The influence of image masking on object representations during rapid serial visual presentation

3

4 Amanda K. Robinson^{*a,b,c}, Tijl Grootswagers^{*a,b,c}, Thomas A. Carlson^{a,b}

5 ^{*}equal contribution

6

7 ^a School of Psychology, University of Sydney, NSW, 2006, Australia

8 ^b ARC Centre of Excellence in Cognition and Its Disorders, NSW, 2109, Australia

9 ^c Department of Cognitive Science, Macquarie University, NSW, 2109, Australia

10

Abstract

Rapid image presentations combined with time-resolved multivariate analysis methods of EEG or MEG (rapid-MVPA) offer unique potential in assessing the temporal limitations of the human visual system. Recent work has shown that multiple visual objects presented sequentially can be simultaneously decoded from M/EEG recordings. Interestingly, object representations reached higher stages of processing for slower image presentation rates compared to fast rates. This fast rate attenuation is probably caused by forward and backward masking from the other images in the stream. Two factors that are likely to influence masking during rapid streams are stimulus duration and stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA). Here, we disentangle these effects by studying the emerging neural representation of visual objects using rapid-MVPA while independently manipulating stimulus duration and SOA. Our results show that longer SOAs enhance the decodability of neural representations, regardless of stimulus presentation duration, suggesting that subsequent images act as effective backward masks. In contrast, image duration does not appear to have a graded influence on object representations. Interestingly, however, decodability was improved when there was a gap between subsequent images, indicating that an abrupt onset or offset of an image enhances its representation. Our study yields insight into the dynamics of object processing in rapid streams, paving the way for future work using this promising approach.

29 Introduction

30 The human brain processes rapidly changing visual input and can effortlessly extract abstract
 31 meaning when stimuli are presented in rapid sequences (Mack, Gauthier, Sadr, & Palmeri, 2008;
 32 Mack & Palmeri, 2011; Potter, Wyble, Haggmann, & McCourt, 2014; Thorpe, Fize, & Marlot, 1996;
 33 VanRullen & Thorpe, 2001). Recently, the temporal dynamics of the emerging representation of
 34 visual objects have been studied using fast presentation rates and multivariate analysis methods
 35 of electroencephalography (EEG) and magnetoencephalography (MEG) (Grootswagers,
 36 Robinson, & Carlson, 2019; Marti & Dehaene, 2017; Mohsenzadeh, Qin, Cichy, & Pantazis,
 37 2018). Notably, multiple visual objects represented in different stages of the visual system can be
 38 decoded from the EEG signal at the same time (Grootswagers et al., 2019). Object
 39 representations persisted for longer when presented at slower presentation rates compared to
 40 faster rates (Grootswagers et al., 2019; Mohsenzadeh et al., 2018). Additionally, images
 41 presented at slower rates reached higher stages of processing, such that categorical abstraction
 42 of animacy was evident for images in 5Hz but not 20Hz rapid serial visual presentation (RSVP)
 43 sequences (Grootswagers et al., 2019). Previous studies have used time-resolved decoding to
 44 study perceptual versus conceptual representations (Linde-Domingo, Treder, Kerrén, & Wimber,
 45 2019; Proklova, Kaiser, & Peelen, 2019; Ritchie & Op de Beeck, 2018; Teichmann,
 46 Grootswagers, Carlson, & Rich, 2018a, 2018b; Teichmann et al., 2019; Weaver, Fahrenfort,
 47 Belopolsky, & van Gaal, 2019). Changing presentation rates during RSVP offers the potential to
 48 explicitly target such different stages of processing. However, to do this we need to understand
 49 how exactly faster presentation rates influence image representations. The extended neural
 50 representations for slower versus faster presentation rates could be ascribed to the longer
 51 stimulus duration, or the longer stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA) of images in slower sequences.

52

Limitations in visual processing during RSVP is likely due to interference from processing multiple images in short succession. Decades of cognitive research have documented limitations in reporting targets during RSVP in phenomena such as the attentional blink (Broadbent & Broadbent, 1987; Raymond, Shapiro, & Arnell, 1992) and repetition blindness (Kanwisher, 1987). Such effects are typically studied to investigate high-level cognitive limitations rather than low-level visual processing interference (Raymond et al., 1992; Sergent, Baillet, & Dehaene, 2005). It is important to note, however, that target masking has a large effect on target detection during RSVP; for example, masking of the first and second targets increases the attentional blink deficit (Giesbrecht & Di Lollo, 1998; Nieuwenstein, Potter, & Theeuwes, 2009; Seiffert & Di Lollo, 1997). These findings suggest an important effect of low-level visual masking on higher-level processing during RSVP. In fast sequences, images are likely subject to forward masking by the previous image and backward masking by the next image in the sequence. Changing the image presentation rates has the effect of altering the timing of the masks. Backward and forward masking seem to have dissociable effects on perception, with one study showing maximal forward masking for 0ms gap between stimuli, and maximal backward masking at 30-90ms gap (Bachmann & Allik, 1976). EEG has shown that backward pattern masking influences processing after approximately 180ms, consistent with recurrent processing rather than feedforward processing deficits (Fahrenfort, Scholte, & Lamme, 2007). Understanding how masking affects the temporal dynamics of image processing during rapid-MVPA can yield important insights about the temporal limitations of the human visual system.

Studies of periodic visual evoked potentials also provide insights into the effect of image presentation rate on the extent of visual object processing. Faces presented at slower frequencies reach further stages of processing than those at faster rates, such that 15Hz presentations seemed limited to early visual processes, 6Hz showed increased occipitotemporal responses,

and 3.75Hz included higher level cognitive effects and frontal responses (Collins, Robinson, & Behrmann, 2018). Retter et al., (2018) showed that SOA and image duration had dissociable effects on the periodic response. Images at 10Hz had larger evoked responses than those at 20Hz, but a 50% on-off image duty cycle (50ms duration, 100ms SOA) resulted in larger responses than 100% duty cycle with same SOA (100ms duration, 100ms SOA), a finding attributed to forward masking in the 100% duty cycle condition (Retter, Jiang, Webster, & Rossion, 2018). Taken together, it seems likely that SOA and image duration have separable influences on visual responses, but how these differentially influence the temporal dynamics of individual image processing remains to be seen.

Here, we investigate the effect of image masking on the temporal dynamics of image processing by studying the emerging neural representation of visual objects in fast visual streams while separately manipulating stimulus duration and SOA. These factors could be predicted to influence the temporal dynamics of individual image processing in a linear or non-linear fashion. Varying SOA, and thus the amount of time an image can be processed before another image (acting as a mask) appears, could linearly influence the duration of image processing if the length of processing is directly related to the amount of time dedicated to processing the uninterrupted images. Alternatively, there might be a limit on the number of items that can be held in the visual system at once. If SOA influences the dynamics of image processing depending on the stage of processing that is influenced by forward and backward masking, this would predict a non-linear increase in image processing. Our results show that a longer SOA enhances the decodability of the neural representations in a non-linear fashion, regardless of stimulus presentation duration. Our results also suggest that presenting stimuli with no gap between subsequent images (100% duty cycle) delays the processing of each image.

103 **Methods**

104 Stimuli, data, and code are available at: <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/3RMJ9>.

105

106 **Stimuli**

107 We collected a stimulus set of 24 visual objects spanning 6 categories (Figure 1A). Stimuli were
 108 obtained from the free image hosting website www.pngimg.com. The top-level categories were
 109 animals and vehicles subdivided into 3 subcategories: birds, dogs, fish, boats, cars, and planes.
 110 Each of the subcategories consisted of 4 images each. These images allowed us to investigate
 111 visual representations for three different categorical levels: animacy (2 categories,
 112 animals/vehicles), object (6 categories, e.g., boats, birds) and image-level (24 images, e.g., yacht,
 113 duck). Images were presented using Psychtoolbox (Brainard, 1997; Kleiner et al., 2007; Pelli,
 114 1997) in Matlab. Images were each shown foveally within a square at approximately 3 x 3 degrees
 115 of visual angle.

116

117 **Participants and experimental procedure**

118 Participants were 20 adults recruited from the University of Sydney (12 female, 8 male; mean
 119 age: 25.75, age range 18-52 years) in return for payment or course credit. The study was
 120 approved by the University of Sydney ethics committee and informed consent was obtained from
 121 all participants. Participants viewed 200 sequences of objects. Each sequence consisted of the
 122 24 stimuli in a random order. To ensure all images were equally masked by other images, the
 123 sequences were padded with 12 stimuli on both ends, which were excluded from the decoding
 124 analysis. The 12 padding stimuli consisted of the same sequence in reverse order, with mirrored
 125 versions of the images. The mirror-reverse padding ensured a minimum of 12 images between
 126 two repeats of the same image within a sequence and that each of the 24 experimental images
 127 was presented twice per sequence. To keep participants engaged, at the end of each sequence,

after a 1000ms blank screen, a random image from the stimulus set was presented for 100ms and participants categorised this stimulus as animal or vehicle using a left or right button press (response mappings were alternated between participants). The presentation rates of the sequences were chosen from one of five conditions, which were randomized throughout the study (40 sequences per condition). In conditions 1-3, the presentation duration varied (200ms, 100ms, and 50ms) while keeping the SOA at 200ms. In conditions 3-5, the SOA varied (200ms, 100ms, and 50ms) while keeping the presentation duration at 50ms (Figure 1B). This set-up allowed us to use condition 3 as anchor point to compare the effects between varying SOA and duration. In total, participants viewed 9600 presentations, consisting of 80 presentations for each of the 24 images and for the 5 duration/SOA conditions.

EEG recordings and preprocessing

EEG data were continuously recorded from 64 electrodes arranged in the international 10–10 system (Oostenveld & Praamstra, 2001) using a BrainVision ActiChamp system, digitized at a 1000-Hz sample rate. Scalp electrodes were referenced to Cz during recording. EEGLab (Delorme & Makeig, 2004) was used to pre-process the data offline, where data were filtered using a Hamming windowed sinc FIR filter with highpass of 0.1Hz and lowpass of 100Hz. Data were then downsampled to 250Hz and epochs were created for each stimulus presentation ranging from [-100 to 1000ms] relative to stimulus onset. The same epoch length was used for all conditions. No further preprocessing steps were applied.

B

Figure 1. Stimuli and design. A) Experimental stimuli consisted of 24 images of objects organised at three different levels: animacy (animals, vehicles), object (6 categories e.g., birds, boats) and image (e.g., duck, chicken). B) Example time-lines illustrating the timing of the first six stimuli in a sequence in the different conditions. Images were presented in sequences with image durations of 200ms, 100ms and 50ms, and SOA of 200ms, 100ms and 50ms (5 conditions).

Decoding analysis

An MVPA time-series decoding pipeline (Grootswagers, Wardle, & Carlson, 2017; Oosterhof, Connolly, & Haxby, 2016) was applied to each stimulus presentation epoch in the sequence to investigate object representations in fast sequences. Voltages for all 63 EEG electrodes were used as features for the decoding analyses, which was performed for each time point separately. Linear discriminant analysis classifiers were trained using an image by sequence cross-validation procedure (Grootswagers et al., 2019) to distinguish between all pairwise groupings within the

categorical levels (animacy, object). This entailed holding out one image from each category in one sequence as test data and training the classifier on the remaining images from the remaining sequences. For pairwise decoding of the non-categorical image-level, we used a leave-one-sequence-out cross-validation procedure. It is important to note that the randomised image presentation order within each sequence ensured that for any given image, the preceding and following images were not informative to the classifier.

The decoding analyses were performed separately for the five duration/SOA conditions. For each condition, this resulted in three decoding accuracies over time (for animacy, object, and image). At each time point, these accuracies were compared against chance (50%) and compared to each other. All steps in the decoding analysis were implemented in CoSMoMVPA (Oosterhof et al., 2016).

Statistical inference

We used Bayes factors (Dienes, 2011, 2016; Jeffreys, 1961; Kass & Raftery, 1995; Rouder, Speckman, Sun, Morey, & Iverson, 2009; Wagenmakers, 2007) to determine the evidence for the null and alternative hypotheses. For the alternative hypothesis of above-chance decoding, a uniform prior was used ranging from the maximum value observed during the baseline (before stimulus onset) up to 1 (i.e., 100% decoding). For testing the hypothesis of a difference between decoding accuracies, a uniform prior was set ranging from the maximum absolute difference between decoding accuracies observed during the baseline up to 0.5 (50%). We then calculated the Bayes factor (BF), which is the probability of the data under the alternative hypothesis relative to the null hypothesis. We thresholded $BF > 6$ as strong evidence for the alternative hypothesis, and $BF < 1/6$ as strong evidence in favour of the null hypothesis (Jeffreys, 1998; Kass & Raftery,

1995; Wetzels et al., 2011). BF that lie between those values indicate insufficient evidence for either hypothesis.

To determine onset, offset, and peak time signatures, we defined onset as the second time point where the Bayes factor exceeded 6 and offset as the second-to-last time point where the Bayes factor exceeded 6. Peak decoding time was defined as the latency at which the maximum decoding accuracy was observed in the entire time window. We obtained bootstrap distributions of these latency measures by sampling from the participants with replacement 1000 times and recomputing the abovementioned statistics.

Exploratory channel searchlight analysis

To explore the spatial source underlying our decoding results, we performed a time-by-channel searchlight analysis. For every channel, a decoding analysis was performed using the data from a local five-channel cluster that included the channel's four closest neighbours (Oostenveld, Fries, Maris, & Schoffelen, 2010; Oosterhof et al., 2016). This was repeated for each categorical contrast yielding a time-by-channel map of decoding accuracies. Instead of obtaining pairwise decoding accuracies, we computed the multiclass decoding accuracies to save computation time.

Results

We examined the temporal dynamics of object processing using rapid-MVPA with sequences of varying image duration and SOA. During the experiment, participants reported whether an image presented after each sequence was an animal or a vehicle. Behavioural performance was high for discrimination of animal ($M = 97.10\%$, $SD = 5.23\%$) and vehicle ($M = 98.10\%$, $SD = 3.01\%$) stimuli.

212 To investigate the temporal dynamics of object processing, we decoded the objects at three levels
 213 of categorical abstraction: animacy-level (animal versus vehicle), object-level (birds, dogs, fish,
 214 boats, planes, cars), and image-level (24 images; 4 per object). The decoding analyses were
 215 performed separately for each SOA and image duration condition. Figure 2 shows the temporal
 216 dynamics of all categorical representations varied by SOA and image duration. For the effect of
 217 duration (left columns), all durations followed a similar decoding trajectory, but classification was
 218 poorer in general for the longest duration, which also happened to be the 100% duty-cycle
 219 condition (200ms SOA, 200ms duration). For animacy and object decoding, the first peak
 220 (~100ms) was similar across the conditions, but the 200ms duration was lower than both the
 221 50ms and 100ms conditions from 150-200ms, suggesting poorer categorical abstraction for this
 222 condition. Additionally, for the individual image decoding analysis, the onset of decoding
 223 appeared to be delayed for the 200ms duration relative to the 50ms and 100ms durations.

224

225 The right columns of Figure 2 show that for a given image duration (50ms), increasing SOA led
 226 to greater neural decoding for all categorical levels. For animacy and object decoding, the initial
 227 peak (~120ms) did not differ by SOA, but the larger second peak (~200ms) showed graded
 228 responses depending on SOA. At this peak, there was a small but reliable increase in decoding
 229 for the 200ms SOA relative to the 100ms, and these were both substantially higher than the 50ms
 230 SOA. Again, for the image decoding the 100% duty-cycle condition (50ms SOA/50ms duration)
 231 appeared delayed and had poorer decoding relative to the other conditions. Furthermore, the
 232 200ms SOA had greater decoding than the 100ms SOA condition between 100 and 200ms.
 233 Overall, these results imply that longer SOA led to stronger image representations.

234

235 To further assess the effect of image duration and SOA on object decoding, we analysed the
 236 timing of the decoding window (onset to offset of above-chance decoding) and the latency of peak

237 decoding. Figure 3 shows that the medium duration condition (duration 100/SOA 200) had the
 238 longest decoding window for all decoding contrasts. In contrast, the shortest duration and SOA
 239 condition (duration 50/SOA 50) had delayed onsets and the shortest decoding window. The peak
 240 latency results revealed that for animacy and object, the 100% duty-cycle conditions (200/200
 241 and 50/50) had the latest peaks. For the image decoding, again the 200/200 condition had the
 242 latest peak, whereas the 50/50 condition had a much earlier peak. This seems to be due to limited
 243 ongoing processing in the 50/50 condition such that peak decoding was for the first decoding
 244 peak whereas the other conditions had larger second peaks. In essence, it seems that the 50/50
 245 peak was actually centred on a different process than the peaks for the other conditions.
 246 Nevertheless, the *onset* of processing appears to be consistently delayed for the 100% duty-cycle
 247 conditions.

248

249 To explore the spatial origins of the decodable information, we performed a time-by-channel
 250 searchlight. Figure 4 shows the averaged multiclass decoding accuracies of this searchlight for
 251 image decoding at the time windows that correspond to the two peaks observed in Figure 2 for
 252 all five conditions. For all categorical levels and timepoints, see
 253 <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/3RMJ9>. During the first peak (100-150ms), the signal was
 254 mainly located in central occipital sensors, and during the second peak (175-225ms) in
 255 occipitotemporal sensors. The second window suggested that stronger accuracies were
 256 lateralised towards the right hemisphere.

257

Figure 3. Onset, offset, and peak latencies for each condition. Onset was defined as the second time point where the Bayes factor exceeded 6 and offset as the second-to-last time point where the Bayes factor exceeded 6. The three rows show the result for the three categorical levels (animacy, object, and image). Left columns: for each condition (y-axis), onset and offset are marked by a filled horizontal bar and are annotated at their respective time points. Shaded areas show the onset (above the filled bar) and offset (below the filled bar) latency distributions calculated by bootstrapping participants with replacement 1000 times and recomputing the statistics. Right columns: Peak latency (time point of peak decoding) for each condition (y-axis, same order as the left column). Shaded areas show the peak latency distribution calculated by bootstrapping participants with replacement 1000 times.

278 Figure 4. Exploratory channel-
 279 searchlight analysis. Plots show
 280 average multiclass image decoding
 281 accuracies as a topographic
 282 distribution over the head. Rows show
 283 all five presentation conditions.
 284 Columns show two time windows that
 285 correspond to the peak decoding time
 286 points in Figure 2. Chance-level is
 287 4.17% (i.e., 1/24).
 288
 289

Discussion

In this study, we disentangled the effects of duration and stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA) on decoding performance in rapid visual processing streams. Our results showed that shorter SOAs systematically reduced the duration of above-chance decoding, as well as the peak decoding accuracy, consistent with masking at earlier stages of visual processing. In comparison, there were no graded effects of presentation duration on decoding accuracies. Our results also suggest that presenting stimuli without a gap (100% duty cycle) leads to delays in visual processing.

Previous work found that fast presentation rates limits visual processing relative to slower presentation rates (Grootswagers et al., 2019). It was however unclear whether this difference was due to shorter stimulus duration or shorter SOA. The results of our study show that stimulus duration and SOA have separable effects on stimulus processing, with the most pronounced effect being that longer SOAs enhance decodability of stimuli relative to shorter SOAs. These findings are consistent with recent work that investigated the effect of duration and SOA on face response amplitudes in a fast periodic visual stimulation paradigm (Retter et al., 2018). Single unit recordings in temporal cortex of macaques have revealed a similar effect; neural responses to monkey faces in RSVP are stronger and last longer for slower presentation rates (Keysers, Xiao, Földiák, & Perrett, 2001, 2005). Interestingly, Keysers et al. (2001) found that the duration of image discrimination coincided with the SOA length plus 60 ms, an effect attributed to neural competition with other images in the sequence (Keysers & Perrett, 2002). Although we found that longer SOA led to longer neural decoding, there was no clear linear relationship between the SOA and length of decoding. Our decoding results utilise whole brain responses, however, which might be one reason for this difference; It could be, for instance, that non-linear interactions between early and late visual cortical regions overshadow or obscure linear effects within any one region

314 as measured with EEG. The current results suggest that SOA influences the degree of masking
315 from subsequent images depending on the stage of processing that is disrupted.

316

317 Our findings that SOA influences object representations in RSVP is consistent with a backward
318 masking account, such that presentation of every new image impairs processing of the previous
319 image. The mechanism for this masking could be explained by conceptual masking, neural
320 competition, or interruption. Conceptual masking is a high-level type of masking observed when
321 the critical image and the mask both activate high level concepts that compete for resources
322 (Intraub, 1984; Potter, 1976). It seems unlikely that our observed effects could be described by
323 conceptual masking because we see a graded effect of SOA on the amplitude and duration of
324 information coding, rather than a common stage of processing that is disrupted. As an alternative,
325 the interruption and neural competition accounts of masking imply that capacity limited processes
326 within the visual hierarchy mean more than one image cannot be fully processed within a short
327 period of time. Our results are consistent with capacity limits within the human brain, however it
328 is important to note that our results suggest that multiple object representations can co-exist in
329 the brain simultaneously, because decoding duration outlasted many subsequent image
330 presentations. What seems likely is that competition and/or interruption can occur within high-
331 order brain regions (Keysers & Perrett, 2002) but at any one time, different object representations
332 can be present at different stages of processing (and potentially within different brain regions).
333 Because of the whole brain approach of EEG decoding, we cannot determine whether
334 competition or interruption are more likely processing for the masking effects observed in the
335 current study, but future work could investigate this using a more fine-grained approach with many
336 more combinations of duration and SOA.

337

338 In contrast to the effects of SOA, we did not observe a notable effect of stimulus duration on
 339 object representations during RSVP. This is consistent with neural persistence, such that visual
 340 information continues to be processed even when it is no longer visible (Duysens, Orban,
 341 Cremieux, & Maes, 1985). Behaviourally, research has found that images presented for a short
 342 duration with a large gap are remembered almost as well as images presented for long durations
 343 (Potter, 2012; Potter, Staub, & O'Connor, 2004). Our neural results add to such findings by
 344 showing that objects presented for short durations followed by a blank gap (e.g., 100 duration/200
 345 SOA vs 50 duration/200 SOA) do not appear to be processed differently. The notable exception
 346 to this effect was for sequences with no gap between successive images. Specifically, neural
 347 responses were delayed when images were presented back-to-back (100% duty cycle). The most
 348 likely explanation for this is forward masking, such that processing of an image impaired
 349 processing of the next image, which is also supported by behavioural results (Bachmann & Allik,
 350 1976). Furthermore, in EEG, smaller periodic signals have been found with 100% duty cycles
 351 than 50% duty cycles (Retter et al., 2018). Our results suggest that forward masking impairs
 352 perception by delaying neural responses to the next image. Taken together, the findings of this
 353 study elucidate some of the complex neural mechanisms operating during RSVP which include
 354 neural persistence, forward masking and backward masking, each of which appear to exhibit
 355 differential effects on object representations.

356

357 Our results can also be used to guide future visual object representation studies that employ a
 358 rapid-MVPA design. For example, using a 5Hz rate, Grootswagers et al. (2019) obtained 40
 359 epochs for 200 stimuli (8000 epochs in total) in a 40-minute session. Here, we did not observe
 360 strong differences between 5Hz and 10Hz presentation rates (200ms and 100ms SOA). Thus, a
 361 10Hz 50% duty cycle presentation paradigm seems to provide a sensitive measure of object
 362 decoding accuracy. Notably, this is also a typical frequency used in RSVP paradigms to study

target selection processes, which are postulated to involve alpha oscillatory activity (Janson, De Vos, Thorne, & Kranczioch, 2014; Zauner et al., 2012). At 10Hz, a 30-minute EEG recording session (excluding breaks) yields 18000 epochs, which has unprecedented potential for studying a large number of different conditions and/or stimuli. It also suggests that it is possible to obtain enough epochs for a small number of conditions in a very short (<5-minute) EEG session. This opens up exciting new possibilities to study special populations for whom long experiments often pose significant difficulties, such as children and patients.

This study showed that analysing the neural signatures of all images in RSVP streams can yield insight into the mechanisms underlying visual masking. Without the need of a separate noise mask, a substantial number of presentations or conditions can be tested using rapid-MVPA, increasing the power of such experiments. By shortening the SOA, the masking affected earlier stages of processing, which has significant potential for studying hierarchical processing systems, such as vision (see also McKeeff, Remus, & Tong, 2007). For example, future work could apply rapid-MVPA and varying SOAs to stimulus sets that vary on orthogonal features that are expected to occur at different stages in the processing streams, such as colour and shape.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Ayesha Dadamia for assisting with data collection, and Denise Moerel for helpful comments on a draft of the manuscript. This work was supported by an Australian Research Council Future Fellowship (FT120100816) and an Australian Research Council Discovery project (DP160101300) awarded to T.A.C. The authors acknowledge the University of Sydney HPC service for providing High Performance Computing resources. The authors declare no competing financial interests.

388 **References**

389

390 Bachmann, T., & Allik, J. (1976). Integration and Interruption in the Masking of Form by Form.

391 *Perception*, 5(1), 79–97. <https://doi.org/10.1068/p050079>

392 Brainard, D. H. (1997). The psychophysics toolbox. *Spatial Vision*, 10, 433–436.

393 Broadbent, D. E., & Broadbent, M. H. (1987). From detection to identification: Response to multiple

394 targets in rapid serial visual presentation. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 42(2), 105–113.

395 Collins, E., Robinson, A. K., & Behrmann, M. (2018). Distinct neural processes for the perception of

396 familiar versus unfamiliar faces along the visual hierarchy revealed by EEG. *NeuroImage*, 181,

397 120–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.06.080>

398 Delorme, A., & Makeig, S. (2004). EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG

399 dynamics including independent component analysis. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 134(1),

400 9–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2003.10.009>

401 Dienes, Z. (2011). Bayesian Versus Orthodox Statistics: Which Side Are You On? *Perspectives on*

402 *Psychological Science*, 6(3), 274–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691611406920>

403 Dienes, Z. (2016). How Bayes factors change scientific practice. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 72,

404 78–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmp.2015.10.003>

405 Duysens, J., Orban, G. A., Cremieux, J., & Maes, H. (1985). Visual cortical correlates of visible persistence.

406 *Vision Research*, 25(2), 171–178. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0042-6989\(85\)90110-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0042-6989(85)90110-5)

407 Fahrenfort, J. J., Scholte, H. S., & Lamme, V. A. (2007). Masking disrupts reentrant processing in human

408 visual cortex. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 19(9), 1488–1497.

409 Giesbrecht, B., & Di Lollo, V. (1998). Beyond the attentional blink: visual masking by object substitution.

410 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 24(5), 1454.

- 411 Grootswagers, T., Robinson, A. K., & Carlson, T. A. (2019). The representational dynamics of visual
412 objects in rapid serial visual processing streams. *NeuroImage*, 188, 668–679.
413 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.12.046>
- 414 Grootswagers, T., Wardle, S. G., & Carlson, T. A. (2017). Decoding Dynamic Brain Patterns from Evoked
415 Responses: A Tutorial on Multivariate Pattern Analysis Applied to Time Series Neuroimaging
416 Data. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 29(4), 677–697. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01068
- 417 Intraub, H. (1984). Conceptual masking: The effects of subsequent visual events on memory for pictures.
418 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 10(1), 115–125.
419 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.10.1.115>
- 420 Janson, J., De Vos, M., Thorne, J. D., & Kranczioch, C. (2014). Endogenous and Rapid Serial Visual
421 Presentation-induced Alpha Band Oscillations in the Attentional Blink. *Journal of Cognitive*
422 *Neuroscience*, 26(7), 1454–1468. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00551
- 423 Jeffreys, H. (1961). *Theory of probability*. Oxford University Press.
- 424 Kanwisher, N. G. (1987). Repetition blindness: Type recognition without token individuation. *Cognition*,
425 27(2), 117–143.
- 426 Kass, R. E., & Raftery, A. E. (1995). Bayes factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(430),
427 773–795.
- 428 Keysers, C., & Perrett, D. I. (2002). Visual masking and RSVP reveal neural competition. *Trends in*
429 *Cognitive Sciences*, 6(3), 120–125. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(00\)01852-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01852-0)
- 430 Keysers, C., Xiao, D.-K., Földiák, P., & Perrett, D. I. (2001). The Speed of Sight. *Journal of Cognitive*
431 *Neuroscience*, 13(1), 90–101. <https://doi.org/10.1162/089892901564199>
- 432 Keysers, C., Xiao, D.-K., Földiák, P., & Perrett, D. I. (2005). Out of sight but not out of mind: the
433 neurophysiology of iconic memory in the superior temporal sulcus. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*,
434 22(3–4), 316–332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643290442000103>

- 435 Kleiner, M., Brainard, D., Pelli, D., Ingling, A., Murray, R., Broussard, C., & others. (2007). What's new in
436 Psychtoolbox-3. *Perception*, 36(14), 1.
- 437 Linde-Domingo, J., Treder, M. S., Kerrén, C., & Wimber, M. (2019). Evidence that neural information flow
438 is reversed between object perception and object reconstruction from memory. *Nature*
439 *Communications*, 10(1), 179. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-08080-2>
- 440 Mack, M. L., Gauthier, I., Sadr, J., & Palmeri, T. J. (2008). Object detection and basic-level categorization:
441 Sometimes you know it is there before you know what it is. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*,
442 15(1), 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.3758/PBR.15.1.28>
- 443 Mack, M. L., & Palmeri, T. J. (2011). The Timing of Visual Object Categorization. *Frontiers in Psychology*,
444 2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00165>
- 445 Marti, S., & Dehaene, S. (2017). Discrete and continuous mechanisms of temporal selection in rapid
446 visual streams. *Nature Communications*, 8(1), 1955. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02079->
447 x
- 448 McKeef, T. J., Remus, D. A., & Tong, F. (2007). Temporal Limitations in Object Processing Across the
449 Human Ventral Visual Pathway. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 98(1), 382–393.
450 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00568.2006>
- 451 Mohsenzadeh, Y., Qin, S., Cichy, R. M., & Pantazis, D. (2018). Ultra-Rapid serial visual presentation
452 reveals dynamics of feedforward and feedback processes in the ventral visual pathway. *ELife*, 7,
453 e36329. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.36329>
- 454 Nieuwenstein, M. R., Potter, M. C., & Theeuwes, J. (2009). Unmasking the attentional blink. *Journal of*
455 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 35(1), 159–169.
456 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.35.1.159>
- 457 Oostenveld, R., Fries, P., Maris, E., & Schoffelen, J.-M. (2010). FieldTrip: Open Source Software for
458 Advanced Analysis of MEG, EEG, and Invasive Electrophysiological Data. *Computational*
459 *Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2011, 156869. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/156869>

- 460 Oostenveld, R., & Praamstra, P. (2001). The five percent electrode system for high-resolution EEG and
461 ERP measurements. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 112(4), 713–719. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1388-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1388-2457(00)00527-7)
462 2457(00)00527-7
- 463 Oosterhof, N. N., Connolly, A. C., & Haxby, J. V. (2016). CoSMoMVPA: Multi-Modal Multivariate Pattern
464 Analysis of Neuroimaging Data in Matlab/GNU Octave. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*, 10.
465 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fninf.2016.00027>
- 466 Pelli, D. G. (1997). The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: Transforming numbers into
467 movies. *Spatial Vision*, 10(4), 437–442.
- 468 Potter, M. C. (1976). Short-term conceptual memory for pictures. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
469 *Human Learning and Memory*, 2(5), 509.
- 470 Potter, M. C. (2012). Recognition and Memory for Briefly Presented Scenes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3.
471 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00032>
- 472 Potter, M. C., Staub, A., & O’connor, D. H. (2004). Pictorial and conceptual representation of glimpsed
473 pictures. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 30(3), 478.
- 474 Potter, M. C., Wyble, B., Haggmann, C. E., & McCourt, E. S. (2014). Detecting meaning in RSVP at 13 ms
475 per picture. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 76(2), 270–279.
- 476 Proklova, D., Kaiser, D., & Peelen, M. V. (2019). MEG sensor patterns reflect perceptual but not
477 categorical similarity of animate and inanimate objects. *NeuroImage*.
478 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.03.028>
- 479 Raymond, J. E., Shapiro, K. L., & Arnell, K. M. (1992). Temporary suppression of visual processing in an
480 RSVP task: An attentional blink? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and*
481 *Performance*, 18(3), 849.
- 482 Retter, T. L., Jiang, F., Webster, M. A., & Rossion, B. (2018). Dissociable effects of inter-stimulus interval
483 and presentation duration on rapid face categorization. *Vision Research*, 145, 11–20.
484 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2018.02.009>

- 485 Ritchie, J. B., & Op de Beeck, H. (2018). A Varying Role for Abstraction in Models of Category Learning
486 Constructed from Neural Representations in Early Visual Cortex. *Journal of Cognitive*
487 *Neuroscience*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01339
- 488 Rouder, J. N., Speckman, P. L., Sun, D., Morey, R. D., & Iverson, G. (2009). Bayesian t tests for accepting
489 and rejecting the null hypothesis. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 16(2), 225–237.
- 490 Seiffert, A. E., & Di Lollo, V. (1997). Low-level masking in the attentional blink. *Journal of Experimental*
491 *Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 23(4), 1061.
- 492 Sergent, C., Baillet, S., & Dehaene, S. (2005). Timing of the brain events underlying access to
493 consciousness during the attentional blink. *Nature Neuroscience*, 8(10), 1391.
- 494 Teichmann, L., Grootswagers, T., Carlson, T., & Rich, A. (2018a). Seeing versus Knowing: The Temporal
495 Dynamics of Real and Implied Colour Processing in the Human Brain. *BioRxiv*, 369926.
496 <https://doi.org/10.1101/369926>
- 497 Teichmann, L., Grootswagers, T., Carlson, T., & Rich, A. N. (2018b). Decoding Digits and Dice with
498 Magnetoencephalography: Evidence for a Shared Representation of Magnitude. *Journal of*
499 *Cognitive Neuroscience*, 30(7), 999–1010. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01257
- 500 Teichmann, L., Quek, G. L., Robinson, A., Grootswagers, T., Carlson, T., & Rich, A. (2019). Yellow
501 strawberries and red bananas: The influence of object-colour knowledge on emerging object
502 representations in the brain. *BioRxiv*, 533513. <https://doi.org/10.1101/533513>
- 503 Thorpe, S., Fize, D., & Marlot, C. (1996). Speed of processing in the human visual system. *Nature*,
504 381(6582), 520–522. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1038/381520a0>
- 505 VanRullen, R., & Thorpe, S. J. (2001). The Time Course of Visual Processing: From Early Perception to
506 Decision-Making. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 13(4), 454–461.
507 <https://doi.org/10.1162/08989290152001880>
- 508 Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2007). A practical solution to the pervasive problems of p values. *Psychonomic*
509 *Bulletin & Review*, 14(5), 779–804. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03194105>

510 Weaver, M. D., Fahrenfort, J. J., Belopolsky, A., & van Gaal, S. (2019). Independent Neural Activity
511 Patterns for Sensory- and Confidence-Based Information Maintenance during Category-Selective
512 Visual Processing. *ENeuro*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0268-18.2018>

513 Wetzels, R., Matzke, D., Lee, M. D., Rouder, J. N., Iverson, G. J., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2011). Statistical
514 Evidence in Experimental Psychology: An Empirical Comparison Using 855 t Tests. *Perspectives*
515 *on Psychological Science*, 6(3), 291–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691611406923>

516 Zauner, A., Fellinger, R., Gross, J., Hanslmayr, S., Shapiro, K., Gruber, W., ... Klimesch, W. (2012). Alpha
517 entrainment is responsible for the attentional blink phenomenon. *NeuroImage*, 63(2), 674–686.
518 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.06.075>

519