



Cerebral Cortex

Network interactions explain sensitivity to dynamic faces in the superior temporal sulcus

Journal:	<i>Cerebral Cortex</i>
Manuscript ID:	CerCor-2013-01178.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Articles
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Furl, Nicholas; MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, Emotion Group Henson, Rik; MRC, CBU Friston, Karl J; Wellcome Trust Centre for Neuroimaging, Institute of Neurology Calder, Andy; Medical Research Council, Cognition and Brain Sciences
Keywords:	functional magnetic resonance imaging, face perception, biological motion, superior temporal sulcus, dynamic causal modeling

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

view

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

1

1
2
3
4
5
6 Network interactions explain sensitivity to dynamic faces in the
7
8 superior temporal sulcus
9
10

11
12
13
14 Running title: Sensitivity to dynamic faces
15
16
17

18 Nicholas Furl¹, Richard N. Henson¹, Karl J. Friston², Andrew J. Calder¹
19

20
21 ¹MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, 15 Chaucer Road, Cambridge, CB2 7EF United
22
23 Kingdom
24

25 ²Wellcome Centre for Imaging Neuroscience, University College London, 12 Queen Square,
26
27 London WC1N 3BG
28
29
30

31
32 Corresponding author:
33

34 Nicholas Furl, Medical Research Council Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, 15 Chaucer
35
36 Road, Cambridge, CB2 7EF, United Kingdom, nick.furl@mrc-cbu.cam.ac.uk
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

2

ABSTRACT

The superior temporal sulcus (STS) in the human and monkey is sensitive to the motion of complex forms such as facial and bodily actions. We used functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) to explore network-level explanations for how the form and motion information in dynamic facial expressions might be combined in the human STS. Ventral occipitotemporal areas selective for facial form were localized in occipital and fusiform face areas (OFA and FFA), and motion sensitivity was localized in the more dorsal temporal area V5. We then tested various connectivity models that modeled communication between the ventral form and dorsal motion pathways. We show that facial form information modulated transmission of motion information from V5 to the STS, and that this face-selective modulation likely originated in OFA. This finding shows that form-selective motion sensitivity in the STS can be explained in terms of modulation of gain control on information flow in the motion pathway, and provides a substantial constraint for theories of the perception of faces and biological motion.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

3

KEYWORDS

functional magnetic resonance imaging; face perception; biological motion; superior temporal sulcus; dynamic causal modeling

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

4

1
2
3 Humans and other animals effortlessly recognize facial identities and actions such as
4 emotional expressions even when faces continuously move. Brain representations of dynamic
5 faces may be manifested as greater responses in the superior temporal sulcus (STS) to facial
6 motion than motion of non-face objects (Pitcher et al. 2012), suggesting localized
7 representations that combine information about motion and facial form. This finding relates
8 to a considerable literature on “biological motion”, which studies how the complex forms of
9 bodily actions are perceived from only the motion of light points fixed to limb joints, with
10 form-related texture cues removed (Johansson 1973). Perception of such stimuli has been
11 repeatedly associated with the human posterior STS (Vaina et al. 2001; Giese and Poggio
12 2003; Vaina et al. 2004; Hein and Knight 2008; Jastorff and Orban 2009) with similar results
13 observed in potentially corresponding areas of the macaque STS (Oram and Perrett 1994;
14 Jastorff et al. 2012). The STS has been described as integrating form and motion information
15 (Vaina et al. 2001; Giese and Poggio 2003), containing neurons that code for conjunctions of
16 certain forms and movements (Oram and Perrett 1996). Nevertheless, the mechanisms by
17 which STS neurons come to be sensitive to the motion of some forms but not others remains
18 a matter of speculation (Giese and Poggio 2003).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 We propose that network interactions can provide a mechanistic explanation for STS
39 sensitivity to motion that is selective to certain forms, in this case, faces. Specifically, STS
40 responses to dynamic faces could result from communicative interactions between pathways
41 sensitive to motion and facial form. Such interactions can occur when one pathway modulates
42 or “gates” the ability of the other pathway to transmit information to the STS. Using
43 functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), we localized face-selective motion sensitivity
44 in the STS of the human and then used causal connectivity analyses to model how these STS
45 responses are influenced by areas sensitive to motion and areas selective to facial form. We
46 localized ventral occipital and fusiform face areas (OFA, FFA) (Kanwisher et al. 1997),
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

5

1
2
3 which selectively respond to facial form versus other objects (Calder and Young 2005;
4
5 Calder 2011). We also localized motion sensitivity to faces and non-faces in the more dorsal
6
7 temporal hMT+/V5 complex (hereafter, V5). Together, these areas provide ventral and dorsal
8
9 pathways to the STS. The ventral pathway transmits facial form information, via OFA and
10
11 FFA, and the dorsal pathway transmits motion information, via V5. We then compared
12
13 combinations of bilinear and non-linear dynamic causal models (Friston et al. 2003) to
14
15 identify connectivity models that optimally explain how interactions between these form and
16
17 motion pathways could generate STS responses to dynamic faces. We found that information
18
19 about facial form, most likely originating in the OFA, gates the transmission of information
20
21 about motion from V5 to the STS. Thus, integrated facial form and motion information in the
22
23 STS can arise due to network interactions, where form and motion pathways play distinct
24
25 roles.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 MATERIALS AND METHODS

33 34 35 36 Participants

37
38 fMRI data were collected from 18 healthy, right-handed participants (over 18 years,
39
40 13 female) with normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Experimental procedures were
41
42 approved by the Cambridge Psychology Research Ethics Committee.
43
44
45
46

47 Imaging Acquisition

48
49 A 3T Siemens Tim Trio MRI scanner with a 32 channel head coil was used for data
50
51 acquisition. We collected a structural T1-weighted MPRAGE image (1 mm isotropic voxels).
52
53 Functional data consisted of whole-brain T2*-weighted echo-planar imaging volumes with 32
54
55 oblique axial slices that were 3.5 mm thick, in-plane 64 × 64 matrix with resolution of 3 × 3
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

6

mm, TR 2s, TE 30 ms, flip angle 78°. We discarded the first five “dummy” volumes to ensure magnetic equilibration.

Experimental Design

The experiment used a block design with two runs (229 scans per run), which were collected as the localizer for another experiment (Furl et al. 2013b). Note that the DCM analyses reported in Furl et al. (2013b) used independent data (from separate runs using different stimuli) to address a different phenomenon than considered here. All blocks were 11 s, comprised eight 1375 ms presentations of greyscale stimuli and were followed by a 1 s inter-block fixation interval. Participants fixated on a grey dot in the center of the display, overlaying the image. On a random one third of stimulus presentations this dot turned red and they pressed a key. Participants viewed six types of blocks, each presented six times. Dynamic face blocks contained dynamic facial expressions taken from the Amsterdam Dynamic Facial Expression Set (ADFES) (Van der Schalk et al. 2011). Four male and four female identities changed among neutral and either disgust, fearful, happy, or sad expressions. Identities and expressions appeared in a pseudo-random order, with each of the four expressions appearing twice in each dynamic face block. Dynamic object blocks included eight dynamic objects (Fox et al. 2009). For comparison, we also included dynamic and static patterns. We used a conventional low-level motion localizer, commonly used to localize and study motion sensitive areas hMT+/V5 and KO (Van Oostende et al. 1997). This ensured that our results are directly comparable to previous studies of low-level motion-sensitivity and verifies that the V5 voxels we identify using faces are a subset of hMT+/V5 voxels, as conventionally defined. These dynamic pattern blocks consisted of random-dot pattern videos with motion-defined oriented gratings. The stimuli depicted 50% randomly-luminous pixels which could move at one frame per second horizontally, vertically or

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

7

1
2
3 diagonally left or right. Oriented gratings were defined by moving the dots within four strips
4
5 of pixels in the opposite direction to the rest of the display, but at the same rate (Van
6
7 Oostende et al. 1997). The remaining three block types — static face, object and pattern
8
9 blocks — consisted of the final frames of the corresponding dynamic blocks.
10
11

12 13 14 Pre-processing and Analysis

15
16 We performed pre-processing and analysis using SPM8, DCM10 (Wellcome Trust
17
18 Centre for Neuroimaging, London <http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/>) and MATLAB (The
19
20 MathWorks, Natick, MA). Data were motion and slice-time corrected, spatially normalized to
21
22 an EPI template in MNI space, smoothed to 8 mm full-width half-maximum and analyzed
23
24 using the general linear model. At the first (within-participant) level, general linear models
25
26 used proportionately-scaled data, an AR(1) autocorrelation model, a high-pass filter of 128 s
27
28 and regressors constructed by convolving the onset times and durations for the different
29
30 experimental blocks with a canonical hemodynamic response function.
31
32

33
34 At the first level, we localized face-selective ROIs in the right OFA and FFA by
35
36 contrasting the average response to dynamic and static faces versus the average response to
37
38 dynamic and static objects and random-dot patterns. We also identified an ROI showing
39
40 motion sensitivity to faces in the vicinity of area hMT+/V5 (V5) by contrasting dynamic
41
42 versus static faces. We further localized an area in the STS by computing the interaction
43
44 effect in which motion sensitivity was larger for faces than for non-faces using the contrast
45
46 (dynamic faces > static faces) > (dynamic objects/patterns > static objects/patterns). Lastly,
47
48 we contrasted faces, objects and patterns versus fixation to localize the peak visual response,
49
50 which was located in right Brodmann area 18 (BA18). For BA 18, we located the peak
51
52 response to faces, objects and patterns in the whole sample of 18 participants (MNI: 16 -90 -
53
54 4) and then identified subject-specific peaks within 8 mm of the group peak. Eleven of the 18
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

8

1
2
3 participants evidenced significant responses (at $p < 0.01$ uncorrected) in all five ROIs in the
4
5 right hemisphere and further analyses focused on these ROIs – given the right hemispheric
6
7 dominance in face perception (Kanwisher et al. 1997). Note that our selection of ROIs for
8
9 subsequent DCM analyses is slightly more conservative than standard approaches. This is
10
11 because we chose subject-specific maxima that were within a specified distance of peaks in
12
13 an orthogonal contrast (at the group level) c.f., (Friston et al 1997). In other words, they were
14
15 selected using orthogonal (independent) criteria, rendering a correction for multiple
16
17 comparisons redundant.
18
19

20
21 For connectivity analysis, we employed dynamic causal modeling (DCM; Friston et
22
23 al. 2003) to test hypotheses about connectivity mechanisms that potentially could give rise to
24
25 the selective facial motion sensitivity that we observed in the STS. DCM models ROI time
26
27 series data by estimating coupling: the extent to which neural activity (hidden variables) in
28
29 each brain area influences dynamics in connected brain areas. DCM parameters include
30
31 exogenous inputs, endogenous connections, bilinear and non-linear modulatory connections.
32
33 Exogenous inputs are estimates of the perturbation of the neuronal states by stimulus
34
35 presentations, in this case, faces, objects and random-dot patterns. Endogenous connections
36
37 reflect directed coupling among areas, averaged over experimental conditions. Connections
38
39 with bilinear modulation show changes in coupling induced by an experimental factor.
40
41 Connections in our models could be bilinearly modulated by the presence of motion or by
42
43 facial form. Nonlinear modulations reflect changes in coupling induced by another ROI. Note
44
45 that non-linear modulations can be used to explain bilinear effects. For example, bilinear
46
47 modulation of faces versus non-faces might arise on a connection because it is non-linearly
48
49 modulated by a face-selective area. We used nonlinear parameters to examine how areas in
50
51 one pathway (e.g., facial form pathway) affect information flow in the other pathway (e.g.,
52
53 motion pathway). With DCM, we varied the presence or absence of endogenous, bilinear or
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

9

1
2
3 nonlinear parameters and performed Bayesian model comparisons to identify the optimal
4
5 model architecture. We first compared a bilinear model space, where we identified the model
6
7 that best explained how bilinear influences of motion and facial form explain STS responses.
8
9 We then performed a second model comparison, using nonlinear models, to identify the brain
10
11 areas whose activity could optimally account for the motion and facial form modulation we
12
13 observed in the optimal bilinear model (See below).
14
15

16
17 Before model comparison, we formulated a 'base model' that accounted for; (a) the
18
19 fact that the entire network is driven by face and non-face stimuli (objects and patterns), and
20
21 (b) that OFA and FFA respond preferentially to faces, while V5 responds preferentially to
22
23 motion. We drove the network by face, object and pattern stimulation by including an input
24
25 area (BA18) that responded to these three stimuli and is in a position to propagate neuronal
26
27 signals throughout the network. This BA18 area corresponds to, low-level visual cortex,
28
29 which is known to respond to visual stimuli generally and to feedforward its responses to
30
31 higher visual areas. Consistent with this role for BA18, we accounted for face-selectivity by
32
33 adding (bilinear) modulation by faces to the connection from BA18 to OFA. Similarly, we
34
35 accounted for motion-sensitivity by adding modulation by motion to the connection from
36
37 BA18 to V5. Model comparison then proceeded by varying other properties of this base
38
39 model.
40
41
42

43 We compared individual models (Table 1) and model families (Table 2) using their
44
45 relative log-evidences and posterior probabilities – assuming all participants used the same
46
47 connectivity architecture (Penny et al. 2004, Penny et al. 2007, Stephan et al. 2010). The
48
49 main focus of our model comparisons was to determine whether motion sensitivity that is
50
51 selective to facial form in the STS could be explained by network interactions between
52
53 motion and facial form pathways. We considered two alternative mechanisms for this
54
55 interaction. First, the connection between a face-selective area (OFA and/or FFA) and the
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces 10

1
2
3 STS could be modulated by motion. Second, the connection between a motion-sensitive area
4
5 (V5) and STS could be modulated by facial form. We first cast these hypotheses in the form
6
7 of bilinear models, and performed a model comparison using 16 models (cells in Table 1).
8
9 These 16 models were divided into four model families, corresponding to the mechanisms
10
11 that could produce the form by motion interaction in STS (See columns in Table 1). These
12
13 four families tested (1) face modulation of the motion pathway to STS from V5, (2) motion
14
15 modulation of the face pathway to STS from OFA, (3) motion modulation of the face
16
17 pathway to STS from OFA and (4) motion modulation of both face pathways from OFA and
18
19 FFA. These four families were crossed with two other variants of model, which tested
20
21 incidental hypotheses, as shown in the rows of Table 1. First, the bilinear models could be
22
23 either “full connectivity”, with all possible endogenous connections, or the connectivity could
24
25 be sparse. The sparse models were motivated by a previous study of
26
27 magnetoencephalographic induced responses that showed no endogenous connectivity
28
29 between FFA and the STS and only feedforward connections (Furl et al. 2013a). Second, the
30
31 bilinear models either possessed modulation by faces on only the connection from BA18 to
32
33 OFA (“OFA only” rows in Table 1) or possessed modulation on the connections from BA18
34
35 to both OFA and FFA (“OFA/FFA” rows in Table 1).

36
37
38
39
40
41 Our bilinear model comparison revealed that facial form information modulated the
42
43 connection from V5 to STS (See Results for more information). However, this result does not
44
45 identify the mechanism that causes this modulation. To do this, we used non-linear models in
46
47 which face-selective areas can directly influence the connection from V5 to STS. Here, we
48
49 could test whether the face-selective responses in OFA, FFA or both influenced the motion
50
51 information propagating to STS from V5. Non-linear influences from these face-selective
52
53 areas could account for the bilinear modulation of faces that we observed. Note that, in
54
55 principle, it would be preferable to test all our hypotheses in one non-linear model space. In
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

11

1
2
3 this case, we would have compared non-linear models where face-selective areas influence
4 the connection from V5 to STS against non-linear models where the motion-sensitive area V5
5 influences connections from the face-selective areas. However, the multiplicative nature of
6 nonlinear terms (Stephan et al. 2008) results in mathematically symmetrical nonlinear DCMs,
7 preventing this model comparison in practice. We therefore first tested bilinear models which
8 showed that faces modulated the connection from V5 to STS and then we tested non-linear
9 models to identify a possible face-selective area responsible for the bilinear modulation of
10 faces.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 RESULTS

24 25 26 27 ROI specification

28
29
30
31
32 We located ROIs in individual participants. We used the contrast of faces, objects and
33 patterns versus fixation to identify BA18; the contrast of dynamic and static faces versus
34 dynamic and static objects and patterns to identify the conventional face-selective areas OFA
35 and FFA; the contrast of dynamic versus static faces to identify the motion-sensitive area V5;
36 and the contrast (dynamic faces > static faces) > (dynamic objects/patterns > static
37 objects/patterns) to identify face-specific motion sensitivity in the STS. For display purposes,
38 Fig. 1 illustrates the results of this contrast in the STS at the group level, using the 11
39 participants who showed every ROI (peak voxel MNI: 56 -24 -8). This STS area was
40 observed at $P < 0.005$ uncorrected where it also met the $P < 0.0001$ threshold for family-wise
41 error correction at the cluster level (Brett et al. 2003).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Group-level ROI analyses

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Fig. 2 shows the response patterns in our ROIs at the group level using ANOVAs with
4 motion (dynamic or static) and category (face, object or pattern) as factors, followed by post-
5 hoc tests (Tukey honest significant difference corrected $P < 0.05$). Some of the ANOVA
6 effects duplicate the contrasts used to define the ROIs including the main effect of category
7 in face-selective ROIs and the main effect of motion in motion-sensitive ROIs. We include
8 these tests here for completeness and to illustrate the quantitative patterns of means within the
9 voxels identified in the ROIs. However, our main conclusions from the ROI analyses are
10 drawn from orthogonal ANOVA effects to preclude biased inferences. These include effects
11 of motion in face-selective ROIs and effects of category in motion-sensitive ROIs.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 BA18 (Fig. 2a) showed robust responses in every condition, with enhanced responses
24 to dynamic patterns, resulting in a motion \times category interaction ($F(1,50) = 9.30$, $P < 0.001$)
25 and a significant pairwise difference between dynamic and static patterns (there were no
26 other significant pairwise effects). V5 (Fig. 2b) showed robust responses to all dynamic
27 stimuli, with no positive responses to any static stimulus, and significant differences between
28 dynamic versus static versions of all three categories of stimuli, resulting in our hypothesized
29 main effect of motion $F(1,50) = 304.65$, $P < 0.001$. Because motion sensitivity was
30 numerically smaller for faces than for objects and patterns, there was a motion \times category
31 interaction ($F(1,50) = 9.52$, $P = 0.009$). The STS also showed a motion \times category interaction
32 ($F(1,50) = 18.72$, $P < 0.001$), but because of a different response pattern than for V5 and
33 BA18. In the STS, pairwise tests showed significant motion sensitivity only for faces, but not
34 for objects or random dot patterns. Neither ventral area showed any motion \times category
35 interaction (OFA: $P = 0.077$; FFA: $P = 0.264$), although we detected main effects of motion
36 (OFA: $F(1,50) = 17.73$, $P < 0.001$; FFA: $F(1,50) = 16.51$, $P < 0.001$) in addition to the main
37 effect of category (OFA: $F(1,50) = 91.06$, $P < 0.001$; FFA: $F(1,50) = 108.79$, $P < 0.001$).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

13

1
2
3 motion sensitivity for patterns but no significant motion sensitivity for faces or objects. For
4
5 the FFA, no category showed significant motion sensitivity when tested alone. In summary,
6
7 only the STS showed motion sensitivity that was selective for faces. V5 showed motion
8
9 sensitivity to faces as well as objects and patterns, while BA18, the OFA and FFA showed no
10
11 evidence for motion sensitivity to faces.
12
13

14
15
16 Connectivity models
17

18
19
20 Our ROI analysis confirmed the presence of dorsal temporal motion sensitivity in V5,
21
22 facial motion sensitivity in the STS, and ventral temporal face selectivity in the OFA and
23
24 FFA. We used connectivity modeling to test how interactions between the dorsal motion-
25
26 sensitive and the ventral face-selective pathways could give rise to motion sensitivity that is
27
28 selective to faces in the STS. We first compared bilinear models to test whether STS
29
30 responses might be explained by a network, either in which faces modulate dorsal motion-
31
32 sensitive pathway connections from V5 to STS, or in which motion modulates the ventral
33
34 face-selective pathway connections from the OFA and/or FFA to the STS. This space of
35
36 bilinear models further explored as secondary hypotheses whether (a) endogenous
37
38 connectivity is full or sparse and (b) face selectivity in the ventral pathway arises from
39
40 modulation by faces on only forward connections to the OFA, or if forward connections to
41
42 the FFA are modulated by faces as well (“OFA only” and “OFA/FFA” rows in Table 1). Of
43
44 the 16 models we tested, we found a high posterior probability (near 1.0) favoring a model
45
46 where faces modulate the dorsal motion-sensitive connections from V5 to the STS. For our
47
48 secondary hypotheses, we found (a) full (rather than sparse) endogenous connectivity and (b)
49
50 face modulation on connections from BA18 to the OFA only (and not also to the FFA). These
51
52 properties of the optimal model were confirmed using model family comparisons (Table 2).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

14

1
2
3 Having established that faces modulate the dorsal motion-sensitive connection from
4 V5 to the STS, we assumed that this face modulation arose from the activity in a face-
5 selective area in the ventral pathway. We therefore used three additional non-linear models to
6 test whether face modulation on the dorsal motion-sensitive connections from V5 to the STS
7 was more likely to arise from face-selective responses in OFA or FFA or both. We found a
8 near perfect posterior probability favoring the model where the OFA, but not the FFA (nor
9 both), modulates the connection from V5 to the STS.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 DISCUSSION

21
22 We show that motion sensitivity to facial form in the STS was best explained by a
23 DCM where transmission of motion information from V5 to the STS is gated or modulated
24 by information about facial form. Face-selective responses in the OFA most likely
25 implemented this gating. This model provides a network-based account for the emergence of
26 face-selective motion sensitivity in the STS and, perhaps, could also explain the integration
27 of motion and form information when viewing biological motion.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Responses to biological motion constitute a type of form-selective motion sensitivity,
37 in the sense that they respond only to conjunctions of motion with specific forms.
38 Consequently, studies in this area often characterize perception of biological motion as
39 resulting from a mixture of contributions of form and motion representations (Thompson and
40 Baccus 2012), which may be transmitted by separate occipitotemporal pathways (Giese and
41 Poggio 2003) and may converge on the STS, where the form and motion information is
42 combined (Oram and Perrett 1996; Vaina et al. 2001; Thompson et al. 2005; Lange and
43 Lappe 2006). Not surprisingly, the dominant theoretical frameworks from the face perception
44 literature are similarly structured, with distinct pathways representing facial form and
45 movements. Low-level facial feature information might be processed in the OFA and then
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

15

1
2
3 fed-forward into dorsal and ventral pathways (Haxby et al. 2000). Information about static
4
5 form or invariant facial features is considered to be represented in ventral areas like the OFA
6
7 and FFA (O'Toole et al. 2002; Calder and Young 2005; Calder 2011; Haxby and Gobbini
8
9 2011), which are selective for facial form (Kanwisher et al. 1997). More dorsal areas, such as
10
11 the STS (Haxby et al. 2000; Haxby and Gobbini 2011) and V5 (O'Toole et al. 2002),
12
13 however, are more sensitive to facial motion than OFA and FFA (Schultz and Pilz 2009;
14
15 Trautmann et al. 2009; Pitcher et al. 2011; Foley et al. 2012; Grosbras et al. 2012; Schultz et
16
17 al. 2013). These dorsal areas may employ motion-based representations to recognize the
18
19 changeable aspects of faces (Haxby and Gobbini, 2011; Foley et al., 2012). While our results
20
21 suggest that the STS is driven by facial motion information, they further show that STS
22
23 responses are not dependent on a single, motion-based pathway, but instead are the result of
24
25 non-linear interactions between motion and form pathways.
26
27
28

29
30 A previous study using connectivity analyses (Foley et al., 2012) showed that
31
32 responses in inferior occipital gyrus and STS were more correlated for dynamic than for static
33
34 faces. Indeed, a model like this could plausibly explain the form by motion interaction that
35
36 we observed in the STS. In this case, the STS would receive signals from OFA that are
37
38 already form-dependent (because OFA is face-selective) and the addition of motion
39
40 modulation on the OFA to STS connection would introduce an interaction of form and
41
42 motion in the STS. However, our bilinear model space tested a family of models with this
43
44 property (Table 1, column 2, Table 2, row 2) and it was suboptimal, compared to another
45
46 means of introducing a form by motion interaction in STS. The more likely model family
47
48 showed that facial form modulated the motion-sensitive responses conveyed to STS from V5
49
50 (Table 1, column 1, Table 2, row 1). We then showed that this facial form modulation could
51
52 occur when OFA activity (which is selective to facial form) non-linearly modulates the flow
53
54 of motion information from V5 to STS. In other words, the OFA acted as a modulatory gain
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

16

1
2
3 control on the “driving signal” in the motion pathway, rather than simply conveying the
4
5 motion information itself (Foley et al., 2012). These non-linear interactions also go beyond
6
7 previous work because they predict hypothetical neural mechanisms (Stephan et al. 2008),
8
9 where a neural population in the OFA might introduce short term synaptic plasticity in its
10
11 target (the STS) by altering its receptivity to other neural populations that drive it (V5). Our
12
13 results therefore provide neural-level hypotheses to be explored in the non-human primate,
14
15 which has well-characterized visual areas sensitive to faces (Tsao et al. 2006) as well as
16
17 motion (Dubner and Zeki 1971; Desimone and Ungerleider 1986; Nelissson et al. 2006),
18
19 including biological motion (Oram and Perrett 1994; 1996; Nelissson et al. 2011).
20
21
22

23 Our study focused on explaining STS motion-sensitive responses to faces versus
24
25 objects. However, some areas in the STS are well-known to be generally sensitive to
26
27 biological forms. Our results suggest a mechanism that might generalize to integration of
28
29 motion and form in cases of biological motion, although this requires confirmation using
30
31 speech movements, grasping actions or point light displays. We can claim that our STS area
32
33 is not involved simply in representing low-level motion or motion-defined shape features,
34
35 because it did not show sensitivity to random-dot patterns with motion-defined contours. We
36
37 can also claim that our STS area did not show sensitivity to motion that depicts complex
38
39 forms, as it was not sensitive to object motion (Beauchamp et al. 2002; 2003; Pitcher et al.
40
41 2012). However, we do not know how sensitive our STS area is to non-face body
42
43 movements. There is evidence that different areas in the STS show sensitivity to specific
44
45 body parts (Wheaton et al. 2004; Thompson et al. 2007; Grosbras et al. 2012). However,
46
47 motion sensitivity to different stimuli may overlap as well. The posterior STS responds in
48
49 common to a variety of different types of movements when they are compared to scrambled
50
51 movements without form cues (Santi et al. 2003; Thompson et al. 2007; Grosbras et al.
52
53 2012). And similar areas in the posterior STS are associated with point-light body actions as
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

17

1
2
3 well as faces (Hein and Knight 2008). The interaction of facial form and motion we observed,
4
5 however, showed its peak effect in a more anterior area of STS than that commonly observed
6
7 for point-light displays of bodily actions. Thus, any overlap between the STS area we
8
9 observed and motion sensitivity to other types of complex stimuli such as bodies still needs to
10
11 be established.
12

13
14 Our results suggest that access of facial motion to the STS is dependent on an
15
16 occipital area that is selective to facial form, the OFA. It remains to be seen whether other
17
18 form-selective areas perform similar gating on motion information in other stimulus domains.
19
20 For example, the extrastriate or fusiform body areas might gate connections between V5 and
21
22 the STS during body perception. Hein and Knight (2008) hypothesized that STS responses to
23
24 actions associated with theory of mind inferences or audiovisual speech movements might be
25
26 dependent, respectively, on responses in medial and inferior prefrontal areas. It remains
27
28 unclear whether these areas might have a driving (like V5) or a gating/modulatory (like the
29
30 OFA) relationship with STS responses. Inferior frontal cortex, in particular, has been
31
32 implicated in perception of facial and other types of biological motion (Saygin et al. 2004;
33
34 Wheaton et al. 2004; Casile et al. 2010; Furl et al. 2010; van Kemenade et al. 2012). Indeed,
35
36 inferior frontal involvement has been characterized as a top-down process involving motor
37
38 representations coded by mirror neuron responses (Caggiano et al. 2011; Kilner 2011;
39
40 Nelissen et al. 2011). We did not observe reliable inferior frontal responses in our individual
41
42 participants useful for modeling using our current data. However, connectivity analyses like
43
44 DCM may provide a powerful technique for measuring top-down influences on STS
45
46 responses to dynamic visual stimuli.
47
48
49
50

51
52 In summary, we present a connectivity model of fMRI data that explains, in terms of
53
54 network dynamics, the origin of motion sensitivity that is selective to facial form in the STS.
55
56 We demonstrate how responses in the STS can depend on interactions between information
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

18

1
2
3 flow in a dorsal motion-sensitive pathway and a ventral facial form-selective pathway. The
4
5 presence of information about facial form enhanced the ability of the motion-sensitive area
6
7 V5 to influence responses in the STS. This gain control modulation likely originated in the
8
9 OFA. Our model of network interactions provides a plausible mechanistic explanation for
10
11 how form and motion information are integrated when viewing biological motion. This new
12
13 perspective on network-level causes of brain responses to dynamic stimuli opens several
14
15 future research avenues.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

19

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Christopher Fox for supplying the dynamic object stimuli. This work was supported by funding from the United Kingdom Economic and Social Research Council [RES-062-23-2925] to NF. AJC (MC_US_A060_5PQ50) and RNH (MC_US_A060_0046) are supported by the Medical Research Council. The authors declare no competing financial interests.

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

20

1
2
3
4
5 REFERENCES
6
7
8

9
10 Beauchamp MS, Lee KE, Haxby JV, Martin A. 2003. FMRI responses to video and point-
11 light displays of moving humans and manipulable objects. *J Cogn Neurosci* 15:991-1001.
12

13
14
15
16 Beauchamp MS, Lee KE, Haxby JV, Martin A. 2002. Parallel visual motion processing
17 streams for manipulable objects and human movements. *Neuron* 34:149-159.
18
19

20
21
22
23 Brett M, Penny WD, Kiebel SJ. 2003. Introduction to random field theory. In: Frackowiak
24 RSJ, Friston KJ, Frith C, Dolan R, KJ, Price CJ, Zeki S, Ashburner J, Penny WD, editors
25 *Human Brain Function*, 2nd ed. San Diego (CA): Academic.
26
27
28

29
30
31
32 Caggiano V, Fogassi L, Rizzolatti G, Pomper JK, Thier P, Giese MA, Casile A. 2011. View-
33 based encoding of actions in mirror neurons of area f5 in macaque premotor cortex. *Curr Biol*
34 21:144-148.
35
36
37

38
39
40 Calder AJ. 2011. Does facial identity and facial expression recognition involve separate
41 visual routes? In: Calder AJ, Rhodes G, Johnson M, Haxby JV, editors. *The Oxford*
42 *Handbook of Face Perception*. Oxford (UK): Oxford University Press.
43
44
45
46

47
48
49 Calder AJ, Young AW. 2005. Understanding recognition of facial identity and facial
50 expression. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 6: 641-651.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces 21

Casile A, Dayan E, Caggiano V, Hendler T, Flash T, Giese MA. 2010. Neuronal encoding of human kinematic invariants during action observation. *Cereb Cortex* 20:1647-1655.

Desimone R, Ungerleider LG. 1986. Multiple visual areas in the caudal superior temporal sulcus of the macaque. *J Comp Neurol* 8: 164-189.

Dubner R, Zeki SM. 1971. Response properties and receptive fields of cells in an anatomically defined region of the superior temporal sulcus in the monkey. *Brain Res* 35: 528-532.

Foley E, Rippon G, Thai NJ, Longe O, Senior C. 2012. Dynamic facial expressions evoke distinct activation in the face perception network: a connectivity analysis study. *J Cogn Neurosci* 24:507–520.

Fox CJ, Iaria G, Barton JJ. 2009. Defining the face processing network: optimization of the functional localizer in fMRI. *Hum Brain Mapp* 30:1637-1651.

Friston KJ. 1997. Testing for anatomically specified regional effects. *Hum Brain Mapp* 5:133-136.

Friston, KJ., Harrison, L. & Penny, W. 2003. Dynamic Causal Modelling. *Neuroimage* 19:1273-1302.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces 22

1
2
3 Furl N, Coppola R, Averbeck BB, Weinberger DR. 2013a. Cross-Frequency Power Coupling
4
5 Between Hierarchically Organized Face-Selective Areas. *Cereb Cortex*. (Epub ahead of print)
6
7 doi: 10.1093/cercor/bht097.
8
9

10
11 Furl N, Henson RN, Friston KJ, Calder AJ. 2013b. Top-down control of visual responses to
12
13 fear by the amygdala. *J Neurosci* 33:17435-43.
14
15

16
17 Furl N, van Rijsbergen NJ, Kiebel SJ, Friston KJ, Treves A, Dolan RJ. 2010. Modulation of
18
19 perception and brain activity by predictable trajectories of facial expressions. *Cereb Cortex*
20
21 20:694-703.
22
23

24
25 Giese MA, Poggio T. 2003. Neural mechanisms for the recognition of biological movements.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Nat Rev Neurosci 4:179-192.

Grosbras MH, Beaton S, Eickhoff SB. 2012. Brain regions involved in human movement perception: a quantitative voxel-based meta-analysis. *Hum Brain Mapp* 33:431-454.

Haxby JV, Gobbini MI. 2011. Distributed neural systems for face perception. In: Calder AJ, Rhodes G, Johnson M, Haxby JV, editors. *The Oxford Handbook of Face Perception*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haxby JV, Hoffman EA, Gobbini MI. 2000. The distributed human neural system for face perception. *Trends Cogn Sci* 4:223-233.

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

23

1
2
3 Hein G, Knight RT. 2008. Superior temporal sulcus--It's my area: or is it? *J Cogn Neurosci*
4
5 20:2125-2136.
6

7
8
9
10 Jastorff J, Orban GA. 2009. Human functional magnetic resonance imaging reveals
11 separation and integration of shape and motion cues in biological motion processing. *J*
12
13 *Neurosci* 29:15-29.
14

15
16
17
18 Jastorff J, Popivanov ID, Vogels R, Vanduffel W, Orban GA. 2012. Integration of shape and
19
20 motion cues in biological motion processing in the monkey STS. *Neuroimage* 60:911-21.
21
22

23
24
25 Johansson G. 1973. Visual perception of biological motion and a model for its analysis.
26
27 *Percept Psychophys* 14:195-204.
28

29
30
31
32 Kanwisher, N, McDermott J, Chun MM. 1997. The fusiform face area: a module in human
33
34 extrastriate cortex specialized for face perception. *J Neurosci* 17:4302-4311.
35

36
37
38
39 Kilner JM. 2011. More than one pathway to action understanding. *Trends Cogn Sci* 15:353-
40
41 357.
42

43
44
45 Lange J, Lappe M. 2006. A model of biological motion perception from configural form
46
47 cues. *J Neurosci* 26:2894-2906.
48

49
50
51
52 Nelissen K, Borra E, Gerbella M, Rozzi S, Luppino G, Vanduffel W, Rizzolatti G, Orban
53
54 GA. 2011) Action observation circuits in the macaque monkey cortex. *J Neurosci* 31:3743-
55
56 3756.
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces 24

Nelissen K, Vanduffel W, Orban GA. 2006. Charting the lower superior temporal region, a new motion-sensitive region in monkey superior temporal sulcus. *J Neurosci* 26: 5929-5947.

Oram MW, Perrett DI. 1994. Responses of anterior superior temporal polysensory (STPa) neurons to “biological motion” stimuli. *J Cogn Neurosci* 6:99-116.

Oram MW, Perrett DI. 1996. Integration of form and motion in the anterior superior temporal polysensory area (STPa) of the macaque monkey. *J Neurophysiol* 76:109-129.

O'Toole AJ, Roark DA, Abdi H. 2002. Recognizing moving faces: a psychological and neural synthesis. *Trends Cogn Sci* 6:261-266.

Penny WD, Stephan KE, Mechelli A, Friston KJ. 2004. Comparing dynamic causal models. *Neuroimage* 22:1157-1172.

Penny WD, Stephan KE, Daunizeau J, Rosa MJ, Friston KJ, Schofield TM, Leff AP. 2010. Comparing families of dynamic causal models. *PLoS Comput Biol* 8:e1000709.

Pitcher D, Dilks DD, Saxe RR, Triantafyllou C, Kanwisher N. 2011. Differential selectivity for dynamic versus static information in face-selective cortical regions. *Neuroimage* 56:2356-2363.

Santi A, Servos P, Vatikiotis-Bateson E, Kuratate T, Munhall K. 2003. Perceiving biological motion: dissociating visible speech from walking. *J Cogn Neurosci* 15:88-809.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

25

1
2
3
4
5 Saygin AP, Wilson SM, Hagler DJ Jr, Bates E, Sereno MI. 2004. Point-light biological
6 motion perception activates human premotor cortex. *J Neurosci* 24:6181-6188.
7

8
9
10
11 Schultz J, Brockhaus M, Bühlhoff HH, Pilz KS. 2013. What the human brain likes about
12 facial motion. *Cereb Cortex* 23:1167-78.
13

14
15
16
17
18 Schultz J, Pilz KS. 2009. Natural facial motion enhances cortical responses to faces. *Exp*
19 *Brain Res* 194:465– 475.
20

21
22
23
24
25 Stephan KE, Kasper L, Harrison LM, Daunizeau J, den Ouden HE, Breakspear M, Friston
26 KJ. 2008. Nonlinear dynamic causal models for fMRI. *Neuroimage* 42:649-662.
27

28
29
30
31
32 Stephan KE, Penny WD, Moran RJ, den Ouden HE, Daunizeau J, Friston KJ. 2010. Ten
33 simple rules for dynamic causal modeling. *Neuroimage* 49:3099-109.
34

35
36
37
38
39 Thompson JC, Baccus W. 2012. Form and motion make independent contributions to the
40 response to biological motion in occipitotemporal cortex. *Neuroimage* 59:625-634.
41

42
43
44
45 Thompson JC, Clarke M, Stewart T, Puce A. 2005. Configural processing of biological
46 motion in human superior temporal sulcus. *J Neurosci* 25:9059-9066.
47

48
49
50
51
52 Thompson JC, Hardee JE, Panayiotou A, Crewther D, Puce A. 2007. Common and distinct
53 brain activation to viewing dynamic sequences of face and hand movements. *Neuroimage*
54 37:966-73.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

26

1
2
3
4
5 Trautmann SA, Fehr T, Herrmann M. 2009. Emotions in motion: dynamic compared to static
6 facial expressions of disgust and happiness reveal more widespread emotion-specific
7 activations. *Brain Res* 1284:100–115.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 Tsao DY, Freiwald WA, Tootell RB, Livingstone MS. 2006. A cortical region consisting
15 entirely of face-selective cells. *Science* 311:670-674.
16
17

18
19
20
21 Vaina LM, Gross CG. 2004. Perceptual deficits in patients with impaired recognition of
22 biological motion after temporal lobe lesions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 101:16947-16951.
23
24

25
26
27 Vaina LM, Solomon J, Chowdhury S, Sinha P, Belliveau JW. 2001. Functional
28 neuroanatomy of biological motion perception in humans. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*
29
30
31
32 98:11656-11661.
33

34
35
36 Van der Schalk J, Hawk ST, Fischer AH, Doosje BJ. 2011. Moving faces, looking places:
37 The Amsterdam Dynamic Facial Expressions Set (ADFES). *Emotion* 11: 907-920.
38
39

40
41
42
43 van Kemenade BM, Muggleton N, Walsh V, Saygin AP. 2012. Effects of TMS over
44 premotor and superior temporal cortices on biological motion perception. *J Cogn Neurosci*
45
46
47
48 24:896-904.
49

50
51
52 Van Oostende S, Sunaert S, Van Hecke P, Marchal G, Orban GA. 1997. The kinetic occipital
53 (KO) region in man: an fMRI study. *Cereb Cortex* 7, 690-701.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

27

Wheaton KJ, Thompson JC, Syngeniotis A, Abbott DF, Puce A. 2004. Viewing the motion of human body parts activates different regions of premotor, temporal, and parietal cortex. *Neuroimage* 22:277-288.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Table 1. Bilinear model evidences and posterior probabilities

		faces modulate V5 to STS	motion modulates OFA to STS	motion modulates FFA to STS	motion modulates OFA/FFA to STS
full	OFA only	285.20 (1)^a	231.47 (0)	222.64 (0)	87.92 (0)
	OFA/FFA	74.15 (0)	81.65 (0)	92.11 (0)	55.79 (0)
sparse	OFA only	12.71 (0)	9.19 (0)	9.49 (0)	0 (0)
	OFA/FFA	12.62 (0)	9.13 (0)	9.43 (0)	0.09 (0)

^a We compared 16 bilinear DCMs on the basis of their model evidences (with posterior probabilities shown in parentheses). The highest evidence model is shown in bold.

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2. Bilinear family model evidences and posterior probabilities

faces modulate V5 to STS	2.89 (1)
motion modulates OFA to STS	0 (0)
motion modulates FFA to STS	0 (0)
motion modulates OFA/FFA to STS	0 (0)
full	2.89 (1)
sparse	0 (0)
OFA only	2.89 (1)
OFA/FFA	0 (0)

^a We compared evidences (with posterior probabilities shown in parentheses) aggregated over “families” of bilinear DCMs that shared specific features of interest. The first four rows compare four families that could each differently explain the face-specific motion sensitivity in the STS. The fifth and sixth rows compare families with full versus sparse endogenous connectivity. The seventh and eighth rows compare a family using modulation of faces on the connection from BA18 to OFA versus a family using modulation on connections from BA18 to both OFA and FFA.

Sensitivity to dynamic faces

30

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Group-level whole-brain analysis. (a) Results of contrast (dynamic faces > static faces) > (dynamic non-faces > static non-faces). Voxels showing significant effects at $P < 0.005$ (uncorrected) are projected on an inflated cortical surface of the right hemisphere in MNI space. STS = superior temporal sulcus.

Figure 2. Group-level region of interest (ROI) analysis. (a) Mean responses in Brodmann area 18 (BA18) to faces, objects and random-dot patterns; (b) Mean responses in V5; (c) Mean responses in the superior temporal sulcus (STS); (d) Mean responses in the occipital face area (OFA); (e) Mean responses in the fusiform face area (FFA). Graph titles describe contrast used to define ROI.

Figure 3. Optimal dynamic causal models (a) the optimal bilinear model generates motion sensitivity that is selective to facial form in the superior temporal sulcus (STS) when faces modulate connections from the motion-sensitive V5 to STS. Bilinear modulations indicated by black arrows, endogenous connections indicated in light grey. The optimal model had full endogenous connectivity. (b) The optimal nonlinear model shows that the face-selective occipital face area (OFA) is the most likely origin of face modulation on the connections from V5 to STS. Bilinear and nonlinear modulations indicated by black arrows, endogenous connections indicated in light grey. FFA = fusiform face area, BA18 = Brodmann area 18.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Group-level whole-brain analysis. (a) Results of contrast (dynamic faces > static faces) > (dynamic non-faces > static non-faces). Voxels showing significant effects at $P < 0.005$ (uncorrected) are projected on an inflated cortical surface of the right hemisphere in MNI space. Blue circle indicates the peak voxel. STS = superior temporal sulcus.
85x132mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2. Group-level region of interest (ROI) analysis. (a) Mean responses in Brodmann area 18 (BA18) to faces, objects and random-dot patterns; (b) Mean responses in V5; (c) Mean responses in the superior temporal sulcus (STS); (d) Mean responses in the occipital face area (OFA); (e) Mean responses in the fusiform face area (FFA). Graph titles describe contrast used to define ROI.
176x199mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3. Optimal dynamic causal models (a) the optimal bilinear model generates motion sensitivity that is selective to facial form in the superior temporal sulcus (STS) when faces modulate connections from the motion-sensitive V5 to STS. Bilinear modulations indicated by black arrows, endogenous connections indicated in light grey. The optimal model had full endogenous connectivity. (b) The optimal nonlinear model shows that the face-selective occipital face area (OFA) is the most likely origin of face modulation on the connections from V5 to STS. Bilinear and nonlinear modulations indicated by black arrows, endogenous connections indicated in light grey. FFA = fusiform face area, BA18 = Brodmann area 18.
85x81mm (300 x 300 DPI)