

Early (M170) activation of face-specific cortex by face-like objects

Nouchine Hadjikhani^{a,b,c}, Kestutis Kveraga^a, Paulami Naik^a and Seppo P. Ahlfors^{a,b}

The tendency to perceive faces in random patterns exhibiting configural properties of faces is an example of pareidolia. Perception of 'real' faces has been associated with a cortical response signal arising at approximately 170 ms after stimulus onset, but what happens when nonface objects are perceived as faces? Using magnetoencephalography, we found that objects incidentally perceived as faces evoked an early (165 ms) activation in the ventral fusiform cortex, at a time and location similar to that evoked by faces, whereas common objects did not evoke such activation. An earlier peak at 130 ms was also seen for images of real faces only. Our findings suggest that face perception evoked by face-like objects is a relatively early process, and not a late reinterpretation cognitive phenomenon. *NeuroReport* 20:403–407 © 2009 Wolters Kluwer Health | Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Introduction

'An old-time hominid would be liable to pay dearly, had s/he failed to recognize a pair of glowing dots in the bush at dark as the eyes of a predator, mistaking it for two fireflies'. David Navon

We tend to see faces in objects that have constituent parts resembling those of a face. This is an example of a phenomenon called pareidolia, which involves the perception of an ambiguous and random stimulus as significant, such as seeing faces in landscapes, clouds – or even in grilled toasts [1]. Why and how do we tend to see faces in objects that have constituent parts resembling those of a face? Is it because our brains are hardwired to detect the presence of a face as quickly as possible, or is it a later cognitive construction or interpretation?

Face perception is an automatic, rapid and subconscious process, already present in human newborns, which preferentially orient toward simple schematic face-like patterns (for review, see Refs [2,3]). The neural substrate for face processing consists of a distributed network of cortical and subcortical regions. The cortical areas include the inferior occipital gyrus, the fusiform gyrus, the superior temporal sulcus, and the inferior frontal gyrus, whereas the subcortical network comprises the superior

NeuroReport 2009, 20:403–407

Keywords: face perception, magnetoencephalography, object perception, subcortical route

^aMGH/MIT/HMS Athinoula A. Martinos Center for Biomedical Imaging, Charlestown, ^bDivision of Health Sciences and Technology, Harvard-MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA and ^cBrain Mind Institute, EPFL, Lausanne, Switzerland

Correspondence to Dr Nouchine Hadjikhani, MD, MGH/HMS/MIT Martinos Center for Biomedical Imaging, Room 2112, Building 75, Third Avenue, Charlestown, MA 02129, USA
Tel: +1 617 7245625; fax: +1 530 3094973;
e-mail: nouchine@nmr.mgh.harvard.edu

Received 30 October 2008 accepted 3 December 2008

colliculus, the pulvinar nucleus of the thalamus, and the amygdala [4–6]. The subcortical route in adults provides residual face-processing abilities in blindsight patients [7], but the role of this route in the intact brain is not clear.

Magnetoencephalographic (MEG) [8–10] and electroencephalographic studies have shown that face perception is accompanied by a signal arising at around 170 ms after stimulus onset, the N170 (or M170) (for review, see Ref. [11]), and this peak of activity has been associated with face identification [12]. This face-specific component is correlated with activation of the fusiform face area (FFA) and the superior temporal sulcus [13]. The face specificity of this component has, however, been challenged by a recent study examining the effect of interstimulus perceptual variance ([14], but see Ref. [15]). In addition to this signal at 170 ms, MEG studies have reported an earlier, face-specific activation peaking between 100 and 120 ms after stimulus onset, which has been associated with face categorization processes [10,16–18].

We used MEG to measure brain responses to photographs of faces, objects, and objects that can be interpreted as faces, and determine whether faces perception evoked by these objects is a late cognitive process, or whether it is initiated in the earliest stages of face processing.


Materials and methods

Nine participants (mean age 27 years; three males) with normal or corrected-to-normal vision volunteered to take part in the study. All procedures were approved by the Massachusetts General Hospital Institutional Review Board, and informed written consent was obtained from each participant.

Magnetoencephalography experiment


Stimuli consisted of neutral faces from the NimStim Emotional Face Stimuli database <http://www.macbrain.org/faces/index.htm#faces>, objects, and face-like objects, which were obtained from the Francois and Jean Robert FACES book (Fig. 1). The control objects were chosen to have similar global shape as the face-like object stimuli (Fig. 2c).

Fig. 1



Examples of stimuli from the Francois and Jean Robert FACES book (with permission of the authors).

Fig. 2



Magnetoencephalographic (MEG) response to images of real faces, face-like objects, and control objects. (a) Time course of MEG signal in one participant recorded at a right lateral gradiometer sensor. (b) A response specific to real faces peaking at 130 ms, followed by a similar response for faces and face-like objects at 165 ms. (c) An example of the stimuli used in our experiment and the color code for (a).

The stimuli of the three categories were controlled for low-level parameters. Spatial frequency content of the images in the three conditions was compared by computing the mean power spectrum density of each image. Two-sample *t*-tests between condition pairs revealed that face, object, and face-like object conditions were not significantly different from one another in terms of their spatial frequency content.

A total of 123 distinct upright black and white stimuli (40 faces, 41 face-like objects, and 42 objects) were projected with an LP350 Digital Light Processor projector (InFocus, Wilsonville, Oregon, USA) onto a back-projection screen placed 1.5 m in front of the participant. Stimuli were presented for 700 ms, followed by a blank interval lasting from 1600 to 2400 ms, during which only a fixation cross was present. To control for retinotopic differences, each stimulus was contained within a circle 480 pixels in diameter and had a fixation cross in the center (Fig. 2c). Upright stimuli were presented randomly 120 times in each condition for a total of 360 trials. In addition, faces were randomly presented 93 times upside down. The task of the participant was to indicate every time they saw an inverted face. Only upright trials were analyzed for this study.

MEG data were acquired with a 306-channel Elekta-Neuromag VectorView system (Elekta, Helsinki, Finland). Eye movements and blinks were monitored with vertical and horizontal electrooculogram. Two participants could not be analyzed because of technical (motion-related) difficulties. MEG signals were averaged across trials for each condition, time locked to the onset

of the stimulus. The evoked responses were low-pass filtered at 40 Hz. T1-weighted structural MR images of the participants were coregistered with their MEG data. The current distribution was estimated at each cortical location using the minimum-norm estimate method [19]. Group movies were created by morphing individual source estimates onto an average brain of all the participants. The FFA was functionally defined for each participant as the area within the fusiform gyrus activated around 170 ms in another MEG data set acquired presenting neutral and emotional faces. Time courses were extracted from the FFA region of interest for each condition. One-way repeated nonparametric analyses of variance were computed for windows of 20 ms around the peak of activation.

Behavioral experiment

To ensure that our face-like stimuli were indeed perceived as faces, we performed a behavioral experiment in eight participants (mean age 30 years; four males). Objects and face-like objects were randomly presented twice upright and inverted, and participants had to press one button when the stimulus looked like a face, and another when it did not.

Results


Behavioral experiment

Participants classified $96.3 \pm 4.4\%$ (mean, SD) of upright face-like objects in the category 'looks like a face'.

Magnetoencephalography experiment

Source analyses of the MEG indicated that the FFA had a first early response to faces peaking at approximately

Fig. 3



Magnetoencephalographic (MEG) source estimates averaged across all participants. (a) A ventral view of the right hemisphere with average MEG signal at 165 ms, evidencing fusiform face area (FFA) activation for faces and face-like objects, but not for objects. (b) The average time course of all participants in a region of interest located in the FFA. In addition to the early response seen for faces (in red, at approximately 130 ms), both face and face-like objects activate the FFA at approximately 165 ms, a signal usually referred as M170.

130 ms, which may have been evoked by global ovoid shapes of faces and be indicative of face detection processes [20]. After that, the FFA responded similarly to faces and face-like objects at 165 ms ($P > 0.05$), but differentially to objects ($P < 0.001$), as shown in Figs 2 and 3. This indicates that the phenomenon of seeing faces in object stimuli with some face cues is mediated by relatively early components of the visual system, rather than resulting from a late, postrecognition reinterpretation of these object stimuli as faces. Conversely, another face-processing area, the superior temporal sulcus, did not show a differential activation between objects and face-like objects ($P > 0.05$), but differentiated between faces and face-like objects ($P < 0.01$), as well as between faces versus objects ($P < 0.001$).

Discussion

Our findings demonstrate that nonface objects can be perceived as faces and activate a region typically associated with face processing in the ventral fusiform gyrus, the FFA (Fig. 3). Although the earliest (approximately 130 ms) activation in the FFA occurred only for real faces, we found that at approximately 165 ms it was activated similarly by stimuli that were perceived as faces, whether they were real faces or nonface objects with some face-like configural cues. This earliest temporal difference between faces and face-like objects may be because of very early differentiation based on global face shape, which is interpreted before the face-like configuration of the inner elements of the stimuli. However, by approximately 165 ms, the FFA was activated similarly by faces and face-like objects (Figs 2 and 3).

Recent studies have challenged the face specificity of the N170 [14] and several studies have reported face-specific activation at earlier times than 170 ms [10,16–18]. Similar

to the data presented here, in their event-related potential investigation Thierry *et al.* [14] observed greater P1 for faces than cars and no differences between faces and cars in the N170 ranges. However, images of full-frontal views of cars may also be perceived to be face-like, which could explain why they generate the same pattern of activity as our face-like objects did, a similar activation as that evoked by faces at N170 ms, and a differential early (P1 component) activation. Notably though, in this study, while controlling for retinotopy and spatial frequency, we did not manipulate interstimulus perceptual variance, yet found differential activation for face-like objects and control objects.

The relatively early activation of the FFA at 165 ms by the face-like objects suggests that the perception of these objects as faces is not a postrecognition cognitive reinterpretation process; rather, the face cues in the face-like objects are perceived early in the recognition process. This process may be supported by the sub-cortical network shown to process behaviorally relevant unseen visual events [3,21], and we are planning further experiments that will specifically address this question.

Why do we sometimes mistakenly interpret a nonface object as a face? It is important to note that although the face-like objects we used in the study shared certain internal configural cues with faces (elements representing two eyes, and mouth/nose), they were neither actually schematic faces, nor did most of them have the global ovoid shape of a real face (Fig. 1). Moreover, although nonface objects have been shown to activate the FFA with extensive training (e.g. 'Greebles', [22], our face-like objects readily evoked an early (approximately 165 ms) activation, similar to that evoked by faces, without any training. This suggests that the FFA can be

activated by crude face-like configural cues embedded in otherwise typical everyday objects.

Dot patterns consisting of two horizontally arrayed elements in the upper part of the stimulus (the 'eyes') and one element vertically centered in the lower part of the stimulus have been shown to evoke stronger looking in infants, as do real faces [3]; a similar pattern of cues also was embedded in our face-like objects (Fig. 1).

Conclusion

The similar response found in FFA at 165 ms seen for the images of both face-like objects and real faces suggests that our visual system has the propensity to rapidly interpret stimuli as faces based on minimal cues. This may be the result of our innate faculty to detect faces, and may rely on the activation of the subcortical route. In addition, face-like objects may provide a new way to study face perception in disorders characterized by difficulties in social and communication skills, such as autism. There has been a long debate about the integrity of the FFA in autism and there have been reports of an abnormal N170 in autism [23,24]. However, face-perception studies in autistic individuals are often difficult because autistic persons do not like to look at faces [25]. Our findings thus may provide a new way of investigating the integrity of the face-processing route in autism without being confounded by social factors necessarily present in real faces.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the NIH NINDS R01NS044824 and the Swiss National Science Foundation PPOOB-110741. The authors want to thank Francois and Jean Robert for allowing to use their images (icuc@mac.com). The authors also thank Jasmine Boshyan for assistance with stimuli preparation, as well as Matti Hämäläinen and Ksenija Marinkovic for fruitful discussions.

References

- 1 BBC. Virgin Mary's toast fetches \$28 000. BBC News 23 November 2004.
- 2 Palermo R, Rhodes G. Are you always on my mind? A review of how face perception and attention interact. *Neuropsychologia* 2007; **45**:75–92.
- 3 Johnson M. Subcortical face processing. *Nat Neurosci Rev* 2005; **6**:2–9.
- 4 Ishai A. Let's face it: it's a cortical network. *Neuroimage* 2008; **40**:415–419.
- 5 Haxby JV, Hoffman EA, Gobbini MI. The distributed human neural system for face perception. *Trends Cogn Sci* 2000; **4**:223–233.
- 6 Vuilleumier P, Armony JL, Driver J, Dolan RJ. Distinct spatial frequency sensitivities for processing faces and emotional expressions. *Nat Neurosci* 2003; **6**:624–631.
- 7 Morris JS, DeGelder B, Weiskrantz L, Dolan RJ. Differential extrageniculostriate and amygdala responses to presentation of emotional faces in a cortically blind field. *Brain* 2001; **124**:1241–1252.
- 8 Xu Y, Liu J, Kanwisher N. The M170 is selective for faces, not for expertise. *Neuropsychologia* 2005; **43**:588–597.
- 9 Watanabe S, Miki K, Kakigi R. Mechanisms of face perception in humans: a magneto- and electro-encephalographic study. *Neuropathology* 2005; **25**:8–20.
- 10 Halgren E, Raji T, Marinkovic K, Jousmaki V, Hari R. Cognitive response profile of the human fusiform face area as determined by MEG. *Cereb Cortex* 2000; **10**:69–81.
- 11 Jeffreys A. Evoked potential studies of face and object processing. *Vis Cogn* 1996; **3**:1–38.
- 12 Bentin S, Allison T, Puce A, Perez E, McCarthy G. Electrophysiological studies of face perception in humans. *J Cogn Neurosci* 1996; **8**: 551–565.
- 13 Sadeh B, Zhdanov A, Podlipsky I, Hendler T, Yovel G. The validity of the face-selective ERP N170 component during simultaneous recording with functional MRI. *Neuroimage* 2008; **42**:778–786.
- 14 Thierry G, Martin CD, Downing P, Pegna AJ. Controlling for interstimulus perceptual variance abolishes N170 face selectivity. *Nat Neurosci* 2007; **10**:505–511.
- 15 Rossion B, Jacques C. Does physical interstimulus variance account for early electrophysiological face sensitive responses in the human brain? Ten lessons on the N170. *Neuroimage* 2008; **39**:1959–1979.
- 16 Liu J, Harris A, Kanwisher N. Stages of processing in face perception: an MEG study. *Nat Neurosci* 2002; **5**:910–916.
- 17 Meeren HKM, Hadjikhani N, Ahlfors SP, Hamalainen MS, De Gelder B. Early category-specific cortical activation revealed by stimulus inversion. *PLoS One* 2008; **3**:e3503, 3501–3511.
- 18 Linkenkaer-Hansen K, Palva JM, Sams M, Hietanen JK, Aronen HJ, Ilmoniemi RJ. Face-selective processing in human extrastriate cortex around 120 ms after stimulus onset revealed by magneto- and electroencephalography. *Neurosci Lett* 1998; **253**:147–150.
- 19 Hamalainen MS, Ilmoniemi RJ. Interpreting magnetic fields of the brain: minimum norm estimates. *Med Biol Eng Comput* 1994; **32**:35–42.
- 20 Tsuchiya N, Adolphs R. Emotion and consciousness. *Trends Cogn Sci* 2007; **4**:158–167.
- 21 Morris JS, Ohman A, Dolan RJ. A subcortical pathway to the right amygdala mediating 'unseen' fear. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1999; **96**:1680–1685.
- 22 Gauthier I, Tarr MJ, Anderson AW, Skudlarski P, Gore JC. Activation of the middle fusiform 'face area' increases with expertise in recognizing novel objects. *Nat Neurosci* 1999; **2**:568–573.
- 23 McPartland J, Dawson G, Webb SJ, Panagiotides H, Carver LJ. Event-related brain potentials reveal anomalies in temporal processing of faces in autism spectrum disorder. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2004; **45**:1235–1245.
- 24 Bailey AJ, Braeutigam S, Jousmaki V, Switheyby SJ. Abnormal activation of face processing systems at early and intermediate latency in individuals with autism spectrum disorder: a magnetoencephalographic study. *Eur J Neurosci* 2005; **21**:2575–2585.
- 25 Klin A, Jones W, Schultz R, Volkmar F, Cohen D. Visual fixation patterns during viewing of naturalistic social situations as predictors of social competence in individuals with autism. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2002; **59**:809–816.