



HAL
open science

Navigation strategies in patients with vestibular loss tested in a virtual reality T-maze

Roberto Gammeri, Jacques Léonard, Michel Toupet, Charlotte Hautefort, Christian van Nechel, Stéphane Besnard, Marie-Laure Machado, Estelle Nakul, Marion Montava, Jean-Pierre Lavieille, et al.

► To cite this version:

Roberto Gammeri, Jacques Léonard, Michel Toupet, Charlotte Hautefort, Christian van Nechel, et al.. Navigation strategies in patients with vestibular loss tested in a virtual reality T-maze. *Journal of Neurology*, 2022, 269 (8), pp.4333 - 4348. 10.1007/s00415-022-11069-z . hal-03819941

HAL Id: hal-03819941

<https://amu.hal.science/hal-03819941>

Submitted on 25 Oct 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Navigation strategies in patients with vestibular loss tested in a virtual reality T-Maze

Roberto Gammeri^{1,2}, Jacques Léonard¹, Michel Toupet^{3,4}, Charlotte Hautefort^{3,5}, Christian van Nechel^{3,6,7,8}, Stéphane Besnard⁹, Marie-Laure Machado⁹, Estelle Nakul¹, Marion Montava⁸, Jean-Pierre Lavieille⁸, and Christophe Lopez^{1(*)}

¹ Aix Marseille University, CNRS, LNC, FR3C, Marseille, France

² Department of Psychology, University of Turin, Torino, Italy

² IRON, Institut de Recherche en Oto-Neurologie, Paris, France

³ Centre d'Explorations Fonctionnelles Oto-Neurologiques, Paris, France

⁴ Service ORL, Hôpital Lariboisière, Paris, France

⁵ Unité Troubles de l'Équilibre et Vertiges, CHU Brugmann, Bruxelles, Belgium

⁶ Unité de Neuro-Ophthalmologie, CHU Erasme, Bruxelles, Belgium

⁷ Clinique des Vertiges, Bruxelles, Belgium

⁸ Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Hôpital La Conception, APHM, Marseille, France

⁹ Université de Normandie, INSERM U1075 COMETE, Caen, France

AUTHORS' ORCID:

Marion Montava = orcid.org/0000-0003-1347-9412

Christophe Lopez = orcid.org/0000-0001-9298-2969

Roberto Gammeri = orcid.org/0000-0002-7858-0653

Stéphane Besnard = orcid.org/0000-0002-9659-8005

(*) Address for correspondence:

Dr Christophe Lopez

Laboratoire de Neurosciences Cognitives - UMR 7291

Aix Marseille Univ & Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS)

Centre Saint-Charles, Fédération de Recherche 3C – Case B

3, Place Victor Hugo. 13331 Marseille Cedex 03, France

Tel: +33 4 13 55 08 41 Fax: + 33 4 13 55 08 44

email: christophe.lopez@univ-amu.fr

Abstract

During navigation, humans mainly rely on egocentric and allocentric spatial strategies, two different frames of reference working together to build a coherent representation of the environment. Spatial memory deficits during navigation have been repeatedly reported in patients with vestibular disorders. However, little is known about how vestibular disorders can change the use of spatial navigation strategies. Here, we used a new reverse T-maze paradigm in virtual reality to explore whether vestibular loss specifically modifies the use of egocentric or allocentric spatial strategies in patients with unilateral ($n = 23$) and bilateral ($n = 23$) vestibular loss compared to healthy volunteers matched for age, sex and education level ($n = 23$). Results showed that the odds of selecting and using a specific strategy in the T-maze was significantly reduced in both unilateral and bilateral vestibular loss. An exploratory analysis suggests that only right vestibular loss decreased the odds of adopting a spatial strategy, indicating a functional asymmetry of vestibular functions. When considering patients who used strategies to navigate, we observed that a bilateral vestibular loss reduced the odds to use of an allocentric strategy, whereas a unilateral vestibular loss decreased the odds to use of an egocentric strategy. Age was significantly associated with an overall lower chance to adopt a navigation strategy and, more specifically, with a decrease in the odds of using an allocentric strategy. We did not observe any sex difference in the ability to select and use a specific navigation strategy. Findings are discussed in light of previous studies on visuo-spatial abilities and studies of vestibulo-hippocampal interactions in peripheral vestibular disorders. We discuss the potential impact of the history of the disease (chronic stage in patients with a bilateral vestibulopathy vs. subacute stage in patients with a unilateral vestibular loss), of hearing impairment and non-specific attentional deficits in patients with vestibular disorders.

Keywords: vestibular system, labyrinth, spatial navigation, spatial strategies, egocentric, allocentric, reference frame.

1. Introduction

Spatial navigation refers to the ability to accurately orient oneself through the environment, which requires the integration of self-motion and environment information (i.e., gravito-inertial and proprioceptive signals, optic flow, visual, olfactory and acoustic landmarks). Vestibular signals, which provide information about own-body translations and rotations, may thus be pivotal for spatial navigation abilities (Angelaki & Cullen, 2008; Jacob et al., 2014; Yoder & Taube, 2014). Indeed, severe navigation deficits have been reported in animals models with bilateral vestibular deafferentation (Baek et al., 2010; Besnard et al., 2012; Machado et al., 2012; Russell et al., 2003). However, research in patients with vestibular disorders has provided equivocal results as to whether spatial navigation abilities are altered, depending on the clinical population and parameters recorded (reviewed in Smith, 2017). Spatial memory deficits have been reported in patients with a chronic bilateral vestibulopathy (BVP) tested in a virtual adaptation of the Morris water maze task (Brandt et al., 2005; Kremmyda et al., 2016). Others studies found no deficits in BVP patients tested with the Morris water maze task (Dobbels et al., 2020) or in other computer-based navigation and visual memory tasks (Jandl et al., 2015). More clearer deficits have been reported in BVP patients during real-space navigation in a building (Schöberl et al., 2021). The effects of unilateral vestibular loss on spatial navigation abilities are similarly equivocal: while some studies reported altered navigation abilities during triangle completion tasks in a desktop-based setting (Péruch et al., 1999, 2005) others found no consistent alteration in a virtual Morris water maze task (Hüfner et al., 2007). Clearer deficits have been reported in real-space navigation, such as when participants walked along a triangular path (Glasauer et al., 2002) or completed triangular paths (Péruch et al., 2005; Xie et al., 2017), without direct investigation of the spatial navigation strategies used by the patients.

Spatial navigation mainly relies on egocentric and allocentric frames of reference (Burgess, 2006), two operational modes working together to build a coherent representation of the environment (Chen et al., 2014; Gramann et al., 2010; Weniger et al., 2011). Egocentric representations are self-centered and based on subject-object associations. Allocentric representations are instead centered on aspects of the external environment, such as object-object or object-environment associations. While age (e.g., Rodgers et al., 2012) and sex (e.g., Astur et al., 2016) have been shown to influence the use of egocentric and allocentric frames of reference for spatial navigation, little is known about how the vestibular system contributes to these reference frames during navigation. Questionnaires given to 783 adults (aged 18–96 from the general German-speaking population) about their navigation strategies indicated that having experienced vertigo/dizziness during the last 12 months “reduced the scores of both the orientation and the route [egocentric] strategies” (Ulrich et al., 2019). However, frame-dependent strategies during navigation have not been systematically evaluated in humans suffering from vestibular loss using objective measures in well-controlled experimental paradigms.

A convenient way to objectively measure navigation strategies in rodents is the “reverse T-maze paradigm” (Machado et al., 2014; McIntyre et al., 2003), during which animals can use either a spatial strategy based on external landmarks (e.g., visual cues on the walls of or around the T-maze) or a response (egocentric) strategy to find the reward hidden in one arm of the maze. Using the reverse T-maze paradigm in rats, Machado et al. (2014) showed that bilateral vestibular loss affected hippocampal-dependent allocentric strategy (i.e.,

109 navigation relied less on visual landmarks around the T-maze) and favoured the use of striatum-dependent
110 egocentric strategy (i.e., the ability to remember if the animal turned to the right/left in previous trials). Here,
111 we adapted these procedures for investigations in humans and created a new reverse T-maze paradigm in
112 virtual reality (VR) presented on a computer screen to explore whether unilateral vestibular loss and BVP
113 specifically modify the use of egocentric or allocentric spatial strategies. Although desktop-based settings limit
114 egocentric signals (vestibular, proprioceptive, motor signals), they provide a safe and well-controlled
115 environment and allow patients to allocate most of their attentional resources to the navigation task, instead of
116 to balance and eye movement controls. Navigation deficits have already been demonstrated in desktop-based
117 settings (e.g., Péruch et al., 1999; Brandt et al., 2005), suggesting that vestibular disorders change spatial
118 memory based only on the optic flow generated by virtual space navigation. This is supported by recent
119 behavioural studies in healthy participants showing similar performance when egocentric information (head
120 rotations and locomotion) was present or not during navigation in a virtual space (e.g., Huffman & Ekstrom,
121 2019).

122 The aim of this study was to compare the ability to select and use a navigation strategy, and to compare
123 the nature of the navigation strategy selected (egocentric vs. allocentric), in a group of patients with a chronic
124 BVP, a group of patients tested in the subacute stage of a unilateral vestibular neurectomy, and a group of
125 healthy participants carefully matched for age, sex and education level. We also included control tasks for
126 visual recognition memory and visuo-spatial processing speed. As found in rodents (Machado et al., 2014),
127 vestibular loss may favour egocentric spatial frameworks during navigation. Alternatively, vestibular loss may
128 favour the use of visual landmarks for spatial navigation, as showed for postural control and spatial orientation
129 (Lopez et al., 2006).

36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

Forty-six patients with a vestibular failure took part in the study. Among them, 45 participants were right-handed and one was left-handed based on the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (Oldfield, 1971). Twenty-three patients presented a severe BVP (*BVP group*: 11 females; mean age \pm SD: 58.9 \pm 14.1 years) according to the diagnostic criteria from the Bárány Society (Strupp et al., 2017). The BVP was idiopathic in all patients, which have been described elsewhere (Deroualle et al., 2017; Nakul et al., 2020). Patients were tested during the chronic stage of the BVP. Twenty-three patients had a unilateral vestibular loss (*UVL group*: 11 females; 58.6 \pm 11.4 years) due to an acute unilateral vestibulopathy (AUPV; vestibular neuritis and labyrinthitis, $n = 9$) or a unilateral vestibular neurectomy (UVN; neuroma and Menière's disease, $n = 14$). Patients with AUPV were tested 1–7 days after hospitalization (3.6 \pm 1.7 days) and patients with UVN were tested 2–8 days (6.3 \pm 1.4 days) after surgery, depending on their fatigue level. All patients tested in the acute or subacute phase of the UVL were included in the study only if they were able to sit upright with their head and trunk straight and motionless at the time of the test, and if they reported no severe fatigue, and experience no severe nausea, vertigo and dizziness the day of the test. Nausea and vomiting were non-inclusion criteria.

146 Patients underwent standard otoneurological examinations, including the bithermal caloric test with
147 water at 44°C and 30°C, and the video head impulse test. Some patients underwent cervical and/or ocular
148 vestibular-evoked myogenic potentials recordings. Clinical data are summarized in **Table 1** and **Tables S1-S2**.
149 Both groups of patients were compared to 23 volunteers without history of otoneurological disorder (*Control*
150 *group*: 11 females, 58.1 ± 13.5 years). **All controls were right-handed based on the Edinburgh Handedness**
151 **Inventory (Oldfield, 1971)**. Although controls did not receive otoneurological examination, they showed
152 subjective visual vertical within the normal range. The three groups of participants did not differ in terms of
153 age, sex, education level, and game experience (**Table 1**). Participants were informed about the study and gave
154 their written informed consent. Procedures were approved by the local Ethics Committee (CPP Sud-
155 Méditerranée II) and followed the Declaration of Helsinki.

156
157

2.2. Visuo-spatial tasks

158
159

160 The virtual environments were designed using the VRmaze RESEARCH software (InMind-Vr ®), previously
161 reported with a learning spatial task in healthy participants (Machado et al., 2019) and displayed on a 24''
162 computer screen (Iiyama ProLite XUB2493HSU-B1). We used a large screen non-immersive VR environment
163 rather than 3D immersive VR, in order to prevent cybersickness, a common complaint of exposure to VR
164 goggles (LaViola, 2000). Participants navigated through the virtual environments by using three arrows on a
165 keyboard: “up” to move forward; “right” and “left” to rotate their viewpoint in the clockwise and counter-
166 clockwise direction, respectively. It was not possible to navigate backwards, neither to move the viewpoint
167 upward or downward.

168
169

2.2.1. *Virtual reverse T-Maze task*

170
171

172 Participants were instructed that they would find themselves in a virtual maze located at the centre of a room.
173 The VR environment gave a first-person viewpoint and contained salient landmarks, i.e., coloured geometric
174 symbols (**Figure 1a**). The T-maze was composed of two opposite arms extending from the middle one, in
175 which participants were initially placed. Each arm ended with a wall, behind which there may or may not be a
176 target, which participants could not see. Before the first trial, participants were instructed that only one of the
177 two opposite arms contained a target and that they had to retrieve it. When they **reached** the target, the text
178 “Found” was displayed on the screen and the trial was over. There was no time limit to complete a trial. Then,
179 participants were relocated to the starting point and asked to find the target again. A total of 5 trials were
180 administered. For the first four trials (T1–T4), the target was always located in the same arm (right or left arm,
181 counterbalanced across patients) **in order to make it possible to create a spatial association between the target**
182 **and the visual landmarks (allocentric reference), or between the target and the arm side with respect to the**
183 **subjective, egocentric viewpoint**. On trial 5, referred to as the *probe* trial, the T-maze was rotated by 180°, so
184 that visual landmarks were inverted front/back and right/left) as classically done in animal studies (Machado
185 et al., 2014) (**Figure 1b**). In the probe trial, both arms contained a target.

186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200

182 After they completed the probe trial, participants were asked to explain which strategy they used during
183 this last trial. For coding the navigation strategy, we followed procedures adapted from previous T-maze
184 studies (Astur et al. 2016):

185 - When participants answered they turned in the same right/left arm of the T-maze (with respect to their
186 viewpoint) where they remembered they found the target previously, and thus ignored the rotation of the visual
187 environment, we recorded an *egocentric strategy*.

188 - When participants reported they followed the visual landmarks (coloured geometrical symbols) that were
189 rotated, we recorded an *allocentric strategy*.

190 - When participants reported to have followed no particular strategy, *No-Strategy* was recorded.

191 Verbal reports were compared to behavioural data and corrected to “No-Strategy” if incongruent, as in this
192 case participants failed to use and report a clear navigation strategy. For example, if participants reported that
193 they followed the rotation of visual landmarks (allocentric strategy), but the behavioural data showed that they
194 turned on the same side where they found the target during the previous trials (egocentric strategy), we
195 corrected to “No-Strategy”. This correction was applied in only 3 out of 69 participants (2 patients, 1 control)
196 and it was confirmed that the overall results were not affected by this correction.

198 2.2.2. Control for visuo-spatial processing speed

199 Participants were virtually placed at the centre of a neutral circular area. They were instructed to locate a
200 circular red target, which could be on their back, front, or side, and to retrieve it as quickly as possible by
201 rotating their viewpoint and moving forward towards the target. When participants reached the target, the text
202 “Found” appeared on the screen and participants were repositioned at the centre of the circular area. The
203 location of the target changed in each trial in a pseudorandomized order. Eight trials were administered, for
204 which the time to retrieve the target was recorded.

206 2.3. Control for visual recognition memory

207 To control that navigation strategy was not modulated by altered visual recognition memory in patients, we
208 used a computer-based adaptation of the Doors Test (Baddeley et al., 2006) following procedures from
209 previous studies on spatial navigation abilities (Brandt et al., 2005; Hübner et al., 2007). The test was presented
210 on a computer screen using PsychoPy (Peirce et al., 2019) and consisted of two parts: Part A and Part B. Each
211 part was composed of a presentation and a response phase. In the ‘presentation phase’, participants were
212 presented with a sequence of 12 different types of doors for 3 s each. In the ‘response phase’, a same target
213 door of the presentation phase was displayed in a 2 × 2 array together with three distractors. The whole phase
214 was composed of 12 arrays in which participants were asked to identify the target door without time limit. In
215 Part A, the distractors were different categories of doors than the target door (e.g., a garage door, a garden
216 door), whereas in the more difficult Part B, the distractors were the same type of door with a few different
217 details (e.g., different doorbells). One point was awarded for each correct response and only those participants
218 who obtained at least a score of 8 in Part A were administered Part B.

219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
60
61
62
63
64
65

2.4. Experimental procedures

Participants were tested while comfortably sitting in front of a desk with the lights switched off in the room to minimize the influence of peripheral visual signals from the experimental room. They first received instructions about the virtual T-Maze task, after which they completed a minimum of 8 training trials with no maze to become familiar with procedures to navigate in the VR environment. During the training, participants were asked to move into a virtual open space in order to retrieve a circular red target. When the training was over, the T-Maze task started, and participants were asked to report the strategy they used. Participants then performed the control task for visuo-spatial processing speed and the Doors Test. Participants took short breaks between tasks and they were instructed to stop if they felt nauseous, dizzy or experienced any kind of discomfort. No patient had to stop the experiment due to any of these symptoms. Several pilot tests were conducted to develop a sequence of cognitive tasks in VR (including the T-Maze task) which reduced as much as possible the duration of VR exposure to avoid the occurrence of nausea, fatigue and lack of comfort. The whole experiment lasted not more than 30 minutes on average.

2.5. Data Analysis

The navigation strategy (Allocentric vs. Egocentric) or absence of strategy (No-Strategy) reported for the probe trial was coded as a categorical variable. To analyse the predictors of the navigation strategy, we calculated several logistic regressions (SPSS 26, IBM, USA). Outcomes were either the presence of a navigation strategy (Strategy vs. No-Strategy) or the type of strategy (Allocentric vs. Egocentric). In patients with unilateral vestibular loss, we also conducted two exploratory analyses regarding (1) the type of UVL, *i.e.* patients with AUVP tested in the acute stage of the disorder vs. patients with UVL tested in the acute stage after the neurectomy but during the chronic stage of a neuroma or a Menière's disease; (2) the influence of left vs. right vestibular lesion, irrespective of the type of UVL. Depending on how participants were stratified, predictors in the logistic regression were the Group (BVP, UVL, Controls), Type of UVL (AUVP vs. UVN) and/or Side of UVL (left vs. right UVL), with the Sex and Age as covariates.

For each participant and each trial in the T-Maze, we measured the time and path length to retrieve the target. For each participant, we calculated the mean time to reach the target in the control task for visuo-spatial processing speed. As the Shapiro-Wilks test showed that most of these data were not normally distributed, we ran non-parametric procedures in SPSS 26 (IBM, USA). Within-group analyses were carried out using Friedman's tests with the trials (T1–T4) as a within-subject factor and post-hoc comparisons were performed using the Wilcoxon test with a Bonferroni correction. Between-group analyses were carried out using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Differences were considered significant for $p < 0.05$ unless alpha level was corrected for multiple comparisons.

255 3. Results

1
256

257 3.1. Spatial strategies in the VR T-Maze

258 Although 65% of the controls reported having used a navigation strategy (whether allocentric or egocentric),
259 only 35% of BVP patients and 30% of UVL patients used one (**Figure 2a**). A first logistic regression indicated
260 that the ability to use a navigation strategy with respect to No-Strategy was significantly predicted by the
261 Group ($\chi^2 = 7.59, p < 0.05$) and Age ($\chi^2 = 10.04, p < 0.01$). The odds to use a navigation strategy vs. No-
262 Strategy were significantly reduced in BVP patients (odds ratio [OR]: 0.23; 95% confidence interval [CI]:
263 0.06–0.89; $p = 0.033$) and in UVL patients (OR: 0.19; CI: 0.05–0.73; $p = 0.016$) when compared to controls
264 (**Table 2**). In other words, the odds of controls to use a navigation strategy compared to No-Strategy were 4.4
265 times more than that for BVP patients and 5.3 times more than that for UVL patients. Age was significantly
266 associated with a reduction in the odds of using a strategy with respect to No-Strategy (OR: 0.93; CI:
267 0.88–0.98; $p = 0.005$). Sex was not a significant predictor ($p = 0.893$) (**Table 2**).

268 **In a first exploratory analysis**, UVL patients were stratified in AUVP and UVN (**Figure S1 and Table**
269 **S3**). A logistic regression showed that the odds to use a navigation strategy vs. No-Strategy were significantly
270 reduced in patients with UVN ($p = 0.008$) when compared to controls, whereas this was not the case in AUVP
271 ($p = 0.348$). The odds of controls to use a navigation strategy compared to No-Strategy were 11.1 times more
272 than that for patients with UVN.

273 **In a second exploratory analysis**, patients were stratified according to the side of the vestibular loss. A
274 logistic regression analysis indicated that only right UVL reduced significantly the odds to use a navigation
275 strategy vs. No-Strategy when compared to controls ($p = 0.015$) (**Figure S2 and Table S4**). This was not the
276 case in patients with left UVL ($p = 0.204$). The odds of controls to use a navigation strategy were 20 times
277 more than that for patients with right UVL.

278 In a last multivariate logistic regression analysis, Group ($\chi^2 = 18.6, p < 0.001$) and Age ($\chi^2 = 16.84, p$
279 < 0.001) were significantly associated with the odds of using specifically an egocentric or an allocentric
280 navigation strategy when compared to No-Strategy (**Figure 2a**). **Table 3** shows that UVL patients had a
281 significantly lower chance of using an egocentric strategy when compared to No-Strategy than controls ($p <$
282 0.05), whereas this was not the case of BVP patients ($p = 0.20$). Conversely, BVP patients had a significantly
283 lower chance of using an allocentric strategy when compared to No-Strategy than controls ($p < 0.05$). This was
284 not the case of UVL patients ($p = 0.23$). Altogether, this indicates a reduced use of allocentric strategies in
285 BVP patients and a reduced use of egocentric strategies in UVL patients. The analysis also indicates that Age
286 was significantly associated with a reduced odds of using an allocentric strategy when compared to No-
287 Strategy ($p = 0.001$). By contrast, Age was not significantly associated with the odds of using an egocentric
288 strategy rather than No-Strategy. Sex was neither related to the odds of using an egocentric or an allocentric
289 strategy when compared to No-Strategy.

290

291

61

62

63
64
65

3.2. Time and path length to retrieve the target

Friedman's tests showed that the time to retrieve the target significantly changed from T1 to T4, indicating improved ability to navigate in the T-Maze in all groups of participants (Controls: $\chi^2_{(3)} = 13.07, p = 0.004$; BVP: $\chi^2_{(3)} = 10.77, p = 0.013$; UVL: $\chi^2_{(3)} = 21.37, p < 0.001$) (**Figure 2b**). Friedman's tests showed that the path length did not significantly change from T1 to T4 for Controls ($\chi^2_{(3)} = 4.47, p = 0.215$) and UVL patients ($\chi^2_{(3)} = 3.26, p = 0.353$), but the change was significant for BVP patients ($\chi^2_{(3)} = 8.48, p = 0.037$) (**Figure 2c**). Followed up tests for the BVP group showed that the path length decreased between T1 and T4 (Wilcoxon test, $p = 0.026$), and between T2 and T4 ($p = 0.009$), however the differences were not statistically significant after Bonferroni correction (corrected $\alpha = 0.0083$). Kruskal-Wallis tests indicated no significant effect of the Group for T1 to T4 regarding the time (all $H_{(2)} < 5.19$ and $p > 0.075$) and the path length (all $H_{(2)} < 5.0$ and $p > 0.082$). For the probe trial, there was no significant effect of the Group for the time ($H_{(2)} = 1.54, p = 0.464$) and the path length ($H_{(2)} = 1.17, p = 0.917$).

3.3. Controls for visuo-spatial processing speed and visual recognition memory

The time to retrieve the target in the control task did not differ between groups (Kruskal-Wallis test: $H_{(2)} = 3.67, p = 0.159$; **Figure 2d**), indicating similar abilities to locate visual targets and to navigate the virtual environment between groups.

Participants from the three groups recollected a similar number of items in the Doors Test, indicating no significant effect of vestibular loss on visual recognition memory ($H_{(2)} = 5.46, p = 0.065$; **Figure 2d**).

4. Discussion

4.1. Vestibular loss decreases the odds of using a navigation strategy

General effect of vestibular loss on the odds of using a navigation strategy

We found that patients with chronic BVP and patients with a UVL in the acute/subacute stage of a vestibular loss failed to select and use a specific strategy to orient themselves in a VR T-maze. Our finding is congruent with results from a recent survey revealing that vertigo/dizziness in the last 12 months decreases the odds that individuals report using either an egocentric or an allocentric strategy (Ulrich et al., 2019). Such a failure to select and use a proper navigation strategy is consistent with studies indicating that vestibular disorders impair performances in spatial memory tasks during navigation in VR (i.e. based only on optic flow and allocentric references, Brandt et al., 2005; Kremmyda et al., 2016; Péruch et al., 1999), as well as during novel route recombination (Schöberl et al., 2021) and triangle completion (Glasauer et al., 1994; Péruch et al., 2005) in VR and real space navigation (i.e. using egocentric references) tasks/settings. Other studies did not find significant effect of BVP and UVL on navigation performance (Dobbels et al., 2020; Jandl et al., 2015).

Results from the present study and results from virtual adaptations of the Morris water maze task are difficult to compare directly, as we focused on self-reports about navigation strategies instead of performance

329 in terms of response time, path length and heading errors as in previous navigation studies (Brandt et al., 2005;
330 Kremmyda et al., 2016; Péruch et al., 1999). Here, we chose to focus on the navigation strategy following
331 procedures from a classical behavioural task in rodents (Machado et al., 2014). Being able to exactly record
332 the participant's experience and strategy (following the landmarks that have rotated in the environment, or
333 remembering the motion with respect to the egocentric viewpoint) and to compare it with the behaviour
334 (recording of the path in the virtual T-maze) is a clear advantage with respect to animal studies. In particular,
335 it avoids confusion between random exploration of either arm of the T-maze and explicit, deliberate
336 exploration of a given arm of the T-maze based on a clear spatial strategy.

337 Only 5 trials were applied in the present task, and it is possible that patients with a BVP or UVL require
338 a larger number of trials before being able to select and report a proper navigation strategy, instead of searching
339 randomly into one arm of the T-maze or the other. The dramatic decrease in the odds of selecting and using a
340 navigation strategy (with respect to No-Strategy) in both groups of patients with vestibular disorders can be
341 accounted for by specific influence of vestibular disorders on the function and structure of the brain network
342 involved in spatial navigation (review in Smith, 2017) and/or by unspecific effects of the vestibular loss on
343 attention, fatigue and ability to explore and remember visual landmarks (see below). The lower ability to select
344 and use navigation strategies in patients with vestibular disorders indicates that vestibular signals about own-
345 body rotations and translations are in general important for spatial memory and wayfinding strategies (Ulrich
346 et al., 2019). Alternatively, it can indicate that vestibular disorders have general effects on cognition reaching
347 beyond spatial navigation, as suggested by recent epidemiological studies (Bigelow et al., 2016; Harun et al.,
348 2016; Semenov et al., 2016).

349 *Measures taken to reduce unspecific effects of vestibular loss on fatigue and attention*

350 There is a large body of evidence showing that patients with a BVP, and to a lesser extent patients with a UVL,
351 can complain about a lack of attention, difficulty to focus and fatigue (Bigelow et al., 2016; Popp et al., 2017).
352 As the experiment lasted about 30 min, fatigue may have installed, especially for patients who underwent
353 surgery and general anaesthesia several days before the T-Maze task. Several measures were taken to reduce
354 these effects. The T-Maze task was administered first during the experiment in order to limit the effects of
355 fatigue on navigation performance. In addition, participants were tested while sitting on a chair in front of a
356 computer screen in order to have most of their attentional resources allocated to the navigation task, instead of
357 to keeping balance control and stabilizing gaze (see below). Overall larger attentional deficits in patients with
358 BVP and stronger fatigue in UVL patients who underwent surgery may have decreased the attention paid to
359 visual landmarks. Although there was no eye movement recording in the present experiment to measure
360 exploration of visual landmarks, there is evidence to suggest that BVP patients exhibit different visual
361 exploration than healthy participants, including fewer object fixations during real-space navigating (Schöberl
362 et al., 2021).

363 It is important to note that the lack of group difference in the control task for navigation speed indicates
364 that the decrease in the likelihood to select and use a navigation strategy cannot be accounted for by a decrease
365

366 in processing speed or in the ability to navigate through the VR environment. In addition, the absence of group
367 difference in the Doors Test rules out an influence of altered visual recognition memory on the difference in
368 navigation strategies. Although the Doors Test did not control for visual memory in the T-Maze task directly,
369 it provides congruent findings with previous investigations in BVP patients (Brandt et al., 2005; Kremmyda et
370 al., 2016) and indicates that general mechanisms of visual memory and attention remained unaltered in chronic
371 BVL and in UVL patients tested in the subacute phase of the surgery for UVN and hospitalization for AUVP.
372 Finally, the careful matching of the groups also excludes an effect of age, education level or computer/game
373 expertise on the reported differences in the navigation strategies.

374 *Impact of hearing impairment*

375 Another factor that may partly explain differences between the groups of patients is a concomitant hearing
376 impairment (reviewed in Smith, 2022). Recent studies suggest that cognitive dysfunctions previously reported
377 in patients with vestibular disorders may be related to hearing loss (Dobbels et al., 2019, 2020). Dobbels et al.
378 (2019) used a battery of cognitive tests in 64 BVP patients and 83 controls and found that the hearing status
379 was significantly related to performance in the immediate memory (remembering a list of words) and language,
380 but hearing loss was not significantly related to visuo-spatial functions, which are at stake in the present study.
381 In another study using the virtual Morris water maze in BVP patients, the degree of hearing loss was
382 significantly related to the time to reach the hidden platform, and inversely related to the time participants
383 spent searching in the right quadrant of the water maze (Dobbels et al., 2020). There was no significant relation
384 with the path length and the heading error. By contrast, other studies found no correlation between hearing
385 loss in UVL patients (after neurectomy for neuroma and Menière's disease) and performance in egocentric and
386 allocentric mental rotation (Deroualle et al. 2019), and found no difference between deaf signers and hearing
387 nonsigners engaged in visuo-spatial perspective-taking, 3D object mental rotation and spatial orientation tasks
388 (Secora & Emmorey, 2019). As pointed out in a recent comprehensive review of the topic (Smith, 2022),
389 understanding the respective contributions of hearing impairment and vestibular loss on spatial cognition will
390 require large scale prospective studies comparing navigation strategies in patients with only a vestibular loss
391 (BVP or UVL), patients with only hearing impairment, patients with vestibular and hearing loss, and carefully
392 matched control participants. At the moment, we cannot exclude that a sensorineural loss, including both
393 vestibular and auditory dysfunctions, is responsible for the reported decrease in the odds of using a navigation
394 strategy.

395 396 397 4.2. Exploratory analysis of the effect of the type of unilateral vestibular loss on the odds of using 398 a navigation strategy

399 An exploratory analysis suggests that patients with UVN, but not patients with AUVP, had lower chance to
400 select and use spatial strategies. This result should be taken with caution because of the small sample size when
401 patients were stratified according to their type of UVL. It is important to note that the chronic/acute stage of
402 the vestibular loss differs strongly in both subpopulations of patients. UVL patients tested in the chronic stage

403 of a neuroma or Menière's disease present a similar reduction in the odds of using a navigation strategy as
404 patients with a chronic BVP. The vestibular loss in the patients was probably already important before the
405 neurectomy, and vestibular compensation was probably well developed before neurectomy, as indicated by
406 moderated subjective visual vertical deviation after the UVN (**Tables S1-S2**). By contrast, patients tested in
407 the acute stage of AUVP do not show this reduction in the odds of using a navigation strategy, despite larger
408 subjective visual vertical deviations (**Tables S1-S2**).

409 We speculate that the decrease in the odds of using a navigation strategy is not an immediate effect of
410 the UVL but reflects the chronic stage of a vestibular loss. While a vestibular neurectomy after a chronic
411 Menière's disease or neuroma creates a total and enduring deafferentation affecting spatial perception and
412 cognition durably (Borel et al., 2008; Devèze et al., 2015; Lopez et al., 2007; Vibert & Häusler, 2000), AUVP
413 may preserve part of the vestibular function, patients may recover within a couple of days (Halmagyi et al.,
414 2010; McGarvie et al., 2020), and its impact on cognition may depend on the disease severity. There is indeed
415 evidence to suggest that both hippocampal functions and structure depend on vestibular reflexivity and the
416 degree of clinical impairment (Göttlich et al., 2016; Jacob et al., 2020; Kamil et al., 2018; Seo et al., 2016).

417 Another important difference between the groups is that UVN patients, but not AUVP and BVP
418 patients, were evaluated shortly after a surgery under general anaesthesia. General anaesthesia may have
419 influenced performance because of its well-known effects on cognition (Belrose & Noppens, 2019). A recent
420 study isolated the specific effect of general anaesthesia on cognition. Cognitive abilities, such as spatial
421 memory and attention, recovered within 3 hours of return of consciousness after general anaesthesia (Mashour
422 et al., 2021). This study was conducted in healthy participants and the effect of anaesthesia on cognition in
423 patients with a chronic UVL may be different. Animal studies showed that anaesthesia can modify the time
424 course of vestibular compensation (reviewed in Gliddon et al., 2004) and anaesthesia may even reduce pre-
425 existing compensation in patients with Menière's disease and neuroma. Although the influence of anaesthesia
426 cannot be excluded in the present study, our control cognitive tasks revealed no significant difference in visual
427 processing speed and visual recognition memory between UVN patients and the two other groups.

428 429 4.3. Exploratory analysis of the effect of the side of unilateral vestibular loss on the odds of using 430 a navigation strategy

431 Our exploratory analysis suggests that only right UVL decreased the probability to select and use spatial
432 strategies. This result should be taken with caution because of the small sample size when patients were
433 stratified according to their lesion side, and because of the different sizes of the two groups. The limited sample
434 size in the present study, as well as in previous studies, may account partly for the equivocal results reported
435 in the literature comparing the effects of left vs. right vestibular disorders on perception and cognition. In line
436 with the present findings, Hüfner et al. (2007) showed a trend to perform worse in a VR navigation task only
437 in patients with right UVL. This result and our results are in line with neuroimaging studies highlighting a
438 dominance of the right cerebral hemisphere in right-handed participants (Dieterich et al., 2003, 2017; Dieterich
439 & Brandt, 2018). Importantly, the neural network involved in visuo-spatial attention has been located mainly

440 in the right cerebral hemisphere (Dieterich & Karnath, 2006), and right UVL (in right-handed participants)
441 may disorganize the functions of this visuo-spatial attention network. In contrast with the present findings,
442 studies have assessed no differences between right and left UVL with respect to cognitive performance (Ayar
443 et al., 2020; Popp et al., 2017), or found that only left UVL altered the perceived straight ahead (Saj et al.,
444 2013) and own-body mental imagery (Deroualle et al., 2019). How the side of the vestibular loss influences
445 cognition requires further investigations in much larger samples of participants, especially with respect to
446 spatial navigation abilities.

447

448 4.4. Effect of BVP and UVL on egocentric vs. allocentric navigation strategies

449 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first systematic comparison of spatial strategies during navigation in
450 humans with unilateral and bilateral vestibular loss.

451 Our results indicate that a chronic BVP dramatically decreased the odds of using an allocentric
452 navigation strategy. Our findings in humans are fully compatible with observations in rats with a bilateral
453 vestibular loss also tested in a reverse T-maze (Machado et al., 2014): bilateral vestibular loss affected
454 hippocampal-dependent allocentric strategy and favoured the use of striatum-dependent egocentric strategy.
455 Allocentric coding has been associated with activation of the hippocampus and/or the entorhinal cortex during
456 visually guided navigation in VR (Bohbot et al., 2012; Guderian et al., 2015; Jacobs et al., 2013; Maguire,
457 1998; Sherrill et al., 2013). Interestingly, there is evidence to suggest that the volume of the hippocampus is
458 reduced in patients with a total and chronic BVP (patients with neurofibromatosis 2; Brandt et al., 2005) and
459 in patients with a partial BVP (Kremmyda et al., 2016) when compared to healthy controls. This hippocampal
460 atrophy remains controversial as it was not confirmed in other groups of patients with chronic and partial BVP
461 (Cutfield et al., 2014; Göttlich et al., 2016). Furthermore, BVP patients showed lower activation in the right
462 anterior hippocampus and bilateral insula during real navigation, which correlated with higher error rates on
463 recombined novel routes (Schöberl et al., 2021). In the same study, patients with a complete BVP showed
464 higher activations in the caudate nucleus when compared to patients with incomplete lesion (Schöberl et al.,
465 2021). Another fMRI study, using a computer-based spatial navigation task, indicated that cerebellar activity
466 was higher in BVP patients when compared to controls (Jandl et al., 2015), especially in a cerebellar region
467 known to be involved in sequence-based navigation (Iglói et al., 2015). Altogether, these results suggest that
468 BVP increases the odds of shifting from an allocentric strategy to a striatum-dependent (i.e., egocentric)
469 navigation strategy.

470 On the contrary, we found that UVL decreased the odds of using an egocentric navigation strategy.
471 The vestibular system has been proposed to be strongly connected to a multisensory fronto-parieto-temporal
472 network in the right cerebral hemisphere underlying visuo-spatial processing and attention in an egocentric
473 frame of reference (Bottini et al., 2001; Fink et al., 2003; Saj et al., 2014). As summarized in Dieterich &
474 Karnath (2006), data from patients with stroke and neuroimaging studies show a right hemisphere dominance
475 and common areas for both visuo-spatial neglect and vestibular information processing. There is evidence to
476 suggest distortions of the egocentric reference frame in patients with unilateral vestibular disorders tested either

477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500

477 in the chronic stage after a total vestibular neurectomy (Saj et al., 2013), or in the chronic stage of a partial
478 unilateral vestibulopathy (Saj et al., 2021), as patients present with deviations of the subjective straight ahead.
479 A study from our group in patients with UVL, operated on for schwannoma and Menière’s disease as in the
480 present study, indicates deficits for spatial imagery in an egocentric reference frame, whereas spatial imagery
481 in an allocentric reference frame was unaffected (Deroualle et al. 2019). Similarly, studies in healthy
482 participants indicate that caloric, galvanic and magnetic vestibular stimulation can change egocentric space
483 perception (Hamann et al., 2009; Lindner et al., 2021; Pavlidou et al., 2018). In addition to interfering with the
484 brain network underlying egocentric representations, UVL can affect the function and structure of the
485 visuospatial attention network (Corbetta et al., 2008), such as altered responses in the intraparietal sulcus
486 (Helmchen et al., 2014), or gray matter volume reduction in the right superior temporal gyrus (zu Eulenburg
487 et al., 2010) and supramarginal gyrus (Hüfner et al., 2009). Consistently, recent measures of visuospatial
488 attention in microgravity showed enhanced stimulus-driven attentional capture to the detriment of endogenous
489 attention (Salatino et al., 2021). A neuroimaging study after short-term acute exposure to microgravity showed
490 a decreased functional connectivity at the right temporo-parietal junction/angular gyrus (Van Ombergen et al.,
491 2017), a core area within the right attentional network and deemed crucial for self and own-body consciousness
492 (Ionta et al., 2011). Acute exposure to microgravity creates mismatches between visual, proprioceptive and
493 vestibular inputs (Van Ombergen et al., 2017), which can disorganize networks supporting visuospatial
494 processing and attention in a body-centred reference frame. We speculate that similar disorganization may
495 occur in UVL patients tested in the acute or subacute stage of a neurectomy or AUVP.

496 The different patterns observed in patients with BVP and UVL can be accounted for by other factors
497 than the extent of the vestibular loss. One crucial difference is that BVP patients were tested in the chronic
498 stage of their vestibular loss, whereas UVL patients were tested in the acute/subacute stage of the vestibular
499 loss. Accordingly, the brain mechanisms that are in place at the time of the cognitive tests in patients with
500 chronic BVP and in patients with acute UVL may be very different.

501 502 4.5. Effect of age on navigation strategies

503 Age was significantly associated with an overall lower chance to adopt a navigation strategy and a decrease in
504 the odds of using an allocentric strategy. These results are consistent with previous studies that pointed out an
505 association between the age-related decline of the vestibular function and spatial orientation accuracy (Anson
506 et al., 2021). Moreover, other studies highlighted the use of an allocentric frame of reference in younger
507 compared to older adults during navigation (Bohbot et al., 2012; Li & King, 2019) and the increased odds of
508 using an egocentric than an allocentric spatial strategy in older adults (Irving et al., 2018; Rodgers et al., 2012).
509 For example, individuals tested in a homing task requiring to combine self-motion signals and visual landmarks
510 revealed that “older adults did not place as much influence on visual information as would have been optimal”
511 for accurate spatial representations (Bates & Wolbers, 2014). However, studies of real-space navigation
512 revealed that older participants make more saccades and search saccades when navigating (Irving et al., 2018).
513 Many factors can explain the effect of age on navigation strategies and performance, including decline in the

514 visual, proprioceptive and vestibular sensory systems, or changes in the entorhinal-hippocampal network
515 (reviewed in Lester et al., 2017). **Functional neuroimaging revealed that activity in the hippocampus decreases**
516 **with age whereas activity in the cerebellum and right putamen increases with age, in line with a shift from**
517 **predominantly allocentric to egocentric navigation strategies (Irving et al., 2018).**

518 519 4.6. Effect of sex on navigation strategies

520 We did not observe any sex difference in the ability to select and use of specific navigation strategy. This
521 results seems in contrast with results from a recent survey in healthy participants (Ulrich et al., 2019), results
522 from navigation tasks (Astur et al., 2016; Mueller et al., 2008) and data from neuroimaging suggesting that
523 men and women use different strategies and activate different brain areas during navigation (Grön et al., 2000;
524 Irving et al., 2018). However, our results are consistent with other studies that did not observe any sex-related
525 difference in the use of navigation strategies **in virtual radial mazes and T-mazes** (Levy et al., 2005; Schmitzer-
526 Torbert, 2007). **Our results are also consistent with a lack of differences in navigation performance and visual**
527 **exploration parameters reported in a recent study using real-space navigation (Irving et al., 2018).** Many
528 reasons could explain these differences. For example, as highlighted by Astur and colleagues, previous
529 administered tasks may influence strategy selection of the subsequent spatial tasks (Astur et al., 2016).
530 Contrary to previous works (Astur et al., 2016; Levy et al., 2005), the current study administered no other
531 spatial tasks before the T-Maze, preventing any bias toward egocentric or allocentric strategies. A second
532 possible issue concerns the different male and female reliance on visual information for navigation. As
533 previously demonstrated, females generally spend more time looking at surrounding landmarks and show
534 impaired performance when no landmarks are available (Andersen et al., 2012; Sandstrom et al., 1998), while
535 males typically show an advantage in time performance as they are more prone to use additional information
536 from the environment, such as room geometry or Euclidian coordinates. Although this is not correlated to the
537 use of a spontaneous spatial strategy during navigation (Andersen et al., 2012), most of the previous findings
538 that revealed an effect of sex resulted from the analysis of the time and accuracy to navigate (Grön et al., 2000;
539 Mueller et al., 2008) and not from a direct comparison of behavioural data and verbal reports. Indeed, a third
540 point concerns the methodology used to determine the strategies. In contrast with other studies (Astur et al.,
541 2016; Levy et al., 2005), participants of the present study were asked to explain which strategy they used
542 during the probe trial, making it possible to correct the behavioural data if inconsistent and to record the No-
543 Strategy option. The evidence on sex-related differences for spatial strategies are therefore equivocal. Further
544 researches are needed to address the influence of sex in adopting a specific spatial strategy during navigation.

545 546 4.7. Time and path length to retrieve the target in the virtual T-maze

547 **The data indicate that overall, there was no difference between groups regarding the time and the path length**
548 **to retrieve the target in the T-maze. This indicates that the ability to navigate through a virtual maze using a**
549 **keyboard was equivalent across groups and that differences in performances were mostly related to differential**
550 **use of spatial navigation strategies. We note a significant effect of the trial on the path length only in patients**

551 with BVL, suggesting that these patients improve their ability to navigate in the VR-maze over the trials
552 repetition. Such an effect might be related to the fact that BVL patients showed delayed spatial learning when
553 required to find a hidden platform in the VR Morris water maze (Kremmyda et al., 2016), and present the
554 strongest cognitive impairments among patients with a vestibular loss, including deficits of visuo-spatial
555 attention, speed processing and executive functions (Popp et al., 2017).

556 557 4.8. The virtual reversed T-maze task to measure navigation strategies in patients with vestibular 558 disorders and healthy controls

559 We used a large screen, VR environment in sitting participants rather than a 3D immersive environment or
560 real-space navigation. The approach, which is common in cognitive neuroscience, has several advantages.
561 First, it aimed at reducing cybersickness, which is common during immersion in VR (LaViola, 2000). Second,
562 a desktop-based setting allows to better control the sensory stimuli between groups of participants. Third, it
563 avoids the confounding factors related to the different abilities of controls, BVP and UVL patients to perform
564 head rotations and to stabilize images on the retina when exploring the environment. Fourth, as patients with
565 vestibular disorders can have attentional deficits, performing the task while sitting in front of a computer screen
566 ensures that most of the attentional resources are allocated to the navigation task, instead of to balance control.

567 Several authors suggested that navigation in desktop-based settings loses ecological validity compared
568 to real-space navigation and immersive VR using goggles (e.g., see review in Taube et al., 2013). Navigating
569 in a 3D environment is much more complex than in a 2D environment (Brandt et al., 2017), especially with
570 respect to the multisensory processing of vestibular and proprioceptive inputs, as well as auditory and olfactory
571 stimuli (Schöberl et al., 2020). Desktop based-settings impoverish sensory feedback from motion-sensitive
572 systems (vestibular, motor, proprioception) as there is no locomotion. The lack of sensory feedback related to
573 locomotion and exploration may have decreased the use of egocentric navigation strategies in all groups of
574 participants tested in the virtual T-maze task. However, recent behavioural and neuroimaging studies in healthy
575 participants suggest that there is a modality-independent brain network underlying spatial memory and that
576 removing egocentric signals does not change navigation performance (Huffman & Ekstrom, 2019). In line
577 with this idea, early studies in patients with vestibular disorders found no difference between real-space and
578 VR navigation (Péruch et al., 1999).

579 The fact that in our study participants were tested sitting on a chair while looking straight to the screen
580 in front of them may have impacted performance with respect to real navigation. This posture decreases the
581 difficulty of the task for patients with BVP and UVL when compared to real navigation because the cognitive
582 load related to balance control (Bessot et al., 2012; Redfern et al., 2004) is reduced in this non-challenging
583 posture. It is therefore possible that this setting decreases the deficits in spatial cognition when compared to
584 the disorders that patients may experience in their daily life when navigating in real space, especially when
585 they are involved in multiple tasks. In our setting, the main sensory feedback about self-motion in the VR
586 environment comes from the optic flow on the screen and there is evidence to suggest that vestibular disorders
587 change the ability to encode navigation based on optic flow only (Péruch et al., 1999).

588 We chose to have no time limit for maze exploration to match procedures from the T-Maze in rodents
589 with a BVL (Machado et al., 2014). There are several advantages of having no time limit to retrieve the target,
590 including a time that participants judge necessary to navigate without experiencing nausea from fast motion in
591 the VR, or a time necessary to explore the visual environment and to pay attention to the visual cues in the VR
592 T-maze. Having no time limit to search for the target in the T-Maze may favour the use of navigation strategy
593 based on the visual exploration of landmarks in all groups of participants.

594 Finally, the presentation of the task on a screen, instead of in head-mounted VR goggles, allowed
595 participants to see visual cues in their peripheral visual field. The number of visual stimuli in the room was
596 kept to a minimum, tests were performed in a dim room, and participants were asked to keep their heads still
597 in front of a large screen, minimizing the influence of the peripheral visual cues on navigation strategies.

599 4.9. Main limitations of the study

600 As detailed above, a predominant limitation of the study is that navigation strategies were collected in patients
601 with a very different history of vestibular disorders: patients with a BVP had a chronic condition, UVL patients
602 with a Menière's disease or a neuroma had a chronic condition but were tested during the acute stage of a
603 vestibular neurectomy, whereas patients with AUVP (neuritis) were tested in the acute stage of their disease.
604 Taken together, the results indicate that BVP and UVL patients show a decrease in the odds of using a
605 navigation strategy, but comparisons between groups will require confirmation in larger groups of participants
606 all tested in the chronic stage of their disease. The impact of hearing impairment on spatial memory and
607 cognition in general will also need to be taken into account more systematically in future studies. Finally, the
608 vestibular function was not measured in the control group. This prevented us from carrying out a
609 comprehensive analysis of the connection between the vestibular system reflexivity and behavioural
610 performance.

612 4.10. Conclusions

613 In conclusion, findings of the present study shed light on the specific contributions of vestibular inputs on the
614 frame-dependent spatial coding. Overall, an impairment of vestibular system has been showed to prevent
615 adopting spatial strategies during virtual navigation. When considering patients who used strategies to orient
616 themselves in the VR environment, we showed that a bilateral vestibular damage decreases the use of
617 allocentric strategy, while a unilateral impairment decreases the use of an egocentric strategy. Further studies
618 are needed to confirm these results using **real-space** navigation tasks and using functional neuroimaging, and
619 to determine **whether and** to what extent these deficits impair the patients' daily life.

621 Acknowledgements

622 The authors thank InMind-VR for providing the VRMaze software.

624 Conflicts of interest

625 S. Besnard and M.L. Machado have or had financial relationships with InMind-VR and have been involved in
626 the development of the VRMaze software.

627 **Figure Legends**

628
629 **Figure 1.** (A) Example of visual landmarks as seen from the first-person perspective at the starting point in
630 the T-maze. (B) Top view of the virtual T-maze in the first four trials (T1–T4) and in the probe trial after the
631 T-maze was rotated by 180°.

632
633 **Figure 2.** (A) Percentage of participants that reported No-Strategy or a specific spatial strategy (egocentric or
634 allocentric) to retrieve the target in the probe trial of the T-Maze task. (B) Box-and-whisker plots showing the
635 time and the path length (C) to retrieve the target in first four trials of the T-Maze task. Means are shown as +.
636 The solid line inside the box is the median and boxes cover the interquartile range (5–95). (D) Box-and-whisker
637 plots showing the number of correct items recalled in the Doors Test and the time to find the target in the
638 control task for visuo-spatial processing speed. BVP = Bilateral vestibulopathy; UVL = Unilateral vestibular
639 loss.

640

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

641 **References**

- 642 Andersen, N. E., Dahmani, L., Konishi, K., & Bohbot, V. D. (2012). Eye tracking, strategies, and sex
643 differences in virtual navigation. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, *97*(1), 81–89.
644 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2011.09.007>
- 645 Angelaki, D. E., & Cullen, K. E. (2008). Vestibular System: The Many Facets of a Multimodal Sense.
646 *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *31*(1), 125–150.
647 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.31.060407.125555>
- 648 Anson, E., Ehrenburg, M. R., Simonsick, E. M., & Agrawal, Y. (2021). Association between vestibular
649 function and rotational spatial orientation perception in older adults. *Journal of Vestibular Research*,
650 *31*(6), 469–478. <https://doi.org/10.3233/VES-201582>
- 651 Astur, R. S., Purton, A. J., Zaniwski, M. J., Cimadevilla, J., & Markus, E. J. (2016). Human sex differences
652 in solving a virtual navigation problem. *Behavioural Brain Research*, *308*, 236–243.
653 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2016.04.037>
- 654 Ayar, D. A., Kumral, E., & Celebisoy, N. (2020). Cognitive functions in acute unilateral vestibular loss.
655 *Journal of Neurology*, *267*(S1), 153–159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-020-09829-w>
- 656 Baddeley, A. D., Emslie, H., & Nimmo-Smith, I. (2006). *Doors and people: A test of visual and verbal*
657 *recall and recognition*. Harcourt Assessment.
- 658 Baek, J. H., Zheng, Y., Darlington, C. L., & Smith, P. F. (2010). Evidence that spatial memory deficits
659 following bilateral vestibular deafferentation in rats are probably permanent. *Neurobiology of*
660 *Learning and Memory*, *94*(3), 402–413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2010.08.007>
- 661 Bates, S. L., & Wolbers, T. (2014). How cognitive aging affects multisensory integration of navigational
662 cues. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *35*(12), 2761–2769.
663 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2014.04.003>
- 664 **Belrose, J. C., & Noppens, R. R. (2019). Anesthesiology and cognitive impairment: A narrative review of**
665 **current clinical literature. *BMC Anesthesiology*, *19*(1), 241. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12871-019-0903-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12871-019-0903-7)**
666 **7**
- 667 Besnard, S., Machado, M. L., Vignaux, G., Boulouard, M., Coquerel, A., Bouet, V., Freret, T., Denise, P., &
668 Lelong-Boulouard, V. (2012). Influence of vestibular input on spatial and nonspatial memory and on
669 hippocampal NMDA receptors. *Hippocampus*, *22*(4), 814–826. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.20942>
- 670 Bessot, N., Denise, P., Toupet, M., Van Nechel, C., & Chavoix, C. (2012). Interference between walking and
671 a cognitive task is increased in patients with bilateral vestibular loss. *Gait & Posture*, *36*(2), 319–321.
672 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2012.02.021>
- 673 **Bigelow, R. T., Semenov, Y. R., du Lac, S., Hoffman, H. J., & Agrawal, Y. (2016). Vestibular vertigo and**
674 **comorbid cognitive and psychiatric impairment: The 2008 National Health Interview Survey. *Journal***
675 **of *Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, *87*(4), 367–372. [https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2015-](https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2015-310319)**
676 **310319**
- 677 Bohbot, V. D., McKenzie, S., Konishi, K., Fouquet, C., Kurdi, V., Schachar, R., Boivin, M., & Robaey, P.
678 (2012). Virtual navigation strategies from childhood to senescence: Evidence for changes across the
679 life span. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, *4*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2012.00028>
- 680 Borel, L., Lopez, C., Péruch, P., & Lacour, M. (2008). Vestibular syndrome: A change in internal spatial
681 representation. *Neurophysiologie Clinique = Clinical Neurophysiology*, *38*(6), 375–389.
682 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucli.2008.09.002>
- 683 **Bottini, G., Karnath, H. O., Vallar, G., Sterzi, R., Frith, C. D., Frackowiak, R. S., & Paulesu, E. (2001).**
684 **Cerebral representations for egocentric space: Functional-anatomical evidence from caloric vestibular**
685 **stimulation and neck vibration. *Brain*, *124*, 1182–1196.**
- 686 Brandt, T., Schautzer, F., Hamilton, D. A., Brüning, R., Markowitsch, H. J., Kalla, R., Darlington, C., Smith,
687 P., & Strupp, M. (2005). Vestibular loss causes hippocampal atrophy and impaired spatial memory in
688 humans. *Brain*, *128*(11), 2732–2741. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awh617>
- 689 Brandt, T., Zwergal, A., & Glasauer, S. (2017). 3-D spatial memory and navigation: Functions and disorders.
690 *Current Opinion in Neurology*, *30*(1), 90–97. <https://doi.org/10.1097/WCO.0000000000000415>
- 691 Burgess, N. (2006). Spatial memory: How egocentric and allocentric combine. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*,
692 *10*(12), 551–557. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.10.005>
- 693 Chen, Y., Monaco, S., Byrne, P., Yan, X., Henriques, D. Y. P., & Crawford, J. D. (2014). Allocentric versus
694 Egocentric Representation of Remembered Reach Targets in Human Cortex. *Journal of Neuroscience*,
695 *34*(37), 12515–12526. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1445-14.2014>

- 696 Corbetta, M., Patel, G., & Shulman, G. L. (2008). The Reorienting System of the Human Brain: From
697 Environment to Theory of Mind. *Neuron*, 58(3), 306–324.
698 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2008.04.017>
- 699 **Cutfield, N. J., Scott, G., Waldman, A. D., Sharp, D. J., & Bronstein, A. M. (2014). Visual and
700 proprioceptive interaction in patients with bilateral vestibular loss. *NeuroImage. Clinical*, 4, 274–282.
701 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2013.12.013>**
- 702 Deroualle, D., Borel, L., Tanguy, B., Bernard-Demanze, L., Devèze, A., Montava, M., Lavieille, J.-P., &
703 Lopez, C. (2019). Unilateral vestibular deafferentation impairs embodied spatial cognition. *Journal of*
704 *Neurology*, 266(S1), 149–159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-019-09433-7>
- 705 Deroualle, D., Toupet, M., van Nechel, C., Duquesne, U., Hautefort, C., & Lopez, C. (2017). Anchoring the
706 Self to the Body in Bilateral Vestibular Failure. *PloS One*, 12(1), e0170488.
707 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0170488>
- 708 Devèze, A., Montava, M., Lopez, C., Lacour, M., Magnan, J., & Borel, L. (2015). Vestibular compensation
709 following vestibular neurotomy. *European Annals of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Diseases*,
710 132(4), 197–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anorl.2015.04.003>
- 711 Dieterich, M., Bense, S., Lutz, S., Drzezga, A., Stephan, T., Bartenstein, P., & Brandt, T. (2003). Dominance
712 for vestibular cortical function in the non-dominant hemisphere. *Cerebral Cortex (New York, N.Y.:*
713 *1991)*, 13(9), 994–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/13.9.994>
- 714 Dieterich, M., & Brandt, T. (2018). Global orientation in space and the lateralization of brain functions.
715 *Current Opinion in Neurology*, 31(1), 96–104. <https://doi.org/10.1097/WCO.0000000000000516>
- 716 Dieterich, M., Kirsch, V., & Brandt, T. (2017). Right-sided dominance of the bilateral vestibular system in
717 the upper brainstem and thalamus. *Journal of Neurology*, 264(Suppl 1), 55–62.
718 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-017-8453-8>
- 719 **Dobbels, B., Mertens, G., Gilles, A., Claes, A., Moyaert, J., van de Berg, R., Van de Heyning, P.,
720 Vanderveken, O., & Van Rompaey, V. (2019). Cognitive Function in Acquired Bilateral
721 Vestibulopathy: A Cross-Sectional Study on Cognition, Hearing, and Vestibular Loss. *Frontiers in*
722 *Neuroscience*, 13, 340. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2019.00340>**
- 723 **Dobbels, B., Mertens, G., Gilles, A., Moyaert, J., van de Berg, R., Fransen, E., Van de Heyning, P., & Van
724 Rompaey, V. (2020). The Virtual Morris Water Task in 64 Patients With Bilateral Vestibulopathy and
725 the Impact of Hearing Status. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 11, 710.
726 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2020.00710>**
- 727 **Fink, G. R., Marshall, J. C., Weiss, P. H., Stephan, T., Grefkes, C., Shah, N. J., Zilles, K., & Dieterich, M.
728 (2003). Performing allocentric visuospatial judgments with induced distortion of the egocentric
729 reference frame: An fMRI study with clinical implications. *Neuroimage*, 20, 1505–1517.**
- 730 Glasauer, S., Amorim, M. A., Viaud-Delmon, I., & Berthoz, A. (2002). Differential effects of labyrinthine
731 dysfunction on distance and direction during blindfolded walking of a triangular path. *Exp Brain Res*,
732 145, 489–497. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-002-1146-1>
- 733 **Glasauer, S., Amorim, M. A., Vitte, E., & Berthoz, A. (1994). Goal-directed linear locomotion in normal and
734 labyrinthine-defective subjects. *Experimental Brain Research*, 98(2), 323–335.
735 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00228420>**
- 736 **Gliddon, C. M., Darlington, C. L., & Smith, P. F. (2004). Rapid vestibular compensation in guinea pig even
737 with prolonged anesthesia. *Neurosci Lett*, 371, 138–141.**
- 738 Göttlich, M., Jandl, N. M., Sprenger, A., Wojak, J. F., Münte, T. F., Krämer, U. M., & Helmchen, C. (2016).
739 Hippocampal gray matter volume in bilateral vestibular failure. *Human Brain Mapping*, 37(5), 1998–
740 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.23152>
- 741 Gramann, K., Onton, J., Riccobon, D., Mueller, H. J., Bardins, S., & Makeig, S. (2010). Human Brain
742 Dynamics Accompanying Use of Egocentric and Allocentric Reference Frames during Navigation.
743 *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 22(12), 2836–2849. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21369>
- 744 Grön, G., Wunderlich, A. P., Spitzer, M., Tomczak, R., & Riepe, M. W. (2000). Brain activation during
745 human navigation: Gender-different neural networks as substrate of performance. *Nature*
746 *Neuroscience*, 3(4), 404–408. <https://doi.org/10.1038/73980>
- 747 Guderian, S., Dzieciol, A. M., Gadian, D. G., Jentschke, S., Doeller, C. F., Burgess, N., Mishkin, M., &
748 Vargha-Khadem, F. (2015). Hippocampal Volume Reduction in Humans Predicts Impaired
749 Allocentric Spatial Memory in Virtual-Reality Navigation. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 35(42), 14123–
750 14131. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0801-15.2015>
- 751 Halmagyi, G. M., Weber, K. P., & Curthoys, I. S. (2010). Vestibular function after acute vestibular neuritis.

- 752 *Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience*, 28(1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.3233/RNN-2010-0533>
- 753 Hamann, K.-F., Weiss, U., & Ruile, A. (2009). Effects of Acute Vestibular Lesions on Visual Orientation
754 and Spatial Memory, Shown for the Visual Straight Ahead. *Annals of the New York Academy of*
755 *Sciences*, 1164(1), 305–308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.03867.x>
- 756 Harun, A., Oh, E. S., Bigelow, R. T., Studenski, S., & Agrawal, Y. (2016). Vestibular Impairment in
757 Dementia. *Otology & Neurotology : Official Publication of the American Otological Society,*
758 *American Neurotology Society [and] European Academy of Otology and Neurotology*, 37(8), 1137–
759 1142. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MAO.0000000000001157>
- 760 Helmchen, C., Ye, Z., Sprenger, A., & Münte, T. F. (2014). Changes in resting-state fMRI in vestibular
761 neuritis. *Brain Structure and Function*, 219(6), 1889–1900. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-013-0608-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-013-0608-5)
762 5
- 763 Huffman, D. J., & Ekstrom, A. D. (2019). A Modality-Independent Network Underlies the Retrieval of
764 Large-Scale Spatial Environments in the Human Brain. *Neuron*, 104(3), 611–622.e7.
765 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2019.08.012>
- 766 Hübner, K., Hamilton, D. A., Kalla, R., Stephan, T., Glasauer, S., Ma, J., Brüning, R., Markowitsch, H. J.,
767 Labudda, K., Schichor, C., Strupp, M., & Brandt, T. (2007). Spatial memory and hippocampal volume
768 in humans with unilateral vestibular deafferentation. *Hippocampus*, 17(6), 471–485.
769 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.20283>
- 770 Hübner, K., Stephan, T., Hamilton, D. A., Kalla, R., Glasauer, S., Strupp, M., & Brandt, T. (2009). Gray-
771 Matter Atrophy after Chronic Complete Unilateral Vestibular Deafferentation. *Annals of the New York*
772 *Academy of Sciences*, 1164(1), 383–385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2008.03719.x>
- 773 Iglói, K., Doeller, C. F., Paradis, A.-L., Benchenane, K., Berthoz, A., Burgess, N., & Rondi-Reig, L. (2015).
774 Interaction Between Hippocampus and Cerebellum Crus I in Sequence-Based but not Place-Based
775 Navigation. *Cerebral Cortex (New York, N.Y.: 1991)*, 25(11), 4146–4154.
776 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhu132>
- 777 Ionta, S., Heydrich, L., Lenggenhager, B., Mouthon, M., Fornari, E., Chapis, D., Gassert, R., & Blanke, O.
778 (2011). Multisensory mechanisms in temporo-parietal cortex support self-location and first-person
779 perspective. *Neuron*, 70, 363–374. [https://doi.org/S0896-6273\(11\)00200-5 \[pii\]](https://doi.org/S0896-6273(11)00200-5 [pii])
780 10.1016/j.neuron.2011.03.009
- 781 Irving, S., Schöberl, F., Pradhan, C., Brendel, M., Bartenstein, P., Dieterich, M., Brandt, T., & Zwergal, A.
782 (2018). A novel real-space navigation paradigm reveals age- and gender-dependent changes of
783 navigational strategies and hippocampal activation. *Journal of Neurology*, 265(S1), 113–126.
784 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-018-8987-4>
- 785 Jacob, A., Tward, D. J., Resnick, S., Smith, P. F., Lopez, C., Rebello, E., Wei, E. X., Tilak Ratnanather, J., &
786 Agrawal, Y. (2020). Vestibular function and cortical and sub-cortical alterations in an aging
787 population. *Heliyon*, 6(8), e04728. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04728>
- 788 Jacob, P.-Y., Poucet, B., Liberge, M., Save, E., & Sargolini, F. (2014). Vestibular control of entorhinal
789 cortex activity in spatial navigation. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, 8.
790 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2014.00038>
- 791 Jacobs, J., Weidemann, C. T., Miller, J. F., Solway, A., Burke, J. F., Wei, X.-X., Suthana, N., Sperling, M.
792 R., Sharan, A. D., Fried, I., & Kahana, M. J. (2013). Direct recordings of grid-like neuronal activity in
793 human spatial navigation. *Nature Neuroscience*, 16(9), 1188–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3466>
- 794 Jandl, N. M., Sprenger, A., Wojak, J. F., Göttlich, M., Münte, T. F., Krämer, U. M., & Helmchen, C. (2015).
795 Dissociable cerebellar activity during spatial navigation and visual memory in bilateral vestibular
796 failure. *Neuroscience*, 305, 257–267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2015.07.089>
- 797 Kamil, R. J., Jacob, A., Ratnanather, J. T., Resnick, S. M., & Agrawal, Y. (2018). Vestibular Function and
798 Hippocampal Volume in the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging (BLSA). *Otology & Neurotology*,
799 39(6), 765–771. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MAO.0000000000001838>
- 800 Karnath, H. O., & Dieterich, M. (2006). Spatial neglect—a vestibular disorder? *Brain*, 129, 293–305.
- 801 Kremmyda, O., Hübner, K., Flanagin, V. L., Hamilton, D. A., Linn, J., Strupp, M., Jahn, K., & Brandt, T.
802 (2016). Beyond Dizziness: Virtual Navigation, Spatial Anxiety and Hippocampal Volume in Bilateral
803 Vestibulopathy. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2016.00139>
- 804 LaViola, J. J. (2000). A discussion of cybersickness in virtual environments. *ACM SIGCHI Bulletin*, 32(1),
805 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.1145/333329.333344>
- 806 Lester, A. W., Moffat, S. D., Wiener, J. M., Barnes, C. A., & Wolbers, T. (2017). The Aging Navigational
807 System. *Neuron*, 95(5), 1019–1035. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.06.037>

- 808 Levy, L. J., Astur, R. S., & Frick, K. M. (2005). Men and women differ in object memory but not
809 performance of a virtual radial maze. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, *119*(4), 853–862.
810 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044.119.4.853>
- 811 Li, A. W. Y., & King, J. (2019). Spatial memory and navigation in ageing: A systematic review of MRI and
812 fMRI studies in healthy participants. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *103*, 33–49.
813 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2019.05.005>
- 814 **Lindner, A., Wiesen, D., & Karnath, H.-O. (2021). Lying in a 3T MRI scanner induces neglect-like spatial
815 attention bias. *ELife*, *10*, e71076. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.71076>**
- 816 Lopez, C., Lacour, M., Ahmadi, A. E., Magnan, J., & Borel, L. (2007). Changes of visual vertical perception:
817 A long-term sign of unilateral and bilateral vestibular loss. *Neuropsychologia*, *45*, 2025–2037.
- 818 Lopez, C., Lacour, M., Magnan, J., & Borel, L. (2006). Visual field dependence–independence before and
819 after unilateral vestibular loss. *NeuroReport*, *17*(8), 797–803.
820 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.wnr.0000221843.58373.c8>
- 821 Machado, M. L., Kroichvili, N., Freret, T., Philoxène, B., Lelong-Boulouard, V., Denise, P., & Besnard, S.
822 (2012). Spatial and non-spatial performance in mutant mice devoid of otoliths. *Neuroscience Letters*,
823 *522*(1), 57–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2012.06.016>
- 824 Machado, M. L., Lefèvre, N., Philoxene, B., Le Gall, A., Madeleine, S., Fleury, P., Smith, P. F., & Besnard,
825 S. (2019). New software dedicated to virtual mazes for human cognitive investigations. *Journal of*
826 *Neuroscience Methods*, *327*, 108388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2019.108388>
- 827 Machado, M.-L., Lelong-Boulouard, V., Philoxene, B., Davis, A., Denise, P., & Besnard, S. (2014).
828 Vestibular loss promotes procedural response during a spatial task in rats: Procedural Memory
829 Preference in Vestibular-Lesioned Rat. *Hippocampus*, *24*(5), 591–597.
830 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.22251>
- 831 Maguire, E. A. (1998). Knowing Where and Getting There: A Human Navigation Network. *Science*,
832 *280*(5365), 921–924. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.280.5365.921>
- 833 **Mashour, G. A., Palanca, B. J., Basner, M., Li, D., Wang, W., Blain-Moraes, S., Lin, N., Maier, K., Muench,
834 M., Tarnal, V., Vanini, G., Ochroch, E. A., Hogg, R., Schwartz, M., Maybrier, H., Hardie, R., Janke,
835 E., Golmirzaie, G., Picton, P., ... Kelz, M. B. (2021). Recovery of consciousness and cognition after
836 general anesthesia in humans. *ELife*, *10*, e59525. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.59525>**
- 837 McGarvie, L. A., MacDougall, H. G., Curthoys, I. S., & Halmagyi, G. M. (2020). Spontaneous Recovery of
838 the Vestibulo-Ocular Reflex After Vestibular Neuritis; Long-Term Monitoring With the Video Head
839 Impulse Test in a Single Patient. *Frontiers in Neurology*, *11*, 732.
840 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2020.00732>
- 841 McIntyre, C. K., Marriott, L. K., & Gold, P. E. (2003). Patterns of brain acetylcholine release predict
842 individual differences in preferred learning strategies in rats. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*,
843 *79*(2), 177–183. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1074-7427\(02\)00014-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1074-7427(02)00014-X)
- 844 Mueller, S. C., Jackson, C. P. T., & Skelton, R. W. (2008). Sex differences in a virtual water maze: An eye
845 tracking and pupillometry study. *Behavioural Brain Research*, *193*(2), 209–215.
846 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2008.05.017>
- 847 Nakul, E., Dabard, C., Toupet, M., Hautefort, C., van Nechel, C., Lenggenhager, B., & Lopez, C. (2020).
848 Interoception and embodiment in patients with bilateral vestibulopathy. *Journal of Neurology*,
849 *267*(Suppl 1), 109–117. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-020-10221-x>
- 850 **Oldfield, R. C. (1971). The assessment and analysis of handedness: The Edinburgh inventory.**
851 ***Neuropsychologia*, *9*, 97–113.**
- 852 **Pavlidou, A., Ferrè, E. R., & Lopez, C. (2018). Vestibular stimulation makes people more egocentric.**
853 ***Cortex*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2017.12.005>**
- 854 Peirce, J., Gray, J. R., Simpson, S., MacAskill, M., Höchenberger, R., Sogo, H., Kastman, E., & Lindeløv, J.
855 K. (2019). PsychoPy2: Experiments in behavior made easy. *Behavior Research Methods*, *51*(1), 195–
856 203. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-01193-y>
- 857 Péruch, P., Borel, L., Gaunet, F., Thinus-Blanc, G., Magnan, J., & Lacour, M. (1999). Spatial performance of
858 unilateral vestibular defective patients in nonvisual versus visual navigation. *Journal of Vestibular*
859 *Research: Equilibrium & Orientation*, *9*(1), 37–47.
- 860 Péruch, P., Borel, L., Magnan, J., & Lacour, M. (2005). Direction and distance deficits in path integration
861 after unilateral vestibular loss depend on task complexity. *Brain Res Cogn Brain Res*, *25*, 862–872.
862 [https://doi.org/S0926-6410\(05\)00287-9](https://doi.org/S0926-6410(05)00287-9) [pii] 10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2005.09.012
- 863 Popp, P., Wulff, M., Finke, K., Rühl, M., Brandt, T., & Dieterich, M. (2017). Cognitive deficits in patients

- 864 with a chronic vestibular failure. *Journal of Neurology*, 264(3), 554–563.
865 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-016-8386-7>
- 866 Redfern, M. S., Talkowski, M. E., Jennings, J. R., & Furman, J. M. (2004). Cognitive influences in postural
867 control of patients with unilateral vestibular loss. *Gait & Posture*, 19(2), 105–114.
868 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362\(03\)00032-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362(03)00032-8)
- 869 Rodgers, M. K., Sindone, J. A., & Moffat, S. D. (2012). Effects of age on navigation strategy. *Neurobiology*
870 *of Aging*, 33(1), 202.e15–202.e22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2010.07.021>
- 871 Russell, N. A., Horii, A., Smith, P. F., Darlington, C. L., & Bilkey, D. K. (2003). Bilateral peripheral
872 vestibular lesions produce long-term changes in spatial learning in the rat. *Journal of Vestibular*
873 *Research: Equilibrium & Orientation*, 13(1), 9–16.
- 874 Saj, A., Bachelard- Serra, M., Lavieille, J., Honoré, J., & Borel, L. (2021). Signs of spatial neglect in
875 unilateral peripheral vestibulopathy. *European Journal of Neurology*, 28(5), 1779–1783.
876 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ene.14701>
- 877 Saj, A., Cojan, Y., Musel, B., Honoré, J., Borel, L., & Vuilleumier, P. (2014). Functional neuro-anatomy of
878 egocentric versus allocentric space representation. *Neurophysiologie Clinique = Clinical*
879 *Neurophysiology*, 44(1), 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucli.2013.10.135>
- 880 Saj, A., Honoré, J., Bernard-Demanze, L., Devèze, A., Magnan, J., & Borel, L. (2013). Where is straight
881 ahead to a patient with unilateral vestibular loss? *Cortex*, 49(5), 1219–1228.
882 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.05.019>
- 883 Salatino, A., Iacono, C., Gamberi, R., Chiadò, S. T., Lambert, J., Sulcova, D., Mouraux, A., George, M. S.,
884 Roberts, D. R., Berti, A., & Ricci, R. (2021). Zero gravity induced by parabolic flight enhances
885 automatic capture and weakens voluntary maintenance of visuospatial attention. *Npj Microgravity*,
886 7(1), 29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41526-021-00159-3>
- 887 Sandstrom, N. J., Kaufman, J., & A. Huettel, S. (1998). Males and females use different distal cues in a
888 virtual environment navigation task. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 6(4), 351–360.
889 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-6410\(98\)00002-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-6410(98)00002-0)
- 890 Schmitzer-Torbert, N. (2007). Place and response learning in human virtual navigation: Behavioral measures
891 and gender differences. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 121(2), 277–290. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044.121.2.277>
- 892 Schöberl, F., Pradhan, C., Grosch, M., Brendel, M., Jostes, F., Obermaier, K., Sowa, C., Jahn, K.,
893 Bartenstein, P., Brandt, T., Dieterich, M., & Zwergal, A. (2021). Bilateral vestibulopathy causes
894 selective deficits in recombining novel routes in real space. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 2695.
895 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-82427-6>
- 896 Schöberl, F., Zwergal, A., & Brandt, T. (2020). Testing Navigation in Real Space: Contributions to
897 Understanding the Physiology and Pathology of Human Navigation Control. *Frontiers in Neural*
898 *Circuits*, 14, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fncir.2020.00006>
- 899 Secora, K., & Emmorey, K. (2019). Social Abilities and Visual-Spatial Perspective-Taking Skill: Deaf
900 Signers and Hearing Nonsigners. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*.
901 <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enz006>
- 902 Semenov, Y. R., Bigelow, R. T., Xue, Q.-L., du Lac, S., & Agrawal, Y. (2016). Association Between
903 Vestibular and Cognitive Function in U.S. Adults: Data From the National Health and Nutrition
904 Examination Survey. *The Journals of Gerontology. Series A, Biological Sciences and Medical*
905 *Sciences*, 71(2), 243–250. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glv069>
- 906 Seo, Y. J., Kim, J., & Kim, S. H. (2016). The change of hippocampal volume and its relevance with inner ear
907 function in Meniere's disease patients. *Auris, Nasus, Larynx*, 43(6), 620–625.
908 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anl.2016.01.006>
- 909 Sherrill, K. R., Erdem, U. M., Ross, R. S., Brown, T. I., Hasselmo, M. E., & Stern, C. E. (2013).
910 Hippocampus and retrosplenial cortex combine path integration signals for successful navigation. *The*
911 *Journal of Neuroscience*, 33(49), 19304–19313. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1825-13.2013>
- 912 Smith, P. F. (2017). The vestibular system and cognition. *Current Opinion in Neurology*, 30(1), 84–89.
913 <https://doi.org/10.1097/WCO.0000000000000403>
- 914 Smith, P. F. (2022). Hearing loss versus vestibular loss as contributors to cognitive dysfunction. *Journal of*
915 *Neurology*, 269(1), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-020-10343-2>
- 916 Strupp, M., Kim, J.-S., Murofushi, T., Straumann, D., Jen, J. C., Rosengren, S. M., Della Santina, C. C., &
917 Kingma, H. (2017). Bilateral vestibulopathy: Diagnostic criteria Consensus document of the
918 Classification Committee of the Bárány Society. *Journal of Vestibular Research*, 27(4), 177–189.

920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

<https://doi.org/10.3233/VES-170619>

Taube, J. S., Valerio, S., & Yoder, R. M. (2013). Is Navigation in Virtual Reality with fMRI Really Navigation? *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 25(7), 1008–1019. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00386

Ulrich, S., Grill, E., & Flanagan, V. L. (2019). Who gets lost and why: A representative cross-sectional survey on sociodemographic and vestibular determinants of wayfinding strategies. *PloS One*, 14(1), e0204781. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0204781>

Van Ombergen, A., Wuyts, F. L., Jeurissen, B., Sijbers, J., Vanhevel, F., Jillings, S., Parizel, P. M., Sunaert, S., Van de Heyning, P. H., Dousset, V., Laureys, S., & Demertzi, A. (2017). Intrinsic functional connectivity reduces after first-time exposure to short-term gravitational alterations induced by parabolic flight. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 3061. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-03170-5>

Vibert, D., & Häusler, R. (2000). Long-term evolution of subjective visual vertical after vestibular neurectomy and labyrinthectomy. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, 120(5), 620–622. <https://doi.org/10.1080/000164800750000432>

Weniger, G., Ruhleder, M., Lange, C., Wolf, S., & Irlé, E. (2011). Egocentric and allocentric memory as assessed by virtual reality in individuals with amnesic mild cognitive impairment. *Neuropsychologia*, 49(3), 518–527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.12.031>

Xie, Y., Bigelow, R. T., Frankenthaler, S. F., Studenski, S. A., Moffat, S. D., & Agrawal, Y. (2017). Vestibular Loss in Older Adults Is Associated with Impaired Spatial Navigation: Data from the Triangle Completion Task. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 8, 173. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2017.00173>

Yoder, R. M., & Taube, J. S. (2014). The vestibular contribution to the head direction signal and navigation. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2014.00032>

zu Eulenburg, P., Stoeter, P., & Dieterich, M. (2010). Voxel-based morphometry depicts central compensation after vestibular neuritis. *Annals of Neurology*, 68(2), 241–249. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.22063>



A


Starting point in the T-Maze







B

T1-T4

Probe trial





	BVP (n = 23)	UVL (n = 23)	Controls (n = 23)
Age (years)	59.3 ± 14.2	58.7 ± 11.4	58.1 ± 13.3
Females/Males	14/9	14/9	14/9
Handedness (laterality quotient, %)	22 right-handed: 85.7 ± 14.0% 1 left-handed: -58%	23 right-handed: 85.6 ± 14.6%	23 right-handed: 89.4 ± 10.2%
Highest education level (%)			
<i>Level 1</i>	21.4%	13.04%	0%
<i>Level 2</i>	0%	17.3%	8.6%
<i>Level 3</i>	7.1%	30.4%	21.7%
<i>Level 4</i>	42.8%	13.04%	30.4%
<i>Level 5</i>	28.5%	26.08%	39.1%
Employment status (%)			
<i>Employed</i>	65.2%	56.5 %	65.2%
<i>Student</i>	0%	0%	4.3%
<i>Retired</i>	34.7%	43.4%	30.4%
<i>Unemployed</i>	0%	0%	0%
Marital status (%)			
<i>Single</i>	0%	0%	13.04%
<i>Married/couple</i>	82.6%	78.2%	82.6%
<i>Divorced/widowed</i>	17.3%	17.3%	4.3%
Game experience			
<i>Keyboard expertise</i>	5	5	5
<i>3D videogames skills</i>	0	0	0
<i>2D videogames skills</i>	0	0	0
<i>Videogaming (childhood)</i>	0	0	0
<i>Videogaming (last year)</i>	0	0	0
SVV (°)	2.3 ± 1.9	Left UVL: -3.6 ± 4.6 Right UVL: 4.0 ± 6.6	1.3 ± 1.6

BVL = Bilateral vestibulopathy; UVL = Unilateral vestibular loss; SVV = Subjective visual vertical.

Table 1. Demographic data of patients with vestibular disorders and healthy participants. Mean ± SD is reported for age and SVV, median is reported for Game Experience, percentage of participants is reported for education level, employment and marital status. Education level is based on the French education system: *Level 1* (before high school), *Level 2* (accomplished high school), *Level 3* (two years after high school), *Level 4* (Bachelor's degree), *Level 5* (Master's degree, Engineering degree, PhD, MD). Game experience score was rated using a six-point Likert scale (1: *never*, 2: *sometimes*, 3: *every month*, 4: *every week*, 5: *almost every day*, 6: *every day*). Negative signs indicate counterclockwise tilt of the SVV; positive signs indicate clockwise tilt of the SVV.

	Strategy vs. No-Strategy		
	β	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p
Intercept	4.96		0.003
Age	-0.07	0.93 (0.88–0.98)	0.005
Group			
<i>BVP</i>	-1.46	0.23 (0.06–0.89)	0.033
<i>UVL</i>	-1.66	0.19 (0.05–0.73)	0.016
<i>Controls</i>	Ref	Ref	
Sex			
<i>Female</i>	0.08	1.08 (0.36–3.27)	0.89
<i>Male</i>	Ref	Ref	

Table 2. Results from the logistic regression. $R^2 = 0.22$ (Cox–Snell), 0.29 (Nagelkerke). Model fitting: $\chi^2(4) = 16.83$, $p = 0.002$.

	Egocentric strategy vs. No-Strategy			Allocentric strategy vs. No-Strategy		
	β	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p	β	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p
Intercept	1.96		0.33	7.34		0.002
Age	-0.04	0.97 (0.91–1.02)	0.23	-0.13	0.88 (0.82–0.95)	0.001
Group						
<i>BVP</i>	-0.92	0.40 (0.10–1.60)	0.20	-3.63	0.03 (0.00–0.46)	0.013
<i>UVL</i>	-2.87	0.06 (0.01–0.55)	0.013	-1.03	0.36 (0.07–1.89)	0.23
<i>Controls</i>	Ref	Ref		Ref	Ref	
Sex						
<i>Female</i>	0.48	1.62 (0.43–6.09)	0.48	-0.26	0.77 (0.17–3.59)	0.74
<i>Male</i>	Ref	Ref		Ref	Ref	

Table 3. Results from the multinomial logistic regression. $R^2 = 0.39$ (Cox–Snell), 0.45 (Nagelkerke).

Model fitting: $\chi^2(8) = 33.79$, $p < 0.0001$.