

PAPER

Neural correlates of action observation and execution in 14-month-old infants: an event-related EEG desynchronization study

Peter J. Marshall,¹ Thomas Young¹ and Andrew N. Meltzoff²

1. Department of Psychology, Temple University, USA

2. Institute for Learning and Brain Sciences, University of Washington, USA

Abstract

There is increasing interest in neurobiological methods for investigating the shared representation of action perception and production in early development. We explored the extent and regional specificity of EEG desynchronization in the infant alpha frequency range (6–9 Hz) during action observation and execution in 14-month-old infants. Desynchronization during execution was restricted to central electrode sites, while action observation was associated with a broad desynchronization across frontal, central, and parietal regions. The finding of regional specificity in the overlap between EEG responses to action execution and observation suggests that the rhythm seen in the 6–9 Hz range over central sites in infancy shares certain properties with the adult mu rhythm. The magnitude of EEG desynchronization to action perception and production appears to be smaller for infants than for adults and older children, suggesting developmental change in this measure.

Introduction

In developmental science, increasing attention is being paid to the ways in which experience with the production of motor acts may impact the perception and interpretation of similar acts performed by others (Longo & Bertenthal, 2006; Meltzoff, 2007; Meltzoff, Kuhl, Movellan & Sejnowski, 2009; Sommerville, Woodward & Needham, 2005; von Hofsten, 2007). One impetus for this attention derives from work proposing that an observed action activates the same motor processes or motor schemas in the human observer's brain that would be activated if the action was performed or planned by the observer (e.g. Hari & Kujala, 2009; Jeannerod, 2001; Prinz, 1997). Speculations about the developmental origins of this shared neural activity have tended to occur in the absence of empirical evidence from infancy (Del Giudice, Manera & Keyzers, 2009; Lepage & Théoret, 2007). However, recent studies have suggested that a neural 'mirroring' system is present in some form in infants and may provide predictive or anticipatory information about others' actions (Southgate, Johnson, El Karoui & Csibra, 2010; Southgate, Johnson, Osborne & Csibra, 2009).

One useful technique for exploring the neural correlates of action perception and production is electroencephalography (EEG) which has high temporal precision and has a history of successful use in the study of infant

social and cognitive development (Marshall & Fox, 2008). A candidate EEG measure is the desynchronization of the mu rhythm, which is typically recorded from central electrode sites overlying sensorimotor cortex. In adults, the mu rhythm occurs in the alpha frequency range (8–13 Hz) but is considered to have distinct properties from other alpha-range rhythms such as the classical posterior alpha rhythm (Pineda, 2005). The mu rhythm in human adults is desynchronized during both action execution (Gastaut, Dongier & Courtois, 1954; Kuhlman, 1978; Pfurtscheller, 2003; Pfurtscheller & Neuper, 1997) and during action observation (Arroyo, Lesser, Gordon, Uematsu, Jackson & Webber, 1993; Muthukumaraswamy & Johnson, 2004; Muthukumaraswamy, Johnson & McNair, 2004; Perry & Bentin, 2009; Pineda, Allison & Vankov, 2000).

While the sensitivity of the mu rhythm to action observation and execution has been reported in older children (Lepage & Théoret, 2006), there is current interest in uncovering a possible infant analog of the adult mu rhythm. In a longitudinal study, Marshall, Bar-Haim and Fox (2002) noted the emergence of an alpha-range rhythm at central electrode sites during periods of attention in infants, with the relative power of this rhythm being particularly strong in the second year of life in the frequency range of 6–9 Hz. This central rhythm in infants was found to be minimally reactive to

Address for correspondence: Andrew N. Meltzoff, Institute for Learning and Brain Sciences, University of Washington, Box 357920, Seattle, Washington, WA 98195, USA; e-mail: meltzoff@u.washington.edu

1 changes in illumination or eye opening/closing (Stroganova, Orekhova & Posikera, 1999), suggesting, as in
2 adults, a functional dissociation from more posterior
3 alpha rhythms.

4 However, in order to make links between the infant
5 central rhythm and the literature on the adult mu
6 rhythm, two further requirements need to be met. First,
7 the reactivity of the infant rhythm needs to be established
8 for action execution and also action observation condi-
9 tions. Second, given that infant EEG rhythms may not
10 map neatly onto adult rhythms in terms of their scalp
11 distributions and functional properties (Stroganova &
12 Orekhova, 2007), it is important to include a consider-
13 ation of the scalp topography of infant EEG responses. If
14 the infant rhythm at central sites is similar to the adult
15 mu rhythm, it would be expected to show a circum-
16 scribed desynchronization during voluntary actions that
17 is specific to sensorimotor (i.e. central) regions, which is
18 the pattern seen in adults (Pfurtscheller & Lopes da
19 Silva, 1999). The infant rhythm should also be desyn-
20 chronized over the same region during action observa-
21 tion, although in line with studies of adults,
22 desynchronization of alpha-range power during action
23 observation might be expected to be more widespread
24 across the scalp than during action execution (Babiloni,
25 Babiloni, Carducci, Cincotti, Coccozza, Del Percio,
26 Moretti & Rossini, 2002).

27 Initial exploratory studies of infant neural ‘mirroring’
28 activity reported EEG responses to action observation,
29 but did not include the crucial action execution condition
30 (Nyström, 2008; van Elk, van Schie, Hunnius, Vesper &
31 Bekkering, 2008). More recently, two studies of 9-month-
32 olds by Southgate and colleagues included both action
33 observation and execution conditions. Southgate *et al.*
34 (2009) noted a desynchronization of the ‘sensorimotor
35 alpha’ rhythm during infants’ own reaching movements
36 and a small but significant desynchronization while
37 infants observed reaching and grasping (see also
38 Southgate *et al.*, 2010). The examination of both action
39 observation and execution conditions in these studies
40 represents a considerable advance. However, the question
41 of the regional properties of EEG desynchronization to
42 action observation and execution – and the overlap
43 between the two – remains unaddressed, because the
44 reported statistical results were limited to one cluster of
45 electrodes over the central and parietal region.

46 In the current study, we analyze EEG from 14-month-
47 old infants during the observation and execution of a
48 goal-directed act (a button press). We selected this age
49 and task based on both theoretical and empirical con-
50 siderations arising from the extant literature and pilot
51 work. First, the longitudinal data of Marshall *et al.*
52 (2002) showed that the relative power of the central
53 rhythm in infancy was particularly strong at 14 months
54 of age compared with both earlier (9 months) and later
55 (24 months) age points. Second, pilot work in our labo-
56 ratory showed that infants at this age were particularly
57 attentive when viewing a button press action and that

their own topographically similar act could be reliably
elicited over a large number of trials by using an inter-
active test paradigm. The combination of these factors
suggested that studying 14-month-olds would allow a
confluence of infants’ directed attention, their readiness
to reproduce a specific goal-directed act, and psycho-
physiological measurement that could provide an ideal
context for elucidating neural correlates of action per-
ception–production overlaps.

We aimed to extend and advance prior work in three
ways. First, in order to make firmer links to the literature
on the mu rhythm in older children and adults, we wished
to include a consideration of the scalp topography of
alpha-range infant EEG responses by presenting analyses
from a range of electrodes across the scalp. Second, the
magnitudes of EEG desynchronization to action obser-
vation and execution reported for 9-month-olds by
Southgate *et al.* (2009) appears to be small compared to the
much stronger effects found for older children (Lepage &
Théoret, 2006) and adults (Muthukumaraswamy *et al.*,
2004). We were partly interested in whether older infants
(14-month-olds) would show stronger desynchronization
responses, a finding which could provide useful informa-
tion on development. Finally, we wished to use a new goal-
directed task (involving a button press action) to examine
the generalizability of the infant mu rhythm response to
intentional actions other than grasping.

Methods

Participants

Families with 14-month-old infants were recruited from a
diverse urban environment using commercially available
mailing lists. Infants were not recruited if they were born
preterm, if both their parents were left-handed, if an
infant had experienced chronic developmental problems,
or if the infant was on long-term medication. Fifty-eight
infants participated in the study ($M = 62$ weeks, $SD =$
1.3; 26 male, 29 female). The final sample for the EEG
analysis comprised 38 infants. The remaining 20 infants
either became excessively fussy during attempts to place
the EEG cap ($n = 7$), or their EEG signal did not provide
enough artifact-free epochs for meaningful analysis to be
carried out (less than three trials per condition; $n = 13$).
This data loss rate is fairly typical of EEG work with
infants (see DeBoer, Scott & Nelson, 2007; Southgate
et al., 2009).

Stimuli and trial structure

The protocol involved the use of five custom-made but-
ton boxes. Each box was decorated in a unique color
scheme and had a recessed button which produced a
unique 2-second electronic melody when pressed. During
the protocol, the infant (who wore an EEG cap – see
below) sat at a table on his or her caregiver’s lap,

opposite an experimenter. Prior to beginning the sequence of trials, the experimenter showed the infant one of the button boxes and then demonstrated the button press to the infant.

Each trial consisted of four parts: An action execution epoch, an action observation epoch, and two baseline epochs. At the start of each trial, the experimenter brought out one of the button boxes from behind a screen and placed it on the table with the button facing the infant. In the action observation epoch, the infant observed the experimenter reaching for the button box with her right hand and producing a button press. In the action execution epoch, the infant was presented with the button box so that he or she could imitate the button press. When presented with the button box, infants almost always reached for the box and pressed the button (> 95% of trials), as is consistent with the literature on infant imitation at this age (Meltzoff, 1988).

For each infant, the first trial always began with an action observation epoch in which the infant saw the experimenter push the button. For subsequent trials, we alternated whether the action observation or action execution epoch came first within the trial. Within each trial, the execution and observation epochs were each preceded by a visual baseline period consisting of the experimenter presenting a flashcard with an abstract pattern for approximately 3 s. After each observation or execution epoch, the button box was placed back behind the screen and then brought out again. The experiment continued for as long as the infant continued to tolerate the EEG cap and remained interested. For the infants included in the EEG analyses, the mean number of trials accomplished was 16 ($SD = 8$).

Timing synchronization of behavioral and EEG records

The experimental procedure was videotaped, with a vertical interval time code (VITC) signal being placed on the video signal during recording. Calibration procedures had ensured that the VITC time code on the video signal was synchronized with EEG collection, such that the video signal was aligned with the EEG data to the precision of one NTSC video frame (33 ms). This allowed the accurate isolation of the baseline epochs and the epochs in which either the experimenter or the infant was reaching for the button box, as well as the precise time point at which the experimenter or infant pressed the button. In the sample of infants used in the EEG analyses, the mean durations of the epochs of interest were as follows: 3.39 s ($SD = 1.11$) for the observation baseline, 3.46 s ($SD = 1.15$) for the execution baseline, 5.00 s ($SD = 1.7$) for the action execution condition and 2.59 s ($SD = .33$) for the action observation condition.

While our EEG artifacting procedure resulted in the exclusion of baseline and observation epochs containing gross motor movement (see below), these epochs were also coded from video for more subtle infant movements, with a focus on identifying epochs in which infants car-

ried out arm and hand movements that resembled a reaching, pointing, or button-pressing action. Epochs which contained such movements were flagged and were not included in the subsequent EEG analyses.

EEG collection and processing

Using a lycra stretch cap (Electro-Cap International, Inc.), EEG was collected from a range of sites across the scalp: Fp1, Fp2, F3, F4, Fz, F7, F8, C3, C4, T7, T8, P3, P4, Pz, P7, P8, O1, O2 as well as the left and right mastoids. The EEG signal was amplified by optically isolated, high input impedance (>1 G Ω) custom bioamplifiers (SA Instrumentation) and was digitized onto the hard drive of a Pentium IV PC using a 16-bit A/D converter (± 5 V input range). Scalp electrode impedances were usually under 25 kilohms. Bioamplifier gain was 4000 and the hardware filter (12 db/octave rolloff) settings were .1 Hz (high-pass) and 100 Hz (low-pass). The signal was collected referenced to the vertex (Cz) with an AFz ground, and all EEG data were re-referenced offline to an average mastoids reference prior to further analysis. In order to clear the EEG data of ocular and muscle artifact, a procedure involving independent component analysis (ICA) was used which was an automation of the method described by Jung, Makeig, Humphries, Lee, McKeown, Iragui and Sejnowski (2000). Following this procedure, any epochs in which the EEG signal for any channel exceeded ± 250 μ V were excluded from further analysis.

Event-related changes in band power between the baselines and the observation or execution epochs were computed using established methods for computing event-related desynchronization (ERD; Pfurtscheller, 2003). In line with work on alpha-range EEG frequency bands in infants of this age (Marshall *et al.*, 2002), the primary frequency band of interest was taken to be 6–9 Hz. For the computation of ERD scores, the following sequence was used: (a) Bandpass filtering of the EEG signals between 6 and 9 Hz; (b) Squaring of the filtered signals to convert to a power metric; (c) Computation of event-related averages for each condition within each participant; (d) Computation of the mean power of the event-related signal in 125 ms epochs.

Desynchronization values were computed for each 125 ms epoch as $([A - R]/R)*100$, where A is band power during action observation or execution, and R is band power during the corresponding baseline reference condition (Pfurtscheller & Lopes da Silva, 1999). Negative ERD scores reflect desynchronization (i.e. a decrease in band power relative to the baseline), while positive values reflect synchronization (i.e. an increase in band power relative to the baseline). The computation of ERD scores was time-locked to the achievement of the goal-directed act (i.e. the point at which the infant or adult pressed the button), with the dependent variable in the analyses being mean ERD over a fixed 1000 ms time interval extending 500 ms before and after the button press.

1 Results


2 Action execution

3 Mean ERD scores using an average of seven artifact-free
4 execution trials per participant (range: 3–15 trials) were
5 computed for central (sites C3/Cz/C4), frontal
6 (F3/Fz/F4/F7/F8), parietal (P3/Pz/P4/P7/P8), and
7 occipital (O1/O2) regions. Nine of the 38 participants
8 had extreme ERD values (more than 1.5 times the
9 interquartile range from the median) at one or more
10 regions and were excluded from subsequent analyses.

11 An initial repeated-measures ANOVA showed a sig-
12 nificant main effect of region, $F(3, 84) = 3.20, p < .05$,
13 after Greenhouse-Geisser Correction (see Figure 1).
14 Follow-up contrasts showed more desynchronization
15 over the central region ($M = -12.40, SD = 25.3$) than over
16 the frontal ($M = 3.9, SD = 41.7, p < .01$), parietal ($M =$
17 $.03, SD = 45.1, p = .07$) and occipital ($M = 8.8, SD =$
18 $52.1, p < .05$) regions. Further planned t -tests indicated
19 that the ERD score for the central region was signifi-
20 cantly different from zero, $t(28) = -2.64, p < .05$, whereas
21 mean ERD scores for the other three regions did not
22 differ from zero. Supplementary analyses showed no
23 significant hemispheric asymmetry in ERD at central
24 sites and no effect of the hand infants predominantly
25 used (left, right, both) to press the button.

28 Action observation

29 Mean ERD scores using an average of 12 artifact-free
30 observation trials per participant (range 3–27) were
31 computed for central (C3/Cz/C4), frontal (sites F3/Fz/
32 F4/F7/F8), parietal (P3/Pz/P4/P7/P8), and occipital
33 (O1/O2) regions. Eleven of the 38 participants had
34 extreme ERD values (more than 1.5 times the inter-
35 quartile range from the median) for one or more regions
36 and were excluded from subsequent analyses.



37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 **Figure 1** Action execution: Mean event-related desynchro-
56 nization (ERD, in %) scores by region (frontal, central,
57 parietal, occipital). Error bars show ± 1 standard error. Significant
58 differences from zero are indicated.




Figure 2 Action observation: Mean event-related desynchro-
nization (ERD, in %) scores by region (frontal, central, parietal,
occipital). Error bars show ± 1 standard error. Significant
differences from zero are indicated.

quartile range from the median) for one or more regions
and were excluded from subsequent analyses.

An initial repeated-measures ANOVA showed no sig-
nificant main effect of region, $F(3, 75) = 1.24, p = .30$ (see
Figure 2). Planned t -tests indicated that mean ERD
scores were significantly different from zero for frontal
($M = -20.1, SD = 33.9, t(25) = -3.03, p < .01$), central
($M = -13.7, SD = 26.1, t(25) = -2.67, p < .05$) and
parietal ($M = -11.2, SD = 25.9, t(25) = -2.21, p < .05$)
regions, but not for the occipital region ($M = -9.8,$
 $SD = 36.7, p = .18$). Supplementary analyses showed no
significant hemispheric asymmetries in ERD over any
region.

Discussion

We tested for EEG desynchronization when infants
observed an experimenter carry out a goal-directed act
(a button press) and when they executed the same action.
We were particularly interested in the reactivity of the
infant EEG rhythm occurring at 6–9 Hz over central
electrode sites (Marshall *et al.*, 2002) to the action
observation and execution conditions relative to baseline
epochs in which infants viewed an abstract visual pat-
tern. The digitized EEG signal was synchronized with the
behavioral record enabling precise time-locking of our
EEG analyses to the button press in both the action
execution and observation conditions. This allowed us to
carry out an infant adaptation of studies in older chil-
dren (Lepage & Théoret, 2006) and adults (Bernier,
Dawson, Webb & Murias, 2007; Muthukumaraswamy &
Johnson, 2004) in which EEG analyses were locked to
the temporal culmination of an object-directed act.

As noted earlier, there are two requirements that
investigations of the mu rhythm as an index of
infant ‘mirroring’ activity should strive to meet:
(a) EEG reactivity to both action execution and action

1 observation needs to be documented, and (b) the regional overlap of desynchronization to action execution and action observation should be examined. The current study simultaneously addressed both of these considerations.

2 Consistent with the findings of Southgate *et al.* (2009), we observed significant event-related desynchronization at central sites during epochs in which infants executed a goal-directed act, and found a similar desynchronization at central sites during observation of the same act. Unlike prior studies of infancy, we also extended our analyses to a wide range of other scalp regions and found that although the reduction in band power during action observation went beyond central sites to frontal and parietal regions, the desynchronization during action execution was specific to central sites. The specificity of desynchronization to central sites during action execution is consistent with studies of adults (Pfurtscheller & Lopes da Silva, 1999) and may reflect the focused nature of the hand and finger movements involved in our button press task. The finding of a more diffuse desynchronization during action observation is also consistent with EEG studies of adults, which have generally found a relatively widespread reduction of alpha-range power during action observation (e.g. Babiloni *et al.*, 2002; Calmels, Holmes, Jarry, Hars, Lopez, Paillard & Stam, 2006; Marshall, Bouquet, Shipley & Young, 2009; Orgs, Dombrowski, Heil & Jansen-Osmann, 2008). We found that the central region was the only scalp region that showed a common desynchronization to both action execution and observation, which is again congruent with work on the adult mu rhythm (Muthukumaraswamy & Johnson, 2004).

34 The current findings provide firmer support for the tentative suggestion that the infant central rhythm at 6–9 Hz is distinct from alpha-range rhythmic activity in other scalp regions (Stroganova *et al.*, 1999), and they further advance the argument that the infant rhythm shares functional properties with the adult mu rhythm. This represents progress in the study of the EEG correlates of action perception–production links in infants. It has long been known that infant EEG rhythms differ from adult rhythms in terms of their frequency ranges, but infant rhythms may also not map neatly onto adult rhythms in terms of their scalp distribution or functional properties (Stroganova & Orekhova, 2007). For instance, Orekhova, Stroganova, Posikera and Elam (2006) suggested that a more anterior central sulcus in infants versus adults could create a more frontal scalp distribution of the mu rhythm in infants. Our findings suggest that despite such potential issues, the infant EEG rhythm at 6–9 Hz over central sites may be a functional analog of the adult mu rhythm over the same scalp region. Our findings also fit well with the assumptions about the properties of the central rhythm in other studies of action perception–production links in infants (Southgate *et al.*, 2009, 2010). However, it should be noted that given the lack of spatial specificity of EEG, documenting overlaps in desynchro-

nization between observation and execution conditions, in this study and others, does not necessarily indicate the activation of the same neural systems. Infant work using other imaging technologies with finer spatial properties, particularly infant magnetoencephalography (MEG), may be useful in addressing this issue for goal-directed actions, as it is doing for the representation of speech in infants (Imada, Zhang, Cheour, Taulu, Ahonen & Kuhl, 2006).

The current findings immediately raise developmental questions. One concerns differences in the magnitude of band power desynchronization seen across prior EEG studies of action execution and observation. In a study of children aged between 4 and 11 years of age, Lepage and Théoret (2006) report that the mean extent of desynchronization of mu power at central sites during execution of a hand grasp relative to a baseline epoch was around 60%, which is similar to that reported for adults (Muthukumaraswamy *et al.*, 2004). In the current study with 14-month-old infants, we observed a smaller decrease in power (around 12%) during action execution, relative to a baseline in which the infants looked at an abstract visual pattern. In the study of Southgate and colleagues (2009) with 9-month-old infants, the extent of desynchronization during reaching execution compared with a baseline epoch just prior to reaching appears to be broadly similar to our study (around 10%). There are also developmental differences between studies in the extent of EEG desynchronization during action observation. Lepage and Théoret (2006) observed a desynchronization of around 25% during action observation relative to baseline, which is again consistent with adult work (Muthukumaraswamy & Johnson, 2004). In the current study we found a smaller decrease (around 14%) in band power at central sites while 14-month-olds observed the adult's action. In the study of 9-month-olds by Southgate *et al.* (2009), the extent of desynchronization during action observation appears to be smaller still (around 5%).

Of course, the studies differ in a number of procedural and methodological aspects which may impede direct comparisons of findings. Further work is needed in this area to disentangle the effects of age and different types of actions on mu desynchronization. However, the increase in reactivity to action execution and action observation seen across the extant studies may represent a developmental increase in the reactivity of the mu rhythm. If this change in reactivity represents a developmental increase in activity of a neural system subserving action perception–production maps, it would be of considerable theoretical interest.

There has been a good deal of recent debate about the nature, scope, and involvement of a so-called mirror neuron system (MNS) in action interpretation (e.g. Hickok, 2009), with recent theoretical proposals arguing against a simple resonance account (e.g. Csibra, 2007). Instead, it has been suggested that a neural mirroring system may provide anticipatory or predictive

1 information as part of a wider system for action inter-
 2 pretation, with this function being present in infancy
 3 (Southgate *et al.*, 2009, 2010). The flexibility of the imi-
 4 tative capabilities demonstrated by infants certainly
 5 suggests that neural linkages between action perception
 6 and production go beyond simple resonance mechanisms
 7 (e.g. Meltzoff, 1995, 2007).

8 Further advances may come from experiments
 9 designed to adapt neuroscience techniques to a broader
 10 set of ages and questions. Are there skeletal linkages
 11 between perception and production at birth that can be
 12 measured not only behaviorally (Meltzoff & Moore,
 13 1997) but also neurally? How might such perception–
 14 production links be engendered or altered by experience?
 15 Is development principally driven by self-generated
 16 intermodal experience, for example, watching oneself
 17 produce hand movements and goal-directed reaches? Or
 18 does contingent responding by external social agents
 19 play a role, for example, seeing a caretaker mirror one's
 20 own acts in reciprocal imitation games? It will be equally
 21 informative to explore the impact of unimodal experi-
 22 ence: There may be important consequences of simply
 23 observing systematic acts of others or even producing
 24 motor acts oneself in the absence of observation
 25 (including prenatal motor experience, Meltzoff & Moore,
 26 1997). By combining neuroscientific and behavioral
 27 studies with a developmental perspective we will deepen
 28 our understanding of the representation of action, and
 29 the degree to which perception and production draw on
 30 shared psychological and neural resources.

33 Acknowledgments

34
 35 This work was supported by NSF grants BCS-0642404
 36 (PJM) and SBE-0354453 (ANM), and NIH grant HD-
 37 22514 (ANM). The views expressed in this article do not
 38 necessarily reflect those of NSF or NIH. We thank Sarah
 39 Sanders, Christina Sartor, and Amanda Thomas for
 40 assistance with data collection.

43 References

44
 45 Arroyo, S., Lesser, R.P., Gordon, B., Uematsu, S., Jackson, D.,
 46 & Webber, R. (1993). Functional significance of the mu
 47 rhythm of human cortex: an electrophysiologic study with
 48 subdural electrodes. *Electroencephalography and Clinical
 49 Neurophysiology*, **87**, 76–87.
 50 Babiloni, C., Babiloni, F., Carducci, F., Cincotti, F., Coccozza,
 51 G., Del Percio, C., Moretti, D.V., & Rossini, P.M. (2002).
 52 Human cortical electroencephalography (EEG) rhythms
 53 during the observation of simple aimless movements: a high-
 54 resolution EEG study. *Neuroimage*, **17**, 559–572.
 55 Bernier, R., Dawson, G., Webb, S., & Murias, M. (2007).
 56 EEG mu rhythm and imitation impairments in individuals
 57 with autism spectrum disorder. *Brain and Cognition*, **64**,
 58 228–237.

Calmels, C., Holmes, P., Jarry, G., Hars, M., Lopez, E., Pail-
 lard, A., & Stam, C.J. (2006). Variability of EEG synchro-
 nization prior to and during observation and execution of a
 sequential finger movement. *Human Brain Mapping*, **27**, 251–
 266.
 Csibra, G. (2007). Action mirroring and action interpretation:
 an alternative account. In P. Haggard, Y. Rosetti & M.
 Kawato (Eds.), *Sensorimotor foundations of higher cognition:
 Attention and performance XXII* (pp. 427–451). Oxford:
 Oxford University Press.
 DeBoer, T., Scott, L.S., & Nelson, C.A. (2007). Methods for
 acquiring and analyzing infant event-related potentials. In M.
 de Haan (Ed.), *Infant EEG and event-related potentials*. (pp.
 5–37). New York: Psychology Press.
 Del Giudice, M., Manera, V., & Keyser, C. (2009). Pro-
 grammed to learn? The ontogeny of mirror neurons *Devel-
 opmental Science*, **12**, 350–363.
 Gastaut, H., Dongier, M., & Courtois, G. (1954). On the sig-
 nificance of 'wicket rhythms' in psychosomatic medicine.
Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology, **6**, 687.
 Hari, R., & Kujala, M.V. (2009). Brain basis of human social
 interaction: from concepts to brain imaging. *Physiological
 Reviews*, **89**, 453–479.
 Hickok, G. (2009). Eight problems for the mirror neuron theory
 of action understanding in monkeys and humans. *Journal of
 Cognitive Neuroscience*, **21**, 1229–1243.
 Imada, T., Zhang, Y., Cheour, M., Taulu, S., Ahonen, A., &
 Kuhl, P.K. (2006). Infant speech perception activates Broca's
 area: a developmental magnetoencephalography study. *Neu-
 roReport*, **17**, 957–962.
 Jeannerod, M. (2001). Neural simulation of action: a unifying
 mechanism for motor cognition. *NeuroImage*, **14**, S103–S109.
 Jung, T.P., Makeig, S., Humphries, C., Lee, T.W., McKeown,
 M.J., Iragui, V., & Sejnowski, T.J. (2000). Removing elec-
 troencephalographic artifacts by blind source separation.
Psychophysiology, **37**, 163–178.
 Kuhlman, W.N. (1978). Functional topography of the human
 mu rhythm. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophys-
 iology*, **44**, 83–93.
 Lepage, J.-F., & Théoret, H. (2006). EEG evidence for the
 presence of an action observation-execution matching system
 in children. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, **23**, 2505–2510.
 Lepage, J.-F., & Théoret, H. (2007). The mirror neuron system:
 grasping others' actions from birth? *Developmental Science*,
10, 513–523.
 Longo, M.R., & Bertenthal, B.I. (2006). Common coding of
 observation and execution of action in 9-month-old infants.
Infancy, **10**, 43–59.
 Marshall, P.J., Bar-Haim, Y., & Fox, N.A. (2002). Develop-
 ment of the EEG from 5 months to 4 years of age. *Clinical
 Neurophysiology*, **113**, 1199–1208.
 Marshall, P.J., Bouquet, C.A., Shipley, T.F., & Young, T.
 (2009). Effects of brief imitative experience on EEG desyn-
 chronization during action observation. *Neuropsychologia*,
47, 2100–2106.
 Marshall, P.J., & Fox, N.A. (2008). Electrophysiological mea-
 sures in affective developmental research. In L.A. Schmidt &
 S.J. Segalowitz (Eds.), *Developmental psychophysiology* (pp.
 127–149). New York: Cambridge University Press.
 Meltzoff, A.N. (1988). Infant imitation after a 1-week delay:
 long-term memory for novel acts and multiple stimuli.
Developmental Psychology, **24**, 470–476.

- 1 Meltzoff, A.N. (1995). Understanding the intentions of others:
2 re-enactment of intended acts by 18-month-old children.
3 *Developmental Psychology*, **31**, 838–850.
- 4 Meltzoff, A.N. (2007). ‘Like me’: a foundation for social cog-
5 nition. *Developmental Science*, **10**, 126–134.
- 6 Meltzoff, A.N., Kuhl, P.K., Movellan, J., & Sejnowski, T.J.
7 (2009). Foundations for a new science of learning. *Science*,
8 **325**, 284–288.
- 9 Meltzoff, A.N., & Moore, M.K. (1997). Explaining facial
10 imitation: a theoretical model. *Early Development and Par-
11 enting*, **6**, 179–192.
- 12 Muthukumaraswamy, S.D., & Johnson, B.W. (2004). Changes
13 in rolandic mu rhythm during observation of a precision grip.
14 *Psychophysiology*, **41**, 152–156.
- 15 Muthukumaraswamy, S.D., Johnson, B.W., & McNair, N.A.
16 (2004). Mu rhythm modulation during observation of an
17 object-directed grasp. *Brain Research: Cognitive Brain Re-
18 search*, **19**, 195–201.
- 19 Nyström, P. (2008). The infant mirror neuron system studied
20 with high density EEG. *Social Neuroscience*, **3**, 334–347.
- 21 Orekhova, E.V., Stroganova, T.A., Posikera, I.N., & Elam, M.
22 (2006). EEG theta rhythm in infants and preschool children.
23 *Clinical Neurophysiology*, **117**, 1047–1062.
- 24 Orgs, G., Dombrowski, J.H., Heil, M., & Jansen-Osmann, P.
25 (2008). Expertise in dance modulates alpha/beta event-
26 related desynchronization during action observation. *Euro-
27 pean Journal of Neuroscience*, **27**, 3380–3384.
- 28 Perry, A., & Bentin, S. (2009). Mirror activity in the human
29 brain while observing hand movements: a comparison
30 between EEG desynchronization in the mu-range and
31 previous fMRI results. *Brain Research*, **1282**, 126–132.
- 32 Pfurtscheller, G. (2003). Induced oscillations in the alpha band:
33 functional meaning. *Epilepsia*, **44** (Suppl 12), 2–8.
- 34 Pfurtscheller, G., & Lopes da Silva, F.H. (1999). Event-related
35 EEG/MEG synchronization and desynchronization: basic
36 principles. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, **110**, 1842–1857.
- 37 Pfurtscheller, G., & Neuper, C. (1997). Motor imagery acti-
38 vates primary sensorimotor area in humans. *Neuroscience
39 Letters*, **239**, 65–68.
- 40 Pineda, J.A. (2005). The functional significance of mu rhythms:
41 translating ‘seeing’ and ‘hearing’ into ‘doing’. *Brain Research
42 Reviews*, **50**, 57–68.
- 43 Pineda, J.A., Allison, B.Z., & Vankov, A. (2000). The effects of
44 self-movement, observation and imagination on mu rhythms
45 and readiness potentials. *IEEE Transactions on Rehabilitation
46 Engineering*, **8**, 219–222.
- 47 Prinz, W. (1997). Perception and action planning. *European
48 Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, **9**, 129–154.
- 49 Sommerville, J.A., Woodward, A.L., & Needham, A. (2005).
50 Action experience alters 3-month-old infants’ perception of
51 others’ actions. *Cognition*, **96**, B1–B11.
- 52 Southgate, V., Johnson, M.H., El Karoui, I., & Csibra, G.
53 (2010). Motor system activation reveals infants’ on-line pre-
54 diction of others’ goals. *Psychological Science*, **21**, 355–359.
- 55 Southgate, V., Johnson, M.H., Osborne, T., & Csibra, G.
56 (2009). Predictive motor activation during action observation
57 in human infants. *Biology Letters*, **5**, 769–772.
- 58 Stroganova, T.A., & Orekhova, E.V. (2007). EEG and infant
states. In M. de Haan (Ed.), *Infant EEG and event-related
potentials* (pp. 251–287). New York: Psychology Press.
- Stroganova, T.A., Orekhova, E.V., & Posikera, I.N. (1999).
EEG alpha rhythm in infants. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, **110**,
997–1012.
- van Elk, M., van Schie, H.T., Hunnius, S., Vesper, C., &
Bekkering, H. (2008). You’ll never crawl alone: neurophysi-
ological evidence for experience-dependent motor resonance
in infancy. *NeuroImage*, **43**, 808–814.
- von Hofsten, C. (2007). Action in development. *Developmental
Science*, **10**, 54–60.

Received: 11 January 2010

Accepted: 22 May 2010

MARKED PROOF

Please correct and return this set

Please use the proof correction marks shown below for all alterations and corrections. If you wish to return your proof by fax you should ensure that all amendments are written clearly in dark ink and are made well within the page margins.

<i>Instruction to printer</i>	<i>Textual mark</i>	<i>Marginal mark</i>
Leave unchanged	... under matter to remain	Ⓟ
Insert in text the matter indicated in the margin	∧	New matter followed by ∧ or ∧ [Ⓢ]
Delete	/ through single character, rule or underline or ┌───┐ through all characters to be deleted	Ⓞ or Ⓞ [Ⓢ]
Substitute character or substitute part of one or more word(s)	/ through letter or ┌───┐ through characters	new character / or new characters /
Change to italics	— under matter to be changed	↙
Change to capitals	≡ under matter to be changed	≡
Change to small capitals	≡ under matter to be changed	≡
Change to bold type	~ under matter to be changed	~
Change to bold italic	≈ under matter to be changed	≈
Change to lower case	Encircle matter to be changed	≡
Change italic to upright type	(As above)	⊕
Change bold to non-bold type	(As above)	⊖
Insert 'superior' character	/ through character or ∧ where required	Υ or Υ under character e.g. Υ or Υ
Insert 'inferior' character	(As above)	∧ over character e.g. ∧
Insert full stop	(As above)	⊙
Insert comma	(As above)	,
Insert single quotation marks	(As above)	Ƴ or ƴ and/or ƶ or Ʒ
Insert double quotation marks	(As above)	ƶ or Ʒ and/or Ʒ or ƶ
Insert hyphen	(As above)	⊥
Start new paragraph	┌	┌
No new paragraph	┐	┐
Transpose	└┐	└┐
Close up	linking ○ characters	Ⓞ
Insert or substitute space between characters or words	/ through character or ∧ where required	Υ
Reduce space between characters or words		↑