1

NEUROSCIENCE



RESEARCH ARTICLE

L. Lu et al./Neuroscience xxx (2018) xxx-xxx

Semantically Congruent Sounds Facilitate the Decoding of Degraded Images

5 Lu Lu, ^a Gaoyan Zhang, ^{a†} Junhai Xu^{a†} and Baolin Liu^{a,b}*

^a School of Computer Science and Technology, Tianjin Key Laboratory of Cognitive Computing and Application, Tianjin University, Tianjin
300350, PR China

8 ^b State Key Laboratory of Intelligent Technology and Systems, National Laboratory for Information Science and Technology, Tsinghua

9 University, Beijing 100084, PR China

10 Abstract—Semantically congruent sounds can facilitate perception of visual objects in the human brain. However, the manner in which semantically congruent sounds affect cognitive processing for degraded visual stimuli remains unclear. We presented participants with naturalistic degraded images and semantically congruent sounds from different conceptual categories in three modalities: degraded visual only, auditory only, and auditory and degraded visual. Functional magnetic resonance imaging was performed to assess variations in brainactivation spatial patterns. In order to account for the facilitation of auditory modulation at different levels, four conceptual categories of stimuli were divided into coarse and fine groups. Conjunction analysis and multivariate pattern analysis were used to investigate integrative properties. Superadditive interactions were found in the visual association cortex and subadditive interactions were observed in the superior temporal sulcus/superior temporal gyrus (STS/STG). Our results demonstrate that the visual association cortex and STS/STG are involved in the integration of auditory and degraded visual information. In addition, the pattern classification results imply that semantically congruent sounds may facilitate identification of degraded images in both coarse and fine groups. Importantly, when naturalistic visual stimuli were further subdivided, facilitation through auditory modulation exhibited category selectivity. © 2018 Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of IBRO.

Key words: degraded visual object, multisensory integration, facilitation, category selectivity, multivariate pattern analysis.

12

INTRODUCTION

To enable effective perception with our multisensory 13 environment, the human brain integrates information 14 from multiple sources into a coherent percept. For 15 example, when watching someone speak, we normally 16 hear the sound of the speech. In such cases, the 17 18 human brain can effectively integrate information from the visual and auditory modalities via semantically 19 congruent sound. However, the manner in which 20 semantically congruent sounds affect the identification of 21 an obscured visual object is still unclear. 22

*Corresponding author at: School of Computer Science and Technology, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300350, PR China. Fax: +86-10-62781789.

E-mail address: liubaolin@tsinghua.edu.cn (B. Liu).

[†] G. Zhang and J. Xu contributed equally to this work.

Abbreviations: EPI, echo-planar imaging; FDR, false discovery rate; fMRI, functional magnetic resonance imaging; GLM, general linear model; IFG, inferior frontal gyrus; LOBOCV, leave-one-block-out cross-validation; MTG, middle temporal gyrus; MVPA, multivariate pattern analysis; RDM, representational dissimilarity matrix; ROI, region of interest; SNR, signal-to-noise ratio; SPL, sound pressure level; STG, superior temporal gyrus; STS, superior temporal sulcus.

Neurophysiological and functional imaging studies in 23 human and nonhuman primates in the past two decades 24 have advanced our understanding of multisensory 25 integration. The components of a multisensory stimulus 26 are more effectively integrated when they originate from 27 congruent spatial locations (Meredith and Stein, 1986, 28 1996) and when they occur simultaneously (Miller and 29 D'Esposito, 2005; Senkowski et al., 2007). Two of the sim-30 plest forms of multisensory interaction are superadditive 31 and subadditive neural responses. A neuronal response that 32 is larger than the sum of the two responses to the unisensory 33 stimulus is called superadditive. In contrast, responses 34 smaller than the sum of the two responses to the unisensory 35 stimulus, but larger than each response to the unisensory 36 stimulus, are called subadditive (Klemen and Chambers, 37 2012). Much discussion has centered around the statistical 38 criteria used to classify multisensory integration when com-39 paring bimodal to unimodal conditions using functional mag-40 netic resonance imaging (fMRI) (Beauchamp, 2005; Stein 41 et al., 2009; Love et al., 2011). The three main criteria used 42 in fMRI research are (1) the additive criteria (AV > A + V); 43 (2) the max criteria (AV > max [A, V]); (3) and the mean 44 criteria (AV > mean [A, V]). The max and additive criteria 45 are the most commonly used and discussed metrics for 46

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2018.01.051

0306-4522/© 2018 Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of IBRO.

1

112

154

155

2

L. Lu et al. / Neuroscience xxx (2018) xxx-xxx

quantifying multisensory integration. Evidence from a cross-47 48 modal object recognition study in humans indicates that the posterior superior temporal sulcus and middle temporal 49 gyrus (pSTS/MTG) have enhanced responses when audi-50 tory and visual object features are presented together, and 51 that this area is specialized for the integration of different 52 types of information (Beauchamp et al., 2004, 2008). In addi-53 tion, primary sensory areas also participate in the process-54 ing of multisensory interactions (Klemen and Chambers, 55 2012). For example, cross-modal modulation has been 56 reported to take place in the visual (de Haas et al., 2013) 57 and auditory (Hsieh et al., 2012) cortices. 58

Recent evidence suggests that the human brain can 59 60 effectively integrate information from different sensory sources when a semantically congruent stimulus in one 61 sensory modality is presented when another sensory 62 modality is disturbed. A recent behavioral study found 63 that semantically congruent sounds can modulate the 64 identification of masked pictures (Chen and Spence, 65 2010). Another multisensory speech interactions study 66 has shown that visual speech signals enhance auditory 67 speech comprehension in noisy environments (Ross 68 69 et al., 2007). An event-related potential study revealed 70 multisensory gains in audio-visual speech recognition at 71 different signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) when different 72 levels of pink noise were added to speech sounds (Liu 73 et al., 2013). A cross-modal object recognition study 74 reported that superadditive interactions were found for degraded stimuli (the linear interpolation between the orig-75 inal audio-visual stimuli and the random noise phase spec-76 tra) in the STS and superior frontal gyrus, and that these 77 interactions successfully modulated audio-visual object 78 categorization (Werner and Noppeney, 2010b). The 79 above study focused on the manner in which auditory 80 and visual stimuli with limited information influence audio-81 visual integration. However, the environment in which 82 83 visual objects are identified is often complex. For instance, 84 the visual object may be obscured. In such cases, it remains largely unknown as to where multisensory inter-85 86 actions take place, and what multisensory properties they have when only a visual object is present are corrupted. 87

In this study, we used naturalistic degraded images and 88 semantically congruent sounds from four conceptual 89 90 categories to investigate the enhancement of the 91 multisensory integration effect when a visual object is obscured. Participants were presented with audio-visual 92 stimuli in three different modalities: auditory only (A), 93 degraded visual only (V_d), and auditory and degraded 94 visual (AV_d). Conjunction analyses and the classical "max 95 criterion" methods were used to elucidate the regions 96 97 wherein auditory and degraded visual information were integrated. Furthermore, we investigated whether the 98 facilitation of auditory modulation was characterized by 99 100 category selectivity by comparing the fine-grained spatial 101 patterns.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES 102

Participants 103

Fourteen participants from Shandong University (mean 104 age, 22 ± 3 years; seven men and seven women) who 105

had normal or corrected-to-normal vision, reported 106 normal hearing, and had no history of neurological or 107 psychiatric illness were enrolled in the fMRI experiment. 108 The study was approved by the local ethics committee. 109 Each participant provided informed consent before the 110 study and received ¥80 after the experiment. 111

Stimuli

The visual stimuli comprised gray-scale images from four 113 categories: human, animal, mechanical, and nature. 114 These images were downloaded from ImageNet (http:// 115 www.image-net.org/). All visual stimuli were presented 116 centrally and were easily distinguished by typical sound 117 characteristics. The size of the each image was edited 118 to 640×480 pixels using Adobe Photoshop CS6 119 (Adobe Systems Incorporated: San Jose, CA, USA), 120 The semantically congruent auditory stimuli, which were 121 selected from the internet, were semantically related to 122 the visual objects. All sound stimuli were edited to have 123 a duration of $2.5 \pm 0.5 s$ (Cool Edit Pro, Syntrillium 124 Software, Adobe Systems Incorporated; San Jose, CA, 125 USA). Auditory stimuli were presented at 80-dB sound 126 pressure level (SPL) (44.1 kHz, 16-bit). 127

In order to ensure the reliability and objectivity of the 128 stimuli, another 12 participants were recruited to 129 the stimuli according familiarity evaluate to 130 emotional valence, categorization, semantic and 131 consistency (Schneider et al., 2008). All stimuli were pre-132 sented in an individually randomized order to each partic-133 ipant using E-Prime (E-Studio 2.0, Psychology Software 134 Tools). Immediately after the presentation of each stimu-135 lus, the participants were asked to provide responses 136 regarding the following features of the stimuli appearing 137 on the screen: 138

Familiarity. For the familiarity rating of the stimuli, the 139 participants were instructed to rate the extent to which 140 they were familiar with the object based on a scale 141 ranging from 1 (familiar) to 4 (unfamiliar). 142

Categorization. The participants allocated each 143 stimulus to one of the four categories (human, animal, 144 mechanical, and nature), which were displayed on the 145 screen. 146

Emotional valence. For the emotional valence rating 147 of the stimuli, the participants rated the pleasantness of 148 the object represented by the stimulus. The scale 149 ranged from 1 (pleasant) to 5 (unpleasant). A rating of 3 150 represented neutral valence. 151

Semantic consistency. For the semantic consistency 152 rating of the stimuli, the participants rated the degree of 153 semantic matching. The scale ranged from 1 (semantic inconsistency) to 4 (semantic consistency).

Stimuli with lower scores on the familiarity and 156 categorization scales, those with biased emotional 157 valence, and those with semantic inconsistency were 158 eliminated. Eight different images and sounds from each 159 category were selected (see Table 1 and Table 2). 160 Gaussian noise (standard deviation = 0.3) was added 161

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8840830

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/8840830

Daneshyari.com