Rapid and Coarse Face Detection in Cortex

Laura Cabral^a, Bobby Stojanoski^a, and Rhodri Cusack^{a,b}

^a Brain and Mind Institute, Western University

^b Trinity College Institute of Neuroscience, Trinity College Dublin

Corresponding Author:

Laura Cabral

Brain and Mind Institute,

Western University,

London ON N6A 5B7

Canada

lcabral@uwo.ca

Abstract

1 Humans have structures dedicated to the processing of faces, which include cortical
2 components (e.g. areas in occipital and temporal lobes) and subcortical components (e.g.
3 superior colliculus and amygdala). Although faces are processed more quickly than
4 stimuli from other categories, there is a lack of consensus regarding whether cortical or
5 subcortical structures are responsible for rapid face processing. In order to probe this, we
6 exploited the asymmetry in the strength of projections to subcortical structures between
7 the nasal and temporal hemiretina. Participants detected faces from unrecognizable
8 control stimuli and performed the same task for houses. In Experiments 1 and 3, at the
9 fastest reaction times, participants detected faces more accurately than houses. However,
10 there was no benefit of presenting to the subcortical pathway. In Experiment 2, we
11 probed the coarseness of the rapid pathway, making the foil stimuli more similar to faces
12 and houses. This eliminated the rapid detection advantage, suggesting that rapid face
13 processing is limited to coarse representations. In Experiment 4, we sought to determine
14 whether the natural difference between spatial frequencies of faces and houses were
15 driving the effects seen in Experiments 1 and 3. We spatially filtered the faces and houses
16 so that they were matched. Better rapid detection was again found for faces relative to
17 houses, but we found no benefit of preferentially presenting to the subcortical pathway.
18 Taken together, the results of our experiments suggest a cortical, coarse rapid detection
19 mechanism, which was not dependent on spatial frequency.

20

Keywords: Rapid processing, face detection, subcortical, retinocollicular pathway, nasal temporal asymmetry.

21 **Introduction**

22 Animals as diverse as fish, birds and sheep can recognize the faces of their
23 conspecifics (Leopold & Rhodes, 2010). In humans there has evolved a network of
24 structures responsible for face processing that facilitate face detection, orientating, and
25 identification (Haxby, Hoffman, & Gobbini, 2000; Mende-Siedlecki & Verosky, 2013;
26 Tong, Nakayama, Moscovitch, Weinrib, & Kanwisher, 2000). This comprises subcortical
27 components, including the superior colliculus and amygdala (Mende-Siedlecki &
28 Verosky, 2013; Vuilleumier, Armony, Driver, & Dolan, 2003), and cortical components
29 in the occipital and temporal lobes (Kanwisher, McDermott, & Chun, 1997; Kanwisher &
30 Yovel, 2006; Pitcher, Dilks, Saxe, Triantafyllou, & Kanwisher, 2011). These specialized
31 processing mechanisms allow faces to be detected more quickly than objects (Crouzet,
32 Kirchner, & Thorpe, 2010) and result in faces being the first category detected in visual
33 search tasks (Fletcher-Watson, Findlay, Leekam, & Benson, 2008). Detecting faces
34 quickly is thought to be evolutionarily advantageous for both survival and social
35 interaction, from the savannahs of Africa to the office party.

36 The subcortical route via the retinocollicular pathway to the amygdala is often
37 thought to facilitate ‘quick and dirty’ face detection (Johnson, 2005). It comprises
38 projections from the retina to the superior colliculus, which in turn project to the pulvinar
39 nucleus on the way to the amygdala (Benevento & Standage, 1983; Jones & Burton,
40 1976; Rafal et al., 2015; Tamietto, Pullens, De Gelder, Weiskrantz, & Goebel, 2012)
41 Evidence that the retinocollicular pathway can process faces comes from blindsight
42 patients, who after extensive damage to visual cortex are still able to detect the emotional
43 content of faces, although they cannot recognize their identity (Tietto & de Gelder, 2010).

Similar behavior is found in healthy controls following transracial magnetic stimulation to the visual cortex; when TMS prevents participants from seeing stimuli, they are still able to recognize the emotional content of the face (Jolij & Lamme, 2005). Furthermore, structures in the retinocollicular pathway are activated by the viewing of neutral and emotional faces, as shown with functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) (Mendes-Siedlecki & Verosky, 2013). Functional magnetic resonance imaging has also found that this pathway has a preference for crude, low-spatial frequency information, with greater activation to faces filtered to emphasize low spatial frequencies than high spatial frequencies (Vuilleumier et al., 2003).

Intracranial recordings in epilepsy patients have found that the retinocollicular pathway is fast, with neural firing in the amygdala as quickly as 100-250 ms after the presentation of an emotional face (Sato et al., 2013). Recent intracranial recording from Méndez-Bértolo et al. (2016) has found even faster processing for fearful faces, with firing in the amygdala recorded 74 ms after stimulus onset. Magnetoencephalography (MEG) data suggests even faster processing with responses to emotional faces detected in just 40 ms (Luo et al., 2010). Supporting this hypothesis, Garvert, Friston, Dolan, & Garrido (2014) used dynamic causal modeling of MEG data to conclude that a model with a subcortical component, containing the pulvinar nucleus and the amygdala, more accurately modeled rapid face processing than a model with a singular cortical process.

Fast detection mechanisms are not limited to subcortical structures, as there is also evidence of rapid mechanisms within cortical areas, such as the inferior occipital gyrus (Pitcher, Walsh, Yovel, & Aviv, 2007; Sadeh, Podlipsky, Zhdanov, & Yovel, 2010). Specifically, an initial feed-forward wave of firing through cortex could allow for rapid,

coarse processing (Cauchoix & Crouzet, 2013; Serre, Oliva, & Poggio, 2007; Vanrullen & Koch, 2001). Electroencephalography (EEG) data from visual cortex can identify responses just 56 ms after stimulus onset (Foxy & Simpson, 2002), and intracranial recordings in epilepsy patients found that the category of image participants were viewing could be decoded from the first 100 ms of response in visual cortex (Liu, Agam, Madsen, & Kreiman, 2009). MEG data suggests occipitotemporal responses to faces in just 100 ms (Liu, Harris, & Kanwisher, 2002). Barragan-Jason, Cauchoix, & Barbeau (2015) have proposed that even the identification of familiar faces has an initial rapid phase, occurring at 140 ms, that depends on coarse visual information, and behavioural responses to familiar faces can be detected in just 180 ms (Visconti di Oleggio Castello & Gobbini, 2015). To formalize how cortex could rapidly detect complex visual objects such as faces in real-world scenes, Thorpe and colleagues (Delorme & Thorpe, 2001; VanRullen, Guyonneau, & Thorpe, 2005) proposed a spike-based model of rapid processing. These models have been supported by recordings from V1 in the macaque and cat (Celebrini, Thorpe, Trotter, & Imbert, 1993; Konig, Engel, Roelfsema, & Singer, 1995; VanRullen et al., 2005).

In summary, there is evidence of both subcortical and cortical mechanisms for rapid visual processing of faces. Which one, therefore, dominates rapid face detection in healthy participants? One way to address whether rapid face perception is driven by subcortical structures is to target the retinocollicular pathway to the amygdala. Presenting stimuli exclusively to the nasal hemiretina preferentially targets the retinocollicular pathway, as the nasal hemiretina contains more fibers projecting to the superior colliculus. Initial evidence for this asymmetry came from tree shrews, cats and macaques

(Conley, Lachica, & Casagrande, 1985; Harrison, 2015; Perry & Cowey, 1985; Pollack & Hickey, 1979; Sterling, 1973). fMRI evidence in humans has demonstrated that the superior colliculus displays a temporal nasal asymmetry that is not found for the LGN or V1 (Sylvester, Josephs, Driver, & Rees, 2007). Additionally, behavioral studies have demonstrated that a nasal-temporal asymmetry is reflective of input to the superior colliculus. For example, making stimuli only visible to the S cones, which do not provide input to the superior colliculus, eliminates the benefit of presenting to the nasal hemiretina (Bertini, Leo, & Làdavas, 2008).

Our goals in this study were to establish a paradigm for behaviorally quantifying rapid face detection, and to determine whether presenting preferentially to the retinocollicular pathway resulted in improved rapid face detection. Participants were asked to detect faces from amongst unrecognizable control stimuli that were matched to have the same low-level visual features, as quantified with a model of the early visual system (Stojanoski & Cusack, 2014). To determine whether any rapid detection mechanism was specific to faces, we also tested a control condition requiring detection another class of visual object, houses.

2. Experiment 1

2.1 Methods

To probe rapid face processing, in two blocks, participants performed a face detection task in which they pressed a button as quickly as possible for intact faces, but not for scrambled foil stimuli. In two additional blocks, they were asked to detect houses in a similar manner. In each block, stimuli were presented monocularly, by asking participants to wear an eye patch. This allowed us to target stimuli exclusively to either

the nasal or temporal hemiretina. In the right eye, presenting stimuli to the right of fixation targets the nasal hemiretina, while presenting to the left of fixation targets the temporal hemiretina. The opposite is true in the left eye. Within each block, stimuli were randomized across the nasal and the temporal hemiretinas.

2.1.1 Participants

Twenty-four individuals (12 males, 12 females, age range 18-21) were given course credit for participation in Experiment 1. The non-medical ethics board at the University of Western Ontario reviewed and approved the experimental protocol. All participants gave informed consent, reported normal or corrected-to-normal vision, and that they were right handed.

2.1.2 Stimuli

Twenty-four face photographs from an online database (http://wiki.cnb.cmu.edu/Face_Place) and 24 house stimuli, created by Martin, McLean, O'Neil, & Köhler (2013), were used in the study. As the house stimuli had a blurred edge, a custom Matlab script added a blurred edge to the face stimuli, to appear similar by eye. As the house stimuli were greyscale, face stimuli were also altered to be greyscale.

All stimuli were centered in a rectangular area of 4.9 degrees by 4.9 degrees of visual angle. The fixation cross was .5 degrees by .5 degrees. A white background was used throughout the experiment. To generate the control stimuli, faces and houses were diffeomorphically warped using the procedure described by Stojanoski & Cusack (2014). Foils were unrecognizable as determined by the behavioural ratings in Stojanoski &

135 Cusack (2014) (image 38 on the diffeomorphic continuum). A depiction of the stimuli
 136 used in Experiment 1 can be found in Fig.1 A.

137
 138 *Figure 1.* Exemplar stimuli from the four experiments. A) Stimuli used in Experiments 1
 139 and 3. Foil stimuli are unrecognizable versions of faces and houses B) In Experiment 2,
 140 the foil stimuli were more similar to the faces and houses. C) In Experiment 4, the stimuli
 141 that were adjusted for differences in spatial frequency between categories.

142 *2.1.3 Procedure*

143 Stimuli were presented on a laptop screen using MATLAB and Psychtoolbox.
 144 Participants wore an eye patch to ensure monocular presentation, placed their heads on a
 145 chin rest, and were instructed to maintain fixation. The centre of the screen was directly
 146 ahead of the nose. In each experimental block, a black fixation cross was offset by 3.2 cm
 147 to the left or right from center in order to put it directly in front of the unpatched eye.
 148 This distance was chosen using the mean interpupillary distance scores from the 1988
 149 Anthropometric Army Survey.
 150 In experiment 1, participants completed two blocks with their left eye unpatched, one that
 151 contained only face targets, the other containing house targets, and two similar blocks
 152 with their right eye unpatched. Block order was counterbalanced across participants.

In each block, participants were presented with 96 trials comprising two repetitions of 24 target stimuli and their 24 warped counterparts. One repetition was presented to the nasal hemiretina, while the other was presented to the temporal hemiretina. To present to the nasal and temporal visual hemiretina, the stimuli were offset horizontally so that the outer edge of their rectangular bounds was 8 degrees from the center of fixation. Stimuli were presented for duration of 122 ms, with an inter-trial interval of 2505 ms. Participants were instructed to perform a simple detection task, pressing a key as quickly as possible when they saw an intact face (in the face blocks) or an intact house (in the house blocks). For a schematic of the experimental configuration, please see Fig. 2.

Figure 2. A schematic illustrating the experimental configuration. Participants wore an eye patch to ensure monocular presentation and to allow the stimuli to be presented

exclusively to the nasal or temporal hemiretina. The retinocollicular pathway is depicted with projections from the nasal hemiretina to the superior colliculus, through the pulvinar nucleus, terminating in the amygdala. Weaker, projections from the temporal hemiretina to the superior colliculus are not shown.

2.1.4 Analysis

In order to quantify rapid processing, we used an analysis strategy similar to Kirchner & Thorpe's (2006) and calculated accuracy for the fastest 10% of responses. All reaction times are relative to stimulus onset. A fast detection mechanism would be expected to improve accuracy on these rapid trials by providing more accurate information to decision and action areas sooner after stimulus onset. The reaction time (RT) threshold for the fastest 10% of trials was calculated for each participant individually, in order to account for individual differences in overall reaction time. We also expected that faces would be detected more quickly overall. If this is the case, to ensure that the overall difference in reaction time between the faces and houses did not drive the results, we adopted a conservative analysis strategy and determined the face and house reaction thresholds separately. Thus, the fastest 10% of face trials were expected to be even faster than the fastest 10% of house trials.

To determine the contribution of the retinocollicular pathway, we examined whether presenting the stimuli to the nasal or the temporal hemiretina modulated performance. As the nasal hemiretina has more connections to the superior colliculus and thus the retinocollicular pathway, we would expect to see faces more accurately detected than houses, when the stimuli are presented to the nasal hemiretina.

189

190 **2.2 Results**

191 Two participants were excluded for failing to follow the task instructions. Across
 192 the remaining participants, mean reaction times for both the fastest 10% and slowest 50%
 193 of trials are shown in Fig. 3A. These reaction times include correct responses and false
 194 alarms, as both contributed to subsequent accuracy metrics.

195

196 *Figure 3.* Mean reaction times for the fastest 10% and slowest 50% of trials A) In
 197 Experiment 1, foil stimuli were unrecognizable versions of faces and houses B) In
 198 Experiment 2, faces and houses were more similar to foil stimuli C) In Experiment 3,
 199 stimuli were the same as in Experiment 1 D) In Experiment 4, spatial frequency of the
 200 faces and houses were matched. Error bars represent plus-or-minus one standard error.

201

202 To probe rapid mechanisms, analyses were confined to trials with a rapid response, in the
203 fastest 10% of RTs for each category. Participants were able to more accurately detect
204 faces than houses ($F(1,21)=10.41$ $p<0.01$) (Fig. 4 A). This shows that our paradigm is
205 sensitive to rapid, accurate face detection. We then turned to the effect of the retinal
206 hemifield manipulation. There was no overall benefit of presenting stimuli to a particular
207 hemiretina ($F(1,21)= 3.87$, $p>0.05$), suggesting no general role for the retinocollicular
208 pathway in fast visual detection. Furthermore, contrary to what would be expected if the
209 retinocollicular pathway was category selective, and supported rapid face detection, there
210 was no significant stimulus by retinal hemifield interaction ($F(1,21)=0.1$, $p>0.05$) (Fig.
211 5A). In fact, there was a trend for better performance for faces in the temporal hemiretina.

Figure 4. Proportion of trials correct, for the fastest 10% and slowest 50% of reaction times. A) In Experiment 1, faces were detected significantly more accurately than houses at the fastest reaction times. B) In Experiment 2, faces and houses were detected with similar accuracy. C) Experiment 3 replicated the results of Experiment 1. D) In Experiment 4, faces were detected significantly more accurately than houses in the fastest 10% of reaction times. In all experiments, error bars represent +/- the standard error.

Figure 5. The difference in accuracy between the temporal and nasal hemiretina is plotted for the fastest 10% and slowest 50% of RT's for Experiments 1-4 (A-D, respectively).

There were no significant differences between the nasal and temporal hemiretina for the faces and houses in any of the experiments. Error bars represent plus-or-minus one standard error.

2.3 Interim Discussion

The results of Experiment 1 demonstrate that there is a rapid route for detecting faces that does not extend to other classes of stimuli (i.e. houses). As there was no benefit for presenting stimuli to the nasal hemiretina, the results of the experiment did not provide

any evidence of a role for the retinocollicular pathway in rapid visual detection or rapid face processing. The lack of contribution from the retinocollicular pathway, taken with the trend for better processing in the temporal hemiretina, suggests that a cortical route could be responsible for the rapid face detection seen in the experiment. Our next goal was to probe the specificity of a rapid cortical pathway. A key feature of the rapid cortical route discussed in the literature is that it is not just quick, but that it is dirty (i.e. a coarse representation). In an evolutionary context, it might be advantageous for neural structures to obtain extremely quick, coarse representations of the faces in the environment. This route is not thought to be capable of fine discrimination. Thus, the next experiment was designed to probe the precision of the rapid detection mechanism identified in Experiment 1.

3. Experiment 2

3.1 Methods

In order to examine the precision of the rapid cortical detection route, participants performed the same task as in Experiment 1, but with less warped foil stimuli. These foil stimuli still had some recognizable features of faces and houses. If detection relied on a rapid route, exclusively for faces, it would support the idea that the rapid detection mechanism was capable of precise representations. Otherwise, the rapid detection mechanism might be limited to rapid, coarse judgments.

3.1.1 Participants

The same participants who participated in Experiment 1 participated in Experiment 2, and the order in which participants completed the two experiments was counterbalanced. Again, two participants were excluded for failing to follow the task instructions.

3.1.2 Stimuli and Procedure

The stimuli and procedure were the same as in Experiment 1, except that the foil images had less warping applied (image 5 in the diffeomorphic continuum). Examples of the stimuli can be found in Fig. 1B.

3.2 Results

As in Experiment 1, overall mean reaction times for the fastest 10% and slowest 50% of trials are shown in Fig. 3B. The mean reaction times include both correct responses and false alarms. We used the same analysis procedure as in Experiment 1, with accuracy in the fastest 10% of trials used to assess rapid face detection. When participants were required to make precise judgments, faces were no longer detected reliably more accurately than houses ($F(1,21)=0.08$, *NS*) (Fig. 4B). Again, to examine the role of the retinocollicular pathway we compared presentations to the nasal or the temporal hemiretina. At the fastest RTs, there was no significant difference in accuracy between hemiretinas ($F(1,21)=0.29$, *NS*). Furthermore, again there was no evidence that faces were detected significantly more accurately than houses in the nasal hemiretina when compared to the temporal hemiretina ($F(1,21)= 3.97$, *NS* (Fig. 5B).

In Experiment 1, we found evidence of a fast face processing mechanism when faces were clearly distinct from foils. In Experiment 2, with a smaller difference between faces and foils, we did not find the same effect. However, it is important to establish whether the effect of the foil manipulation was significant, by directly testing whether the results of the two experiments are significantly different. This comparison showed that performance was significantly more accurate in Experiment 1 than in Experiment 2 ($F(1,21)=6.81$, $p<0.05$). Furthermore, there was a significant interaction between the

experiments and stimulus type ($F(1,21)=8.03, p<0.05$). This is driven by a greater difference between rapid detection of faces and houses in Experiment 1 than in Experiment 2.

3.3 Interim Discussion

When foil stimuli were created with less warping, requiring participants to make fine discriminations, faces were no longer detected more accurately than houses at the fastest reaction times. Again, there was not a significant advantage, or a trend for better performance, when stimuli were preferentially presented to the retinocollicular pathway. The results of this experiment support the idea that rapid detection of faces is limited to coarse visual characteristics. When taking Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 together, the results support the idea that there is a cortical mechanism capable of, and responsible for rapid and coarse face processing.

One weakness of the current analysis is that the comparisons of the nasal and temporal hemiretina contain half as much data as the collapsed analyses, and perhaps the consequently reduced power that results is responsible for the lack of significance. Thus, we conducted a further experiment, to double the number of subjects for this comparison. Given recent concerns about the reproducibility of results in psychology (Open Science Foundation, 2015) this also affords us the opportunity to test for replication of the other findings from Experiment 1.

4 Experiment 3

4.1 Methods

Experiment 3 was conducted to ensure that the results from Experiment 1 were generalizable, replicating it in a different group of participants. In addition, we sought to

combine the participants from Experiment 1 and Experiment 3 into a larger analysis, where we would have increased power to detect differences in performance between the nasal and temporal hemiretina.

4.1.1 Participants

Twenty-five self-reported right handed individuals (12 males, 13 females, age range 18-42) participated in Experiments 3 and 4. Twenty-four participants reported normal or corrected to normal vision. One participant did not have corrected to normal vision, their prescription was +0.75 for the right eye and +0.5 for the left eye. Two participants were excluded from the experiment, one because a fire alarm occurred during their experimental session and the other because of technical difficulties that prevented button presses from being recorded.

The participants received \$10 for their participation in the experiment. All participants gave written informed consent. The non-medical ethics board at the University of Western Ontario reviewed and approved the experimental protocol.

4.1.2 Stimuli and Procedure

Stimuli were identical to those that were used in Experiment 1. One important change was made to the procedure. In order to gain information about the participants' reaction times in both warped and intact trials, participants were instructed to press two buttons, one for the warped images and another for the intact images. Exemplar images of the stimuli can be found in Fig. 1A.

4.2 Results

Reaction times for the fastest 10% and slowest 50% of trials are shown in Fig. 3C.

As in Experiments 1 and 2, accuracy in the fastest 10% of trials was examined. In this experiment, we included the data from both the target and foil trials in our analysis. Replicating the findings from Experiment 1, faces were detected significantly more accurately than houses at faster RTs ($F(1,22)=6.24, p<0.05$) (Fig. 4C). Again, when collapsed across faces and houses, no difference in accuracy at fast RTs was found across the nasal and temporal hemiretina ($F(1,22)=1.88$ NS). Furthermore, the interaction between the visual field and stimulus class showed that faces were not significantly more accurate than houses in the nasal hemiretina than the temporal hemiretina ($F(1,22)=.19$, NS) (Fig. 5C).

In order to test if a difference in response bias was responsible for the difference in accuracy at the fastest reaction times, we also calculated the false alarm and hit rate for the faces and houses. We were able to do this in Experiment 3 because it was a two-button response task, which allowed us to bin all responses by RT. The mean false alarm rate was lower for faces ($M=.21, SE=0.016$) than for houses ($M=.25, SE=0.016$) at the fastest 10% of RT's. The mean hit rate was higher for faces ($M=.91, SE=0.017$) than for houses ($M=.82, SE=0.017$) at the fastest 10% of RT's. A higher hit rate and a lower false alarm rate shows the results were not driven by a response bias and were actually better at identifying faces than houses. The higher hit rate and low false alarm rate for faces suggests that participants were not merely responding less carefully to the rapid face trials and that the results were not a result of a speed accuracy trade off.

Although a response bias does not appear to be causing the results in the experiment, it is possible that the effect of hemifield is not being seen because of insufficient power. Therefore, we conducted a further analyses in which we included

participants from both Experiment 1 and Experiment 3 yielding $N=45$. In both the nasal and the temporal hemiretina, a significant difference in accuracy at fast reaction times was found for face compared with house detection ($t(1,44)=2.03$, $p<0.05$, $t(1,44)=3.91$, $p<0.001$, respectively). This supports the idea that increases in face detection accuracy are not driven exclusively by an increase in performance in the nasal hemiretina, as would be expected if the retinocollicular pathway were responsible.

Further combined analyses from Experiment 1 and Experiment 3 replicated the key results. At the fastest reaction times, faces were detected more accurately than houses ($F(1,44)=16.44$, $p<0.001$), consistent with the results of previous experiments. In addition, at the fastest RTs, overall performance in the nasal hemiretina was significantly worse than performance in the temporal hemiretina ($F(1,44)=5.74$, $p<0.05$). With the larger sample, there was still no significant interaction between stimulus and field ($F(1,44)=0.03$, NS) as would be expected if a nasal benefit was driving improved face detection.

4.3 Interim Discussion

Experiment 3 replicated the results of Experiment 1, generalizing the findings to a different group of participants and a slightly different response procedure. In addition, calculating the false alarm and hit rates allowed us to determine that a response bias was not the cause of our results. A higher hit rate and a lower false alarm rate for faces suggests that increased accuracy is not a result of a speed accuracy trade off. This is further emphasised because faces have a faster mean reaction time than houses.

Combining the results from Experiments 1 and 3 into a single analysis revealed that presentation to the nasal hemiretina led to significantly worse rapid detection of faces

and houses. This result is contrary to what would be expected if the nasal hemiretina, and thus the retinocollicular pathway, were driving the results. In addition, both the nasal and the temporal hemiretina show evidence of significantly more accurate face detection at fast reaction times, demonstrating that there is not one hemiretina driving the fast face detection advantage.

Taken together, these results provide more support for the idea that a cortical, rather than a subcortical, process is responsible for rapid face detection. Why might presenting to the nasal hemiretina result in reduced detection of visual stimuli? It is possible that reduced performance could be caused by distracting information (i.e. emotional content) being communicated from subcortical structures to cortical structures. At fast RTs, the brain might be only capable of attending only to a subset of information, and emotional content might take precedence over visual categorization, decreasing the accuracy of the nasal hemiretina in Experiments 1 and 3.

In a final experiment we control for a potential low-level visual explanation for the category specificity of the rapid detection mechanism. In our stimulus sets (and more generally, Awasthi, Sowman, Friedman, & Williams, 2013), faces contained lower spatial frequencies than houses. Natural images generally have greater power at lower frequencies (Burton & Moorhead, 1987) so perhaps we have more rapid mechanisms for low spatial frequencies, that process faces more rapidly. Thus, perhaps spatial frequency, rather than category *per se* is responsible for the category specific rapid detection we observed in Experiments 1 and 3.

6 Experiment 4

6.1 Methods

In Experiment 4 we repeated Experiment 3, but the face and house stimulus sets filtered so that they had balanced power spectra.

6.1.2 Participants

Experiment 4 tested the same participants as Experiment 3, and the order in which they participated was counterbalanced. Again two participants were excluded - one because of a fire drill and the other because of technical difficulties that prevented button presses from being recorded.

6.1.2 Stimuli and Procedure

The same stimuli that were used in Experiment 1 and 3 were used in Experiment 4, but with the spatial frequency of the images balanced. Each image was transformed into 2D frequency space using a Fourier transform. Each pixel was then multiplied by a scalar filtering function that depended only on distance from the origin of frequency space. Finally, an inverse Fourier transform was used to return to image space. Houses were filtered to remove high spatial frequency information, and faces were filtered to remove low spatial frequency information. A further processing stage was applied, to remove a visually salient artefact, which was the bleeding of images into the background surrounding them. All voxels outside of each object in the original image (i.e., that were exactly background color) were reset to the background color after filtering. This led to a slight residual mismatch in the resulting frequency spectra, which can be seen in the original and final frequency spectra, shown in Fig. 6. Exemplar images can be found in Fig. 1C. All other aspects of the experiment were the same as in Experiment 3.

Figure 6. Power of the faces and houses at each spatial frequency (cycles/pixel).

6.2 Results

Reaction times for the fastest 10% of trials and the slowest 50% of trials can be found in Fig. 3D.

As we obtained data from both target and foil trials, both were included in our analysis.

In the fastest 10% of trials, faces were again detected more accurately than houses,

despite the matching of spatial frequencies ($F(1,22)=4.83$, $p<0.05$) (Fig. 4D).

Again, the contribution of the retinocollicular pathway was assessed. No significant differences in accuracy were seen for the nasal compared with the temporal hemiretina

($F(1,22)=0.02$, NS). The interaction between hemiretina presentation and stimulus was

also not significant; houses were not detected significantly more accurately than faces at fast reaction times when contrasting the temporal with the nasal hemiretina ($F(1,22)=.67$, NS) (Fig. 5D).

To investigate whether spatial frequency manipulation substantially modulated performance, the fastest 10% of trials from experiment 3 were compared to the fastest 10% of trials from experiment 4 using a 2x2 ANOVA with experiment and stimulus as the within-subject factors. Overall, there were no significant difference in performance between the two experiments ($F(1,22)=2.80$, $p>0.05$). Furthermore, there was no significant interaction between stimulus and experiment, showing the difference in accuracy for faces compared with houses was not significantly different in experiments 3 and 4 ($F(1,22)=0.60$, $p>0.05$). In line with the results of each experiment, there was a main effect for stimuli, with faces detected significantly more accurately than houses at the fastest reaction times ($F(1,22)=10.17$, $p<0.01$).

To further investigate if response bias caused the differences in accuracy at the fastest reaction times, we calculated the false alarm and hit rate for the faces and houses. The mean false alarm rate was lower for faces ($M=.13$, $SE=0.018$) than for houses ($M=0.15$, $SE=0.018$) at the fastest 10% of RT's. The mean hit rate was higher for faces ($M=.91$, $SE=0.017$) than for houses ($M=.83$, $SE=0.017$) at the fastest 10% of RT's. A higher hit rate and a lower false alarm rate again confirms that response bias cannot account for the differences in accuracy, and that participants were better at identifying faces than houses.

6.3 Interim Discussion

This experiment explored the idea that spatial frequency might have caused the category-specific effects in experiment 1 and 3. Altering the spatial frequency of the images did

not have any significant effect on the results. In trials with fast RTs, faces were still detected more accurately than houses. Furthermore, the spatial filtering in experiment 4 did not change the results from those seen in experiment 3. These results support a face-specific rapid detection mechanism, rather than a low-spatial frequency mechanism.

7 General Discussion

Four experiments were conducted to determine whether a rapid route for face detection could be identified in a behavioural experiment. In addition we sought to determine whether a cortical or a subcortical process, facilitated by the retinocollicular pathway, could be responsible for the rapid detection of faces. If the retinocollicular pathway to the amygdala were responsible for rapid face detection, we would expect to see a benefit for faces, but not houses, when presenting to the nasal hemiretina. In Experiments 1, 3 and 4, participants rapidly detected faces but not houses from very distinct warped foil stimuli. However, there was no benefit of presenting the stimuli to the nasal hemiretina, providing no support for a retinocollicular route in rapid face detection in our task. Even when we combined the participants from Experiments 1 and 3 into a single analysis to increase power, we did not see a benefit for face detection in the nasal hemiretina, and in fact, faces or houses presented to the nasal hemiretina were detected less accurately.

We then considered what aspects of the face stimuli could have led to rapid detection. Faces have greater power at lower spatial frequencies than houses. In Experiment 4, we filtered the images to enhance relative power at high spatial frequencies for the faces and reduce it for the houses. Faces were still detected more accurately than houses, showing that it is category, and not just spatial frequency, that facilitates rapid detection. Furthermore, we found performance overall was no worse

when high frequencies were emphasized. This suggests low spatial frequencies did not have a strong role, and that perhaps the rapid detection mechanism is capable of precise visual representation. We tested this in Experiment 2 and found that when participants were required to make fine visual discriminations, more accurate fast face detection disappeared. This suggests the rapid discrimination method is “dirty” as well as being “quick”. Again no contribution was evident from the retinocollicular pathway.

Taken together, our results show there is a rapid route for the detection of faces, which relies on coarse visual information, but not low on spatial frequencies in particular. In none of the experiments did we find evidence of a benefit for face detection in the nasal hemiretina. This supports the idea that a cortical rather than a subcortical mechanism is responsible for rapid face detection (Cauchoix, & Crouzet, 2013), and is congruent with evidence that cortex is capable of rapid processing (Barragan-jason et al., 2015; Foxe & Simpson, 2002; H. Liu et al., 2009).

Strengthening the results of the study, the warped foil stimuli used in this experiment were well matched in terms of luminance, contrast, and spatial frequency to the target stimuli, and could not be differentiated in a model of the early visual system (HMAX, Stojanoski & Cusack, 2014), eliminating a series of confounding variables not often considered. There is one study where the authors found participants were orienting more quickly to ‘face like’ stimuli when they were presented to the nasal hemiretina (Tomalski, Johnson, & Csibra, 2009). However, this study used ‘Johnson faces’ where black boxes are put in place of the eyes, nose and mouth. Control stimuli in this study were an inverted version of the ‘Johnson face’. Although these control stimuli were matched for variables like spatial frequency, the target stimuli will have a large ‘top-

heavy' bias in comparison with the foil stimuli, which could be what was responsible for the increased performance of the nasal hemiretina. Our naturalistic stimuli will likely have had less of a top-heavy bias, and this could be a potential reason why we do not see a benefit of presenting to the nasal hemiretina. It is also possible that cortex is needed to make category judgements when target and foil stimuli are well matched.

In order to ensure that the visual stimuli were unrecognizable, Stojanoski and Cusack (2014) quantified how much warping was necessary to remove semantic information from different categories. Faces, along with bikes, needed the highest levels of warping in order to render them unrecognizable. Therefore, it is unlikely that face blocks in experiments 1 and 3 represented an easier task than house blocks. In addition, different diffeomorphic fields were used for each foil, which makes them distinct, even within a category. For example, although the first exemplar in Figure 1 has a dark portion in the center, not all face stimuli have this. Across the entire face and house categories, these small characteristics were insufficient to have driven the broader differences between the faces and the houses.

Other researchers have also failed to see a benefit for face identification when presenting stimuli to the nasal hemiretina (Gabay, Burlingham, & Behrmann, 2014). In addition to the nasal/temporal manipulation, these researchers use a Wheatstone stereoscope to exploit the fact that visual information is segregated monocularly until visual cortex. Gabay et al. (2014) present stimuli monocularly, either to the same or different eyes and have participants make identity judgements. They find a benefit for presenting stimuli to the same eye, which they hypothesize, could be due to the monocular properties of subcortical structures, such as the lateral geniculate nucleus

(LGN). Although the retinocollicular pathway does not seem to be contributing to improved face detection, it is possible that the LGN, on the way to cortex, could be partially responsible for our results.

If the amygdala is not responsible to the rapid detection of faces, it could still be processing emotional information (Vuilleumier, Richardson, Armony, Driver, & Dolan, 2004). This could explain why we see decreased overall performance for the nasal hemiretina. It is possible that when the amygdala feeds information to the cortex creating competing processing, which makes it more difficult for cortex to rapidly categorize visual stimuli.

If faces are being detected more accurately at fast reaction times than the houses, what features of the stimuli are causing this increase in accuracy? Faces have significantly less inter-exemplar variability than houses. It is possible that the invariance of face stimuli allows tighter tuning in cortex, leading to more accurate, robust and efficient detection. If the invariability in our stimuli is causing the effects seen in the experiments, it is possible that other stimulus categories with limited variability could tap into a rapid mechanism. If other categories of stimuli could be capable of tapping into the rapid mechanism, are faces really special or is expertise what is important in order to develop “expert” face processing capabilities? Several studies have highlighted how important experience is in the processing of faces. For example, cataracts that substantially decrease visual input from reaching the right hemisphere in infancy impair “expert” face processing from completely developing (Le Grand, Mondloch, Maurer, & Brent, 2003). There is also evidence that perceptual narrowing and other complex aspects of face processing continue to emerge over the first year of life, substantiating the

hypothesis that experience is important in face processing (Kelley, Quinn, Slater, Lee, Ge, Pascalis, 2008; Sai, 2005). However, other researchers have found that cortex responds to faces extremely quickly after birth (Tzourio-Mazoyer et al., 2002), and dispute the experience hypothesis (McKone, Crookes, Jeffery, & Dilks, 2012). Our results could suggest that other categories of stimuli with limited variability and increased experience could tap into this rapid route.

Another theoretical framework that our results are relevant for is dual process theory. Proponents of dual process theories have suggested that there are two processes involved in cognition, the first an unconscious process (often thought of as procedural learning), and the second a conscious, effortful process (i.e. explicit learning) (Barrett, Tugade, & Engle, 2004). In the categorization literature, others have proposed a dual process model specific to categorization (COVIS), which has a procedural learning component and a cognitively demanding, verbal hypothesis driven component, mediated by the executive network (Ashby, Alfonso-Reese, Turken, & Waldron, 1998; Maddox & Ing, 2005). It could be that faces access a rapid procedural mechanism while slower categorization is dominated by the explicit process. However, other researchers have criticised COVIS (Newell, Dunn, & Kalish, 2011). From our current data is impossible to determine whether our results are reflective of a dual process theory or are the result of a single process that is more robust to faces. Future work should seek to examine this.

8 Conclusions

In conclusion, faces were detected with greater accuracy at fast reaction times than houses, when they are distinct from the foil stimuli. Our data do not offer any support that

these results are due to the contributions of the retinocollicular pathway, suggesting that a traditional route to cortex is involved in the rapid detection of faces.

Acknowledgements

Jacob Matthews contributed helpful programming advice. The research was funded by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Discovery Grant (418293DG-2012). LC was supported by a Canadian Institute of Health Research Master's scholarship.

References

- Ashby, F. G., Alfonso-Reese, L. A., Turken, A. U., & Waldron, E. M. (1998). A neuropsychological theory of multiple systems in category learning. *Psychological Review*, 105(3), 442–81. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9697427>
- Awasthi, B., Sowman, P. F., Friedman, J., & Williams, M. A. (2013). Distinct spatial scale sensitivities for early categorization of faces and places : neuromagnetic and behavioral findings. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7(March), 1–11. <http://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00091>
- Barragan-jason, G., Cauchoix, M., & Barbeau, E. J. (2015). The neural speed of familiar face recognition. *Neuropsychologia*, 75, 390–401. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.06.017>
- Barrett, L. F., Tugade, M. M., & Engle, R. W. (2004). Individual Differences in Working Memory Capacity and Dual-Process Theories of the Mind. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(4), 553–573. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.4.553>
- Benevento, L. A., & Standage, G. P. (1983). The organization of projections of the retinorecipient and nonretinorecipient nuclei of the pretectal complex and layers of the superior colliculus to the lateral pulvinar and medial pulvinar in the macaque monkey. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 217(3), 307–336. <http://doi.org/10.1002/cne.902170307>
- Bertini, C., Leo, F., & Làdavas, E. (2008). Temporo-nasal asymmetry in multisensory integration mediated by the Superior Colliculus. *Brain Research*, 1242(MAY), 37–44. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2008.03.087>

- 605 Burton, G. J., & Moorhead, I. R. (1987). Color and spatial structure in natural scenes.
606 *Applied Optics*, 26(1), 157–170.
- 607 Cauchoix, S Crouzet, M. C. (2013). How plausible is a subcortical account of rapid visual
608 recognition ? *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7(February), 1–4.
609 <http://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00039>
- 610 Celebrini, S., Thorpe, S., Trotter, Y., & Imbert, M. (1993). Dynamics of orientation
611 coding in area V1 of the awake primate. *Visual Neuroscience*, 10, 811–825.
- 612 Conley, M., Lachica, E. A., & Casagrande, V. A. (1985). *Demonstration of ipsilateral*
613 *retinocollicular projections in the tree shrew (Tupaia glis)*. *Brain Research* (Vol.
614 346).
- 615 Crouzet, S. M., Kirchner, H., & Thorpe, S. J. (2010). Fast saccades toward faces: face
616 detection in just 100 ms. *Journal of Vision*, 10(2010), 16.1-17.
617 <http://doi.org/10.1167/10.4.16>
- 618 Delorme, a., & Thorpe, S. J. (2001). Face identification using one spike per neuron:
619 Resistance to image degradations. *Neural Networks*, 14(6–7), 795–803.
620 [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0893-6080\(01\)00049-1](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0893-6080(01)00049-1)
- 621 Fletcher-Watson, S., Findlay, J. M., Leekam, S. R., & Benson, V. (2008). Rapid detection
622 of person information in a naturalistic scene. *Perception*, 37, 571–584.
623 <http://doi.org/10.1068/p5705>
- 624 Foundation, O. S. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science.
625 *Science*, 349(6251). <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4716>
- 626 Foxe, J. J., & Simpson, G. V. (2002). Flow of activation from V1 to frontal cortex in
627 humans A framework for defining “ early ” visual processing, 139–150.

<http://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-001-0906-7>

Gabay, S., Burlingham, C., & Behrmann, M. (2014). The nature of face representations in subcortical regions. *Neuropsychologia*, 59C, 35–46.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.04.010>

Garvert, M. M., Friston, K. J., Dolan, R. J., & Garrido, M. I. (2014). Subcortical amygdala pathways enable rapid face processing. *NeuroImage*, 102, 309–316.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.07.047>

Harrison, D. W. (2015). *Brain Asymmetry and Neural Systems*. Cham: Springer

International Publishing. <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13069-9>

Haxby, J., Hoffman, E., & Gobbini, M. (2000). The distributed human neural system for face perception. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4(6), 223–233. Retrieved from

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10827445>

Johnson, M. H. (2005). Subcortical face processing. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*,

6(10), 766–74. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1766>

Jolij, J., & Lamme, V. A. F. (2005). Repression of unconscious information by conscious processing: Evidence from affective blindsight induced by transcranial magnetic

stimulation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(30), 10747–

10751. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0500834102>

Jones, E. G., & Burton, H. (1976). *A projection from the medial pulvinar to the amygdala in primates*. *Brain Research* (Vol. 104).

Kanwisher, N., McDermott, J., & Chun, M. M. (1997). The Fusiform Face Area : A

Module in Human Extrastriate Cortex Specialized for Face Perception. *The Journal*

of Neuroscience, 17(11), 4302–4311.

- 651 Kanwisher, N., & Yovel, G. (2006). The fusiform face area : a cortical region specialized
652 for the perception of faces, (November), 2109–2128.
653 <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2006.1934>
- 654 Kelley, D, Quinn, P, Slater, A, Lee, K, Ge, L, Pascalis, O. (2008). The Other-Race Effect
655 Develops During Infancy, *18*(12), 1084–1089. [http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.02029.x)
656 [9280.2007.02029.x](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.02029.x).The
- 657 Kirchner, H., & Thorpe, S. J. (2006). Ultra-rapid object detection with saccadic eye
658 movements: Visual processing speed revisited. *Vision Research*, *46*(11), 1762–1776.
659 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2005.10.002>
- 660 Konig, P., Engel, A. K., Roelfsema, P. R., & Singer, W. (n.d.). How Precise is Neuronal
661 Synchronization?
- 662 Le Grand, R., Mondloch, C. J., Maurer, D., & Brent, H. P. (2003). Expert face processing
663 requires visual input to the right hemisphere during infancy. *Nature Neuroscience*,
664 *6*(10), 1108–12. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nn1121>
- 665 Leopold, D. a, & Rhodes, G. (2010). NIH Public Access, *124*(3), 233–251.
666 <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0019460.A>
- 667 Liu, H., Agam, Y., Madsen, J. R., & Kreiman, G. (2009). Article Timing , Timing ,
668 Timing : Fast Decoding of Object Information from Intracranial Field Potentials in
669 Human Visual Cortex. *Neuron*, *62*(2), 281–290.
670 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2009.02.025>
- 671 Liu, J., Harris, A., & Kanwisher, N. (2002). Stages of processing in face perception: an
672 MEG study. *Nature Neuroscience*, *5*(9), 910–916. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nn909>
- 673 Luo, Q., Holroyd, T., Majestic, C., Cheng, X., Schechter, J., & Blair, R. J. (2010).

- 674 Emotional Automaticity Is a Matter of Timing, *30*(17), 5825–5829.
675 <http://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.BC-5668-09.2010>
- 676 Maddox, T. W., & Ing, D. A. (2005). Delayed Feedback Disrupts the Procedural-
677 Learning System but Not the Hypothesis-Testing System in Perceptual Category
678 Learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *21*(1), 100–107.
679 <http://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.31.1.100>
- 680 Martin, C. B., McLean, D. A., O’Neil, E. B., & Köhler, S. (2013). Distinct familiarity-
681 based response patterns for faces and buildings in perirhinal and parahippocampal
682 cortex. *The Journal of Neuroscience : The Official Journal of the Society for*
683 *Neuroscience*, *33*(26), 10915–23. <http://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0126-13.2013>
- 684 McKone, E., Crookes, K., Jeffery, L., & Dilks, D. D. (2012). A critical review of the
685 development of face recognition: experience is less important than previously
686 believed. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *29*(1–2), 174–212.
687 <http://doi.org/10.1080/02643294.2012.660138>
- 688 Mende-Siedlecki, P., & Verosky, S. (2013). Robust selectivity for faces in the human
689 amygdala in the absence of expressions, 2086–2106. <http://doi.org/10.1162/jocn>
- 690 Méndez-Bértolo, C., Moratti, S., Toledano, R., Lopez-Sosa, F., Martínez-Alvarez, R.,
691 Mah, Y. H., ... Strange, B. A. (2016). A fast pathway for fear in human amygdala.
692 *Nature Neuroscience*, *19*(8), 1041–1049. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4324>
- 693 Newell, B. R., Dunn, J. C., & Kalish, M. (2011). Systems of Category Learning: Fact or
694 Fantasy? In *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation* (Vol. 54, pp. 167–215).
695 Academic Press. <http://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385527-5.00006-1>
- 696 Perry, V. H., & Cowey, A. (1985). The ganglion cell and cone distributions in the

- 697 monkey's retina: implications for central magnification factors. *Vision Research*,
698 25(12), 1795–810. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3832605>
- 699 Pitcher, D., Dilks, D. D., Saxe, R. R., Triantafyllou, C., & Kanwisher, N. (2011).
700 Differential selectivity for dynamic versus static information in face-selective
701 cortical regions. *NeuroImage*, 56(4), 2356–2363.
702 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.03.067>
- 703 Pitcher, D., Walsh, V., Yovel, G., & Aviv, T. (2007). TMS Evidence for the Involvement
704 of the Right Occipital Face Area in Early Face Processing. *Current Biology*, 17,
705 1568–1573. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2007.07.063>
- 706 Pollack, J. G., & Hickey, T. L. (1979). The distribution of retino-collicular axon terminals
707 in rhesus monkey. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 185(4), 587–602.
708 <http://doi.org/10.1002/cne.901850402>
- 709 Rafal, R. D., Koller, K., Bultitude, J. H., Mullins, P., Ward, R., Mitchell, A. S., & Bell,
710 A. H. (2015). Connectivity between the superior colliculus and the amygdala in
711 humans and macaque monkeys: virtual dissection with probabilistic DTI
712 tractography. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 114(3), 1947–62.
713 <http://doi.org/10.1152/jn.01016.2014>
- 714 Sadeh, B., Podlipsky, I., Zhdanov, A., & Yovel, G. (2010). Event-related potential and
715 functional MRI measures of face-selectivity are highly correlated: A simultaneous
716 ERP-fMRI investigation. *Human Brain Mapping*, 31(10), 1490–1501.
717 <http://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.20952>
- 718 Sai, F. Z. (2005). The Role of the Mother ' s Voice in Developing Mother ' s Face
719 Preference : Evidence for Intermodal Perception at Birth, 50, 29–50.

- 720 <http://doi.org/10.1002/icd>.
- 721 Sato, W., Kochiyama, T., Uono, S., Matsuda, K., Usui, K., Inoue, Y., & Toichi, M.
- 722 (2013). Rapid and multiple-stage activation of the human amygdala for processing
- 723 facial signals. *Communicative & Integrative Biology*, 6(4), e24562.
- 724 <http://doi.org/10.4161/cib.24562>
- 725 Serre, T., Oliva, A., & Poggio, T. (2007). A feedforward architecture accounts for rapid
- 726 categorization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104.
- 727 Sterling, P. (1973). Quantitative mapping with the electron microscope: retinal terminals
- 728 in the superior colliculus. *Brain Research*, 54, 347–354.
- 729 Stojanoski, Bobby, Cusack, R. (2016). Time to wave good-bye to phase scrambling :
- 730 Creating controlled scrambled images using diffeomorphic transformations,
- 731 14(2014), 1–16. <http://doi.org/10.1167/14.12.6.doi>
- 732 Sylvester, R., Josephs, O., Driver, J., & Rees, G. (2007). Visual fMRI Responses in
- 733 Human Superior Colliculus Show a Temporal – Nasal Asymmetry That Is Absent in
- 734 Lateral Geniculate and Visual Cortex, (Fries 1984), 1495–1502.
- 735 <http://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00835.2006>.
- 736 Tamietto, M., & de Gelder, B. (2010). Neural bases of the non-conscious perception of
- 737 emotional signals. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*, 11(10), 697–709.
- 738 <http://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2889>
- 739 Tamietto, M., Pullens, P., De Gelder, B., Weiskrantz, L., & Goebel, R. (2012).
- 740 Subcortical connections to human amygdala and changes following destruction of
- 741 the visual cortex. *Current Biology*, 22, 1449–1455.
- 742 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.06.006>

- 743 Tomalski, P., Johnson, M. H., & Csibra, G. (2009). Temporal-nasal asymmetry of rapid
744 orienting to face-like stimuli. *Neuroreport*, 20(15), 1309–1312.
745 <http://doi.org/10.1097/WNR.0b013e32832f0acd>
- 746 Tong, F., Nakayama, K., Moscovitch, M., Weinrib, O., & Kanwisher, N. (2000).
747 Response properties of the human fusiform face area. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*,
748 17(1), 257–80. <http://doi.org/10.1080/026432900380607>
- 749 Tzourio-Mazoyer, N., De Schonen, S., Crivello, F., Reutter, B., Aujard, Y., & Mazoyer,
750 B. (2002). Neural correlates of woman face processing by 2-month-old infants.
751 *NeuroImage*, 15(2), 454–61. <http://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2001.0979>
- 752 VanRullen, R., Guyonneau, R., & Thorpe, S. J. (2005). Spike times make sense. *Trends*
753 *in Neurosciences*, 28(1), 1–4. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2004.10.010>
- 754 Vanrullen, R., & Koch, C. (2001). Visual Selective Behavior Can Be Triggered by a
755 Feed-Forward Process. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 15(2), 209–217.
- 756 Visconti di Oleggio Castello, M., & Gobbini, M. I. (2015). Familiar Face Detection in
757 180 ms. *PloS One*, 10(8), e0136548. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0136548>
- 758 Vuilleumier, P., Armony, J. L., Driver, J., & Dolan, R. J. (2003). Distinct spatial
759 frequency sensitivities for processing faces and emotional expressions. *Nature*
760 *Neuroscience*, 6(6), 624–31. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nn1057>
- 761 Vuilleumier, P., Richardson, M. P., Armony, J. L., Driver, J., & Dolan, R. J. (2004).
762 Distant influences of amygdala lesion on visual cortical activation during emotional
763 face processing, 7(11), 1271–1278. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nn1341>
- 764