal for running experiments with larger and
538 more diverse samples that will better represent the general population.

539 Third, while we developed PONT to facilitate our research program on subcortical
540 contributions to cognition, this protocol can be readily adopted for different populations. It can
541 be readily adopted for disorders such as Alzheimer’s disease, stroke, and dyslexia which are
542 associated with support groups or online social networks. We anticipate recruitment will be more
543 challenging for any individual lab when these points of contact are absent. However, PONT can
544 provide a common test protocol to support multi-lab collaborative operations, an alternative way
545 to increase the participant pool that may be especially useful for studies aimed at more targeted
546 populations (e.g., medulloblastoma, non-fluent aphasia). As such, PONT provides a valuable
547 approach to conduct neuropsychological research to explore a wide range of brain regions and
548 neurological disorders.

549 An important benefit of PONT is that it is user-friendly for the participants. The
550 participants complete the experiment at home, choosing a time that fits into their personal
551 schedule. As we have learned from our experience over the past three decades working with
552 SCA and PD participants, arranging transportation to and from the lab can present a major
553 obstacle, especially when the travel is to participate in a study that offers no direct clinical
554 benefit to the participants. The participants also seem to enjoy the challenge of their
555 “assignment,” although they, like our college-age participants may complain about the repetitive
556 nature of a task when hundreds of trials are required to obtain a robust data set. Table 2 provides
557 a sample of the comments we have received in our post-session surveys. Although we had

558 embarked on the PONT project prior to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the timing was
559 fortuitous, allowing us to continue and ramp up our neuropsychological testing, allowing
560 vulnerable populations to participate in studies in a safe manner. PONT can serve as an “immune
561 system” for neuropsychological research development—protecting research development even
562 when patients’ accessibility is more limited than ever.

563 Lastly, PONT provides considerable benefit in terms of reduced economic and
564 environmental cost. Setting aside the hard-to-calculate benefits from reduced travel and
565 reductions in personnel time, the savings are substantial when just considering participant costs.
566 For our in-lab studies, we typically conduct two 35-min experiments, sandwiched around a 30
567 min break. When we factor in compensation for travel time, the cost tends to come to around
568 \$100/session. The same amount of data can be obtained for approximately \$40 over two PONT
569 sessions, with the added benefit that potential fatigue effects are reduced given that each session
570 is run on a different day.



571 Figure 4. Advantages of the online protocol for neuropsychological research.

572

573

| Participant | Feedback |
|-------------|--|
| 1 | “There were a few that I struggled with but over-all it helped me practice my mental math. Thank you.” |
| 2 | “I tried so hard to do them faster each round and just wanted to get them right which caused me to push the wrong key several times. Competing against myself was good for my brain. This old lady thanks you for the challenge.” |
| 3 | “I thought this was fun. A little repetitive but enjoyable.” |
| 4 | “Thanks for inviting me. Would like to know more about the study outcomes.” |
| 5 | “At times I knew the correct answer and pressed the wrong finger. I feel that there was a learning curve in my responses.” |
| 6 | “I needed a blowing the nose break” |
| 7 | “what's to say? my eyes got tired” |
| 8 | “I had issues with my computer - twice I inadvertently brought up an unwanted window and had to click to get rid of it, and during the last set I lost the whole page, had to click on the link the email and it took me to where I believe I left off.” |
| 9 | “Test is too long” |

574 Table 2. A sample of the Participants’ feedback after completing the online experiments. Green –
 575 positive feedback, yellow – neutral, red – negative feedback.

576

577

578 Although there are many advantages to this online approach, there are also some notable
579 limitations that need to be taken into account. First, the procedure for online experiments is
580 likely to be less standardized across participants. A major source of variability comes about
581 because participant uses his/her own computer and response device. These are, of course,
582 standardized for in-lab studies, including positioning the participants such that the visual displays
583 are near-identical. It may be possible to impose some degree of control on viewing angle by
584 specifying how the participants' position themselves, but this is likely going to be challenging
585 when the participants are self-administering the experimental task.

586 Second, online experiments are unlikely to be well-suited for all domains of study. For
587 example, given the variability in hardware, it would be difficult to run experiments that require
588 precise timing; for example, studies in which stimuli are presented for a short duration followed
589 by a mask. Moreover, we have avoided studies that use auditory stimuli since computer speakers
590 are so variable and can be of poor quality, and it is not possible use tactile or olfactory stimuli.

591 Third, the use of an automated, self-administered system comes with a cost. In our in-
592 person studies, it is not uncommon for a participant to misunderstand the instructions or need
593 extra practice when they find a particular task difficult. These situations can be readily identified
594 and addressed when an experimenter is present. Moreover, a participant can get discouraged if
595 they find the task too challenging or have an error rate higher than their personal "standard." An
596 encouraging experimenter can help ensure motivation remains high. We incorporate various
597 feedback messages to keep the participants' morale and motivation high, but an online system
598 will be less flexible than in-person testing (which could be seen as a positive for maintaining test
599 uniformity). We imagine there will be some experiments that may require the virtual presence of
600 an experimenter. We have also conducted post-experiment live check-ins with some participants

601 to both maintain a human touch and get feedback on how we can make the experience more
602 enjoyable and beneficial. Inspired by the feedback, we have started providing periodic
603 newsletters to the participants, describing recent findings from both basic and translational
604 studies ([https://mailchi.mp/ab940c63fa5c/newsletter-by-the-cognac-lab-at-uc-berkeley-the-](https://mailchi.mp/ab940c63fa5c/newsletter-by-the-cognac-lab-at-uc-berkeley-the-neuroscience-of-ataxia-3556742?e=ae8c913a37)
605 [neuroscience-of-ataxia-3556742?e=ae8c913a37](https://mailchi.mp/ab940c63fa5c/newsletter-by-the-cognac-lab-at-uc-berkeley-the-neuroscience-of-ataxia-3556742?e=ae8c913a37)).

606 Lastly, but of critical importance, is concern about the quality of the data when testing is
607 self-administered and the environment may be conducive to distraction (e.g., from a TV in the
608 background or attention-grabbing text alerts). Although the Covid-19 pandemic precluded a
609 direct comparison of in-person and online testing with the PONT protocol, the results from the
610 sequence learning study seem similar to those published from in-person experiments. Several
611 studies have made more systematic comparisons of online and in-person experiments
612 (Barnhoorn, Haasnoot, Bocanegra, & van Steenbergen, 2014; Simcox & Fiez, 2014). Overall, the
613 results are encouraging in that, while the data may be noisier, the general patterns are similar.
614 We note that this is especially true with large sample sizes, something that is unlikely to be true
615 in many neuropsychological studies. One recent review provides recommendations for
616 improving data quality that are certainly appropriate for PONT (Grootswagers, 2020): Keep the
617 experiments as short as possible, provide reasonable compensation, and make the tasks as
618 engaging as possible.

619

620 **Conclusion**

621 The emergence of online protocols has provided behavioral scientists with the opportunity to
622 conduct studies that involve large and diverse samples, while being cost efficient. The PONT
623 protocol described in this paper describes how this general approach can be adopted to meet the

624 challenges associated with neuropsychological testing. Currently, our work is limited to
625 individuals with ataxia and PD, allowing us to expand our research program on subcortical
626 contributions to cognition. The materials provided with this paper can be readily adopted by
627 researchers working with any patient population, especially when recruitment can be conducted
628 via support groups, web-based groups, or through collaborations across multiple labs/clinics. In
629 terms of the latter, we see PONT as a fertile tool to support multi-national collaborative research
630 operations. We expect PONT will significantly increase the sample size, the number of studies
631 conducted, and the overall pace of neuropsychological research. As such, it offers a powerful
632 tool for this field, one that has and will continue to yield fundamental insights into brain-
633 behavior relationships.

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644 **Acknowledgments**

645 We thank Sharon Binoy, Nandita Radhakrishnan, Rachel Woody, Sidra Seddiqee, and
646 Sravya Borra for their assistance. This research was supported by funding from the
647 National Institute of Health (NS116883).

648 **Open Practices Statement:** Materials and data are available at <https://osf.io/fktn9/>.

649 **References**

- 650 Adjerid, I., & Kelley, K. (2018). Big data in psychology: A framework for research
651 advancement. *American Psychologist*, 73(7), 899–917. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000190>
- 652 Barnhoorn, J. S., Haasnoot, E., Bocanegra, B. R., & van Steenbergen, H. (2014). QRTEngine:
653 An easy solution for running online reaction time experiments using Qualtrics. *Behavior
654 Research Methods*, 47(4), 918–929. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-014-0530-7>
- 655 Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. M., & Walker, S. C. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects
656 models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1).
657 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- 658 Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. *Perspectives
659 on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610393980>
- 660 Casini, L., & Ivry, R. B. (1999). Effects of Divided Attention on Temporal Processing in Patients
661 With Lesions of the Cerebellum or Frontal Lobe. In *Neuropsychology* (Vol. 13).
- 662 Casler, K., Bickel, L., & Hackett, E. (2013). Separate but equal? A comparison of participants
663 and data gathered via Amazon’s MTurk, social media, and face-to-face behavioral testing.
664 *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(6), 2156–2160.
665 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.05.009>
- 666 Chandler, J., & Shapiro, D. (2016). Conducting Clinical Research Using Crowdsourced
667 Convenience Samples. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 12(1), 53–81.
668 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-021815-093623>
- 669 Debas, K., Carrier, J., Orban, P., Barakat, M., Lungu, O., Vandewalle, G., ... Doyon, J. (2010).
670 Brain plasticity related to the consolidation of motor sequence learning and motor
671 adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*

- 672 *America*, 107(41), 17839–17844. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1013176107>
- 673 Doyon, J., Song, A. W., Karni, A., Lalonde, F., Adams, M. M., & Ungerleider, L. G. (2002).
674 Experience-dependent changes in cerebellar contributions to motor sequence learning.
675 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 99(2),
676 1017–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.022615199>
- 677 Gamble, K. R., Cummings, T. J., Lo, S. E., Ghosh, P. T., Howard, J. H., & Howard, D. V.
678 (2014). Implicit sequence learning in people with Parkinson’s disease. *Frontiers in Human*
679 *Neuroscience*, 8(AUG). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00563>
- 680 Geschwind, N. (1970, November 27). The organization of language and the brain. *Science*, Vol.
681 170, pp. 940–944. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.170.3961.940>
- 682 Gong, Y., Chen, Z., Liu, M., Wan, L., Wang, C., Peng, H., ... Jiang, H. (2020). *Mental health of*
683 *spinocerebellar ataxia patients during COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study*. 1–17.
684 <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-40489/v1>
- 685 Goodman, L. A. (1961). Snowball Sampling. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 32(1), 148–
686 170. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177705148>
- 687 Grootswagers, T. (2020). A primer on running human behavioural experiments online. *Behavior*
688 *Research Methods*, (April), 2283–2286. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-020-01395-3>
- 689 Hurvitz, E. A., Gross, P. H., Gannotti, M. E., Bailes, A. F., & Horn, S. D. (2020, February 1).
690 Registry-based Research in Cerebral Palsy: The Cerebral Palsy Research Network. *Physical*
691 *Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America*, Vol. 31, pp. 185–194.
692 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmr.2019.09.005>
- 693 Jouen, A.-L. (2013). Discrete sequence production with and without a pause: the role of cortex,
694 basal ganglia, and cerebellum. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7(SEP), 492.

- 695 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00492>
- 696 Lezak, M. D. (2000). *Nature, Applications, and Limitations of Neuropsychological Assessment*
697 *following Traumatic Brain Injury*. 67–79. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-5569-5_4
- 698 Logan, G. D. (1988). *Toward an Instance Theory of Automatization*. 95(4), 492–527.
- 699 Molinari, M., Leggio, M. G., Solida, A., Ciorra, R., Misciagna, S., Silveri, M. C., & Petrosini, L.
700 (1997). Cerebellum and procedural learning: Evidence from focal cerebellar lesions. *Brain*,
701 *120*(10), 1753–1762. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/120.10.1753>
- 702 Muslimović, D., Post, B., Speelman, J. D., & Schmand, B. (2007). Motor procedural learning in
703 Parkinson’s disease. *Brain*, *130*(11), 2887–2897. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awm211>
- 704 Poeppel, D. (2014, October 1). The neuroanatomic and neurophysiological infrastructure for
705 speech and language. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, Vol. 28, pp. 142–149.
706 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2014.07.005>
- 707 Ranard, B. L., Ha, Y. P., Meisel, Z. F., Asch, D. A., Hill, S. S., Becker, L. B., ... Merchant, R.
708 M. (2014, July 11). Crowdsourcing--harnessing the masses to advance health and medicine,
709 a systematic review. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, Vol. 29, pp. 187–203.
710 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-013-2536-8>
- 711 Roy, E. A., Saint-Cyr, J., Taylor, A., & Lang, A. (1993). Movement sequencing disorders in
712 parkinson’s disease. *International Journal of Neuroscience*, *73*(3–4), 183–194.
713 <https://doi.org/10.3109/00207459308986668>
- 714 Ruitenbergh, M. F. L., Duthoo, W., Santens, P., Notebaert, W., & Abrahamse, E. L. (2015).
715 Sequential movement skill in Parkinson’s disease: A state-of-the-art. *Cortex*, *65*, 102–112.
716 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2015.01.005>
- 717 Ruitenbergh, M. F. L., Duthoo, W., Santens, P., Seidler, R. D., Notebaert, W., & Abrahamse, E.

- 718 L. (2016). Sequence learning in Parkinson's disease: Focusing on action dynamics and the
719 role of dopaminergic medication. *Neuropsychologia*, 93(October), 30–39.
720 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.09.027>
- 721 Schmitz-Hübsch, T., Du Montcel, S. T., Baliko, L., Berciano, J., Boesch, S., Depondt, C., ...
722 Fancellu, R. (2006). Scale for the assessment and rating of ataxia: Development of a new
723 clinical scale. *Neurology*, 66(11), 1717–1720.
724 <https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000219042.60538.92>
- 725 Shin, J. C., & Ivry, R. B. (2003a). Spatial and Temporal Sequence Learning in Patients with
726 Parkinson's Disease or Cerebellar Lesions. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 15(8),
727 1232–1243. <https://doi.org/10.1162/089892903322598175>
- 728 Shin, J. C., & Ivry, R. B. (2003b). Spatial and Temporal Sequence Learning in Patients with
729 Parkinson's Disease or Cerebellar Lesions. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 15(8),
730 1232–1243. <https://doi.org/10.1162/089892903322598175>
- 731 Simcox, T., & Fiez, J. A. (2014). Collecting response times using Amazon Mechanical Turk and
732 Adobe Flash. *Behavior Research Methods*, 46(1), 95–111. [https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-](https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0345-y)
733 [013-0345-y](https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0345-y)
- 734 Spencer, R. M C, & Ivry, R. B. (2009). Sequence learning is preserved in individuals with
735 cerebellar degeneration when the movements are directly cued. *Journal of Cognitive*
736 *Neuroscience*, 21(7), 1302–1310. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21102>
- 737 Spencer, Rebecca M.C., & Ivry, R. B. (2009). Sequence learning is preserved in individuals with
738 cerebellar degeneration when the movements are directly cued. *Journal of Cognitive*
739 *Neuroscience*, 21(7), 1302–1310. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21102>
- 740 Tran, M., Cabral, L., Patel, R., & Cusack, R. (2017). Online recruitment and testing of infants

741 with Mechanical Turk. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 156, 168–178.
742 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2016.12.003>

743 Tremblay, P. L., Bedard, M. A., Langlois, D., Blanchet, P. J., Lemay, M., & Parent, M. (2010).
744 Movement chunking during sequence learning is a dopamine-dependant process: A study
745 conducted in Parkinson’s disease. *Experimental Brain Research*, 205(3), 375–385.
746 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-010-2372-6>

747 Tzvi, E., Zimmermann, C., Bey, R., Münte, T. F., Nitschke, M., & Krämer, U. M. (2017).
748 Cerebellar degeneration affects cortico-cortical connectivity in motor learning networks.
749 *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 16(March), 66–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2017.07.012>

750
751
752
753
754
755
756

757 **Appendix:** Full weblink to materials for running the PONT protocol is accessible in open
758 science framework - <https://osf.io/fktn9/> .
759