

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Pupil dilation reveals the intensity of touch

Antonia F. Ten Brink  | Iris Heiner | H. Chris Dijkerman | Christoph Strauch 

Experimental Psychology, Helmholtz Institute, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

Correspondence

Christoph Strauch, Experimental Psychology, Helmholtz Institute, Utrecht University, Heidelberglaan 1, 3584CS Utrecht, the Netherlands.
Email: c.strauch@uu.nl

Abstract

Touch is important for many aspects of our daily activities. One of the most important tactile characteristics is its perceived intensity. However, quantifying the intensity of perceived tactile stimulation is not always possible using overt responses. Here, we show that pupil responses can objectively index the intensity of tactile stimulation in the absence of overt participant responses. In Experiment 1 ($n = 32$), we stimulated three reportedly differentially sensitive body locations (finger, forearm, and calf) with a single tap of a tactor while tracking pupil responses. Tactile stimulation resulted in greater pupil dilation than a baseline without stimulation. Furthermore, pupils dilated more for the more sensitive location (finger) than for the less sensitive location (forearm and calf). In Experiment 2 ($n = 20$) we extended these findings by manipulating the intensity of the stimulation with three different intensities, here a short vibration, always at the little finger. Again, pupils dilated more when being stimulated at higher intensities as compared to lower intensities. In summary, pupils dilated more for more sensitive parts of the body at constant stimulation intensity and for more intense stimulation at constant location. Taken together, the results show that the intensity of perceived tactile stimulation can be objectively measured with pupil responses – and that such responses are a versatile marker for touch research. Our findings may pave the way for previously impossible objective tests of tactile sensitivity, for example in minimally conscious state patients.

KEYWORDS

pupil size, pupillometry, somatosensory perception, tactile stimulation, touch

1 | INTRODUCTION

Touch perception is central to many aspects of our daily lives. We use it to detect a mosquito on our arm, to comfort a friend, or to control the amount of pressure we apply when grasping an object. Our perception of touch has many different characteristics, and its intensity is

one of them. Perceived touch intensity is influenced by a number of factors. It depends on stimulus characteristics, such as the amount of pressure applied to the skin, but also on non-stimulus characteristics, such as the sensitivity of the part of the body being touched (Weinstein, 1968). The ability to perceive touch and differences in perceived touch intensity is typically assessed

Antonia F. Ten Brink and Iris Heiner contributed equally to this work.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2024 The Authors. *Psychophysiology* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of Society for Psychophysiological Research.

using psychophysical methods involving overt motor or verbal responses (e.g. Fritz & Zimmermann, 2023; Kusnir et al., 2023). While this has many advantages, it does not allow for the assessment of more implicit representations and prevents the testing of touch perception in situations where overt verbal and motor responses are not possible.

Changes in pupil size are a promising candidate for providing an objective psychophysiological index. The eye's pupil does not only respond to changes in low-level vision but also reflects attentional processing (see Strauch et al., 2022 for a review). Pupil dilation is shown to capture any modulations in mental effort/alerting/intensity of attention, no matter the content or origin (Bumke, 1911; Strauch et al., 2022; van der Wel & van Steenbergen, 2018). More specifically, pupil size is arguably the most sensitive psychophysiological indicator of the mental effort involved in any given physical or cognitive process. These effort-evoked pupil dilations are considered to primarily result from parasympathetic inhibition (see Braunstein, 1894; Bumke, 1911; Hartgraves & Kronfeld, 1931; Steinhauer et al., 2004). Pupil size likely captures effort due to the close link between pupil size and activity in the noradrenergic locus coeruleus in the brainstem (Alnaes et al., 2014; Aston-Jones & Cohen, 2005; Joshi et al., 2016; Lloyd et al., 2023; Murphy et al., 2014; Strauch et al., 2022). The locus coeruleus has widespread projections throughout the brain and is thought to be involved in the coordination and communication of neural populations, including flexibly switching between circuits and synchronizing activity (Dahl et al., 2022; Poe et al., 2020; Wainstein et al., 2022). Likely, locus coeruleus activity is needed for any higher-level cognition, including tactile perception and appraisal. Via this indirect route, pupil size should reflect any changes in tactile processing intensity. As more intense tactile perception should go hand in hand with more intense processing thereof, we predicted that pupils would dilate in response to tactile stimulation and that the more intense the stimulation is perceived the more dilation would occur.

The effects of pain on pupil size were described already more than a century ago (Bumke, 1911) and have been reported in a variety of populations (Drummond & Clark, 2023; Ji et al., 2022; Macchini et al., 2022; Sillevs et al., 2021; Yilmaz, 2022). Only a few modern-day studies have directly investigated the effects of *non-painful tactile stimulation* on pupil size, mostly in animals (Gusso et al., 2021). The studies in humans have shown that pupils dilate in response to tactile stimulation, with some indications that the magnitude of this dilation is modulated by whether the stimulus is consciously perceived (Gusso et al., 2022), the stroke speed (van Hooijdonk et al., 2019),

the frequency of vibrotactile stimulation (Mückschel et al., 2020), and the type of the material that participants actively touched (Bertheaux et al., 2020). While these findings suggest that pupil size changes scale with stimulus intensity, previous studies suffer from serious methodological limitations, such as the non-automated delivery of tactile stimulation (Bertheaux et al., 2020; van Hooijdonk et al., 2019). These shortcomings make it impossible to draw substantive conclusions, for example about the temporal course of tactile processing. However, if pupil size as a passive indicator can indeed serve as a reliable indicator of tactile perception, this would allow for the objective investigation of a variety of questions: For example, how intensely is tactile stimulation processed with differing degrees of attention paid to a particular part of the body, or as a function of conscious perception (Gusso et al., 2022)? How strong is the processing of tactile stimulation as a function of stimulation intensity and frequency, receptor density, or skin and receptor type in healthy subjects and in pathology? Does pupil size show residual processing of tactile stimulation intensity in patients with somatosensory impairments after brain lesions?

In two experiments, for which the overarching hypotheses were pre-registered, we investigated whether and how well changes in pupil size can indicate the objective intensity of tactile processing – and thus the basis for how intensely tactile stimulation is perceived. In Experiment 1, we measured pupil size in response to stimulation by a tapper on body parts that differ in tactile sensitivity (Weinstein, 1968) in addition to a non-stimulation baseline. We expected more dilation with stimulation than without stimulation and a greater increase in pupil size for subjectively more sensitive body parts than for less sensitive body parts. In Experiment 2, we stimulated only the little finger, but at different vibration intensities and against a non-stimulation baseline. Again, we expected more dilation with stimulation than without stimulation and more pronounced effects with more intense stimulation than with less intense stimulation. Finally, we expected differences in pupil size to reflect differences in subjective tactile sensitivity as assessed by von Frey filaments (Experiment 1) and differences in tactile discrimination performance (Experiment 2).

2 | EXPERIMENT 1

2.1 | Materials and methods

The research and consent procedures were conducted in accordance with the standards of the Declaration of Helsinki and were approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences of Utrecht

University (protocol number 23-0229). Overarching hypotheses were preregistered via the Open Science Framework: <https://osf.io/rb3gh/>. Participants were recruited between March and May 2023. As the effects were of unknown size, no power estimation could be performed.

2.1.1 | Participants

Inclusion criteria were corrected-to-normal vision and no reported history of psychiatric or neurological illness. A convenience sample of 32 healthy participants ($M_{\text{Age}} = 23.56$ years, $SD_{\text{Age}} = 2.78$ years; all but 3 right-handed; 7 male/24 female/1 non-binary) was assessed. None of the participants reported impaired or irregular tactile sensation. Participants were compensated with money or in course credits. All participants provided written informed consent.

2.1.2 | Procedure

Prior to participation, participants were instructed to shave their forearm and calf to prevent hair movement that could interfere with any tactile stimulation. Participants provided details of their age, sex, and handedness. We assessed pupil responses to tactile stimulation at each of three body locations: the tip of the right little finger, the right forearm, and the right calf. In addition, we assessed subjective tactile sensitivity for the same three body locations using Von Frey filaments. The order of the pupilometry assessment and the subjective tactile sensitivity assessment was counterbalanced between participants.

2.1.3 | Apparatus and stimuli

Visual stimuli (i.e., fixation cross) were presented on an Asus ROG PG278Q monitor (99 Hz, 2560 × 1440 px, 67.5 cm distance from eye position) in a light- and sound-attenuated room. A chin and forehead rest was used. Psychopy version 2021.2.3 (Peirce et al., 2019) was used to conduct the experiment. Participants' left eyes were tracked using a video-based Eyelink 1000 tracker (SR research; 1000 Hz). A nine-point calibration and validation of the eye tracker was performed at the beginning of each block.

Tactile stimulation was delivered using custom-made tappers. A tapper consisted of a cord with a copper coil at the end, in which a small magnet and a pin were embedded. Binary input from the PC could reverse the magnetic field, pushing out the magnet and pin. When applied to

the skin, this produced a single brief, non-painful tactile stimulation.

As auditory stimulation causes pupil dilation (Strauch et al., 2020), we ensured that participants could not hear the tapper. Participants had to wear earplugs and noise-canceling headphones (Sony WH-1000x M3) playing brown noise (throughout the study, apart from while testing subjective sensitivity using Von Frey filaments). The volume was set to the highest level that the participant found comfortable. To check whether the sound of the tappers was sufficiently masked, a sound detection task was performed. Participants were presented with a gray screen for 1 s, during which a tapper could be fired. Participants then had to indicate whether or not they had heard a tapper by pressing a key, with written instructions presented on the screen after each trial. A tapper would fire in 20 out of 30 trials, in random order. Most participants ($n = 28$) could not discriminate between tapper-present and tapper-absent trials ($d' = 0$), three showed reversed sensitivity ($d' = -0.67$, $d' = -1.04$, $d' = -0.15$), and one participant showed sensitivity ($d' = 0.44$).

Adhesive tape was then used to secure the tappers to the tip of the little finger, forearm (positioned in a downward orientation), and calf, ensuring that they were hidden from view (Figure 1a). A foam ring was placed at the base of the little finger to prevent contact with the adjacent ring finger. A fourth tapper was placed on a cushion, to be used in a control condition. The experiment consisted of four blocks, one for each of the three body locations and a control block, which were counterbalanced using a Latin square design. To ensure that the tactile stimulation was similar across locations, the same tapper was always used for the given stimulus location within a block and thus the tapper was swapped between blocks. Each block consisted of 25 trials for the given stimulus location. In addition, in every sixth trial, a randomly selected different tapper was fired, to avoid habituation or expectation effects. These trials were not included in the analysis.

The trial sequence is shown in Figure 1b. Throughout the trial, participants had to look at a central fixation cross (white, gray background). Trials started with a variable baseline period of 0.5 to 2.5 s, which was set to 1.5 to 2.5 s after the first 14 participants to ensure a stable baseline pupil measurement. Tactile stimulation was then applied, and the pupil response was recorded for a further 1.5 s. Trials were considered invalid if participants blinked or looked >3 visual degrees from the center for >200 ms. The participant received feedback via a red (invalid) or gray (valid) cross of 0.5 s. After feedback, an intertrial interval of 1.5 s occurred. Invalid trials were repeated at the end of each block. If blinks or gaze deviations from the center




FIGURE 1 (a) Schematic representation of the experimental set-up for the tactile stimulation task. Participants were seated at a desk with their head resting on a chin rest. Tappers were attached to the right little finger, arm, and leg. (b) Trial sequence. Participants had to fixate on a central cross. After fixation, the trial started with a baseline period of 0.5 to 2.5 s, followed by tactile stimulation and a post-stimulus period of 1.5 s. If the participant looked more than 3 visual degrees outside of the center for more than 200 ms during the measurement period, the trial was invalid. Participants received feedback via a red or gray cross for 0.5 s. The feedback was followed by an intertrial interval of 1.5 s. Invalid trials were repeated at the end of each block.

occurred during the baseline, the baseline timer was simply reset to zero and no feedback was given.

2.1.4 | Subjective tactile sensitivity

For each of the three body locations, i.e., the tip of the little finger, the forearm, and the calf, subjective tactile sensitivity was assessed using Von Frey synthetic monofilaments (North Coast Medical; model: Touch Test) with a force ranging from 0.008 g to 300 g, starting at 2.0 g (Keizer et al., 2012; Weinstein, 1968). Participants were blindfolded and instructed to report whether they felt a stimulus at a given location. The experimenter applied tactile stimulation according to a forced-choice one up/one down staircase procedure (resulting in 5 subthreshold and 5 suprathreshold reversals), pseudo-randomly intermixed with sham trials in which no stimulation was applied. The tactile sensitivity threshold was calculated as the geometric mean of all reversal points, ranging from 0.008 g (high sensitivity) to 300 g (low sensitivity).

2.1.5 | Statistical analyses

Pupil size data were subtractively baseline corrected using the average of the last 50 ms of the baseline period and downsampled to 100 Hz. Negative values indicate pupil constriction and positive values indicate pupil dilation.

To minimize the effects of slower frequency trends/drifts in pupil size, the first derivative of pupil size was calculated, indicating the velocity of pupil size changes. Note that the first derivative contains broadly

similar information compared to relative pupil size changes (Strauch et al., 2021). The pupil size derivative data were filtered using a low-pass Butterworth filter, with a critical frequency of 18 Hz and an order of 3 to remove high-frequency noise.

All statistical tests were two-tailed with an alpha of 0.05 to determine statistical significance. Non-parametric tests were used for non-normally distributed data. Holm-Bonferroni corrections were used for post hoc pairwise comparisons for discretized/single-value measures (latencies, amplitudes, and Von Frey sensitivities). Functional tests were corrected with the upper limit of the frequency response of the pupil, 3 Hz (based on Naber et al., 2013). For 1.5 s, this results in 4.5 possible independent responses which is why we corrected α with factor five. The corrected alpha therefore corresponded to $\alpha=0.01$. We reported the findings in relation to both the uncorrected and corrected alpha. Interpretations were based on the corrected alpha only.

A linear mixed effects model (LME) was used to examine differences in pupil responses after tactile stimulation of the different body parts and the control condition. The best model was determined by using the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), with pupil size derivative as the dependent variable, using random intercepts for each participant. Stimulation site was used as an independent variable (i.e., control condition, little finger, forearm, and calf). The trial number within a block and the block number were additionally included to control for possible habituation effects. It is recommended to fit random slopes for predictor variables unless this leads to non-convergence of the model. As this was the case for several time points, we followed Barr (2013) and only fitted random intercepts.

Next, we tested whether potential differences in the pupil size derivative could be explained by differences in the response latency. The time to the maximum pupil size derivative between the three stimulation sites was compared using Friedman's ANOVA.

To assess whether the three body locations differed in terms of tactile sensitivity, the Von Frey tactile sensitivity threshold was compared between body locations using Friedman's ANOVA.

2.2 | Results

Figure 2a shows the pupil size as compared to baseline over time, and Figure 2b shows the pupil size derivatives

(see Figure S1 for plots per individual participant; and Figure S2 for plots with maximum derivative per individual participant). First, we found that tactile stimulation at each of the three body locations resulted in larger pupil size derivatives as compared to those in the control condition (see Figure S3 for statistical comparisons), demonstrating that the pupil responds to tactile stimulation.

In particular, the pupil showed a faster change in the amount of increase after stimulation of the little finger versus forearm, little finger versus calf, and forearm versus calf. In Figure 2c, the results of the linear mixed effects model are plotted, showing the t -values for comparisons between stimulus locations over time (see Figure S4 for the main effects of block number and trial number within




FIGURE 2 (a) Baseline-corrected pupil response over time after tactile stimulation, expressed in arbitrary units (a.u.), plotted per stimulation site. Positive values indicate pupil dilation and negative values indicate pupil constriction. Error bands indicate one standard error above and below the mean of all trials. (b) Pupil response derivative traces over time averaged per stimulation site. Positive values indicate the change in the amount of pupil size increase, negative values indicate the change in the amount of pupil size decrease compared to the previous time point. Error bands indicate one standard error above and below the mean of all trials. (c) Linear mixed effects model for pupil response comparing t -values between stimulus locations over time. Each line represents the t -values of the comparisons between stimulus locations on pupil response after tactile stimulation over time, with an additive effect of block number and trial number within a block and random intercepts for each participant. The gray dotted line represents $t = \pm 1.96$, corresponding to $p = .05$ and the black dotted line represents $t = \pm 2.58$, $p = .01$. (d) Time to maximum pupil response averaged per participant and split between stimulation sites.

block). Both uncorrected α (0.05) and corrected α (0.01) are given as horizontal dashed lines. Note that even with $\alpha = 0.001$ would leave the principal conclusions unaltered here. The results remained conceptually unchanged when simple functional t -tests were performed on the mean traces per condition and participant instead of LMEs (Figure S5). Thus, tactile stimulation to the presumably more sensitive body locations resulted in stronger pupil responses as compared to the less sensitive body locations.

The time to the maximum pupil response (Figure 2d) differed between the three stimulation sites, $\chi^2(1596) = 7.76$, $p = .021$. The maximum pupil response derivative was later for the calf than for the little finger ($W = 139,053$, $p = .037$, $r = -.10$), which was a small effect. There were no differences in the time to maximum derivative between the calf and the forearm ($W = 145,287$, $p = .200$, $r = -.06$) and between the forearm and the little finger ($W = 151,355$, $p = .564$, $r = -.02$).

Tactile sensitivity thresholds as assessed with the Von Frey filaments (see Figure S6 for the thresholds per location) differed between the three body locations, $\chi^2(62) = 44.43$, $p < .001$. Lower subjective tactile sensitivity thresholds were observed for the little finger versus forearm ($W = 1$, $p < .001$, $r = -.86$), little finger versus calf ($W = 1$, $p < .001$, $r = -.87$), and forearm versus calf ($W = 65$, $p < .001$, $r = -.66$), all with large effect sizes.

2.3 | Interim discussion

As hypothesized, tactile stimulation elicited pupil dilation responses that could not be attributed to visual or auditory input. In particular, we observed more pronounced pupil dilation following tactile stimulation of body locations with a presumed higher tactile sensitivity. Specifically, stronger responses were observed for the little finger versus calf, the little finger versus forearm, and the forearm versus calf. A slower pupil response to tactile stimulation of the calf compared to the finger could partly contribute to the differences in pupil response strength between these body locations. However, no differences were found in the latency of the pupil response between the forearm and the finger. The presumed difference in subjective tactile sensitivity between the finger, the arm, and the calf was replicated using a tactile detection paradigm with Von Frey filaments and showed superior tactile detection abilities for the little finger versus calf, the little finger versus forearm, and the forearm versus calf, consistent with existing work (Weinstein, 1968). In conclusion, our results show that tactile stimulation applied to different parts of the body elicits pupil responses of varying magnitude, probably due to differences in tactile sensitivity. In Experiment 2, we investigated whether pupil

responses following tactile stimulation at a single body location would scale with stimulus intensity, expecting stronger pupil responses with more intense stimulation as shown in less controlled previous work (van Hooijdonk et al., 2019).

3 | EXPERIMENT 2

Methods and statistical analyses were as in Experiment 1, unless otherwise stated.

3.1 | Materials and methods

The research and consent procedures were approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences of Utrecht University (protocol number 23-1738). Participants were recruited between June and July 2023. No power estimation was performed.

3.1.1 | Participants

A convenience sample of 20 healthy participants ($M_{\text{Age}} = 24.55$ years, $SD_{\text{Age}} = 2.87$ years; all but one right-handed; 6 male/14 female) were included, of whom one of the authors (IH).

3.1.2 | Procedure

We assessed pupil responses to tactile stimulation of three different intensities (i.e., low, medium, and high) applied to the tip of the right little finger. We then assessed participants' ability to discriminate between the different stimulation intensities.

3.1.3 | Apparatus and stimuli

Tactile stimulation was delivered using a tactor (Dancer Design), a miniature electromagnetic solenoid-type stimulator. The tactor provided vibrotactile stimulation at 40 Hz. Four different levels of stimulation intensity were provided: 0%, 20%, 50%, and 100%. Stimulus intensity was treated as an ordinal variable (i.e., 20%: low intensity, 50%: medium intensity, 100%: high intensity) because no information on absolute intensities was available. The intensity of the vibrotactile stimuli is exponentially related to the perceived intensity of the vibrotactile stimuli (Stevens, 1959), so we chose for larger percentage differences between medium and high

intensities than between low and medium intensities. Participants had to wear earplugs throughout the study to ensure that they did not hear the sound produced by the tactor. As the tactors produced almost no sound, neither a sound detection control task nor additional headphones were considered necessary.

Adhesive tape was used to attach the tactor to the tip of the right little finger, which was hidden from view. A foam ring was placed at the base of the little finger to prevent it from touching the adjacent ring finger.

The experiment consisted of 50 trials per stimulus intensity (i.e., none, low, medium, and high), resulting in 200 trials in total. Stimulus intensities were randomized within clusters of 20 trials, to ensure a balanced presentation. The trial sequence was similar to that in Experiment 1, except that the tactile stimulation lasted for 80 ms and the pupil response was recorded for 1.58 s after stimulus onset.

3.1.4 | Tactile discrimination

We assessed whether participants could discriminate between the different stimulus intensities. In each trial, vibrotactile stimuli of two different stimulus intensities were presented to the right fingertip for 80 ms each, separated by a 1 s pause. Participants then had to indicate whether they perceived the first or second vibration to be stronger by pressing either “1” or “2” on a keyboard, and how confident they were in this choice by providing a certainty score on a scale ranging from 0 (not at all sure) to 100 (completely sure), by providing a mouse click. There were five trials per unique stimulus pair and order, resulting in a total of 30 randomly presented trials.

3.1.5 | Statistical analyses

The four stimulus intensities (i.e., none, low, medium, and high) were included as predictors of pupil size in a linear mixed-effects model. The trial number was also included to control for possible habituation effects.

As in Experiment 1, the time to the maximum pupil size derivative was compared between the four stimulus intensities.

To assess whether participants could discriminate the different stimulus intensities within each pair, we tested whether the number of correct responses was above the chance level (i.e., 5 out of 10 correct responses) using parametric one-sample *t*-tests or non-parametric Wilcoxon signed-rank tests. Next, we compared the performance (i.e., number of correct responses) and participants'

confidence in their responses between the three pairs of stimulus intensities using a non-parametric Friedman's ANOVA and post hoc Wilcoxon signed-rank tests. One participant had no data available on the discrimination task and was excluded from these analyses.

3.2 | RESULTS

Figure 3a shows the changes in pupil size relative to baseline over time, and Figure 3b shows the pupil size derivatives (see Figure S7 for plots per individual participant, and Figure S8 for the plots with maximum derivative per individual participant). First, we found that tactile stimulation at each of the three stimulation intensities resulted in larger pupil size derivatives as compared to the no-stimulation condition (see Figure S9 for the statistical comparisons), replicating the stimulation effect reported in Experiment 1.

We found faster increases in pupil size following high- versus low-intensity tactile stimulation, and medium versus low-intensity tactile stimulation. No difference was found between high and medium-intensity stimulation. In Figure 3c, the results of the linear mixed effects model are plotted, showing the *t*-values for comparisons between stimulus intensities over time. Both uncorrected α (0.05) and corrected α (0.01) are given as horizontal dashed lines. Note that even with $\alpha = 0.001$ would leave the principal conclusions unaltered here. The results remained conceptually unchanged when simple functional *t*-tests were performed on the mean traces per condition and participant (Figure S10). Thus, tactile stimulation at higher stimulus intensities resulted in larger pupil responses as compared to lower stimulus intensities.

The time to maximum pupil response (Figure 3d) did not differ between the three stimulus intensities, $\chi^2(1998) = 0.58$, $p = .748$, indicating that differences in pupil response after tactile stimulation were not driven by differences in pupil response latency.

Participants performed above chance level in the forced-choice task discriminating between the three stimulus intensities (low vs. medium: $W = 0$, $p < .001$, $r = .51$; low vs. high: $W = 1$, $p < .001$, $r = .92$; medium vs. high: $t(18) = 5.22$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.92$; see Figure S11a for performance per stimulus intensity pair). Performance differed between the three stimulus intensity pairs, $\chi^2(38) = 26.63$, $p < .001$. Participants performed worse in discriminating the medium vs. high intensities as compared to the low vs. high intensities ($W = 0$, $p = .002$, $r = -.82$), and as compared to the low vs. medium intensities ($W = 0$, $p = .001$, $r = -.85$), both with large effect sizes. No differences were found between the low vs. medium intensities as compared to the low vs. high intensities




FIGURE 3 (a) Baseline-corrected pupil response over time after tactile stimulation, expressed in arbitrary units (a.u.), plotted per stimulation intensity. Positive values indicate pupil dilation and negative values indicate pupil constriction. Error bands indicate one standard error above and below the mean of all trials. (b) Pupil response derivative traces over time averaged per stimulation intensity. Positive values indicate the change in the amount of pupil size increase, and negative values the change in the amount of pupil size decrease compared to the previous time point. Error bands indicate one standard error above and below the mean of all trials. (c) Linear mixed effects model for pupil response comparing t -values between stimulation intensities over time. Each line represents the t -values of the comparisons between stimulation intensities on pupil response after tactile stimulation over time, with an additive effect of trial number and random intercepts for each participant. The gray dotted line represents $t = |1.96|$, corresponding to $p = .05$ and the black dotted line represents $t = |2.58|$, $p = .01$. (d) Time to maximum pupil response averaged per participant and split between stimulation intensities.

($W = 6$, $p = .655$, $r = -.10$). Thus, participants were better able to discriminate the low intensity from the medium and high intensities; whereas the medium and high intensities were perceived as being more similar.

Participants differed in the certainty of their responses in the stimulus intensity discrimination task, $\chi^2(38) = 25.62$, $p < .001$ (see Figure S11b for the certainty scores per stimulus intensity pair). Participants were less confident discriminating the medium vs. high intensities as compared to the low vs. high intensities ($W = 5$, $p < .001$, $r = .83$), and as compared to the low vs. medium intensities ($W = 1$, $p < .001$, $r = .87$), both with large effect sizes. There were no differences between the low and medium intensities as compared to the low and high intensities ($W = 44$, $p = .124$, $r = .38$). Thus, the

certainty scores were consistent with the accuracy in discriminating the different stimulus intensities.

4 | DISCUSSION

Previous studies of the perceived intensity of tactile stimuli have relied on overt motor or verbal responses. However, an objective measure of perceived tactile intensity without the need for overt responses has so far been lacking. Such an index is useful when overt responses are not possible or metacognitive insights are possibly affecting measures. Here, we set out to systematically test pupil size change as an objective measure of perceived intensity

of tactile stimulation. We found greater pupil dilation following stimulation of constant intensity on more sensitive parts of the body (Experiment 1) and following higher stimulation intensity on the finger (Experiment 2). This highlights the usefulness of pupillometry as a means of studying tactile perception.

4.1 | Present findings and theoretical contributions

In the current study, pupils responded more strongly to tactile stimulation of more sensitive parts of the body. Specifically, stronger pupil responses were observed after stimulation of the little finger versus calf, the little finger versus forearm, and the forearm versus calf. Secondly, pupils responded more strongly to more intense vibratory stimulation on the finger as compared to less intense vibratory stimulation. In both experiments, the enhanced response was reflected in a greater increase in pupil size already within 0.5 s of stimulation, providing the basis for short measurement times and therefore minimal effort on the part of the participant (to maintain fixation). Our results align with previous findings from less systematic and less controlled studies, in which greater pupil dilations were observed in response to more intense thermal stimulation (Drummond & Clark, 2023; Eisenach et al., 2017) and faster stroke velocity (van Hooijdonk et al., 2019).

The greater increase in pupil size in response to stimulation of more sensitive body parts or more intense stimulation is likely due to more intense cognitive processing associated with greater noradrenaline release (Alnaes et al., 2014; Aston-Jones & Cohen, 2005; Joshi et al., 2016; Murphy et al., 2014; Strauch et al., 2022), which has been interpreted to subserve the communication between neural populations (Dahl et al., 2022; Wainstein et al., 2022).

Unlike overt responses, pupil size signals the processing intensity in response to tactile stimulation without needing metacognition or being affected by the need to press a key or report on a rating scale. On the other hand, pupil dilation will likely also reflect appraisal processes, in an implicit manner. Although we showed that pupil size change is sensitive to tactile stimulation, it is not necessarily *specific* to the processing of touch, as all changes in cognitive processing intensity go in hand with pupil size changes (Strauch et al., 2022).

4.2 | A roadmap to solve outstanding questions and challenges

Using more standardized pupillometric setups, such as the one introduced in this study, opens up exciting

possibilities. Pupil responses to touch can be used to investigate at which level tactile stimulation is processed. For instance, if tactile stimuli elicit a pupil response without explicit conscious perception, it implies that the stimulus is only implicitly processed, a dissociation that resembles a condition termed numbsense (Gallace & Spence, 2008; Rossetti et al., 1995). To gain further insight into the patterns of pupil response for consciously and unconsciously perceived stimuli, measuring pupil responses after tactile stimulation on numbed skin using local anesthesia could be employed. While it has been shown that pupil responses scale with the intensity of nociceptive stimuli (Chapman et al., 1999; Sabourdin et al., 2018; Wildemeersch et al., 2018) and with the concentration of administered analgesia (Aissou et al., 2012; Larson et al., 1997), there is a gap in understanding pupil response after non-noxious tactile stimulation on a body location under local anesthesia. Alternatively, paradigms could be used in which the stimuli are presented at the threshold of detection (Gusso et al., 2022) or in which attention to the stimulated location is manipulated. The resulting findings could contribute to a better understanding of (subtypes of) tactile hypo- and hypersensitivity in pathologies such as chronic pain (fibromyalgia, complex regional pain syndrome) and autism spectrum disorder, and neuropsychological disorders such as tactile neglect and extinction following brain damage. Potentially, characteristics of the pupil response following tactile stimulation may be used to index the level of (residual) processing of touch, and consequently predict recovery or outcomes of rehabilitation therapy.

The differences observed in pupil responses across the three stimulated body locations in our study were in line with the known patterns of subjective tactile sensitivity (Weinstein, 1968). The pupillometric index could be used to expand these findings and create a “pupil-based homunculus” – where pupil responses serve as a detailed map, mirroring the processing intensity of tactile sensation in the brain. This could potentially lead to novel insights into the underlying neural mechanisms of differences in tactile sensitivity of different body parts. Whilst our results show clear evidence of stronger pupil dilation to stimulation to more subjectively sensitive body parts and stronger stimulation, at this point, we cannot elucidate which mechanical receptor types drove these effects the strongest. However, the systematic variation of stimulation frequency at constant amplitude might allow us to narrow down this question, as different types of mechanoreceptors have different frequency ranges to which they are most sensitive (Delhaye et al., 2018). For instance, Meissner’s Corpuscles reportedly respond strongest to stimulation in the band of 10 to 50 Hz (Piccinin et al., 2022), whilst Pacinian Corpuscles should respond

stronger to stimulation at much higher frequencies such as 250 Hz (Talbot et al., 1968). A straightforward prediction is therefore that matching stimulation intensities trigger certain receptor types specifically. Comparing pupil responses to these different frequencies at constant amplitude could therefore allow us to make inferences about relative receptor distributions/proportions.

4.3 | Limitations and future work

While the current method effectively shows the predicted differences between conditions at a group level, substantial individual variability poses a challenge. To enhance the method for both research and clinical use, it is crucial to optimize the signal-to-noise ratio and obtain a measure that ideally encompasses a low number of trials and is still reliable. Random sequences of trials (as in Experiment 2), optimal stimulation intensities that can be clearly distinguished by participants (i.e., by determining thresholds between stimulation intensities with psychophysical methods upfront), and optimized interstimulus interval lengths that capture the entire pupillary response to the stimulus and limit carry-over effects between trials, might be ways to improve the signal-to-noise ratio further. We further recommend using tappers for which the stimulation intensity can be changed (as in Experiment 2).

5 | CONCLUSION

We set out to test pupillometry as an objective indicator of touch processing without the need for overt responses. In the first experiment, we showed that the pupil responded differently following tactile stimulation at the finger, arm, and calf. More specifically, the pupil responded more strongly following stimulation of more sensitive body locations. In a second experiment, we found that the pupil responded more strongly to vibrotactile stimulation of higher intensities applied at the finger. Altogether, these findings show that pupil responses have the potential to be used as an objective index of tactile sensitivity that is not dependent on verbal responses.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Antonia F. Ten Brink: Conceptualization; data curation; formal analysis; investigation; methodology; project administration; supervision; visualization; writing – original draft; writing – review and editing. **Iris Heiner:** Conceptualization; data curation; formal analysis; investigation; methodology; project administration; software; visualization; writing – original draft; writing – review and editing. **H. Chris Dijkerman:** Conceptualization;

investigation; methodology; writing – review and editing.

Christoph Strauch: Conceptualization; data curation; formal analysis; investigation; methodology; project administration; software; supervision; visualization; writing – original draft; writing – review and editing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank all participants for their time.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

None.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All raw data, materials, and analysis scripts can be retrieved via the Open Science Framework: <https://osf.io/rb3gh/>.

Python 3.9 scripts were used to process eye-tracking data and statistics (using the statsmodels, scipy.stats, pingouin, and researchpy packages). Data pre-processing for the sound detection task and the subjective tactile sensitivity task was performed in Excel (version 2208).

ORCID

Antonia F. Ten Brink  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7634-0819>

Christoph Strauch  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6380-8635>

REFERENCES

- Aissou, M., Snauwaert, A., Dupuis, C., Atchabahian, A., Aubrun, F., & Beaussier, M. (2012). Objective assessment of the immediate postoperative analgesia using pupillary reflex measurement. *Anesthesiology*, 116(5), 1006–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0b013e318251d1fb>
- Alnaes, D., Sneve, M. H., Espeseth, T., Endestad, T., van de Pavert, S. H. P., & Laeng, B. (2014). Pupil size signals mental effort deployed during multiple object tracking and predicts brain activity in the dorsal attention network and the locus coeruleus. *Journal of Vision*, 14(4), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1167/14.4.1>
- Aston-Jones, G., & Cohen, J. D. (2005). An integrative theory of locus coeruleus-norepinephrine function: Adaptive gain and optimal performance. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 28(1), 403–450. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.28.061604.135709>
- Barr, D. J. (2013). Random effects structure for testing interactions in linear mixed-effects models. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4(June), 3–4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00328>
- Bertheaux, C., Toscano, R., Fortunier, R., Roux, J.-C., Charier, D., & Borg, C. (2020). Emotion measurements through the touch of materials surfaces. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 13(January), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2019.00455>
- Braunstein, E. P. (1894). In J. Bergmann (Ed.), *Zur lehre von der innervation der pupillenbewegung*. Wiesbaden.
- Bumke, O. (1911). *Die Pupillenstörungen bei Geistes- und Nervenkrankheiten: Physiologie und Pathologie der Irisbewegungen*. Verlag von Gustav Fischer.

- Chapman, C. R., Oka, S., Bradshaw, D. H., Jacobson, R. C., & Donaldson, G. W. (1999). Phasic pupil dilation response to noxious stimulation in normal volunteers: Relationship to brain evoked potentials and pain report. *Psychophysiology*, *36*(1), 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048577299970373>
- Dahl, M. J., Mather, M., & Werkle-Bergner, M. (2022). Noradrenergic modulation of rhythmic neural activity shapes selective attention. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *26*(1), 38–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.10.009>
- Delhaye, B. P., Long, K. H., & Bensmaia, S. J. (2018). Neural basis of touch and proprioception in primate cortex. *Comprehensive Physiology*, *8*(4), 1575–1602. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cphy.c170033>
- Drummond, P. D., & Clark, K. J. R. (2023). The sensory and affective components of pain differentially shape pupillary dilatation during cold pressor tests. *Autonomic Neuroscience*, *246*(March), 103084. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autneu.2023.103084>
- Eisenach, J. C., Curry, R., Aschenbrenner, C. A., Coghill, R. C., & Houle, T. T. (2017). Pupil responses and pain ratings to heat stimuli: Reliability and effects of expectations and a conditioning pain stimulus. *Journal of neuroscience methods*, *279*, 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2017.01.005>
- Fritz, C., & Zimmermann, E. (2023). Temporal adaptation of sensory attenuation for self-touch. *Experimental Brain Research*, *241*(9), 2333–2344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-023-06688-5>
- Gallace, A., & Spence, C. (2008). The cognitive and neural correlates of “tactile consciousness”: A multisensory perspective. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *17*(1), 370–407. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2007.01.005>
- Gusso, M. M., Christison-Lagay, K. L., Zuckerman, D., Chandrasekaran, G., Kronemer, S. I., Ding, J. Z., Freedman, N. C., Nohama, P., & Blumenfeld, H. (2022). More than a feeling: Scalp EEG and eye signals in conscious tactile perception. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *105*(March), 103411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2022.103411>
- Gusso, M. M., Serur, G., & Nohama, P. (2021). Pupil reactions to tactile stimulation: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *15*(February), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2021.610841>
- Hartgraves, H., & Kronfeld, P. C. (1931). The synergistic action of atropine and epinephrine on the intrinsic muscles of the eye. *Archives of Ophthalmology*, *5*(2), 212–218. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archophth.1931.00820020062005>
- Ji, S., Cho, S., Jang, Y., Kim, E., Lee, J., Kim, J., & Kim, H. (2022). Pupil response to painful stimuli during inhalation anaesthesia without opioids in children. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*, *66*(7), 803–810. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aas.14071>
- Joshi, S., Li, Y., Kalwani, R. M., & Gold, J. I. (2016). Relationships between pupil diameter and neuronal activity in the locus coeruleus, colliculi, and cingulate cortex. *Neuron*, *89*(1), 221–234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.11.028>
- Keizer, A., Smeets, M. A. M., Dijkerman, H. C., van Elburg, A., & Postma, A. (2012). Aberrant somatosensory perception in anorexia nervosa. *Psychiatry Research*, *200*(2–3), 530–537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2012.05.001>
- Kusnir, F., Pesin, S., & Landau, A. N. (2023). Hello from the other side: Robust contralateral interference in tactile detection. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, *0123456789*, 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-023-02801-6>
- Larson, M. D., Kurz, A., Sessler, D. I., Dechert, M., Bjorksten, A. R., & Tayefeh, F. (1997). Alfentanil blocks reflex pupillary dilation in response to noxious stimulation but does not diminish the light reflex. *Anesthesiology*, *87*(4), 849–855. <https://doi.org/10.1097/0000542-199710000-00019>
- Lloyd, B., de Voogd, L. D., Mäki-Marttunen, V., & Nieuwenhuis, S. (2023). Pupil size reflects activation of subcortical ascending arousal system nuclei during rest. *eLife*, *12*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.84822>
- Macchini, E., Bertelli, A., Bogossian, E. G., Annoni, F., Minini, A., Quispe Cornejo, A., Creteur, J., Donadello, K., Taccone, F. S., & Peluso, L. (2022). Pain pupillary index to prognosticate unfavorable outcome in comatose cardiac arrest patients. *Resuscitation*, *176*(April), 125–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2022.04.026>
- Mückschel, M., Ziemssen, T., & Beste, C. (2020). Properties of lower level processing modulate the actions of the norepinephrine system during response inhibition. *Biological Psychology*, *152*(June 2019), 107862. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2020.107862>
- Murphy, P. R., O’Connell, R. G., O’Sullivan, M., Robertson, I. H., & Balsters, J. H. (2014). Pupil diameter covaries with BOLD activity in human locus coeruleus. *Human Brain Mapping*, *35*(8), 4140–4154. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22466>
- Naber, M., Alvarez, G. A., & Nakayama, K. (2013). Tracking the allocation of attention using human pupillary oscillations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *4*(DEC), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00919>
- Peirce, J., Gray, J. R., Simpson, S., MacAskill, M., Höchenberger, R., Sogo, H., Kastman, E., & Lindeløv, J. K. (2019). PsychoPy2: Experiments in behavior made easy. *Behavior Research Methods*, *51*(1), 195–203. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-01193-y>
- Piccinin, M. A., Miao, J. H., & Schwartz, J. (2022). *Histology*. StatPearls Publishing.
- Poe, G. R., Foote, S., Eschenko, O., Johansen, J. P., Bouret, S., Aston-Jones, G., Harley, C. W., Manahan-Vaughan, D., Weinschenker, D., Valentino, R., Berridge, C., Chandler, D. J., Waterhouse, B., & Sara, S. J. (2020). Locus coeruleus: A new look at the blue spot. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *21*(11), 644–659. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-020-0360-9>
- Rossetti, Y., Rode, G., & Boisson, D. (1995). Implicit processing of somesthetic information. *Neuroreport*, *6*(3), 506–510. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001756-199502000-00025>
- Sabourdin, N., Giral, T., Wolk, R., Louvet, N., & Constant, I. (2018). Pupillary reflex dilation in response to incremental nociceptive stimuli in patients receiving intravenous ketamine. *Journal of Clinical Monitoring and Computing*, *32*(5), 921–928. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10877-017-0072-5>
- Sillevis, R., Trincado, G., & Shamus, E. (2021). The immediate effect of a single session of pain neuroscience education on pain and the autonomic nervous system in subjects with persistent pain, a pilot study. *PeerJ*, *9*, e11543. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.11543>
- Steinhauer, S. R., Siegle, G. J., Condray, R., & Pless, M. (2004). Sympathetic and parasympathetic innervation of pupillary dilation during sustained processing. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *52*(1), 77–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2003.12.005>
- Stevens, S. S. (1959). Tactile vibration: Dynamics of sensory intensity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *57*(4), 210–218. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0042828>
- Strauch, C., Hirzle, T., Van der Stigchel, S., & Bulling, A. (2021). Decoding binary decisions under differential target probabilities

- from pupil dilation: A random forest approach. *Journal of Vision*, 21(7), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1167/jov.21.7.6>
- Strauch, C., Koniakowsky, I., & Huckauf, A. (2020). Decision making and oddball effects on pupil size: Evidence for a sequential process. *Journal of Cognition*, 3(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.5334/joc.96>
- Strauch, C., Wang, C.-A., Einhäuser, W., Van der Stigchel, S., & Naber, M. (2022). Pupillometry as an integrated readout of distinct attentional networks. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 45(8), 635–647. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2022.05.003>
- Talbot, W. H., Darian-Smith, I., Kornhuber, H. H., & Mountcastle, V. B. (1968). The sense of flutter-vibration: Comparison of the human capacity with response patterns of mechanoreceptive afferents from the monkey hand. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 31(2), 301–334. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.1968.31.2.301>
- van der Wel, P., & van Steenbergen, H. (2018). Pupil dilation as an index of effort in cognitive control tasks: A review. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 25(6), 2005–2015. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-018-1432-y>
- van Hooijdonk, R., Mathot, S., Schat, E., Spencer, H., van der Stigchel, S., & Dijkerman, H. C. (2019). Touch-induced pupil size reflects stimulus intensity, not subjective pleasantness. *Experimental Brain Research*, 237(1), 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-018-5404-2>
- Wainstein, G., Müller, E. J., Taylor, N., Munn, B., & Shine, J. M. (2022). The role of the locus coeruleus in shaping adaptive cortical melodies. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 26(6), 527–538. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2022.03.006>
- Weinstein, S. (1968). Intensive and extensive aspects of tactile sensitivity as a function of body part, sex, and laterality. In D. Kenshalo (Ed.), *The skin senses* (pp. 195–222). Charles C. Thomas.
- Wildemeersch, D., Peeters, N., Saldien, V., Vercauteren, M., & Hans, G. (2018). Pain assessment by pupil dilation reflex in response to noxious stimulation in anaesthetized adults. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*, 62(8), 1050–1056. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aas.13129>
- Yilmaz, R. (2022). Evaluation of pupil diameter for pain assessment in interventional headache management. *Ağrı*, 35(1), 22–27. <https://doi.org/10.14744/agri.2022.37880>

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

Figure S1. Pupil response derivative traces over time in Experiment 1. Each subplot depicts average traces of one participant, with the different colors depicting the different stimulation sites. Positive values indicate the change in the amount of pupil size increase, negative values indicate the change in the amount of pupil size decrease compared to the previous time point. Error bands indicate one standard error above and below the mean.

Figure S2. Violin plots showing the maximum derivative across stimulation sites in Experiment 1. Dots correspond to averages per individual.

Figure S3. Linear mixed effects model in Experiment 1, comparing the control location with each of the

three stimulus locations over time in seconds. Each line represents the t -values of the comparisons between the control location and one of the stimulus locations regarding pupil response following tactile stimulation over time, with an additive effect of block number and trial number within a block, and random intercepts for each participant. The grey dotted line represents $t = |1.96|$, corresponding to $p = .05$ and the black dotted line represents $t = |2.58|$, $p = .01$.

Figure S4. Linear mixed effects model in Experiment 1, depicting the effect of block number and trial number over time in seconds. Each line represents the t -values of the main additive effect of block and trial number regarding pupil response following tactile stimulation over time, with random intercepts for each participant. The grey dotted line represents $t = |1.96|$, corresponding to $p = .05$ and the black dotted line represents $t = |2.58|$, $p = .01$.

Figure S5. Paired samples t -test over time in Experiment 1, comparing the three stimulus locations with each other over time in seconds. Each line represents the t -values of the comparison of pupil responses after tactile stimulation between stimulus locations. The grey dotted line represents $t = |1.96|$, corresponding to $p = .05$ and the black dotted line represents $t = |2.58|$, $p = .01$.

Figure S6. Boxplots showing the tactile sensitivity thresholds in grams of force (gf) in Experiment 1, assessed with Von Frey monofilaments, for the little finger, forearm, and calf. Higher tactile sensitivity thresholds indicate lower tactile sensitivity. The boxes represent the interquartile range, and the horizontal line represents the median. Whiskers indicate minimum and maximum values, excluding outliers. Circles represent outliers (1.5 times the interquartile range above or below the upper or lower quartile, respectively). Lines represent tactile sensitivity thresholds per participant.

Figure S7. Pupil response derivative traces over time in Experiment 2. Each subplot depicts average traces of one participant, with the different colors depicting the different stimulation intensities. Positive values indicate the change in the amount of pupil size increase, negative values the change in the amount of pupil size decrease compared to the previous time point. Error bands indicate one standard error above and below the mean.

Figure S8. Violin plots showing the maximum derivative across stimulation intensities in Experiment 2. Dots correspond to averages per individual.

Figure S9. Linear mixed effects model in Experiment 2, comparing the control location with each of the three stimulus intensities over time in seconds. Each line represents the t -values of the comparisons between the control location and one of the three stimulus intensities on pupil response after tactile stimulation over time, with an additive effect of trial number and random intercepts

for each participant. The grey dotted line represents $t = |1.96|$, corresponding to $p = .05$ and the black dotted line represents $t = |2.58|$, $p = .01$.

Figure S10. Paired samples t -test over time in Experiment 2, comparing each of the three stimulus intensities with each other. Each line shows the t -values of the comparison between pupil responses after tactile stimulation of differential stimulus intensities. The grey dotted line represents $t = |1.96|$, corresponding to $p = .05$ and the black dotted line represents $t = |2.58|$, $p = .01$.

Figure S11. (a) Boxplots showing the number of correct responses on the discrimination task in Experiment 2, split per stimulus intensity pair. The dotted line represents the score at chance level (i.e., 5 out of 10 correct answers). (b) Boxplots showing the certainty of the answers given in the discrimination task, split per stimulus intensity pair. For

both figures, the boxes represent the interquartile range and the horizontal line represents the median. Whiskers indicate minimum and maximum values, with the exception of outliers. Circles represent outliers (1.5 times the interquartile range above or below the upper or lower quartile, respectively). Lines represent scores per participant.

Data S1. Supporting Information.

How to cite this article: Ten Brink, A. F., Heiner, I., Dijkerman, H. C., & Strauch, C. (2024). Pupil dilation reveals the intensity of touch. *Psychophysiology*, 61, e14538. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.14538>