

# Out-of-body projection of visual system revealed by non-identity law

Jinsong Meng<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, 611731, China.

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: mengjinsong@uestc.edu.cn

**Consciousness is an explicit outcome of brain activity; however, it is reputed to be inapprehensible in physical terms. Here, a new logic tool, the non-identity law, was extracted from physics and applied into the analysis of the visual dynamics related to naturalistic observation of night-shot still life. I show that visual awareness possesses a postponed recurrent out-of-body projection, suggesting that visual system possesses an instinct of not only subjectively imaging but also projecting the image back onto its original or to a specific place according to the cue of the afferent messenger-light pathway of the original. It likewise provides a foundation for understanding the subjectivity and intentionality of consciousness as well as the isomorphic relations between original, experience, and expression. The result paves the way for scientific research on consciousness and facilitates the integration of humanities and natural science.**

Consciousness is closely related to psychological activities such as sensing, emotion and thinking. It is the focus of the mind-body problem long argued by philosophers from different philosophical schools such as animism, dualism, materialism, idealism, and Kantianism (1). Up to date, however, it is still difficult to give a quantitative definition of consciousness. Contemporary philosophers of mind have argued that consciousness is just about the last surviving mystery (2), and that consciousness is the biggest mystery and probably the largest outstanding obstacle in our quest for a scientific understanding of the universe (3).

Due to the close relation between neuroscience and consciousness, neurobiologists first initiated the scientific research on consciousness (4-8). There are four closely related questions to answer: 1) how does unconscious neural activity respond to an afferent sensory stimulus and memory recall, 2) where does consciousness arise, 3) how does consciousness arise, and 4) what is consciousness? Significant progress has been made regarding the first question over the past century (9,10). For the second question, the scientific research on the biological substrate of consciousness results in the determination of the most likely neural correlates of consciousness (NCC) that supports conscious experience (11). There is, however, a debate as to whether NCC is local or global (12). Although somewhat controversial at present, these two questions can be experimentally determined; by contrast, the biggest challenge is to explain conscious experience, the last two questions, which have drawn more scientists, including physicists, into this field. As a result, several types of theories of consciousness, such as global workspace theory, integrated information theory, and Orch-OR theory, have been proposed to explain consciousness (13). These theories, however, can neither derive from each other, nor provide adequate support for explaining what consciousness is—in turn, it is difficult for us to determine which theory is true or false. Chalmers argued that there are systematic reasons why the usual methods of cognitive science, neuroscience and physicalism fail to account for the existence of consciousness (3,14). The last two questions remain to be solved, implying that the explanatory gap between materialism and qualia remains (15).

The negative influences of the unsolved problem are profound. Other research involving consciousness has to fall into a situation where the research either has to be conducted only with a vague notion of consciousness or neglects consciousness outright. For instance, the frustration of interdisciplinary integration has raised concerns about the future of cognitive science enterprise (16), whose big mistake can be traced back to the absence of consciousness (17). In a sense, no consciousness, no cognition, and all the cruxes of scientific research involving consciousness point to the problem as to what consciousness is. The problem turns back to where it started, and hence we have to face the problem directly.

To address the problem in a principled manner (18), a novel logic tool called non-identity law was extracted from physics to replace the law of identity firstly; secondly, a visual dynamics model was built on the expanded visual stimulation-response pathway; lastly, the non-identity law was applied into the analysis of the expanded visual dynamics. The result showed that visual awareness, the representative sensation, can be understood in physical terms. In this paper, the term ‘visual awareness’ will be used in its broadest sense to refer to the entire process of sight including various objective and subjective behavior manifestations.

## Non-identity law

Logic is known to be a cognitive tool for understanding the things in the universe, in which the law of identity, one of the three basic laws, is denoted as


$$Q = Q, \text{ or } Q \rightarrow Q,$$

here  $Q$  is a thought object such as name, concept, event, or relation. Obviously, the definition of the law is a tautology, which is to say nothing at all (19).

Here, I endeavor to challenge the law of identity. It is known that time, space, and matter are the three measurable interdependent elements that constitute the universe, and that any object reveals itself (endurance, size, and position) by its interactions with other matter (20). Thus, an object can be denoted as

$$Q = Q(m, s, t),$$

where  $Q$  is an alias of an object; it depends on three measurable physical parameters,  $s$ ,  $t$ , and  $m$ , in which  $s$  denotes the shape and location of  $Q$ ,  $m$  the rest or relativistic mass of  $Q$ , and  $t$  the time. These values are determined by  $Q$  interacting with its surroundings. For simplicity, unless otherwise stated,  $Q$  refers to  $Q(m, s, t)$ , and the rest is done in the same manner.



**Fig. 1. Identifying object in the inertial frame of reference.** (A) Discriminating two objects in the space dimension. An observer simultaneously observes two objects  $Q$  and  $Q'$  that are located at different places at the same time  $t_0$ . (B) Identifying one object in the time dimension. An observer sees an object  $Q$  at  $t_0$  for the first time; after closing his/her eyes for  $\Delta t$ , the observer sees an object  $Q'$  at  $t_0 + \Delta t$ , where  $Q'$  is the continuation of  $Q$  in the time dimension.

Firstly, consider two condensed objects,  $Q(m, s, t)$  and  $Q'(m', s', t)$  in an inertial frame of reference (Fig. 1A). It is known that each macroscopic condensed matter consists of a large number of particles under four interaction forces. Suppose  $Q$  contains  $J(t)$  elementary particles  $\{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{J(t)}\}$  at time  $t$ , where the  $i$ th particle  $q_i$  possesses the mass  $m(i)$  and the occupying space  $s(i)$ . Thus,  $Q$  possesses the shape and location expressed by  $s = \cup_{i=1}^{J(t)} s(i)$  and a mass denoted by  $m = \sum_{i=1}^{J(t)} m(i)$ . Similarly,  $Q'$  containing  $K(t)$  elementary particles  $\{q'_1, q'_2, \dots, q'_{K(t)}\}$  at time  $t$  possesses the shape and location expressed by  $s' = \cup_{i=1}^{K(t)} s'(i)$  and a mass denoted by  $m' = \sum_{i=1}^{K(t)} m'(i)$ . Obviously, both macroscopic objects do not share any particle at any time, and hence a term ‘absolute non-identity law’ can be defined as

$$Q' \cap Q = \emptyset.$$

Note that both macroscopic objects are isolated as long as their spaces are independent of each other at the same time; hence, the absolute non-identity law can be further defined as

$$\forall(t)(s \cap s' = \emptyset) \rightarrow Q' \cap Q = \emptyset.$$

Secondly, suppose there is only one object in the inertial frame of reference (Fig. 1B); the observer sees an object  $Q(m, s, t)$  at  $t_0$ . Closing his/her eyes for  $\Delta t$  ( $\Delta t \neq 0$ ), the observer opened the eyes again and sees an object  $Q'(m', s', t)$  at  $t_1 = t_0 + \Delta t$ . Is  $Q'$  identical to  $Q$ ?

It is known that each spinning particle in  $Q$  interacts with one another, resulting in the creation, decay, and annihilation of the particle whose position and momentum cannot be, even in principle, determined precisely (20). Meanwhile, substances have been continuously adsorbed on  $Q$  or have escaped from  $Q$  in the open system. Considering that both the spatial structure and mass of  $Q$  has been altered perpetually, the number of varied particles in  $Q'$  observed at  $t_1$  is not identical with that of  $Q$  at  $t_0$ . Thus, a term: ‘relative non-identity law,’ can be defined as

$$\forall(t_0)\forall(t_1)(t_1 \neq t_0) \rightarrow (Q' \cap Q \neq Q) \wedge (Q' \cap Q \neq Q') \wedge (Q' \cap Q \neq \emptyset),$$

where  $Q'$  is the continuation of  $Q$  in the time dimension.

The absolute non-identity law provides a method to discriminate and name one macroscopic object from others in the space dimension, whereas the relative non-identity law indicates the evolution of one macroscopic object in the time dimension. Both build the bridge between real thing and its concept, thereby having greater reductive connotation than the law of identity. Using the non-identity law, we can readily solve some classic paradoxes such as the ship of Theseus and the dispute as to whether or not a man can step in the ‘same’ river twice. Because the absolute macroscopic non-identity law, an unambiguous binary computing tool, is more rigorous than the relative macroscopic non-identity law, this study applied the former into visual dynamics analysis; unless otherwise stated, the non-identity law refers to the absolute macroscopic non-identity. In other sections, we can find that non-identity law is useful as a quantitative tool of reductionism for elucidating what consciousness is from the angel of visual awareness.

## Classic projection of brain-generated imagery from brain to observed object

Visual awareness is a vital component of consciousness, whose biological substrate involves almost half of the cerebral cortex. It has several advantages over other components for investigating the neural basis of consciousness (6); in particular, it is scarcely affected by emotion. Great progress has been made in visual dynamics in brain (21-23). However, the contribution of the messenger of the observed object and the outcome of visual system has been neglected. Therefore, the analysis of the visual dynamics described with the first- and third-person data (24) that arise over an expanded visual pathway beginning with an observed object and ending with the visual outcome is required.


Let us first build the expanded visual dynamics model. Suppose there is a ball in a room in the dark, the ball is denoted by

$$Q(m, s, t).$$

At this moment, the ball in the darkness is unknown to all observers, and hence it is called original or thing-in-itself. How does an observer perceive the original?

It is known that to actively explore an unknown thing, a stimulus-response test is usually required. Here, a specific research paradigm for visual stimulus-response test was conceived, in which the single-pulse diffuse reflection is a dark-to-light-to-dark stimulus, whereas the human visual system acts as a detector. Different from self-luminous masking, not only is this paradigm closer to the naturalistic observation, but it also has an added advantage—the darkness not being able to induce the retina to effectively encode, thereby excluding the potential interference before and after visual stimulus. The psychophysical test in compliance with the paradigm shows that just 500  $\mu$ s, the duration of a single-pulse flash, is adequate for each participant ( $n = 18$ ) to correctly report his/her perception of a constant or randomly-selected still life under the pre-induced accommodation condition associated with the visual attention (figs. S1 to S4, and Supplementary Table S1).

Having a rough outline of the visual stimulus-response effect, let us now consider how the effect occurs in the detector (visual system). On the basis of the above visual psychophysical experiments in conjunction with the neural dynamics identified in existing literature, a complete visual dynamics model is presented (Fig. 2). In this model, the flash, when turned on at  $t_1$ , starts to emit broad-spectrum photons to strike the surface of  $Q$ , where the photons are



**Fig. 2. Visual perception in response to afferent single-pulse messenger light.** (A) An accommodation pattern is built in advance using a weak LED crosshair, where the original  $Q$  and human perception are all dark. (B) Messenger-light pathway of FSP (FSPm). After the flash onset, some detective photons ( $p_d$ ) reflected by  $Q$ ,  $p_r$  converging at the retina, has been encoded as APs ( $Q'$ ) for  $\Delta t_{p,a}$ , and then  $Q'$  is submitted to the optic nerve; meanwhile the perception is still dark. (C) APs pathway of FSP (FSPa).  $Q'$  has been relayed over the retinocortical pathway (RC-pathway) beginning with retina and ending with PVC in  $\Delta t_{r,c}$ . Then, it takes  $\Delta t_{f,f}$  for  $Q'$  to sweepingly propagate in a feedforward-feedback pathway (FF-pathway, red bidirectional long-dash ring). Finally,  $Q'$  feeds back into the posterior parietal cortex (PPC, Cyan area); meanwhile, everything is in the darkness. (D) Out-of-body projection (OBP). After previous unconscious brain activity, a bright image  $Q''$  arising from the PPC hot zone (the likely NCC, yellow area) appears in front of the observer when the world is dark, and hence an OBP linking  $Q'$  to  $Q''$ . Subsequently, everything falls into darkness. (E) Timing sequences of events related to vision. The reflected  $p_d$  shaping FSPm at  $t_1$  has been encoded as  $Q'$  in the retina for about 20 ms (10). Subsequently,  $Q'$  has propagated through the rest of FSPa to NCC. At length, the perception  $Q''$  of  $Q$  arises from NCC at  $t_2$ . The duration of unconscious response,  $t_2 - t_1$ , is between 80 ms and 120 ms (21, 23), of which the retinocortical transmission time  $\Delta t_{r,c}$  is around 60 ms (23).

called detective photons. Some of the detective photons are absorbed and the rest are reflected around, in which some reflected photons enter the eyes (Fig. 2B). The process can be described as

$$\xrightarrow{p_d(t_1)} Q(m, s, t) \xrightarrow{p_r(t_1)},$$

where  $p_d$  is the detective photons, and  $p_r$  (that is, the stray light cone entering the eyes) carrying the absorption and reflection information of  $p_d$  interacting with  $Q$  at  $t_1$  is the messenger light of  $Q$ . Given the complexity of particle physics, space and mass parameters of the light were omitted for simplicity.

Subsequently, the retina performs the light-to-electricity transduction: the messenger light induces the rods and cones to continuously trigger the chemical signals; these signals are sent through bipolar cells to the retinal ganglion cells where the chemical signals are eventually encoded as trains of action potential (APs) that facilitates the information propagation over the long-distance optic nerve (10, 25). There is evidence that some ganglion cells have a response peak of only 20 ms after the flash onset (10). The light-to-electricity transformation that takes place in the retina can be described as

$$\xrightarrow{p_r(t_1)} \text{retina} \xrightarrow{Q'(e', s', t_1 + \Delta t_{p_a})},$$

where  $Q'$  denotes the encoding APs,  $e'$  the bioelectrical energy,  $s'$  the finite-dimensional traces of  $Q'$ , and  $\Delta t_{p_a}$  the light-to-electricity transformation latency of about 20 ms. Correspondingly, there is a messenger-light signaling pathway  $Q \xrightarrow{p_r} \text{retina}$ , the external feedforward signaling pathway (FSP), which is termed FSPm.

Up to this point, the retina has accomplished such low-level visual processing task as light-to-electricity transduction, acquisition, and iconic memory. At this point, image acquisition devices can directly project an image onto a screen for us. In comparison, where and how does the human visual system present what one sees for oneself?

First, the encoding  $Q'$  arising from the retina is conveyed through the lateral geniculate nucleus to the primary visual cortex (PVC) (Fig. 2C), whose neural pathway is often referred to as ‘retinofugal projection’ (25). Electrophysiological study demonstrates that the retinocortical transmission time  $\Delta t_{r_c}$  varies from 55 ms to 70 ms and averages at approximately 60 ms (23).

Next, the encoding in PVC is principally divided into two pathways: a dorsal pathway from the PVC to the frontal lobe through a number of extrastriate areas in the parietal lobe, and a ventral pathway from the PVC to the frontal lobe through the inferior temporal cortex, which were first discovered for a monkey (26). Generally, the dorsal pathway is used to process the spatial information (position, motion, speed) related to fast visuo-motor control, whereas the ventral pathway is used to process information about the form (color, shape, texture) related to perception, both of which also exist in other sensory systems (10). Besides, the propagation of APs in the lateral and feedback connections, in which the same cortical neurons contribute to different analyses at different moments in time, can be incorporated into a sweeping feedforward–feedback response (22).

Note that though unconscious, the above stage that  $Q'$  propagates sweepingly in the brain, the intermediate- and high-level visual processing, is not only correlated with consciousness, but also necessary for it (23). Compared to image acquisition devices, the added sweeping feedforward–feedback response shows that the brain makes an extraordinary effort to generate imagery.

At length, the distributed encodings associated with the different visual features (e.g., position, shape, and color) is eventually bound together (6, 7, 27). As a result, a perception of  $Q$ , composed of various features, arises from the NCC. NCC is believed to be primarily localized to a posterior cortical hot zone that includes sensory areas (11); however, the distribution of NCC is still controversial (12). Considering that no consequence is altered by the different layouts of NCC, the statement of the posterior cortical hot zone is adopted in this study.

Thus far, the visual signaling pathway,  $p_d \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{p_r} \text{retina} \xrightarrow{Q'} \text{NCC}$ , has been completely presented. In contrast to the external messenger-light pathway  $Q \xrightarrow{p_r} \text{retina}$ , the APs pathway  $\text{retina} \xrightarrow{Q'} \text{NCC}$ , the intracorporal part of FSP, is termed FSPa. The experiment that the perception is blocked by transcranial magnetic stimulation pulses being applied to early visual cortex shows that the duration of unconscious brain activity after stimulus onset,  $\Delta t_{FSPa}$  (that is,  $\Delta t_{r_c} + \Delta t_{f-f}$ ), typically ranges from 80 ms to 120 ms (21, 23), where  $\Delta t_{f-f}$  is the duration of feedforward–feedback response. This figure is in line with other visually psychophysical studies; for instance, the critical flicker fusion frequency of humans is 60 Hz (28); the perception happens approximately 80 ms after stimulus onset in the flash-lag effect experiment (29). In other words, these experimental methods for measuring the cycle of visual awareness are equivalent.

As far as the duration of NCC activity is concerned, it is known that a visual experience of afterimage can last for several minutes, which can help us infer the duration of NCC activity without examining the NCC activity. By contrast, the duration of participant’s visual perception of night-shot still life is very short, and therefore the duration of NCC activity,  $\Delta t_N$ , should be accurately determined by carefully examining the NCC activity. However, NCC has not yet been finalized, and hence  $\Delta t_N$  remains unknown. Alternatively, another issue of greater concern is surfacing: what is the output of the physically visual processing?

It should heed the fact that the migrating APs carrying all visual information regarding  $Q$  is situated inside the

brain (Fig. 2C), and hence the output of visual processing should likewise be confined to the brain. However, the amazing thing is that although the real world is dark, an orange ball  $Q''$  appears in front of the observer, rather than inside the brain of the observer (Fig. 2D). Though short-lived,  $Q''$  is a real visual experience for the observer. No matter what it is,  $Q''$  can always be expressed as

$$Q''(m'', s'', c, t_2),$$

where  $Q''$  denotes what one sees in front of him/her; it can be described with four parameters:  $m''$  is the unknown mass of  $Q''$ ,  $s''$  is the space occupied by  $Q''$ ,  $c$  denotes the color of  $Q''$ , and  $t_2$  (that is,  $t_1 + \Delta t_{FSPa}$ ) is the time at which the perception emerges from the NCC (Fig. 2E).

There is no doubt that a transformation has occurred in the NCC,

$$\xrightarrow{Q'(e', s', t_1)} NCC \Rightarrow Q''(m'', s'', c, t_2),$$

where  $t_2 - t_1 = \Delta t_{FSPa} \approx 100 \text{ ms}$ . Analogous to the projectors, the behavioral manifestation,  $NCC \Rightarrow Q''$ , can be termed visual projection; accordingly,  $Q''$  is an out-of-body projection (OBP). So far, the global (expanded) visual dynamics have been mainly presented, based on which we can draw a conclusion that visual awareness possesses an OBP in response to the messenger light of an original.

Let us now consider the relations between  $Q$ ,  $Q'$ , and  $Q''$ . First, the encoding  $Q'$  of the messenger light and the original  $Q$  are located at both ends of the FSPm pathway, that is,  $Q$  is located at an external place while  $Q'$  in the body, and hence

$$s \cap s' = \emptyset.$$

Thus, by the non-identity law, we obtain

$$Q \cap Q' = \emptyset,$$

that is,  $Q'$  and  $Q$  are two different things.

Similarly,

$$Q'' \cap Q' = \emptyset,$$

$Q''$  and  $Q'$  are therefore two different things. Then what is  $Q''$ ? To answer this question, it could be simply announced with a new concept; however, after searching existing knowledge, we are sure that an OBP, the conscious outcome of the visual system, the brain-generated imagery, is the so-called visual awareness in a narrow sense—in other words, what we see in front of us is precisely the visual awareness. Notably, although we know the timing sequences of  $Q$ ,  $Q'$ , and  $Q''$  (Fig. 2E), the spatial connection between  $Q$  and  $Q'$ , and the spatial connection between  $Q'$  and  $Q''$ , we are unable to directly deduce the spatial connection between  $Q''$  and  $Q$  by the equations  $Q \cap Q' = \emptyset$  and  $Q'' \cap Q' = \emptyset$ . Consequently, the next step to do is to quantitatively confirm their spatial connection.


## Projection position reciprocally determined by vision and touch

As described above, the dorsal pathway determines where the outside thing is, whereas the ventral pathway determines what the outside thing is. There is evidence that the visuospatial information regarding gaze direction and gaze distance is common to all visual cortical areas (30). The messenger light of an original, however, cannot carry the visuospatial information other than the absorption and reflection information that detective photons interact with the original. It is natural to question where the visuospatial information comes from.

Obviously, visual system needs a mechanism to generate the visuospatial information. Today, we know that this mechanism is a set of sophisticated dynamical-optical control system involving eye movement, pupillary reflex, and accommodation (10). In principle, a dynamical system can be regarded as an automatic regulatory system. When they are introduced into the global (expanded) visual dynamics model, a symbolized semi-closed-loop visual pathway model, the automatic regulatory system with two typical transformations that separately occur at the eye and NCC, can be presented (Fig. 3A). In this symbolized model, an optical focus is achieved by applying the top-down encoding  $Q'_{mov}$  regarding eye movement control and the local encoding  $Q'_{acc}$  regarding accommodation to the extraocular and ocular muscles, where the encodings are correlated with the direction and distance of the observed object  $Q$ . In turn, the visuospatial information regarding the direction and distance of  $Q$  can be resumed by the both encodings. Thus, it can be inferred that the sites at which the encodings  $Q'_{mov}$  and  $Q'_{acc}$  are encoded for an optical focus provide a copy of the encodings to all visual cortical areas for the intermediate- and high-level visuospatial processing in compliance with size constancy, such as shape, position, depth, motion, and speed (10, 31).

In fact, spatial cognition is achieved by visuotactile integration that has been developed by long-term multisensory training (32-34). It is known that when touch something, one can shape a tactile experience  $Q''_{tou}(p''_{tou}, s''_{tou}, k''_{tou}, t)$  of  $Q$ , where  $p''_{tou}$  is the perceptual pressure in response to the electromagnetic interaction that occurs at the contact interface and  $k''_{tou}$  is the perceptual temperature of  $Q$ . It should be pointed out that although much more objective and subjective parameters can be adopted, only four parameters are used here for simplicity. Obviously, the tactile





**Fig. 3. Visual-tactile intercalibration based on visual and tactile automatic regulatory systems. (A)** Semi-closed-loop visual regulatory system. When an observer stares at  $Q$ , the encoding  $Q'$  of the messenger light of  $Q$ , which arises from the retina, is propagated to the feedforward–feedback circuitry (ellipsoid). As a result, a top-down encoding  $Q'_{mov}$  regarding eye movement control innervates extraocular muscles to move the eyeball, pointing the fovea towards the fixation point (FP) on  $Q$ , whereas the local encoding  $Q'_{acc}$  regarding accommodation deriving from the optic nerve innervates the ocular muscles to regulate the pupil and lens. As a result, the controlled optical system only allows a narrow beam of the messenger light of the FP to focus on the fovea, and collaterally allows the messenger light of  $Q$  to focus on the retina. At length, a sharp image  $Q''$  is projected back to  $Q$  by the NCC. **(B)** Closed-loop tactile regulatory system. The encoding  $Q'_{mot}$  coming from the motor area controls the coordinated arm-wrist-finger motion until the fingers touches an object. Consequently, the encoding  $Q'_{tou}$  of the electromagnetic interaction occurring at the interface  $Q \parallel \text{Fingers}$  is fed back through the feedforward–feedback circuitry into NCC, by which a tactile experience  $Q''_{tou}$  is projected to the interface. **(C)** Visual-tactile intercalibration. The reflected photons shaping FSPm reach the retinae at which  $Q'$  is encoded and conveyed to the visual cortex (VC); meanwhile, the tactile encoding through the tactile nerve and spinal cord enters the somatosensory cortex (SSC), both of which propagate sweepingly through the feedforward-feedback pathway to the NCC. At length, an image  $Q''$  projected onto  $Q$  is confirmed by the tactile perception  $Q''_{tou}$ .

outcome is not located inside the brain but at the contact interface. Thus, similar to the symbolized visual pathway, we can obtain a symbolized closed-loop tactile pathway model, the automatic regulatory system with two typical transformations that occur separately at NCC and the receptors of the fingers (Fig. 3B).


In contrast to the semi-closed-loop visual system, tactile receptors, the farthest node of the closed-loop pathway of touch, can directly approach an object through the moveable arm and fingers (Fig. 3C). For example, to explore the outside world, the top-down encoding  $Q'_{mot}$  encoded by the motor system voluntarily moves the arm and fingers until the fingers touch an object, hence a contact interface  $Q \parallel \text{Finger}$  at which the electromagnetic interaction occurs. Subsequently, the encoding  $Q'_{tou}$  of the electromagnetic interaction is conveyed into the brain and mediates NCC to project a tactile perception  $Q''_{tou}$  of  $Q$  to the contact interface. Thus,  $Q''_{tou}$  spatially accords with  $Q$ , that is,  $s''_{tou} \approx s$ . In addition, there is evidence that sight and touch can calibrate the spatial information of the same object with each other (34), implying that  $s'' \approx s''_{tou}$ . Therefore,  $s'' \approx s$ . The result demonstrates that visual OBP is spatially superimposed onto the observed object.

On the basis of the quantitative analysis above, we can draw a conclusion that a visual system possesses a semi-closed-loop FSP-OBP pathway  $p_d \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{p_r} \text{retina} \xrightarrow{Q'} \text{NCC} \Rightarrow Q''$ , where  $p_d \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{p_r} \text{retina} \xrightarrow{Q'} \text{NCC}$  is the unconscious FSP, whereas  $\text{NCC} \Rightarrow Q''$  is the OBP pathway of the conscious outcome, and that the OBP, a response to the afferent messenger of a particular original, is spatially superimposed onto the original.

## Nontrivial projection of brain-generated imagery separated from its original

As described above, a classic visual pathway  $p_d \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{p_r} \text{retina} \xrightarrow{Q'} \text{NCC} \Rightarrow Q''$ , where  $Q''$  is usually superimposed onto its original  $Q$ , can be reciprocally verified by visual and tactile perception, enabling one to easily believe that what one sees is exactly the object itself. However, another instance that each of us encounters every day should have challenged this impression, but perhaps this event is a common incident that happens to us; therefore, little attention is paid to it. It is none but the mirror image.

To revisit the mirror image, let us conceive a thought experiment on the mirror image (Fig. 4A). When an observer looks toward the mirror, the messenger-light pathway of  $Q$  is  $Q \xrightarrow{p_r} \text{mirror} \xrightarrow{p_r} \text{retina}$ , where the FSPm is deflected by the mirror, hence two segments of the messenger-light pathway:  $S_1$ , the pathway from  $Q$  to the mirror, and  $S_2$  the pathway from the mirror to the retina. The messenger light converging at the retina is encoded as  $Q'$ , which through the optic nerve enters the brain for intermediate- and high-level visual processing. To clearly present the



**Fig. 4. Separating visual projection from its original by regulating messenger-light pathway with mirror. (A)**

A mirror is fixed on one side of a sealed metal box whereas a ball  $Q$  covered by a semi-enclosed barrier hangs above the observer. The lamp, when turned on, fires detective photons whose FSPm from the unknown object  $Q$  to the retina of the observer is divided into two segments,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ . The messenger light in  $S_1$  induces the retina to fire APs  $Q'$ , from which the top-down encoding regarding eye movement and the local encoding  $Q'_{acc}$  arise to regulate the optical system (10). As a result, the messenger light of the fixation point (the dark brown centerline of  $S_2$  and  $S_2'$ ) is focused on the fovea, and the messenger light of  $Q$  is focused collaterally on the retina. At length, a sharp reflection  $Q''$  of  $Q$  appears behind the mirror. (B) After the metal box and mirror are withdrawn, the observer watches the ball again (here the original  $Q$  is not shown, see Fig. 3C for detail).


image  $Q''$  behind the mirror, the top-down encoding  $Q'_{mov}$  innervates the extraocular muscles to point the fovea to  $S_2$ , and the local encoding  $Q'_{acc}$  innervates the ocular muscles to accommodate the optical system to focus the messenger light of the fixation point on the fovea. At length, the observer sees a sharp image  $Q''$  behind the mirror.

Let us now withdraw the mirror and box, and move the ball to the place where the preceding  $Q''$  used to be, while leave the rest unchanged (Fig. 4B). When the observer fixates on the current fixation point (that is, the previous virtual fixation point), the terminal pathway of the current FSPm,  $S_2'$ , is in line with the previous  $S_2$ ; accordingly, the top-down encoding  $Q'_{mov}$  and the local encoding  $Q'_{acc}$  for the current FSPm are the same as the one for  $S_2$ , and the same is true for the intermediate- and high-level visuospatial processing. As a result, in either case, NCC projects the same image to the same place, that is, both observation modes are equivalent for visual perception. To distinguish the two types of OBP, the OBP that is spatially superimposed onto its original is termed classic projection, whereas other OBPs, such as starlight deflection, mirror image, afterimage, imagination, and dream, are called nontrivial projections.

More importantly, contrary to the classic projection, the mirror image clearly shows that  $s'' \cap s = \emptyset$ , and hence  $Q'' \cap Q = \emptyset$ , revealing that the visual projection  $Q''$  and its original  $Q$  are two different things. It is noteworthy that  $Q''$  and  $Q$  are deemed to be symmetric with respect to the mirror; however, this cannot be experimentally determined—it is the cause why the thought experiment is adopted instead of a true experiment.

Moreover, the mirror image shows that the OBP pathway in response to the messenger light of the original is of constancy and that the OBP can be manipulated by regulating or reconstructing the FSPm. The FSPm-regulating technique whereby FSPm is regulated in real-time has long been used to make such optical tools as microscope, telescope, periscope, and spectacles, whereas the FSPm-reconstructing technique whereby FSPm can be reconstructed anytime and anywhere is used to make such image and video production as 3D paintings, 3D movies, and virtual reality. In addition, the FSPm-regulating technique can be used to treat such chronic neurological disorders as phantom limb pain and hemiparesis from stroke (35). It can even be used to unveil the nontrivial mental phenomenon, the out-of-body experience (OBE) (36, 37). In a word, these are not isolated manifestations but different forms of nontrivial projections whose FSPm are regulated, reconstructed, or simulated.

To further understand the classic and nontrivial projections, a scene where one ball and two mirror images appeared simultaneously in a visual field was constructed (Fig. 5). It is natural to ask which one is true. By the OBP principle, the ball that could be touched was a classic projection, whereas the two other mirror images were nontrivial projections, and therefore all of them were true images but none of them was the real object. By the non-identity law, the three images located at different positions were three different things. There is, however, little doubt that all of them, which were very much alike in appearance, corresponded to the same unknown original. The result demonstrates that an original can simultaneously present multiple images to an observer.



**Fig. 5. Multi-image perception of an original.** The test equipment comprised two mirrors (LW: 56 × 35 cm) and an orange metal ball that had a diameter of 15 cm. Both mirrors were close to each other and had an intersection angle of approximate 130 degree, whereas the ball was suspended approximately 25 cm above the floor.  $Q_1''$  was a “ball” that could be seen and touched simultaneously, whereas  $Q_2''$  and  $Q_3''$ , which could not be touched, were two non-trivial images whose FSPm were regulated by mirror I and mirror II, respectively. The three images possessed the same shape and color but differed in their positions and directions. Note that  $Q_1''$ , which could be touched by an observer, is generally regarded as a real object; however, it is a classic projection of brain-generated imagery in response to the messenger light of an unknowable original.

## Is visual projection a physical behavior?

In fact, scholars have been aware of the OBP of afterimage for a long time and proposed Emmert’s law hypothesis (38), which provides nontrivial cues for revealing visual awareness. Perhaps, because subsequent research has focused on feedforward size-constancy (39) instead of visual projection, and an unexplainable deviation occurring between the hypothesis and fact (40, 41), the visual projection has been regarded as an isolated visual phenomenon and has not been developed into a universal visual principle, until now. The root cause, however, may lie in the consciousness itself.

It is known that consciousness, generally regarded as the subjective experience arising from brain, has several typical components such as sensation, emotion, reasoning, imagination, and self-awareness, which possess some common features such as subjectivity and intentionality (42, 43). Then, as a representative sensation, what about visual awareness?

Firstly, visual awareness is founded on an FSP-OBP pathway whose FSP has a physical delay of approximately 100 ms after flash onset. Similarly, related research on motion control demonstrates that a decision can be encoded into the prefrontal and parietal cortex up to 10 s before it enters awareness (44). Furthermore, the lesion to the FSPa may pose a loss of conscious outcome such as blindsight and motion-blind (45-47), resulting in a remarkable deterioration in behavioral flexibility. However, even though the FSP functions normally, all brain activities do not cause conscious awareness (48). These provide converging evidence that the postponed conscious outcomes of sight and motion are determined by sophisticated brain activity, supporting the argument that conscious outcome is neither predictive nor online but rather postdictive (29). It also supports the hypothesis that conscious outcome is a collateral product or epiphenomenon of brain activity (49), just like a host-controlled screen that selectively display something. Although this view is not widely accepted, we actually acquiesce and follow this principle to conduct neurological investigations into and clinical treatments for patients with cognitive disorders (e.g. Alzheimer's disease, and Parkinson’s disease), and to anesthetize a patient before the operation to deprive the patient of pain and even awareness.

Secondly, the media of the FSP ( $p_d \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{p_r} \text{Retina} \xrightarrow{Q'} \text{NCC}$ ) are known to be photons and APs in physical terms. Analogously, we assume that the medium of OBP ( $\text{NCC} \Rightarrow Q''$ ) is  $x$ , hence the updated OBP expression  $\text{NCC} \xrightarrow{x} Q''$ . Then, what is  $x$ ? It is known that the materials that support the life system are the same as those in the universe, after all, it did create us. Because the operation of an object can be influenced by its interaction with other objects (20), we can always use certain materials to intervene with OBP if visual projection is a physical behavior, as we have done in other scientific experiments. However, we have never encountered a situation where a wall (or a sealed metal box, or anything else) on which a mirror is fixed blocks the OBP pathway and obstructs the visual perception of mirror image. In addition, the color, one feature of thing—whether it is in or outside the mirror, cannot be deduced from the three fundamental elements in physics. Therefore, OBP is not a physical thing, thereby falling into the so-called subjectivity category or the transcendental category (1). It is worth emphasizing that the method can be called mirror test, which is likewise suitable for examining the theories of consciousness.

Thirdly, it should be pointed out that the brain-generated imagery is projected back onto an original in response to the afferent messengers of the original, signifying that NCC possesses an ability of voluntary OBP, whose behavior can be termed projection intentionality. This evidence shows that human has an instinct of making the subjective OBP to keep up with its original in space, like a searchlight trying to track and shine on a moving object in the dark, or a bat positioning and catching a moth in the dark. The same is true for other sensations, such as touch and hearing; for example, when we touch something with a tool, we can feel the touch at the tip of the tool, just like



an extension of body (50, 51), signifying that touch likewise possesses the capacity of out-of-body projection, breaking through the bounds of body. The accumulating evidence demonstrates that human perceptions such as vision, touch and hearing possess the attribute of spatial expansion outward from body. Thus, it can be inferred intentionality is one aspect of the subjectivity of consciousness, and that the recurrent out-of-body projection may be the psychophysical origin of the intentionality of consciousness.

In sum, all the experiences, the responses to the messengers of originals or to the memory recall, should fall into the subjective manifestation category. For example, 'space', 'time', and 'acting force', generally regarded as so-called objective things, are merely the measurable components of conscious outcomes that can be reciprocally verified by different perceptions (especially visual and tactile perceptions). The argument suggests that what one perceives is just a fantasy that coincides with reality—that is to say, none of the experiences is the original itself, but they are merely subjective perception that metaphysically reflect particular originals. Now, it is not difficult to understand why the symmetry of the mirror image has never been experimentally determined, and why the visual projection presented in afterimages has not been developed into a universal visual principle.

## **Isomorphic relations between original, experience, and expression**

Thus far, a panorama of the universe is unfolded: the world for an observer (first-person) is composed of dark originals, messengers of the originals that can be perceived by the observer, the body in which two transformations occur, and a subjective perception (conscious outcome, also known as experience, imagery, appearances, manifestation or representation) that follows or reflects the dark originals. This corroborates the following famous philosophical ideas: though the thing is completely unknown to us as to what they may be in themselves, we know through the representations which their influence on our sensibility, and to which we give the name of a body (*I*); manifestation stems from the thing-in-itself, and consequently, the thing-in-itself and its manifestation are the same though they are named differently, which are called mysteries, and the mystery underlying the mysteries is the gateway to all understanding (52).

However, not all originals can induce sensory receptor to shape an experience; for example, the invisible originals such as air and most of the radiations provide evidence that in some cases, human sensory experience is absent from the revelry of varied originals. In addition, the nontrivial projection demonstrates that the experience may deviate remarkably from its original. Therefore, a human experience is a limited and even nontrivial reflection of the originals in some cases, and it must be emphasized that a sensory experience, the response to messengers of particular original, is trustworthy yet also questionable.

Since an experience that arises from NCC fades away as the messengers of an original disappear is a transient, private and subjective event, how do we record and express our feelings and communicate with each other? We have to use certain languages (gesture, sound, character, symbol or drawing) that can be perceived by sight, hearing and touch of other people to describe, name and record the apparent events, and statistically build up constant conjunction between different apparent events. This process is termed apparent expression, which is a man-made, abstracts, and limited mapping (isomorphism) to the experience, and hence it is full of symbolization and suggestiveness. Interestingly, in turn, the symbolic and kinematic suggestiveness of the expression leaves something to our imagination, resulting in several rigorous metaphysical systems such as mathematics, logic, and graphic art, which have laid the groundwork for scientific research.

We can even go farther; using above metaphysical systems, we can consolidate as many manifestations within a unified metaphysical framework as possible, whose process may be termed metaphysics-consolidated expression, such as conservation laws, evolution theory, Maxwell's equations, special relativity, and the Standard Model. Parallel to this, through the apparent observations by the aid of the ever-improving apparatus, combing with the proper rational analysis, scientists have made many significant empirical findings; for example, elementary elements, elementary particles, the constant speed of light, and the DNA double-helix structure.

In comparison to the apparent and metaphysics-consolidated expressions, the more revolutionary thing is to seek the cause of the manifestations. First, regarding certain manifestations as evidence, we tentatively put forward a hypothesis as the common cause for the manifestations and model it with several acknowledged constant laws such as interaction laws, conservation laws, and evolution rules. Next, if the deduction or laboratory development on the hypothesis does not fit into the current and hypothetical-deductive-forecasted evidence, we revise the hypothesis and try again until it fits the evidence well; consequently, the best-matching hypothesis is regarded to be true. This process is termed hypothetical expression. Interestingly, it is the hypothesis-to-manifestation research approach that has helped us break through the cognitive limitation and power the progress of science, resulting in a series of theories such as heliocentrism, gravity, atomic model, energy quantum, and general relativity.

However, both apparent and hypothetical expressions remain apprehensive. On the one hand, a manifestation is only a limited or even a nontrivial reflection of particular originals; therefore, the apparent expressions extracted from the manifestations are fallible, which further affects the legitimacy of metaphysics-consolidated expressions. On the other hand, the hypothesis-to-manifestation expressive paradigm may put our cognition or metaphysics at

risk of straying from the natural original-to-manifestation route; it is therefore not surprising that multiple hypotheses on the same problem may exist in parallel for a long time. Unfortunately, we have no other choice. These provide insight into the core thought of Taoism: we can name and describe manifestations, think and talk about Tao underlying manifestations, but the expressions are not manifestations and Tao themselves; nevertheless, we can still explore both mysteries by relying on their constancy (52).

Because manifestations and expressions are fallible, how do we ensure that our intellectual adventure is safe? In addition to rigorous algorithmic rules, the expressed hypotheses or truths should satisfy the criteria: compatibility, completeness, and simplicity. As far as the mind-body problem is concerned, Kant's transcendental philosophy and Lao-Tzu's Wu-You thought, which acknowledge the existence of unknowable thing-in-itself, are thoroughly materialistic philosophies. They are not only compatible with each other but also applicable to classic and nontrivial imaging. In contrast, those traditional theories existing in parallel such as dualism, materialism, and idealism, which treat free will as the cause of human activities to varying degrees, are neither compatible with each other nor able to pass the mirror test. Fortunately, subjective perception generally conforms to its original; however, this is not always the case. Therefore, we should be open to the expressions with respect to the manifestations and their underlying causes.

## Concluding remarks

The main goal of the current study was to address what consciousness is from the angle of visual awareness. It is the first comprehensive investigation of the global visual dynamics between thing-in-itself, brain, and visual experience via an interdisciplinary approach involving philosophy, physics, logic, neuroscience, and psychophysics. The results revealed that visual awareness features a postponed recurrent out-of-body projection, suggesting that visual system has an instinct of not only subjectively imaging but also trying to project the image back onto its original according to the cue of afferent messenger pathway of the original. This finding, coupled with NCC, adds a key puzzle piece to visual system, hence a complete visual feedforward-recurrent (FSP-OBP) pathway. In contrast, a lack of OBP may pose a remarkable deterioration in behavioral flexibility such as blindsight and motion-blind. A possible explanation for this might be that the OBP is an optimum option of evolution strategy, essential for the survival of fast-moving creatures.

Using these findings, this study smoothly explained nontrivial projections such as mirror image and starlight deflection, proposed mirror test as a criterion for examining the theories of consciousness, elucidated the psychophysical root of both subjectivity and intentionality of consciousness, and highlighted a growing principled understanding of the isomorphic relations between the original, manifestation, and expression, suggesting that cognitive science can be further integrated and that the potential bounds of artificial intelligence that we create can be perceived. Although OBP plays a crucial role in visual awareness, the recurrent OBP pathway is only roughly provided, while the only related hypothesis, Emmert's law, is at variance with the fact. Therefore, the projection geometry of OBP remains to be experimentally determined. The solution to the projection geometry will further prove that consciousness, including self-awareness, can be apprehensible in physical terms. Furthermore, other research in this field will require: the interpretation of how consciousness arises from the brain activity of life developed from a fertilized egg, and the empirical works that address the issues regarding more accurate dynamics of sensing, emotion, and thinking.

## REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Kant, I. (2004). *Prolegomena to any future metaphysics, that will be able to come forward as science with selections from the critique of pure reason* [1783]. New York: Cambridge University Press.
2. Dennett, D.C. (1991). *Consciousness Explained*. New York: Little Brown & Co.
3. Chalmers, D.J. (1996). *The conscious mind: in search of a fundamental theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
4. Eccles, J.C. (1951). Hypotheses relating to the brain–mind problem. *Nature* **168**(4263), 53-57. doi:10.1038/168053a0
5. Edelman, G.M. (1989). *The remembered present: a biological theory of consciousness*. New York: Basic Books.
6. Crick, F., Koch, C. (1990). Towards a neurobiological theory of consciousness. *Seminars in Neuroscience* **2**, 263-275.
7. Crick, F., Koch, C. (2003). A framework for consciousness. *Nature Neuroscience* **6**(2), 119-126. doi:10.1038/nn0203-119
8. Koch, C. (2004). *The Quest for Consciousness: A Neurobiological Approach*. Roberts & Company Publishers.
9. Albright, T. D., Jessell, T. M., Kandel, E. R., Posner, M. I. (2000). Neural science: A century of progress and the mysteries that remain. *Cell*, **100**, S1-S55. doi:10.1016/S0896-6273(00)80912-5
10. Kandel, E.R., Schwartz, J.H., Jessell, T.M., Siegelbaum, S.A., Hudspeth, A.J. (2012). *Principles of Neural Science* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Medical.
11. Koch, C., Massimini, M., Boly, M., Tononi, G. (2016). Neural correlates of consciousness: progress and problems. *Nature Review Neuroscience* **17**(5), 307-321. doi:10.1038/nrn.2016.22
12. Mashour, G.A. (2018). The controversial correlates of consciousness. *Science* **360**(6388), 493-494. doi:10.1126/science.aat5616

13. Van Gulick, R. (2018). Consciousness. In E. N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Spring 2018). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/consciousness/>
14. Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies* **2**(3), 200-219.
15. Levine, J. (1983). Materialism and qualia: the explanatory gap. *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* **64**(4), 354-361. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0114.1983.tb00207.x
16. Núñez, R., Allen, M., Gao, R., Miller Rigoli, C., Relaford-Doyle, J., Semenuks, A. (2019). What happened to cognitive science? *Nature Human Behaviour* **3**(8), 782–791. doi:10.1038/s41562-019-0626-2
17. Searle, J. R. (1990). Consciousness, explanatory inversion, and cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **16**(1), 585-642. doi:10.1017/S0140525X00080304
18. When a proposition in a knowledge system can neither be proved nor disproved, the knowledge system is considered incomplete. What we need to do is either complement the knowledge system or put the proposition in an expanded knowledge system (e.g. interdisciplinary integration) or both.
19. Wittgenstein, L. (2001). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* [1921]. New York: Routledge.
20. Ridley, B. K. (1995). *Time, Space and Things* (3rd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
21. Walsh, V., Cowey, A. (1998). Magnetic stimulation studies of visual cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **2**(3), 103-110. doi:10.1016/S1364-6613(98)01134-6
22. Lamme, V. A. F., Roelfsema, P. R. (2000). The distinct modes of vision offered by feedforward and recurrent processing. *Trends in Neurosciences* **23**(11), 571-579. doi:10.1016/S0166-2236(00)01657-X
23. Tapia, E., Beck, D. M. (2014). Probing feedforward and feedback contributions to awareness with visual masking and transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Frontiers in Psychology* **5**, Article 1173. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01173
24. Chalmers, D. J. (2013). How can we construct a science of consciousness? *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1303**, 25-35. doi:10.1111/nyas.12166
25. Bear, M. F., Connors, B. W., Paradiso, M. A. (2015). *Neuroscience: Exploring the Brain* (4th ed.), Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
26. Mishkin, M., Ungerleider, L. G., Macko, K. A. (1983). Object vision and spatial vision: two cortical pathways. *Trends in Neurosciences* **6**, 414-417.
27. Treisman, A. (1996). The binding problem. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* **6**(2), 171–178. doi:10.1016/S0959-4388(96)80070-5
28. Healy, K., McNally, L., Ruxton, G. D., Cooper, N., Jackson, A. L. (2013). Metabolic rate and body size are linked with perception of temporal information. *Animal Behaviour* **86**(4), 685-696. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.06.018
29. Eagleman, D. M., Sejnowski, T. J. (2000). Motion integration and postdiction in visual awareness. *Science* **287**(5460), 2036-2038. doi:10.1126/science.287.5460.2036
30. Dobbins, A. C., Jee, R. M., Fiser, J., Allman, J. M. (1998). Distance modulation of neural activity in the visual cortex. *Science* **281**(5376), 552-555. doi:10.1126/science.281.5376.552
31. Schwartz, E. L., Desimone, R., Albright, T. D., Gross, C. G. (1983). Shape recognition and inferior temporal neurons. *PNAS* **80**(18), 5776-5778. doi:10.1073/pnas.80.18.5776
32. Batista, A. P., Buneo, C. A., Snyder, L. H., Andersen, R. A. (1999). Reach plans in eye-centered coordinates. *Science* **285**(5425), 257-260. doi:10.1126/science.285.5425.257
33. Gentile, G., Petkova, V. I., Ehrsson, H. H. (2011). Integration of visual and tactile signals from the hand in the human brain: An fMRI study. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **105**(2), 910-922. doi:10.1152/jn.00840.2010
34. Chen, J., Wu, E. De, Chen, X., Zhu, L. H., Li, X., Thorn, F., Ostrovsky, Y., Qu, J. (2016). Rapid Integration of Tactile and Visual Information by a Newly Sighted Child. *Current Biology* **26**(8), 1069-1074. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2016.02.065
35. Ramachandran, V. S., Altschuler, E. L. (2009). The use of visual feedback, in particular mirror visual feedback, in restoring brain function. *Brain* **132**(7), 1693-1710. doi:10.1093/brain/awp135
36. Ehrsson, H. H. (2007). The experimental induction of out-of-body experiences. *Science* **317**(5841), 1048. doi:10.1126/science.1142175
37. Lenggenhager, B., Tadi, T., Metzinger, T., Blanke, O. (2007). Video ergo sum: Manipulating bodily self-consciousness. *Science* **317**(5841), 1096-1099. doi:10.1126/science.1143439
38. Boring, E. G. (1940). Size Constancy and Emmert's Law. *The American Journal of Psychology* **53**(2), 293-295. doi:10.2307/1417427
39. Epstein, W., Park, J., Casey, A. (1961). The current status of the size-distance hypotheses. *Psychological Bulletin* **58**(6), 491-514. doi:10.1037/h0042260
40. Young, F. A. (1948). The projection of after-images and Emmert's law. *The Journal of General Psychology* **39**(2), 161-166. doi:10.1080/00221309.1948.9918172
41. Furedy, J. J., Stanley, G. (1970). The apparent size of "projected" afterimages under conditions where size-constancy holds. *Perception & Psychophysics* **7**(3), 165-168. doi:10.3758/BF03208650
42. Searle, J. R. (1984). *Minds, Brains and Science*. New York: Harvard University Press.
43. Searle, J.R. (2004). *Mind: a brief introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
44. Soon, C. S., Brass, M., Heinze, H. J., Haynes, J. D. (2008). Unconscious determinants of free decisions in the human brain. *Nature Neuroscience* **11**(5), 543-545. doi:10.1038/nn.2112

45. Lamme, V. A. F. (2001). Blindsight: The role of feedforward and feedback corticocortical connections. *Acta Psychologica* **107**(1-3), 209-228. doi:10.1016/S0001-6918(01)00020-8
46. Goodale, M. A., Milner, D. (2013). *Sight Unseen: An Exploration of Conscious and Unconscious Vision*. New York: Oxford University Press.
47. Zihl, J., von Cramon D., Mai, N. (1983). *Selective disturbance of movement vision after bilateral brain damage*. *Brain* **106**(2), 313-340. doi:10.1093/brain/106.2.313
48. Custers, R., Aarts, H. (2010). The unconscious will: how the pursuit of goals operates outside of conscious awareness. *Science* **329**(5987), 47-50. doi:10.1126/science.1188595
49. Huxley, T. (2011). On the hypothesis that animals are automata, and its history [1874]. In *Collected essayed: Methods and Results* **1**, 199-250. Cambridge: Cambridge Library Collection. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139149204.007
50. Miller, L. E., Montroni, L., Koun, E., Salemme, R., Hayward, V., Farne, A. (2018). Sensing with tools extends somatosensory processing beyond the body. *Nature* **561**(7722), 239-242. doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0460-0
51. Heed, T. (2019). Tool Use: Two Mechanisms but One Experience. *Current biology* **29**(24), R1301-R1303. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2019.10.062
52. Lao-Tzu. (1996). Tao Te Ching [circa 480 BC] (Chapter 1, 40). In G. Ming (ed.), *Variorum of silk book of Lao-Tzu*. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Kok Lay Teo (Curtin University) for his support and encouragement during my one-year visit. **Funding:** This work was funded by the China Scholarship Council (201506075088 to J. M.). **Author contributions:** J. M. conceived the research, drew the diagrams, designed the experiments, developed the circuit for experiments, analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript. **Data and materials availability:** All data is available in the main text or in the supplementary material. **Competing interests:** The author declares no competing interests.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Materials and Methods

Supplementary Text

Figs. S1 to S4

Table S1

# Supplementary Materials for

## Out-of-body projection of visual awareness revealed by non-Identity law

Jinsong Meng\*

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: mengjinsong@uestc.edu.cn

### **This PDF file includes:**

Materials and Methods  
Supplementary Text  
Figs. S1 to S4  
Table S1



## **Materials and Methods**

This section includes detailed descriptions of two visual psychophysical experiments under the pre-induced accommodation condition. Experiment 1: visual perception of night-shot metal ball. Experiment 2: visual perception of night-shot randomly-selected drawing.

### **1 Participants**

Eighteen volunteers participated in the experiment (fourteen males and four females, aged between ten and forty-nine years, not colorblind), six of whom had a normal vision, whereas the others had corrected-to-normal vision and had no known neurological or visual disorders. They were unaware of the specific aim of the study. The experimental protocols were approved by the Ethics Committee of University of Electronic Science and Technology of China—and each experiment was conducted in line with the Helsinki Declaration. The person on the photographs of Figure S3 and S4 has given written informed consent to publication of his photographs. Participants gave written informed consent to participate in the experiment before inclusion in the experiment.

### **2 Objects to be observed**

The objects to be observed included an orange metal ball and nine-piece drawings (Fig. S1). The orange ball had a diameter of 12 cm, and the drawings with black margins were classified as circle, square, and triangle types. Each type of drawing (LW: 12 × 12 cm) was available in red, green, and cyan. Each drawing was marked on the back with a unique number from 1 to 9.

### **3 Test equipment**

The test equipment comprised a camera, an off-camera flash (flash model: DF-800II; Sidande Co., Shenzhen, China), a pair of master-slave wireless flash triggers (model: WFC-02; Sidande Co., Shenzhen, China) used to synchronize the actions among the camera and the off-camera flash, a specially-designed visual pre-induced accommodation circuit (VPAC) that comprises a lumen measurement circuit (LMC) and a crosshair display circuit (CDC) (Fig. S2A and S2B), and a digital oscilloscope.

LMC can measure the luminous intensity received at the center of the observed object using a light sensor (model: SFH 5711-2/3) with a comparable spectral sensitivity as human eyes do, while the digital oscilloscope, when connected with the two test points (TP) of VPAC, can sample and display the luminous intensity CDC can present a red crosshair, with a diameter of 2 cm, through eight LEDs after pressing the set button of the VPAC and can be automatically closed after the flash onset (Fig. S2C). The surroundings of the LEDs were obscured by a light barrier to prevent their lights from shining on objects that were to be observed, thereby ensuring that any object that was to be observed remained unknown to the participant prior to the experiment.

Before experiment, the experimenter linked the slave trigger to the flash, pointed the flash

towards the object to be observed, and linked the two test-point outputs (that is, TP1 and TP2) of VPAC to the digital oscilloscope.

#### **4 Experiment 1: visual perception of night-shot metal ball**

First, the experimenter adhered the VPAC to the center of the ball that was fixed on the light-absorbing backdrop. The VPAC and ball were shielded by a black curtain, thereby obscuring the vision of the participant. Subsequently, one participant was seated 3 m away from the ball (Fig. 3A). Thereafter, the lamp in the room was turned off and the curtain was withdrawn; the experimenter pressed the set button of the VPAC to light the crosshair and asked the participant to concentrate on the red crosshair for 5 s (Fig. 3B). The experimenter then pressed the button of the master trigger and the flash shined on the ball (Fig. 3C). The participant was instructed to report the shape and color of what he/she saw.

Repeated tests ( $n = 18$ ) showed that under the pre-induced accommodation condition, each subject correctly reported the shape and color of the metal ball after a single-pulse diffuse reflection stimulus lasting for 500  $\mu$ s (Table S1).

#### **5 Experiment 2: visual perception of night-shot randomly-selected drawing**

Eighteen random numbers in uniform distribution (discrete) were generated in advance (none of the numbers exceeded 9, and any two adjacent numbers were different). The experiments were conducted as follows:


First, according to the first unused random number in the list, the experimenter sought out the drawing marked with the same number and fixed it on the light-absorbing backdrop. The experimenter adhered the VPAC to the center of the drawing, both of which were shielded by a curtain, thereby obscuring the vision of the participant. Subsequently, one participant was seated 3 m away from the drawing (Fig. S4A). Thereafter, the lamp was turned off and the curtain was withdrawn; the experimenter pressed the set button of the VPAC and asked the participant to concentrate on the red crosshair for 5 s (Fig. S4B). The experimenter then pressed the button of the master trigger and the flash shined on the drawing once (Fig. S4C). The participant was instructed to report the shape and color of what he/she observed. Thus, a test task for one participant recognizing a randomly-selected drawing was completed, and the random number was marked as “used.”

Repeated tests ( $n = 18$ ) showed that under the pre-induced accommodation condition, each subject correctly reported the shape and color of a randomly-selected drawing after a single-pulse diffuse reflection stimulus lasting for 500  $\mu$ s (Table S1).

#### **Supplementary Text:**


Although the home camera flash working at full power was safe for any healthy participant, the experimenter applied a diffuser in front of the flash to soften the flash light, and to adjust the

output power of the flash to a lower level (here the output power was set to 1/64 of the full power). Furthermore, a dark blue filter was applied to cover the crosshair of the VPAC to attenuate its luminous intensity. These measures ensured that the participants were visually comfortable, and therefore the potential negative impacts on participants in this study were even less than those of usual night photography.



**Fig. S1**




**Two types of objects to be observed.** (A) An orange metal ball with a diameter of 12 cm. (B) Nine drawings of different shapes in different colors with black margins, on which back were marked with a unique number from 1 to 9.



**Fig. S2**



**Circuit of VPAC and its response to flash.** (A) Schematic frame of the VPAC. The module comprises two simple circuits: CDC and LMC. In the dark, on clicking the set button, CDC can present a red crosshair until the LMC receives a single-pulse flash stimulus. The comparator can output a low level through a flip-flop to turn off the power switch of the LEDs, when  $V_a$ , the output voltage of the light sensor, exceeds the threshold of 0.3 V. (B) Physical appearance of the VPAC. The light barrier, i.e., a trimmed, round, self-adhesive furniture pad, had a height of 2 mm. (C) Response of the VPAC to single-pulse flash. The duration of the flash was approximately 500 μs at 1/64 full power of the flash, whereas the red crosshair went out immediately after the flash onset.





**Fig. S3**

**Experimental procedure of recognizing metal ball.** (A) Layout of the participant and equipment. The participant was seated 3 m away from the ball to be observed. (B) The participant fixated on the red crosshair in the dark for 5 s. (C) After the experimenter pressed the button of the master trigger, the flash shined on the ball once.



**Fig. S4**

**Experimental procedure of recognizing randomly-selected drawing.** (A) Layout of the participant and equipment. The participant was seated 3 m away from the drawing to be observed. (B) The participant fixated on the red crosshair in the dark for 5 s. (C) When the experimenter pressed the button of the master trigger, the flash shined on the drawing once.

**Table S1. Experimental result of participants recognizing night-shot still life**

	Observed object	Number of participants	Stimulation intensity	Stimulation duration	Recognition rate
<a href="#">Experiment 1</a>	Metal ball	18	1/64 full power	500 $\mu$ s	100%
<a href="#">Experiment 2</a>	Drawing*	18	1/64 full power	500 $\mu$ s	100%

\*Note: in experiment 2, each test was conducted in compliance with single-blind procedure—a drawing was randomly selected from nine drawings and unknown to the participant in the darkness before flash onset.