

Perception of invisible masked objects in early infancy

5
Yusuke Nakashima^{1,2*}, So Kanazawa³, Masami K. Yamaguchi⁴

¹Research and Development Initiative, Chuo University, Tokyo, Japan.

²Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Tokyo, Japan.

³Department of Psychology, Japan Women's University, Kanagawa, Japan.

10 ⁴Department of Psychology, Chuo University, Tokyo, Japan.

*Correspondence to: ynakashima214@gmail.com

Keywords:

15 visual development, recurrent processing, backward masking, infant

Abstract

Recurrent loops in the visual cortex play a critical role in visual perception, which is likely not
20 mediated by purely feedforward pathways. However, the development of recurrent loops is
poorly understood. The role of recurrent processing has been studied using visual backward
masking, a perceptual phenomenon in which a visual stimulus is rendered invisible by a
following mask, possibly because of the disruption of recurrent processing. Anatomical studies
25 have reported that recurrent pathways are immature in early infancy. This raises the possibility
that younger infants process visual information mainly in a feedforward manner, and thus, they
might be able to perceive visual stimuli that adults cannot see because of backward masking.
Here, we show that infants under 7 months of age are immune to visual backward masking and
that masked stimuli remain visible to younger infants while older infants cannot perceive them.
These results suggest that recurrent processing is immature in infants under 7 months and that
30 they are able to perceive objects even without recurrent processing. Our findings indicate that the
algorithm for visual perception drastically changes in the second half of the first year of life.

Introduction

The standard view of cortical visual processing is that visual information is hierarchically
35 processed along feedforward pathways, with more complex representations created serially by
relaying information from lower to higher visual areas (1). However, recurrent processing, which
is mediated by corticocortical feedback and intra-areal horizontal pathways (2, 3), also
contributes to fundamental visual functions (4-6). Although the role of recurrent processing is
not yet well understood, many studies have proposed that visual perception is not mediated by a
40 purely feedforward system but rather by a system incorporating recurrent loops (7-12).

Anatomical studies of the infant brain have reported that feedback and horizontal connections develop later than feedforward connections (13-15). Anatomical data from postmortem brains of human infants have shown that the adult-like laminar termination pattern of forward connections between V1 and V2 emerges by 4 months of age (14), but the feedback (14) and long-range
45 horizontal (15) connections are immature at that age. These findings imply that until at least around the second half of the first year of life, recurrent processing is immature, and visual information may be processed mainly in a feedforward manner. However, this possibility has so far not been examined. Although neuroimaging studies of human infants have revealed functional and structural brain development (16, 17), it is difficult to determine whether the
50 observed activities or structures are derived from feedforward or recurrent pathways using imaging techniques in human infant studies. Thus, in the present study, we examined recurrent processing in early infancy using visual backward masking.

Visual backward masking is a perceptual phenomenon in which a stimulus is rendered invisible by a mask presented after the target stimulus. We used object substitution masking
55 (OSM) (18), a type of backward masking, which is thought to arise from a disruption of recurrent processing (18-23). In OSM, target perception is impaired when a target is briefly presented with a sparse mask that surrounds the target and the mask remains on-screen after the target disappears, while target perception remains intact when the target and the mask disappear simultaneously. OSM has been proposed to occur because the temporally trailing mask disrupts
60 the recurrent signals related to the target (18). Although some studies have questioned the recurrent explanation (24, 25), evidence from psychophysical studies suggests that OSM can be plausibly explained by the recurrent theory rather than the feedforward theory (18, 20, 22, 23). Indeed, a neuroimaging study has shown that recurrent activities in the early visual cortex are modulated when target perception is impaired by OSM (19).

65 Although an infant study has suggested that OSM occurs in 6-month-old infants (26), its
mechanism and development remain poorly understood. If visual processing is performed
without recurrent processing in early infancy, as suggested by the anatomical studies (14, 15),
OSM may not occur in younger infants. In other words, younger infants may be able to perceive
a masked stimulus that older infants cannot.

70

Results

OSM is present in older infants

75 We first examined the development of OSM in 3- to 8-month-old infants, using a preferential
looking paradigm with face stimuli (Fig. 1A). It is known that infants show spontaneous
preferences for faces over non-face objects (27). Thus, by measuring preferences for a face, we
can test whether or not infants can perceive the face followed by a mask. In an adult study, OSM
has been shown to occur when faces are used as a target (28).

80 A face was presented with three distractors (scrambled faces) for 250 ms, during which the
face was surrounded by a four-dot mask typically used in OSM (18). In the delayed-mask offset
condition (masked condition), the mask remained on the screen for 250 ms after the face and
distractors disappeared. In the simultaneous-offset condition (unmasked condition), the face and
mask disappeared simultaneously. The stimulus sequence was repeated for 11 s on each trial, and
the infant's looking time at the stimulus array during the trial was measured. Trials in the two
conditions were presented alternately and were repeated five times. If OSM occurs, infants
85 should not perceive faces in the delayed-mask offset condition, and looking times at the stimulus
array should be longer in the simultaneous offset condition, in which faces can be perceived.

 Infants were separated into three age groups: 3–4 months, 5–6 months, and 7–8 months of
age. Looking time was different between the two conditions only in 7- to 8-month-old infants

(Fig. 1B, C). Total looking time on the five trials was compared between the two conditions (Fig. 1C). Infants at 7–8 months looked longer in the simultaneous-offset condition (paired t -test, $t_{19} = 3.36$, $p < 0.01$, $d = 0.52$), while infants at 3–4 months and at 5–6 months showed no differences between conditions (3–4 months: $t_{19} = -1.12$, $p = 0.56$, $d = -0.11$; 5–6 months: $t_{19} = 0.19$, $p = 0.86$, $d = 0.02$). These results indicate that only 7- to 8-month-old infants could not perceive faces in the delayed-mask offset condition, suggesting that OSM begins to occur in 7- to 8-month-old infants.




Fig 1. OSM occurs in 7- to 8-month-old infants. (A) The two conditions in the first experiment. If OSM occurs, faces can be perceived in the simultaneous offset condition but not in the delayed-mask offset condition. Thus, looking times should be longer in the simultaneous offset condition. (B) Looking times for simultaneous offset (blue) and delayed-mask offset (orange) conditions on each trial. (C) Total looking times on the five trials for each condition. See Fig. S1A for individual data. All data are mean \pm s.e.m. $**P < 0.01$.

105 **OSM is ineffective for younger infants**

Although there was no difference between the masked and unmasked conditions in 3- to 6-month-old infants in the first experiment, we cannot conclude that masking does not occur in younger infants based solely on non-significant results. To further test the absence of OSM in younger infants, we next compared delayed-mask offset and no-face conditions (Fig. 2A). The
110 delayed-mask offset condition was same as that in the first experiment, and the no-face condition was the same as the simultaneous-offset condition, except that a face was not presented at the target position. If OSM does *not* occur, infants should perceive faces in the delayed-mask offset condition, and looking time should be longer in the delayed-mask offset condition than in the no-face condition.

115 In contrast to the first experiment, a difference in looking time between the two conditions was observed for infants at 3–4 months and 5–6 months but not at 7–8 months (Fig. 2B, C). Total looking time on the five trials was longer in the delayed-mask offset condition for infants at 3–4 and 5–6 months (3–4 months: $t_{19} = 6.15$, $p < 0.01$, $d = 0.66$; 5–6 months: $t_{19} = 5.26$, $p < 0.01$, $d = 0.52$), while there was no difference for 7–8-month-old infants ($t_{19} = 1.18$, $p = 0.25$, $d = 0.14$; Fig. 2C). These results indicate that the persisting four-dot mask was not effective for 3- to
120 6-month-old infants and that they could perceive faces that the older infants could not. Taken together, these results suggest that OSM occurs in infants over 6 months of age as it does in adults, whereas younger infants are immune to OSM.




Fig 2. Infants at 3–6 months are immune to OSM and can perceive faces in the masked

condition. (A) The no-face and delayed-mask offset conditions in the second experiment. If OSM does *not* occur, looking times should be longer in the delayed-mask offset condition. (B) Looking times for the no-face (blue) and delayed-mask offset (orange) conditions on each trial. (C) Total looking times on the five trials for each condition. See Fig. S1B for individual data. All data are mean \pm s.e.m. $**P < 0.01$.

OSM is ineffective for younger infants even with a contour mask

Infants under 7 months of age were able to perceive a face in the masked condition. However, the four-dot mask may have been insufficiently strong to cause OSM in younger infants. That is, 3- to 6-month-old infants may have perceived the four-dot mask as four separate dots, rather than as an object (a blank square produced by four dots). To test this possibility, we examined whether the results for younger infants could be replicated with a stronger mask, an elliptical contour, instead of four dots. The delayed-mask offset and no-face conditions were compared (similar to the second experiment) in 5- to 6-month-old infants (Fig. 3A). The delayed-mask offset condition was the same as that in the previous experiments except that the mask was

140 an elliptical ring, and the no-face condition was same as the delayed-mask offset condition
except that the face was replaced by a distractor.

The results replicated those of the second experiment (Fig. 3B, C). Infants at 5–6 months
looked longer in the delayed-mask offset condition ($t_{19} = 3.47$, $p < 0.01$, $d = 0.48$). Thus, infants
at 5–6 months could perceive faces although the mask was stronger, supporting the conclusion
145 that OSM is ineffective for infants under 7 months.




Fig 3. Infants at 5–6 months can perceive faces even with the contour mask. (A) In the third experiment, a stronger mask, an elliptical ring, was used in the same conditions as in the second experiment. (B) Looking times for the no-face (blue) and delayed-mask offset (orange) conditions on each trial. (C) Total looking times on the five trials for each condition. See Fig. S1C for individual data. All data are mean \pm s.e.m. $^{***}P < 0.01$.

150

Validation of the preferential looking paradigm

In these three experiments, it was possible that faces were presented so briefly that infants could not perceive them clearly even without masking. To confirm the validity of our paradigm, we examined whether infants preferred faces without masking. We compared looking times
155 between face and no-face conditions without masks (Fig. S2A, D). The two types of comparisons

were conducted in separate experiments, that is, face versus no-face with a blank in the target position (blank experiment) and face versus no-face with a distractor in the target position (distractor experiment).

160 In the blank experiment, infants in all age groups had longer looking times in the face condition (3–4 months: $t_{15} = 3.49$, $p < 0.01$, $d = 0.58$; 5–6 months: $t_{15} = 3.96$, $p < 0.01$, $d = 0.57$; 7–8 months: $t_{15} = 7.49$, $p < 0.01$, $d = 0.74$; Fig. S2B, C). In the distractor experiment as well, infants in all age groups preferred the face condition (3–4 months: $t_{15} = 3.54$, $p < 0.01$, $d = 0.52$; 5–6 months: $t_{15} = 6.51$, $p < 0.01$, $d = 0.65$; 7–8 months: $t_{15} = 4.94$, $p < 0.01$, $d = 0.96$; Fig. S2E, 165 F). Thus, we confirmed that infants could clearly perceive faces and discriminate them from distractors.

Discussion

The present study revealed that OSM occurs in 7- to 8-month-old infants but not in 3- to 6- 170 month-old infants. Importantly, the target masked by OSM, which disrupts perception in adults, remained visible to infants at 6 months and younger. This provides evidence of distinct mechanisms of visual perception in younger infants and adults. Given the anatomical studies showing immature recurrent pathways in early infancy (14, 15), the present results could be interpreted as suggesting that recurrent processing is immature in infants at 6 months and 175 younger, and that they can perceive visual stimuli without mature recurrent processing.

Our results demonstrate that a stimulus that can be perceived in early infancy becomes imperceptible during development. This counterintuitive result suggests that the algorithm for visual perception drastically changes in the second half of the first year. Visual processing may be performed through a feedforward system without (or with immature) recurrent processing 180 until around 6 months, while it is performed through the recurrent loops in older infants and

adults. Several positive functions would be acquired by incorporating recurrent processing, but it also may lead to backward masking since recurrent processing becomes critical to perceive objects.

185 What positive functions are acquired by maturing recurrent loops? Recurrent processing is related to the ability to integrate local information into a global context, such as figure-ground segregation (4, 6), illusory contour (29), and surround suppression (30). Thus, these functions are expected to be lacking in younger infants that do not have mature recurrent processing. Indeed, orientation-based texture segregation develops after 5 months (31), and illusory contours can be robustly perceived after 7 months (32, 33). Surround suppression is also immature until 6 months
190 (34). These complex functions develop later than processing of simple features such as orientation and motion selectivity, which develops by 3 months (35). These facts, together with our results, imply that basic processing such as simple feature selectivity is mediated by feedforward pathways, while more complex functions that require global integration are acquired through the development of the feedback and horizontal connectivity.

195 Some studies have proposed that OSM can be explained by the disruption of feedforward processing without assuming recurrent feedback (24, 25). However, our results are somewhat difficult to reconcile with the feedforward theory of OSM. A feedforward account of the absence of OSM in younger infants may posit that the forward processing of a target is so fast that a masker does not catch up with it. It is unlikely, however, that forward processing is faster in
200 younger infants than in older infants. Myelination in the occipital lobe is immature in infants (36), and the latencies of event-related potentials associated with visual perception are longer in infants than in adults (37, 38). Thus, in line with other studies suggesting that OSM is involved in recurrent processing (18-23), the recurrent account is a more plausible explanation for our results.

205 Another important function related to recurrent loops is predictive processing. Theoretical
studies assume that the visual system constantly integrates top-down predictions with sensory
inputs to resolve perceptual ambiguity (7, 11, 12). Recurrent processing has been shown to be
important for robustly perceiving degraded stimuli such as occluded or unclear images (39, 40).
In early infancy, such predictive mechanisms may be immature, and perception could be
210 vulnerable to degradation and ambiguity. Perhaps, in return for susceptibility to visual masking,
robustness of visual perception is acquired. On the other hand, it has been shown that visual
cortical activity is modulated by top-down predictions in infants at 6 and 12 months (41, 42).
These studies used association learning tasks with visual and auditory stimuli; thus, they were
related to cross-modal processing. Moreover, association learning tasks may be related to the
215 subcortical pathways (43). We infer that the mechanisms related to those tasks are different from
those in the present study and that their developmental time course may also be different.

Materials and Methods

Participants

220 Sixty infants participated in the first experiment. The infants were divided into three age
groups: 3- to 4-month-olds (8 female and 12 male, age range 90–132 days, mean age 115.5 days),
5- to 6-month-olds (9 female and 11 male, age range 148–191 days, mean age 170.8 days), and 7-
to 8-month-olds (12 female and 8 male, age range 207–254 days, mean age 233.2 days). An
additional 17 infants were excluded from the analysis because of fussiness ($n = 10$) or insufficient
225 looking time ($n = 7$; the total looking time on the ten trials was less than 30% of the entire duration
of the trials).

Sixty infants participated in the second experiment and were divided into three age groups: 3-
to 4-month-olds (11 female and 9 male, age range 82–133 days, mean age 109.0 days), 5- to 6-

month-olds (11 female and 9 male, age range 150–194 days, mean age 170.5 days), and 7- to 8-
230 month-olds (10 female and 10 male, age range 204–254 days, mean age 227.9 days). An additional
16 infants were excluded because of fussiness ($n = 8$) or insufficient looking time ($n = 8$).

Twenty infants at 5–6 months participated in the third experiment (7 female and 13 male, age
range 136–190 days, mean age 162.1 days). An additional infant was excluded because of
insufficient looking time.

235 In the fourth experiments, 96 infants participated. In the blank experiment, 48 infants were
divided into three age groups: 3- to 4-month-olds (9 female and 7 male, age range 86–134 days,
mean age 113.3 days), 5- to 6-month-olds (9 female and 7 male, age range 142–194 days, mean
age 171.8 days), and 7- to 8-month-olds (11 female and 5 male, age range 204–254 days, mean
age 230.8 days). An additional nine infants were excluded because of fussiness ($n = 6$) or
240 insufficient looking time ($n = 3$). In the distractor experiment, 48 infants were divided into three
age groups: 3- to 4-month-olds (7 female and 9 male, age range 85–134 days, mean age 114.5
days), 5- to 6-month-olds (9 female and 7 male, age range 152–194 days, mean age 172.8 days),
and 7- to 8-month-olds (11 female and 5 male, age range 200–253 days, mean age 230.5 days). An
additional six infants were excluded because of fussiness ($n = 5$) or insufficient looking time ($n =$
245 1).

The infants were recruited through newspaper advertisements. All infants were at full term at
birth and healthy at the time of the experiment. This study was conducted according to the
Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Ethical Committee of Chuo University. Written
informed consent was obtained from parents.

250 **Apparatus and visual stimuli**

Visual stimuli were presented on an LCD monitor (Cambridge Research Systems, Display++,

32 inch, 1920 × 1080 resolution, 120 Hz) using PsychoPy 1.90.3. An infant sat on a parent's lap in front of the display at a viewing distance of 60 cm in a dark room. A camera was set below the display to monitor and record the infant's looking behavior. An experimenter observed the infant's behavior through a monitor connected to the camera.

Face stimuli were created by morphing photo images of female frontal view faces. Five face stimuli were created; 4–8 different persons were morphed for each face stimulus. All face stimuli were cropped into an identical shape (5.3° in width, 6.6° in height) to remove the outer features. Distractors were created by local-phase scrambling of a face: the face image was separated into nine square areas and phase-scrambling was done in each area. The scrambled image was then cropped and a Gaussian blur was applied. Six scrambled images were created, and three were randomly chosen as distractors for each trial. The size and contour of distractors were the same as the face stimuli. A face and three distractors were presented in the cells of a 2 × 2 matrix on a uniform gray background (50.2 cd/m²). The distance between the centers of the monitor and the stimuli was 3.2° on the horizontal axis and 3.4° on the vertical axis.

The four-dot mask consisted of four white dots (0.7° in diameter, 98.8 cd/m²) located at the corners of the face stimulus. The distance between each dot and the center of the face stimulus was 3.1° on the horizontal and vertical axes. In the third experiment, the ring mask (6.6° in width, 7.8° in height, 0.3° in line width, 98.8 cd/m²) was presented instead of the four-dot mask. The spacing between the ring mask and the contour of the faces was at least 0.4°. The dot array presented after the four-dot mask consisted of a few dozen dots (each identical to those in the four-dot mask) and subtended 12.8° (width) by 15.5° (height).

Experimental procedure

We used the preferential looking paradigm to test whether infants could perceive faces. Trials

of two conditions were presented sequentially, and we measured infants' looking behavior to examine which condition infants looked at longer.

280 In the first experiment, the delayed-mask offset and simultaneous-offset conditions were compared in 3- to 8-month-old infants (Fig. 1A). A face surrounded by the four-dot mask and three distractors were presented for 250 ms. In the delayed-mask offset condition, the mask remained on the screen for 250 ms after the face and distractors disappeared. In the simultaneous-offset condition, the face and mask disappeared simultaneously and were followed by a 250-ms blank. The dot array was then presented for 100 ms in both conditions to prevent the persisting four-dot
285 mask from attracting the infants' attention. The stimulus sequence was repeated ten times at 500-ms intervals (i.e., 11 s) in a trial. On each repetition, the face and distractors were located at random positions in the 2×2 matrix, but a face did not appear in the same position sequentially so that infants did not see the face in central vision. Five trials were presented in each of the two conditions. The same face was presented ten times within each of the five trials, and five different faces were
290 used on the five trials. The ordering of the five face stimuli (i.e., ordering of the trials) within each condition was randomized for each infant. Trials in the two conditions were presented alternately, with the order of the two conditions counterbalanced across infants. Each trial started when the infant looked at a cartoon presented at the center of the monitor at the same time as a short beeping sound. The infant's looking time at the stimulus array during the trial was measured. If OSM
295 occurred, the looking time would be longer in the simultaneous-offset condition.

In the second experiment, the delayed-mask offset and no-face conditions were compared in 3- to 8-month-old infants (Fig. 2A). The delayed-mask offset condition was the same as that in the first experiment. The no-face condition was the same as the simultaneous-offset condition except that the face was replaced by a blank. If OSM did *not* occur, the looking time would be longer in
300 the delayed-mask offset condition.

In the third experiment, the delayed-mask offset and no-face conditions were compared in 5- to 6-month-old infants (Fig. 3A). The same two conditions as in the second experiment were compared, but an elliptical ring was used as the mask instead of the four dots. In the no-face condition, unlike that in the second experiment in which a blank was surrounded by the mask, a
305 distractor was surrounded by the mask. Also, unlike the previous no-face condition, the mask remained on-screen after the target disappeared to exclude the possibility that infants would prefer the persisting mask. This enabled a fairer comparison of the delayed-mask offset and no-face conditions. The dot array was not presented in this experiment because the mask was presented in both conditions.

In the fourth experiments, to confirm validity of our paradigm, the face and no-face conditions
310 were compared without the mask in 3- to 8-month-old infants (Fig. S2, A and B). In the face condition, the face and the four dots coterminated (as in the simultaneous-offset condition of the first experiment). The no-face conditions were same as the face condition except that the face was replaced by either a blank or a distractor. The two experiments were conducted separately: face
315 versus no-face (blank) and face versus no-face (distractor).

Data coding and analysis

An observer, blind to the stimuli presented on the trials, measured each infant's looking times from recoded videos. The looking time for each trial was measured by pressing a key while the
320 infant looked at the stimulus array.

Sample size was estimated based on data of previous infant studies that measured looking time (44) and was calculated to achieve a power of 0.8 with an effect size of 0.65 in the first, second, and third experiments (masking paradigm). In the fourth experiments (non-masking paradigm), sample size was determined to achieve a power of 0.8 with an effect size of 0.75.

325 Paired t tests were conducted to compare the total looking times on five trials between the
two conditions for each age group. All t tests were two-sided. The p values were adjusted using
the Bonferroni-Holm method for the three comparisons of each age group in all experiments
except the third.

330

Acknowledgments: We thank S. Tsurumi, J. Yang, Y. Ujiie, K. Sato, and Y. Tsuji for their
assistance with data collection and discussions. This study was supported by JSPS KAKENHI
grant number 19K14479 (Y.N.) and MEXT KAKENHI grant number 17H06343 (M.K.Y.)

335

Author contributions: Y.N., S.K., and M.K.Y. designed the study. Y.N. performed experiments
and analyzed data. Y.N., S.K., and M.K.Y. interpreted the data. Y.N. wrote the original manuscript.
Y.N., S.K., and M.K.Y. reviewed and revised the manuscript.

Competing interests: Authors declare no competing interests.

340

Data availability: The data used to generate the findings of this study are available in “figshare”
with the identifier “doi: 10.6084/m9.figshare.13220873”.

345

References

1. M. Riesenhuber, T. Poggio, Hierarchical models of object recognition in cortex. *Nat. Neurosci.* **2**, 1019–1025 (1999).
2. D. J. Felleman, D. C. Van Essen, Distributed hierarchical processing in the primate cerebral cortex. *Cereb. Cortex* **1**, 1–47 (1991).
350
3. N. T. Markov, J. Vezoli, P. Chameau, A. Falchier, R. Quilodran, C. Huissoud, C. Lamy, P. Misery, P. Giroud, S. Ullman, P. Barone, C. Dehay, K. Knoblauch, H. Kennedy, Anatomy of hierarchy: feedforward and feedback pathways in macaque visual cortex. *J. Comp. Neurol.* **522**, 225–259 (2014).
4. J. M. Hupé, A. C. James, B. R. Payne, S. G. Lomber, P. Girard, J. Bullier, Cortical feedback improves discrimination between figure and background by V1, V2 and V3 neurons. *Nature* **394**, 784–787 (1998).
355
5. A. Pascual-Leone, V. Walsh, Fast backprojections from the motion to the primary visual area necessary for visual awareness. *Science* **292**, 510–512 (2001).
6. M. W. Self, T. Van Kerkoerle, H. Super, P. R. Roelfsema, Distinct roles of the cortical layers of area V1 in figure-ground segregation. *Curr. Biol.* **23**, 2121–2129 (2013).
360
7. K. Friston, A theory of cortical responses. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **360**, 815–836 (2005).
8. C. D. Gilbert, W. Li, Top-down influences on visual processing. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **14**, 350–363 (2013).
365
9. S. Hochstein, M. Ahissar, View from the top: hierarchies and reverse hierarchies. *Neuron* **36**, 791–804 (2002).
10. V. A. F. Lamme, P. R. Roelfsema, The distinct modes of vision offered by feedforward and recurrent processing. *Trends Neurosci.* **23**, 571–579 (2000).

- 370 11. D. Mumford, On the computational architecture of the neocortex. II. The role of cortico-
cortical loops. *Biol. Cybern.* **66**, 241–251 (1992).
12. R. P. N. Rao, D. H. Ballard, Predictive coding in the visual cortex: a functional interpretation
of some extra-classical receptive-field effects. *Nat. Neurosci.* **2**, 79–87 (1999).
13. A. Batardiere, et al. Early specification of the hierarchical organization of visual cortical areas
375 in the macaque monkey. *Cereb. Cortex* **12**, 453–465 (2002).
14. A. Burkhalter, Development of forward and feedback connections between areas V1 and V2
of human visual cortex. *Cereb. Cortex* **3**, 476–487 (1993).
15. A. Burkhalter, K. Bernardo, V. Charles, Development of local circuits in human visual cortex.
J. Neurosci. **13**, 1916–1931 (1993).
- 380 16. G. Dehaene-Lambertz, E. S. Spelke, The infancy of the human brain. *Neuron* **88**, 93–109
(2015).
17. J. Dubois, et al., The early development of brain white matter: a review of imaging studies in
fetuses, newborns and infants. *Neuroscience* **276**, 48–71 (2014).
18. V. Di Lollo, J. T. Enns, R. A. Rensink, Competition for consciousness among visual events:
385 the psychophysics of reentrant visual processes. *J. Exp. Psychol. Gen.* **129**, 481–507 (2000).
19. C. N. Boehler, M. A. Schoenfeld, H. J. Heinze, J. M. Hopf, Rapid recurrent processing gates
awareness in primary visual cortex. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **105**, 8742–8747 (2008).
20. S. Bouvier, A. Treisman, Visual feature binding requires reentry. *Psychol. Sci.* **21**, 200–204
(2010).
- 390 21. B. Breitmeyer, Visual masking: past accomplishments, present status, future developments.
Adv. Cogn. Psychol. **3**, 9–20 (2007).
22. S. C. Goodhew, P. E. Dux, O. V. Lipp, T. A. W. Visser, Understanding recovery from object
substitution masking. *Cognition* **122**, 405–415 (2012).

23. A. Jannati, T. M. Spalek, V. Di Lollo, A novel paradigm reveals the role of reentrant visual
395 processes in object substitution masking. *Atten. Percept. Psychophys.* **75**, 1118–1127 (2013).
24. S. MacKnik, S. Martinez-Conde, The role of feedback in visual masking and visual processing.
Adv. Cogn. Psychol. **3**, 125–152 (2007).
25. E. Pöder, Attentional gating models of object substitution masking. *J. Exp. Psychol. Gen.* **142**,
1130–1141 (2013).
- 400 26. E. Kotsoni, D. Mareschal, G. Csibra, M. H. Johnson, Common-onset visual masking in
infancy: behavioral and electrophysiological evidence. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **18**, 966–973 (2006).
27. C. C. Goren, M. Sarty, P. Y. Wu, Visual following and pattern discrimination of face-like
stimuli by newborn infants. *Pediatrics* **56**, 544–549 (1975).
28. J. E. Reiss, J. E. Hoffman, Disruption of early face recognition processes by object substitution
405 masking. *Vis. Cog.* **15**, 789–798 (2007).
29. P. Kok, L. J. Bains, T. Van Mourik, D. G. Norris, F. P. De Lange, Selective activation of the
deep layers of the human primary visual cortex by top-down feedback. *Curr. Biol.* **26**, 371–
376 (2016).
30. J. J. Nassi, S. G. Lomber, R. T. Born, Corticocortical feedback contributes to surround
410 suppression in V1 of the alert primate. *J. Neurosci.* **33**, 8504–8517 (2013).
31. C. Rieth, R. Sireteanu, Texture segmentation and visual search based on orientation contrast:
an infant study with the familiarization-novelty preference method. *Infant Behav. Dev.* **17**,
359–369 (1994).
32. G. Csibra, Illusory contour figures are perceived as occluding surfaces by 8-month-old infants.
415 *Dev. Sci.* **4**, F7–F11 (2001).
33. Y. Otsuka, M. K. Yamaguchi, Infants’ perception of illusory contours in static and moving
figures. *J. Exp. Child Psychol.* **86**, 244–251 (2003).

34. Y. Nakashima, M. K. Yamaguchi, S. Kanazawa, Development of center-surround suppression in infant motion processing. *Curr. Biol.* **29**, 3059–3064 (2019).
- 420 35. O. Braddick, D. Birtles, J. Wattam-Bell, J. Atkinson, Motion- and orientation-specific cortical responses in infancy. *Vision Res.* **45**, 3169–3179 (2005).
36. H. C. Kinney, B. A. Brody, A. S. Kloman, F. H. Gilles, Sequence of central nervous system myelination in human infancy: II. patterns of myelination in autopsied infants. *J. Neuropathol. Exp. Neurol.* **47**, 217–234 (1988).
- 425 37. M. de Haan, O. Pascalis, M. H. Johnson, Specialization of neural mechanisms underlying face recognition in human infants. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **14**, 199–209 (2002).
38. S. Kouider, C. Stahlhut, S. V. Gelskov, L. S. Barbosa, M. Dutat, V. de Gardelle, A. Christophe, S. Dehaene, G. Dehaene-Lambertz, A neural marker of perceptual consciousness in infants. *Science*, **340**, 376–380 (2013).
- 430 39. K. Kar, J. J. DiCarlo, Fast recurrent processing via ventrolateral prefrontal cortex is needed by the primate ventral stream for robust core visual object recognition. *Neuron* **109**, 164–176 (2021).
40. D. Wyatte, T. Curran, R. O'Reilly, The limits of feedforward vision: Recurrent processing promotes robust object recognition when objects are degraded. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **24**, 2248–
- 435 2261 (2012).
41. L. L. Emberson, J. E. Richards, R. N. Aslin, Top-down modulation in the infant brain: learning-induced expectations rapidly affect the sensory cortex at 6 months. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, 9585–9590 (2015).
42. S. Kouider, et al., Neural dynamics of prediction and surprise in infants. *Nat. Commun.* **6**,
- 440 8537 (2015).
43. H. E. M. den Ouden, K. J. Friston, N. D. Daw, A. R. McIntosh, K. E. Stephan, A dual role for

prediction error in associative learning. *Cereb. Cortex* **19**, 1175–1185 (2009).

44. L. M. Oakes, Sample size, statistical power, and false conclusions in infant looking-time research. *Infancy* **22**, 436–469 (2017).

445

Supplementary Materials




Fig. S1. Individual data for each experiment. Differences in total looking time between the

450

two conditions as a function of the infants' age in days. (A) Data from the first experiment,

calculated by subtracting looking time in the delayed-mask offset from that in the simultaneous

offset condition. (B) Data from the second experiment, calculated by subtracting looking time in

the no-face condition from that in the delayed-mask offset condition. (C) Data from the third

experiment, calculated by subtracting looking time in the no-face condition from that in the


455

delayed-mask offset condition. (D, E) Data from the fourth experiments, calculated by

subtracting looking time in the no-face condition from that in the face condition, for the blank (d)

and distractor (e) experiments. Yellow triangles, 3–4 months; green circles, 5–6 months; purple

diamonds, 7–8 months.



460

Fig. S2. Procedures and results in the fourth experiments. (A) No-face (blank) and face conditions without masking. (B, E) Looking times for the no face (blue) and face (orange) conditions on each trial. (C, F) Total looking times on the five trials for each condition. See Fig. S1D, E for individual data. (D) No-face (distractor) versus face conditions. All data are mean \pm s.e.m. $**P < 0.01$.

465