

Perceptual grouping-dependent lightness processing in human early visual cortex

Huseyin Boyaci

Department of Psychology and National Research Center for Magnetic Resonance (UMRAM), Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey



Fang Fang

Department of Psychology and Key Laboratory of Machine Perception (Ministry of Education), Peking University, Beijing, People's Republic of China



Scott O. Murray

Department of Psychology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA



Daniel Kersten

Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA




Lightness, the perceived relative achromatic reflectance of a surface, depends strongly on the context within which the surface is viewed. Modest changes in the two-dimensional configuration or three-dimensional scene geometry may lead to profound variations in lightness even though the surface luminance remains constant. Despite recent progress, we are far from a complete understanding of how various aspects of spatial context affect lightness processing in the cortex. Here we use a novel stimulus to show that perceptual grouping through occluders can affect lightness. We first report behavioral results showing how lightness across occlusion depends on spatially distant image features, including luminance and contrast. Next using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) we show that human early visual cortex responds strongly to occlusion-dependent lightness variations with little or no attention. These results suggest that elements of three-dimensional scene interpretation play a role in early cortical processing of lightness.

Keywords: lightness/brightness perception, visual cortex, perceptual organization

Citation: Boyaci, H., Fang, F., Murray, S. O., & Kersten, D. (2010). Perceptual grouping-dependent lightness processing in human early visual cortex. *Journal of Vision*, 10(9):4, 1–12, <http://www.journalofvision.org/content/10/9/4>, doi:10.1167/10.9.4.

Introduction





...). H ...
... F... la,
... T ...
... (Na a a, S... , & Ra a a a ,
1990).
I ...
(2D) ... (A ... & S a , 1993;
La & M Ca , 1971; L ... , 1999; M ... &
K ... , 1991; O'B ... , 1958), a
(3D) ... (A ... ,
1993; A ... & W a w , 2005; B ... , K ... , &
H ... , 1999; B a , D ... , S ... , & M a ... ,
2006; B a , M a ... , & H ... , 2003; D ... ,
B a , & M a ... , 2007; G ... , 1977; H ... &

B, 1954; Kaas, K., & Maunsell, 2008; K. W. & K., 1991; P. & M., 2009; P., S., & L., 1999; R. (2004) a 3D (B., 2004; B., 2003; S. & B., 1996), a (G., 1999), a (K., M., & Y., 2004; P., 1999), 2D (B. & M. C., 1999; M. & K., 1991), (L. & M. C., 1971; R. & Z., 2005; S. & R., 1985), a (K. & Z., 2002). H. a. T. a.

(A., D., & R., 2009; B., F., M., & K., 2007; H., L., & R., 2004; P. & M., 2008; R., R., & P., 1996; S. & W., 2004)

The role of early visual cortical areas in lightness processing

T. a. a. S. a.



Behavioral measure of the lightness effect in 3D stereo

Methods

Participants

T... FF a HB, ...
 a...
 a...
 a...
 U... M... a.


Display system

GDMC520 CRT
 3D, ... 63.5
 Ma... (P... Ma G5). C...
 Ca... R... S...
 T... a...
 T... a...
 [CIE]: $x = 0.312$, $y = 0.339$;
 T... a...
 E... a... Ja a

Stimuli

T... 3D...
 (F... 2a). T...
 12 6.25 ... 0.625
 7.5 ... (W × ...). T... a...

$$L = \begin{cases} I_a & a \text{ is white} \\ I_a \pm I_a \times C_a & a \text{ is gray} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$



Experimental procedure and the task

T... a... a... (1° × 1°)
 (F... 2). Pa... a... 5...
 T... a... (LE)
 T... a... () a...

$$LE = \frac{L_a - I_a}{2I_a} \quad (C), \quad (2)$$

W... () ...

Results

I... a...
 (F... 2). I...
 F... 2, C...
 F... 1a,
 A...
 A...
 A...
 A...






Figure 2. Behavioral measure of the lightness effect. (a) Stereo image pairs. Left pair for crossed fusion, right one for uncrossed fusion. (b) Task. Observers adjusted the intensity of a patch superimposed on one flank to match the intensity of the opposite flank. Eleven border contrast levels were tested. (c) Individual observer results. Magnitude of the lightness effect (computed as described in the text) first increases with the border contrast but then starts to decrease after mid-levels and nearly diminishes at higher levels. This is consistent with the subjective observation in Figure 1. (Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.)




Behavioral measure of the dynamic lightness effect in 2D





Methods

Participants



Display system







Figure 3. Behavioral measure of dynamic lightness effect in 2D. (a) Experimental design. In a 2IFC experiment, we compared context-dependent lightness changes to real luminance variations. Participants' task was to indicate the interval in which the flanks appeared to vary most during the dynamic display. (b) Results. Contrast of the perceptually equivalent real stimulus was estimated from observers' data and defined as the magnitude of the lightness effect. (Error bars indicate 95% confidence interval.)

Stimuli




Experimental procedure and the task

The experimental procedure and task are detailed in the text, describing the 2IFC task and the dynamic display parameters. It mentions a 12s illusory period and a 2s real period, and refers to a resolution of $(1.6^\circ \times 1.6^\circ)$.

(Wang & He, 2001) a a

Results



FMRI measure of the lightness effect

Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited from the University of Michigan and the University of Washington. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards at both universities. Participants received monetary compensation for their participation.

MR data acquisition

MR data were acquired using a 3T MRI scanner (Siemens Magnetom TIM Trio) with a 12-channel head coil. The BOLD signal was measured during the task.





Figure 4. FMRI measure of the lightness effect. (a) Stimuli used in the experiment. The stimuli in the illusory and control conditions were identical except that in the control condition we added gray bands with the mean luminance below and above the occluded rectangular surface. While a strong lightness effect is observed in the illusory condition, the effect is nearly abolished in the control condition. (b) ROI definition. The experimental data were analyzed in retinotopically identified voxels that respond to the center of the flanks as marked by the small squares subtitled “ROI”. (c) FMRI design. Both illusory and control stimuli were presented statically and dynamically in a block design. Average of last two time points of static intervals served as a common baseline in a scan. During the scan, observers performed a demanding fixation task to control for attention.



a a a a a
I a a a a
Ba a a a a
(., a),
0.25
a a a a
f a f a f

Experimental procedure and the fixation task

I F. 4a. Ea
18 MRI a a
12- a -wa a a
0.25 H. (F. 4). A a wa a
MRI B a a
a a a (Ha., 2004), a a
a a B
a a a a Ea
wa a 4 a a A a 250 ,
a 10- a a a T a
a . T a a a
a a (100 150 a a , a
: X a : Z , L , P, a J). O
a a a a wa 61.46% (SEM 1.51)
a a a a wa 606.52 (SEM 8.78).

ROI localization

W a a (ROI) a a a
a a -wa a a (8 H)
a -a -a a a 2 2
a a a a
T ROI a a 6
a T a
a (F. 4). ROI a
12 a 12- a a O

Data processing and analysis

U Ba V a QX (Ba I a , Maa ,
T N a),

3D a a a a a
0.015 H ; a., 1999). T a a a
a a a V a QX. F a
a a a a a
a a a B a a-
Ba V a QX f a
BOLD a a
BOLD a a
a (E a., 1997; S a., 1995). A a
a (GLM) ROI
a a (p(.) < 10⁻⁴) Ba V a QX a
a a MRI a
a ROI a a
a a a a T
a a -a a a
a a a
a - a a a a
a a BOLD
(6 a 12)
a a a a
a a a

Results

Possible outcomes

T a a a
a a a I ROI.
T a a a (F. 5).
T a a H a
F. 5 a a MRI a
(C a., 2006). T a a
a a a a a
a a (F. 5). B a
a a a
a a T
a a a
a a N a wa
T a wa a a a





Figure 5. Possible outcomes of the fMRI experiment. (a) Dynamical presentation of the stimulus. (b) Because there is no physical change at the flanks, in the null hypothesis we expect no increase in fMRI signal to dynamically presented stimuli. (c) Alternatively, because of distant physical changes we would expect an increased fMRI activity. If these temporal physical variations were the sole factors driving the activity in the cortex, we would expect the fMRI signal to be identical across the illusory and control conditions. (d) Lightness changes at the flanks only in the illusory condition, not in the control condition. If the cortical activity correlates with perceived lightness rather than physical luminance, we would expect to find a larger fMRI activity in the illusory condition.



(Carandina & Cicchini, 2006).

Discussions

U... a... F... 1, C... (a... a...), (F... 2 a 3). I... W... T... I... (a... a...), (F... 1a. (T...







Figure 6. fMRI results. (a) Time course of activity in V1, V2, and V3 averaged across observers. (b) Averaged response from 3rd to 6th time point. There is a significant difference between the conditions in all three cortical areas ($***p < 0.001$; error bars are one standard error of the mean).



O'Brien, M. C., & F. (2006). T. W. EEG 3D. H. W. a. 3D. T. H. F. W. A. (Fa. & H., 2005; M. & E., 1997). S. D. a. a. ? F. a. ? S. TMS a. MRI. (B. a., Fa., M. a., A. a., & K., 2008; M. C. & F., 2006).



Acknowledgments

T. a. wa. f. Ga. R01 EY015261 Na. a. I. f. H. a. T. 3T. a. a. U. f. M. a, C. f. Ma. R. a.

- 3(8):2, 541–553, <http://www.jneurosci.org/content/3/8/2>. [P M] [A B]
- Cohen, F., Wang, A., Van der, T., D., & Wang, B. (2006). Neural mechanisms of visual perception. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 26, 3634–3641.
- Cornelissen, T. (1970). *Visual perception*. New York: Academic Press.
- Davies, K., Bailey, H., & Martini, L. (2007). The visual system. *Vision Research*, 47, 3409–3423.
- Eidson, S., G., G., & Wang, B. (1997). Receptive field mapping with MRI. *Cerebral Cortex*, 7, 181–192.
- Fang, F., & He, S. (2005). Cortical visual areas. *Nature Neuroscience*, 8, 1380–1385.
- Gauthier, A. (1977). Perception. *Science*, 195, 185–187.
- Gauthier, A. (2007). Learning. *Current Biology*, 17, 267–269.
- Gauthier, A., K., C., Bailey, F., Anderson, T., Casanova, J., & Li, X., et al. (1999). A new visual system. *Psychological Review*, 106, 795–834.
- Haxby, J., L., R. B., & Rapoport, G. (2004). Receptive field mapping. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 101, 4286–4291.
- Hellwig, J., & B., J. (1954). A new visual system. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 47, 263–266.
- Kanwisher, D., Martini, P., & Y., A. (2004). Object representation. *Annual Reviews of Psychology*, 55, 271–304.
- Kanwisher, B., & Zha, Q. (2002). Cortical visual areas: Perceptual learning. *Vision Research*, 42, 211–226.
- Kanwisher, M., K., H., & Martini, L. T. (2008). The visual system. *PLoS ONE*, 3, 3177.
- Kanwisher, D., & K., D. (1991). A new visual system. *Nature*, 351, 228–230.
- Kanwisher, H. (2006). The visual system. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 7, 220–231.
- Land, E., & McClelland, J. (1971). Learning. *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, 61, 1–11.
- Land, A. (1999). Learning. *Perception*, 28, 803–816.
- McClelland, M. E., & F., J. J. (2006). Behavioral learning. *NeuroReport*, 15, 49–56.
- Murray, C., & E., H. (1997). Perceptual learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 23, 339–352.
- Murray, B., & Kersten, F. (1991). The visual system. *Vision Research*, 31, 1999–2008.
- Nakamura, K., S., S., & R., V. (1990). The visual system. *Perception*, 19, 497–513.
- O’Brien, V. (1958). Cortical visual areas. *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, 48, 112–119.
- Panagiotarou, M., & Murray, S. O. (2008). Neural learning. *Journal of Vision*, 8(15):8, 1–10, <http://www.jneurosci.org/content/8/15/8>. [P M] [A B]
- Panagiotarou, M., & Murray, S. O. (2009). Dorsal visual areas. *Journal of Vision*, 9(2):19, 1–10, <http://www.jneurosci.org/content/9/2/19>. [P M] [A B]
- Panagiotarou, A., T., M., Martini, D., & Murray, M. (2005). Neural learning. *Neuron*, 47, 645–651.
- Panagiotarou, L., T., E., & N., A. (1998). Functional learning. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 21, 723–748.
- Panagiotarou, D., S., A., & L., R. (1999). A new visual system. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 19, 8542–8551.
- Rapport, C., B., M., Ha, R., K., K., G., S., & Martini, S., et al. (2004). Mapping. *Journal of Vision*, 4(9):7, 747–763, <http://www.jneurosci.org/content/4/9/7>. [P M] [A B]
- Rapport, A., L., H., & H., C. (2005). Cortical visual areas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102, 3869–3874.

- Riesenhuber, P., Poggio, T., & Paupel, M. (1996). The dynamics of object recognition: A comparison of the human and monkey data. *Science*, *273*, 1104–1107.
- Riesenhuber, P., & Poggio, T. (2005). The dynamics of object recognition: A comparison of the human and monkey data. *Journal of Vision*, *5*(11):5, 983–1003. <http://www.jov.org.uk/doi/10.1167/5.11.5>. [PubMed]
- Sagvick, Y., & Watanabe, T. (2004). The dynamics of object recognition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *101*, 18251–18256.
- Sagvick, M., Datta, A., Riesenhuber, P., Kersten, D., Boyaci, A., & Poggio, T. (1995). The dynamics of object recognition. *Science*, *268*, 889–893.
- Sagvick, R., & Riesenhuber, P. (1985). The dynamics of object recognition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *82*, 5983–5986.
- Sagvick, A., Lippman, B., Riesenhuber, P., Ullman, S., & Yip, Y. (1999). The dynamics of object recognition. *NeuroImage*, *9*, 526–533.
- Sagvick, J., & Boyaci, D. (1996). The dynamics of object recognition. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, *13*, 436–451.
- Watanabe, F., & Horiuchi, N. (2001). The dynamics of object recognition. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *63*, 1293.