1	Voxelwise encoding models of body stimuli reveal a representational
2	gradient from low-level visual features to postural features in extrastriate
3	body area.
4	
5	Giuseppe Marrazzo ¹ , Federico De Martino ^{1,3} , Agustin Lage-Castellanos ^{1,4} , Maarten J.
6	Vaessen ¹ , Beatrice de Gelder ^{1,2*}
7	
8	¹ Department of Cognitive Neuroscience, Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience, Maastricht
9	University, Limburg 6200 MD, Maastricht, The Netherlands
10	² Department of Computer Science, University College London, London WC1E 6BT, UK
11	³ Center for Magnetic Resonance Research, Department of Radiology, University of Minnesota,
12	Minneapolis, MN 55455, United States and Department of NeuroInformatics
13	⁴ Cuban Center for Neuroscience, Street 190 e/25 and 27 Cubanacán Playa Havana, CP 11600, Cuba
14	
15	* Corresponding author
16	E-mail: <u>b.degelder@maastrichtuniversity.nl</u>
17	
18	
19	
20	

21 Abstract

Previous research has focused on the role of the extrastriate body area (EBA) in categoryspecific body representation, but the specific features that are represented in this area are not well understood. This study used ultra-high field fMRI and banded ridge regression to investigate the coding of body images by comparing the performance of three encoding models in predicting brain activity in ventral visual cortex and specifically the EBA. Our results suggest that EBA represents body stimuli based on a combination of low-level visual features and postural features.

29 Author Summary

Historically, research on body representation in the brain has focused on category-specific 30 representation, using fMRI to investigate the most posterior body selective region, the 31 32 extrastriate body area (EBA). However, the role of this area in body perception is still not well understood. This study aims to clarify the role of EBA, in coding information about body 33 images. Using ultra-high field neuroimaging (fMRI) and advanced encoding techniques we 34 tested different computational hypotheses to understand how body images are represented in 35 EBA. Our results suggest that EBA represents bodies using a combination of low-level 36 properties and postural information extracted from the stimulus. 37

38 Introduction

Faces and bodies are amongst the most frequently encountered visual objects and provide essential information about the behaviour of conspecifics. In contrast to face perception, body perception is still poorly understood. Mainstream research on body representation in humans has focussed on category specific body representation in the brain, investigated with fMRI to identify conceptual category defined functional selectivity. Initially a body category selective 44 area was reported in the middle occipital\temporal gyrus, the extrastriate body area (EBA) (1).
45 Later a second body selective area was described in the fusiform cortex and labelled fusiform
46 body area (FBA) (2). Studies on body representation in nonhuman primates using fMRI as
47 well as invasive electrophysiology resulted in a similar situation of multiple body sensitive
48 patches in temporal cortex (3). Once multiple category selective areas were reported in human
49 as well as in nonhuman primate, the central issue is to understand how body images are coded
50 in the different body selective areas and how to account for the observed body selectivity.

An attractive notion that has been explored but ultimately not supported is that EBA coded 51 52 body parts and the more anterior FBA whole bodies, but this distinction proved inconclusive (for review, (4, 5)). An earlier proposal that EBA was selective for body parts and the more 53 anterior FBA for whole bodies and their overall configuration (6, 7) is not supported by current 54 findings in humans or non-human primates (3, 5). Furthermore, this is not easy to combine 55 with findings that activity in EBA is influenced by task setting (8-10) but also by experimental 56 manipulations of semantic attributes like gender and emotional expression (11-18). The fact 57 that such stimulus attributes have an impact on the level of activity observed in EBA also 58 challenges the notion that EBA only codes for body parts. 59

60

Thus our current understanding of how body images are processed shows a gap between the extraction of low-level physical features of the stimulus taking place in early visual cortex and the generation of a high-order semantic concept of bodies at stake in processing information about emotions or action and presumably linked to FBA activity (5). In view of its location in temporal cortex it is likely that the kind of coding to expect in EBA is related to computing some subsymbolic body features rather than identifiable body parts because the latter already implies high level body category representations (<u>19</u>). Candidate subsymbolic features are

overall shape representation and related to that, viewpoint tolerance, an important dimension 68 in the posterior to anterior gradient of object recognition. Studies in non-human primates that 69 use single cell recordings indicate that moving from posterior to anterior temporal cortex, body 70 patch neurons increase their selectivity for body identity and posture, while there is a decrease 71 in viewpoint selectivity. Specifically, recordings in body selective patches, middle superior 72 temporal body (MSB) and anterior superior temporal body (ASB) showed strong viewpoint 73 selectivity for the former and conversely, high tolerance for the latter (20). Furthermore, 74 Caspari and colleagues using the same set of category stimuli as Kumar and colleagues, 75 76 showed similar decoding pattern between monkeys and humans in body selective regions, suggesting an homology between the human EBA and monkey MSB as well as the human 77 FBA and monkey ASB (20, 21). 78

This suggests a general principle of object coding in the inferior temporal cortex (IT): a greater tolerance to image transformations that preserve identity (22) and, in the case of bodies, posture, for more anterior patches. The monkey data fits human fMRI work that found viewpoint-invariant decoding of body identity in FBA but not EBA (14), but as noted above, results of between-area differences in fMRI multi voxel pattern analysis (MVPA) are difficult to interpret (23).

85

An important question is whether a similar posterior to anterior organisation can be found for EBA by using ultra high field fMRI in combination with computational hypotheses. One popular approach to test and compare different computational hypotheses of brain function is to use (linearized) encoding (24, 25) approaches. In these approaches brain activity (e.g. the blood oxygen level dependent (BOLD) signals in a voxel or an brain area in fMRI) is predicted from the features of (different) computational models, and their accuracy can be compared to

adjudicate between competing models or partitioned with the respect to the variance explained
by each of the models (<u>26-32</u>).

We used ultra-high field fMRI and linearized encoding to evaluate to what extent the response
in extrastriate body areas can be explained on the one hand by low-level visual features (Gabor)
(<u>33</u>) and on the other by the features extracted by two computational models that represent the
postural features of the body (kp2d, kp3d) (<u>34</u>, <u>35</u>) (see Material and Methods).

98

99

100 **Results**

101 Behavioural analysis

The analysis of the responses to the questionnaires revealed that no action was recognised for 92% of the stimuli (298 out of 324). Likewise, no emotion was recognised for 97% of the stimuli (314 out of 324). Participants reported that they focused on the overall body pose in 65% of the cases (211 out of 324), on the hands in 20% (64 out of 324) of the cases and on the arms for 11% (38 out of 324). The full report on the behavioural results is found in the supplementary material.

108 Univariate analysis and voxels selection for encoding

In each subject, voxels that significantly (q(FDR)<0.05) responded to the localizer conditions (main effect) were selected for the encoding analysis (Fig. 2a). At the group level, we observed significant (q(FDR<0.01) activation in occipital-temporal cortex as well as parietal cortex in the occipital gyrus (superior/middle/inferior) (SOG/MOG/IOG), fusiform gyrus (FG), lingual gyrus (LG), middle



Figure 2 Univariate analysis.

(a) Brain maps showing the responses for the main effect of the localizer in a single subject computed with a fixed-effect GLM. This map was created in volume space (q(FDR) < 0.05) and overlaid on the subject mesh for visualization purposes.

(b) Brain activation for the main effect of the localizer obtained when including all the subjects in a RFX GLM. The activation map is corrected for multiple comparison at q(FDR) < 0.01 and is cluster thresholded (cluster size = 25).

(c) Body selective regions obtained by contrasting the localizer conditions Body > Objects (Houses + Tools). As in (a), the statistical thresholding of the map was performed in volume space (q(FDR)<0.05) and then overlaid on the group average mesh for visualization purposes. We used this contrast to obtain a group definition of EBA which was intersected with single subjects' activation maps for the subsequent ROI analysis.

114

temporal gyrus (MTG), superior parietal lobule (SPL), intraparietal sulcus (IPS), inferior
temporal sulcus (ITS), lateral occipital sulcus (LOS), superior temporal sulcus (STS) (Fig 2b).

- Subtracting the response to object stimuli from the response to body stimuli allowed us to define EBA. This cluster spanned the MOG, MTG as well as the ITS (Fig 2c). The voxels selection for the encoding analysis was performed at the individual level and based on the main effect. A probabilistic map (computed by counting the number of subjects for which a given voxel was included in the analysis) showed a consistent overlap with the functionally defined EBA (Fig 3).
- 123



Figure 3. Probabilistic map of the main effect of the localizer.

(a) This brain map shows the extent of the overlap between participants within the main effect of the localizer computed for each participant across all runs via a fixed-effect GLM. This overlap is expressed via a probability map where at each spatial location the percentage of the relative number of subjects leading to significant activity is reported (low probability \rightarrow high probability: white \rightarrow green).

(b) In the second row, we overlay the binarized (suprathreshold voxels q(FDR) < 0.05 = 1) group definition of EBA (in blue) (see Fig. 2c) on the probabilistic map. This shows that most (90-100%) of the participants shared significant responses (q(FDR) < 0.05) within the region of interest.

124

125 Encoding results

The voxels selected using the response to the localizer were submitted to the encoding analysis. The response to the body stimuli presented in the main experiment (data independent from the localizer) were modelled using banded ridge regression. The group performance of the joint (three) encoding model is shown in Fig. 4. The accuracy of the joint (kp2d, kp3d, Gabor) encoding model at the group level (after statistical testing and correction for multiple comparisons) is shown in Fig. 4. We found that when combining information from the three models we could significantly predict responses to novel stimuli

133



Figure 4. Joint model performance.

Group Prediction accuracy for the joint model (kp2d, kp3d, Gabor). Statistical significance was assessed via permutation test (subject wise sign-flipping, 10000 times), and correction for multiple comparison was performed using Bonferroni correction (p<0.05). The bar plot depicts the group (mean + standard error) correlation coefficient between the joint model predictions and brain response to novel stimuli (test stimuli) across participants in bilateral EBA. We did not find any significant difference across hemispheres (two-sample t-test, p=0.481). For reference, the bottom right corner shows the functional definition of EBA already presented in Fig. 2c.

134

(Fig. 4) throughout the ventral visual cortex (SOG, MOG, IOG, ITG, MTG, FG, LOS), and in parietal cortex (SPL). We assessed spatial differences in how models contributed to the fMRI response by colour coding the relative contribution of each of the models to the overall prediction accuracy (Fig. 5). The response to bodies in early visual cortical areas was in average better explained by the Gabor model (blue-purple-dark magenta).



Figure 5. Comparison between encoding models.

(a) RGB map in which each vertex is colour coded according to the relative contribution of each model to the accuracy of the joint model (red = 100% kp2d; blue = 100% Gabor; green = 100% kp3d).

(b) In EBA, the information contained in the joint model predictions which significantly correlates with BOLD activity is split across models with kp2d accounting for 50-60% of the variance, Gabor approximately 25-30% of the variance and kp3d the remaining 15-20%. We tested for statistical difference across models' pair (solid lines at the top), using a two-sample t-test (*** p<0.0001) (see bar plot). Additionally, the variance explained follows a gradient from the posterior part (posterior ITG/LOS) to the anterior (anterior LOS) of EBA, with darker shades of magenta in the posterior part indicating higher representation of low-level body features (Gabor), and lighter shades of magenta in the anterior part indicating higher representation of mid-level features (kp2d-kp3d).

ITG = inferior temporal gyrus; MTG = middle temporal gyrus; LOS = lateral occipital sulcus.

Moving to higher visual cortical areas corresponded to a shift in the relative contribution 141 towards a combination of kp2d and Gabor (magenta), while in EBA the model that contributed 142 most to the prediction accuracy was kp2d (magenta - light magenta - pink). When considering 143 EBA (Fig. 5), the joint model significantly predicted brain responses to test stimuli (Fig. 4), 144 and the kp2d model accounts for approximately 50-60% of the variance of this prediction (Fig. 145 5b). It is worth noting that when considering the spatial distribution of relative model 146 147 contributions to the prediction accuracy (Fig. 5), the posterior part of EBA, specifically the posterior part of lateral occipital sulcus (LOS) was best explained by the Gabor model (dark 148 149 magenta area), while the anterior part of LOS showed lighter shades of magenta indicating that the leading representation is kp2d. 150

151

152 **Discussion**

In this study, we used ultra-high field fMRI to determine the main (stimulus) features that drive 153 brain responses to still body stimuli, with a particular focus to the responses in the extrastriate 154 body selective area (EBA). We compared the performance of three encoding models using 155 banded ridge regression. We observed that a combination of the three models (kp2d, kp3d, 156 Gabor) could significantly predict fMRI BOLD responses in ventral cortex and in parietal 157 cortex (SPL). The partial correlation analysis revealed that, in EBA, approximately 50% of the 158 variance of the prediction accuracy is explained by kp2d, 30% by Gabor and 20% by kp3d. 159 These results lead us to conclude that EBA represents body stimuli based on the combination 160 of low-level visual features and postural features. 161

162

EBA was originally defined as a category selective area associated with body representationbut the computations underlying this selective response are not yet well understood. Previous

proposals stressed the role of EBA for individual body parts but not whole body images (<u>1</u>, <u>36</u>, <u>37</u>). These results are difficult to combine with evidence that EBA is selective for human bodies when only represented as stick figures, line drawings or silhouettes (<u>38</u>). Our findings are consistent with the latter hypothesis as the kp2d/3d model explain approximately 70% of the accuracy in EBA.

170

The Gabor model proposed by (33) was specifically constructed to encode low-level visual 171 features such as spatial frequency, location, size and object orientation. Gabor based models 172 have been shown to be powerful tool for inferring (encoding/decoding) (25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 173 39-42) brain activity inside and outside early visual cortex. Our findings suggest that the 174 175 variance explained by the Gabor model shows a decreasing gradient from early to higher-level 176 visual cortex. This suggests that within early sensory regions (superior occipital gyrus, blue patches in Fig. 4b) Gabor features are critical for predicting BOLD responses to body stimuli. 177 178 Conversely, the variance explained by kp2d shows the opposite gradient, and it is highest in EBA. This suggests that postural features are critical in driving the response to body pictures 179 in EBA. Interestingly, the transition between low-level features driving the response in early 180 areas and mid-level (postural) features driving the response in high-level visual cortex (EBA) 181 at the group level is smooth and suggests a dynamic, stimulus dependent, representation of 182 bodies (5). Likewise, similar patterns can be seen at the single subject level (see Supplementary 183 material). 184

Another important point is the performance difference between kp2d and kp3d. These models represent body poses as the spatial location of specific keypoints (joints, hand, head etc). In the case of kp3d, the keypoints represent the 3D coordinates used by VPoser to pose the mesh (<u>34</u>, <u>35</u>) and construct the actual stimulus. Similarly, kp2d represents the orthogonal projection of

the 3D coordinates on the camera plane. Therefore, the only difference between the models is 189 that kp3d is isotropic (invariant across viewpoints), whereas the features of kp2d change across 190 different view of the same pose. Our findings show that between kp2d/3d, banded ridge almost 191 always selects the former as predictive and consider the latter as redundant. This is reflected in 192 the percentage maps where on average kp2d outperforms kp3d. One possible explanation for 193 this result is that the information contained in the 3rd dimension of kp3d was not needed to 194 explain the variance in the data and, as a result, the selected feature space was kp2d for most 195 of the voxels, suggesting that the viewpoint information is encoded in EBA. Previous research 196 197 has shown that EBA is sensitive to body orientation (11-14, 16), although we did not find significant differences in brain activity when looking at differences between viewpoints 198 (RFXGLM with three viewpoints as predictors of interest). This result is in line with what has 199 200 been shown in single cell recordings on primates, where the MSB (analogous of the EBA in 201 humans) showed strong viewpoint selectivity (20).

It is worth mentioning that our stimuli were specifically controlled for the presence of high-202 level stimulus attributes (i.e. emotion, action information) and validated using behavioural 203 ratings (see behavioural analysis). Many previous studies have shown that activity in EBA is 204 205 modulated by emotional body expressions (43-50). Moreover, a recent study has shown that unique information from the posture feature limb contractions is involved in fearful body 206 207 expression perception (51). This indicates that body expression may be based on body posture and movement features rather than implicating body representation as a high-level semantic 208 category (5). 209

Our results corroborate the notion that the functional EBA definition spans several anatomical regions with potentially different roles. Specifically, the EBA may be subdivided in three anatomical regions (52) located respectively in the inferior temporal gyrus (ITG), middle temporal gyrus (MTG) and lateral occipital sulcus (LOS). When looking closely at the partial

correlation patterns in EBA around the anatomical landmarks ITG, MTG, LOS (Fig. 5b and 214 the barplot Fig. 5b) we see that not all the variance can be explained by combining the kp2d 215 model with the Gabor model. This is graphically represented in figure 5b, where we find a 216 green (or green derived) colour in the anterior part of EBA (anterior LOS/ITG), indicating that 217 the variance explained by kp3d model is on average located in the more anterior portion of 218 EBA. Specifically, bodies in the anterior portion of EBA are represented as a combination of 219 220 kp2d/Gabor features with the kp3d model (yellow/light-blue patches in Fig. 5b). This finding might indicate that, as shown for early sensory regions, body representation in EBA is 221 222 differentially encoded, going from a low-level representation (Gabor like/blue patches) in pITG/pLOS, to a mid-level (viewpoint dependent) postural representation (kp2d, light-223 magenta, orange, pink patches) in the (middle) LOS to a high-level (viewpoint independent) 224 postural representation (kp3d) in aITG/aLOS (green, light-blue, yellow patches). 225

Concerning the other major body selective region FBA, we observed that for the voxels 226 significantly responding to localizer stimuli, the group definition of this region was not 227 consistent across participants. Moreover, among the voxels functionally identified as part of 228 the FBA, only few survived the statistical correction for multiple comparison of the encoding 229 230 analysis. For completeness, we include the results of the encoding compared to EBA in the supplementary information. Briefly, the joint model performs significantly worse in FBA than 231 232 in EBA, this could be due to low signal to noise ratio in the area. Nonetheless, the barplot depicting the percentage of the correlation explained by each model reveals a similar behaviour 233 to what has been presented for EBA. The main difference is that kp3d model has an increase 234 (from 20 to 25%) in percentage of correlation explained in FBA, at the expense of the 235 correlation explained by kp2d. This is consistent with the fact that FBA has higher viewpoint 236 237 tolerance than EBA as is expected if FBA is more involved in higher cognitive processing of body information like personal identity (13-15). 238

Taken together, these results suggest that the EBA encodes features pertaining specifically to posture. This representation appears to be viewpoint dependent posteriorly (pITG/pLOS) whereas greater viewpoint tolerance arises anteriorly (aITG/aLOS). On this account, the body selectivity observed in many studies in EBA is rooted in body specific feature representation that is not yet dependent of high order body categorisation processes. Future research must investigate whether these body selective features are rooted in uniquely defined biomechanical constraints, in human skeleton keypoint priors or also in sensorimotor processes.

246 Material and methods

247 Participants

20 right-handed subjects (8 males, mean age = 24.4 ± 3.4 years) participated in this study. They 249 all had normal (or corrected to normal) vision and were recruited from Maastricht University 250 student cohorts. All subjects were naïve to the task and the stimuli and received monetary 251 compensation for their participation (7.5 \in VVV vouchers/per hour or a bank transfer for the 252 same amount; 4h in total, 30 \in). Scanning sessions took place at the neuroimaging facility 253 Scannexus at Maastricht University. All experimental procedure conformed to the Declaration 254 of Helsinki and the study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Maastricht University.

255 Stimuli

256 Main experiment stimuli

The stimulus set consisted of 108 pictures of 3D rendered body meshes shown in different orientations: 0° (frontal), -45° (left rotated) and 45° (right rotated) for a total of 324 unique images. Examples of the stimuli in the different orientation are shown in Fig 1a. 3D rendered body meshes were generated via VPoser, a variational autoencoder (VAE) trained to learn a 32-dimensional (normal distribution) latent representation of Skinned Multi-Person Linear

262 Model (SMPL) parameters (34, 35). The stimuli used in the study were generated via randomly sampling the latent space and generating via the decoder part of the VPoser the associated body 263 image. To also sample images sufficiently distant from the mean image (and thus maintain a 264 265 sufficiently large variability of poses in the stimulus set), we sampled the latent space within three distinct shells defined by the standard deviations from the mean pose (Fig. 1a). 266 Ultimately, the body images were generated by transferring the decoded SMPL parameters to 267 a posed mesh. The resulting body poses had mean widths and heights of 2.43° x 5.22° of visual 268 angle and were colour rendered (mean RGB: 120,157,144). 269

270



Figure 1. Stimuli and experimental procedure

(a) (top) Stimuli were generated by randomly sampling the latent space of the VAE (34, 35). The 32-dimensional latent space was sampled in three shells, defined by the value of the standard deviation from the mean pose, to ensure variability among the generated poses. (a) (bottom) 108 unique poses were generated from three different viewpoints: 0° (frontal), -45° (left rotated) and 45° (right rotated) for a total of 324 unique stimuli. (b) Body sensitive areas were identified by mean of a localizer using stimuli selected from four different object categories: bodies, tools, houses, and faces. These stimuli underwent the same rendering process as the stimuli of the main experiment. (c) During the main experiment participants performed a one-back task. They fixated on the green cross and were presented with pictures of body poses each for approximately 750 ms followed by a blank screen which appeared for 1, 2 or 3 s. When the fixation cross turned red, they had to report by button press whether the current stimulus matched the previously presented one.

271

272 *Localizer stimuli*

273 Stimuli for the localizer experiment consisted of 3D rendered images depicting four object 274 categories: faces, bodies, tools, and houses (Fig. 1b). The stimuli were colour rendered using 275 the same colour for the main experiment stimuli (mean RGB: 120,157,144). None of the stimuli 276 from the localizer were used in the main experiment.

277 Behavioural validation

Stimuli used in the main experiment were generated via the VAE. Random sampling from the latent space allowed us to produce a varied set of body poses but did not allow us to control the stimuli for the possible presence of semantic body attributes like action or emotion. Therefore, we asked 113 participants (25 excluded for missing data, 88 in total: 29 males, mean age = 23 ± 4 years, 72 right handed) to rate the stimuli using a questionnaire consisting of both categorical and likert-scale questions. Participants were presented with 1/3 (108) of the total stimuli (324) for 750 ms each. For each participant, the stimuli were pseudo-randomized (108 stimuli randomly selected for each participant, but evenly distributed so that each stimulus got approximately the same number of answers). After each presentation, participants were asked to answer 6 questions about the emotional expression, action content; salience of specific body parts; implied body movement and realism of the posture (see supplementary material).

289

290 MRI acquisition and experimental procedure

Participants viewed the stimuli while lying supine in the scanner. Stimuli were presented on a screen positioned behind participant's head at the end of the scanner bore (distance screen/eye = 99 cm) which the participants could see via a mirror attached to the head coil. The screen had a resolution of 1920x1200 pixels, and its angular size was 16° (horizontal) x 10° (vertical). The experiment was coded in Matlab (v2018b The MathWorks Inc., Natick, MA, USA) using the Psychophysics Toolbox extensions (53-55).

Each participant underwent two MRI sessions, we collected a total of twelve functional runs 297 (six runs per session) and one set of anatomical images. Images were acquired in a 7T MR 298 scanner (Siemens Magnetom) using a 32-channel (NOVA) head coil. Anatomical images were 299 collected via a T1-weighted MP2RAGE: 0.7 mm isotropic, repetition time (TR) = 5000 ms, 300 echo time (TE) = 2.47 ms, matrix size= 320×320 , number of slices = 240. The functional 301 dataset covered the entire brain and was acquired via T2*-weighted Multi-Band accelerated 302 2D-EPI BOLD sequence, multiband acceleration factor = 3, voxel size = 1.6 mm isotropic, TR 303 = 1000 ms, TE = 20 ms, number of slices = 68 without gaps; matrix size = 128×128 . 304

Each run consisted of three main sections: 1) two short localizers parts (approximately one minute at the beginning and at the end of the run), during which images were presented in blocks of categories (faces, bodies, tools, and houses), and 2) a main experimental part where stimuli (body images different from the ones used in the localizer) were presented following a fast event-related design. Participants were asked to fixate at all times on the green cross at the centre of the screen.

Each localizer block each contained six images which were presented for 750 ms and followed by 250 ms blank screen. Each block lasted six seconds followed by a fixation period of eight seconds and each category block was presented once at the beginning and once at the end of each run (24 blocks per condition across the 12 runs). During the localizer participants did not perform any task.

316 During the main experiment, stimuli were presented for 750 ms with an inter stimulus interval that was pseudo-randomised to be 1, 2 or 3 TRs. To keep attention on the stimuli, participants 317 performed a one-back task om stimulus identity. Following a visual cue (colour change of the 318 fixation cross), they were asked report via a button press whether the current stimulus was the 319 same as the previous one (Fig. 1c). Within each run, the experimental section consisted of the 320 presentation of 54 stimuli (18 unique poses x 3 viewpoints) repeated 3 times each. Six target 321 trials were added for a total of 168 trials. Across the two sessions each of the 108 unique poses 322 323 were repeated 18 times (3 repetitions x 3 viewpoints x 2 sessions) across the 12 runs, whereas the 324 unique stimuli were repeated 6 times (3 repetitions x 2 sessions). 324

Preprocessing was performed using BrainVoyager software (v22.2, Brain Innovation B.V., Maastricht, the Netherlands) and FSL (<u>56-58</u>). The following steps were performed in BrainVoyager unless indicated otherwise. EPI Distortion was corrected using the Correction based on Opposite Phase Encoding (COPE) plugin in BrainVoyager, where the amount of

distortion is estimated based on volumes acquired with opposite phase-encoding (PE) with 329 respect to the PE direction of the main experiment volumes (59), after which subsequent 330 corrections is applied to the functional volumes. Other preprocessing steps included: scan slice 331 time correction using cubic spline, 3D motion correction using trilinear/sinc interpolation and 332 high-pass filtering (GLM Fourier) cut off 3 cycles per run. During the 3D motion correction 333 all the runs were aligned to the first volume of the first run. Anatomical images were resampled 334 at 0.5mm isotropic resolution using sinc interpolation and then normalized to Talairach space 335 (60). To ensure a correct functional-anatomical and functional-functional alignment, the first 336 337 volume of the first run was coregistered to the anatomical data in native space using boundary based registration (61). Volume Time Courses (VTCs) were created for each run in the 338 normalized space (sinc interpolation) and exported in nifti format for further processing in FSL. 339 340 To further reduce non-linear intersession distortions, functional images were additionally corrected using the fnirt command in FSL (62) using as template the first volume of the first 341 run in normalized space. Prior to the encoding analysis (and following an initial general linear 342 model [GLM] analysis aimed at identifying regions of interest based on the response to the 343 localizer blocks), we performed an additional denoising step of the functional time series by 344 regressing out the stimulus onset (convolved with a canonical hemodynamic response function 345 [HRF]) and the motion parameters. 346

Segmentation of white matter (WM) and gray matter (GM) boundary was performed in BrainVoyager using the deep learning-based segmentation algorithm and in house Matlab scripts. The resulting boundaries were then inflated to a reference sphere and aligned using cortex based alignment (CBA) (<u>63</u>). The aligned meshes were averaged to create a group WM-GM mesh for each hemisphere.

352

353 Voxels selection for encoding analysis

The functional time series of each participant were analysed using a fixed-effect GLM with 5 354 predictors (4 for the localizer blocks and 1 modelling the responses to all the stimuli in the 355 main experiment). Motion parameters were included in the design matrix as nuisance 356 regressors. The estimated regressor coefficients representing the response to the localizer 357 blocks were used for voxel selection. A voxel was selected for the encoding analysis if 358 significantly active (q(FDR)<0.05) within the main effect of the localizer (Body, Houses, 359 Tools, Faces - Fig. 2). Note that this selection is unbiased to the response to the main stimuli 360 presented in the experimental section of each run. 361

To assess the spatial consistency of activation to the localizer across subjects, we created a probabilistic functional map depicting, at each spatial location, the percentage of subjects for which that location was significantly (q(FDR)<0.05) modulated by the localizer blocks (Fig 365 3a).

366

367 Functional ROI definition

We defined body selective regions at the group level using a random-effect GLM (RFX-GLM), 368 in which EBA was defined using the localizer contrast Body > Objects([Houses + Tools]) (64) 369 with a statistical threshold of q(FDR) < 0.05. Functional images from every participant were 370 spatially smoothed using a gaussian filter (FWHM = 4mm) and then entered the RFX GLM in 371 which we defined 5 predictors of interest (4 for the localizer 1 for modelling the responses to 372 373 the main experiment). For each participant, we regressed out signals coming from head motion by including motion parameters in the design matrix. Responses from each subject were 374 selected via intersection with the group ROI definition of EBA and the single subject localizer's 375 main effect map (see previous paragraph). Figure 3b projects the group definition of EBA onto 376 the probabilistic functional map of the localizer's main effect. 377

The group level body sensitive ROIs were intersected with the single subject activation maps (see previous section) to obtain individual ROIs. Note again that while this procedure makes use of the same data (localizer) twice, its purpose was to define single subject regions to be subsequently used for encoding analysis which was performed on an independent portion of the data set. Figure 3b reports the overlap between EBA defined at the group level and the probabilistic activation maps of the localizer's main effect.

384

385 Encoding models

386 In order to understand what determines the response to body images we tested several hypotheses, represented by different computational models, using fMRI encoding (24, 25, 29, 387 65). We compared the performance (accuracy in predicting left out data) of three encoding 388 models. The first represented body stimuli using the position of joints in two dimensions (kp2d) 389 390 using 54 keypoints (joints, hand and facial features like eyeballs, neck and jaw) plus one keypoint for global rotation extracted during the stimulus creation using VPoser (35). This 391 encoding model extracts for each pose the orthogonal projection of the pose's spatial 392 coordinates on the camera plane which ultimately constitutes the image coordinates (i.e. x,y) 393 of the keypoints. Therefore, this model has 110 features (55 kp * 2 dimensions). The second 394 model represented body stimuli using the three-dimensional position of the keypoints (kp3d) 395 extracted from VPoser. This representation differs from the kp2d one by adding the third 396 397 dimension (no projection on the camera plane), resulting in an encoding model with 165 features (55 kp * 3 dimensions). It is important to note that the main difference between the 398 kp2d and kp3d representations is that the latter is viewpoint invariant as the position of the 399 400 joints is independent from the angle under which the object is observed.

401 The last encoding model we tested is a Gabor filtering of the images (<u>33</u>, <u>66-68</u>). In this
402 procedure, each stimulus was transformed into the Commission internationale de l'éclairage

403 (CIE) L*A*B* color space and the luminance signals then passed through a bank of 1425
404 spatial Gabor filters differing in position, orientation, and spatial frequency (<u>33</u>, <u>69</u>, <u>70</u>).
405 Ultimately, the filters output underwent a logarithmic non-linear compression in which large
406 values were scaled down more than small values. For details on this procedure we refer to the
407 original publication (<u>33</u>).

408

409 Banded ridge regression and model estimates'

Generally, in the linearized encoding framework (as applied in fMRI) the information 410 411 explained in brain activity is obtained via L2-regularized (ridge) regression (71). Ridge regression is a powerful tool which allows to improve performance of encoding models whose 412 features are nearly collinear, and it minimizes overfitting. When dealing with more than one 413 encoding model, ridge regression can either estimate parameters of a joint feature space 414 415 (combining all feature spaces in one encoding model) or obtain model estimates from each encoding model separately. Fitting a joint model with ridge regression allows considering the 416 complementarity of different feature spaces but subjects all models (feature sets) to a unique 417 regularization. As the optimal regularization required when fitting each individual feature 418 space may differ (since it depends, among others, on factors such as number of features and 419 features covariances) (27), fitting a joint model with one regularization parameter may be 420 421 suboptimal and can be extended to banded ridge regression. In banded ridge regression, 422 separate regularization per parameters for each feature space are optimized, which ultimately improves model performance by reducing spurious correlations and ignoring non-predictive 423 feature spaces (27, 28). In the present work we used banded ridge regression to fit the three 424 425 encoding models and performed a decomposition of the variance explained by each of the models following established procedures (27). All analyses were performed using a publicly 426 available repository in Python (Himalaya, https://github.com/gallantlab/himalaya). 427

Model training and testing were performed in cross-validation (3-folds: training on 8 runs [216 428 stimuli] and testing on 4 runs [108 stimuli]). For each fold, the training data were additionally 429 split in training set and validation set using split-half crossvalidation. Within the (split-half) 430 training set a combination of random search and gradient descent (27) was used to choose the 431 model (regularization strength and model parameters) that maximized the prediction accuracy 432 on the validation set. Ultimately, the best model over the two (split-half) folds was selected to 433 434 be tested on the yield out test data (4 runs). The fMRI predicted time courses were estimated as follows. Within each fold, the models' representations of the training stimuli were 435 436 normalized (each feature was standardized to zero mean and unit variance withing the training set). The feature matrices representing the stimuli were then combined with the information of 437 the stimuli onset during the experimental runs. This resulted in an experimental design matrix 438 (nrTRs x NrFeatures) in which each stimulus was described by its representation by each of 439 the models. To account for the hemodynamic response, we delayed each feature of the 440 experimental design matrix (15 delays spanning 15 seconds). The same procedure was applied 441 to the test data, with the only difference that when standardizing the model matrices, the mean 442 and standard deviation obtained from the training data were used. We used banded ridge 443 regression to determine the relationship between the fMRI response at each voxel, which 444 significantly responded to the localizer stimuli (p(FDR)<0.05), and the features of the encoding 445 models (stimulus representations). 446

For each cross-validation, we assessed the accuracy of the model in predicting fMRI time series by computing the correlation between the predicted fMRI response to novel stimuli (4 runs, 108 stimuli) and the actual responses. The accuracy obtained across the three folds were then averaged. To obtain the contribution of each of the models to the overall accuracy we computed the partial correlation between the measured time series and the prediction obtained when considering each of the models individually (<u>27</u>).

453

454 Group maps and statistical inference

To evaluate the statistical significance of the model fittings, accuracy maps of each subject were projected on the cortex based aligned group WM-GM mesh. We computed the probability of the mean accuracy (across subjects) to be higher than chance by sign flipping (10000 times) the correlations. This procedure allowed estimating a non-parametric null distribution for each vertex, which was used to obtain a significance value for the mean accuracy. We accounted for the multiple comparisons by correcting the p-values using Bonferroni correction (i.e. dividing by the number of tests, equal to the number of vertices in the analysis).

462

463 Acknowledgements

464 The authors are grateful to Rufin Vogels and Giancarlo Valente for fruitful discussion and465 comments on the original draft. The authors declare no competing financial interests.

466 Data availability statement

467 Data and code are being prepared to be shared.

468 CRediT authorship contribution statement

Giuseppe Marrazzo: Conceptualization, Investigation, Software, Formal analysis, Validation,
Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing - review & editing. Federico De
Martino: Conceptualization, Investigation, Supervision, Validation, Writing - review &
editing. Agustin Lage-Castellanos: Conceptualization, Supervision, Validation, Writing review & editing. Maarten J. Vaessen: Conceptualization, Investigation, Software. Beatrice
de Gelder: Conceptualization, Project Administration, Resources, Supervision, Funding
Acquisition, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing - review & editing

476 **References**

Downing PE, Jiang Y, Shuman M, Kanwisher N. A cortical area selective for visual 1. 477 processing of the human body. Science. 2001;293(5539):2470-3. 478 2. Peelen MV, Downing PE. Selectivity for the human body in the fusiform gyrus. 479 Journal of Neurophysiology. 2005;93(1):603-8. 480 3. Vogels R. More Than the Face: Representations of Bodies in the Inferior Temporal 481 Cortex. Annual Review of Vision Science. 2022;8(1):383-405. 482 483 4. Downing PE, Peelen MV. Body selectivity in occipitotemporal cortex: Causal evidence. Neuropsychologia. 2016;83:138-48. 484 485 5. de Gelder B, Poyo Solanas M. A computational neuroethology perspective on body and expression perception. Trends in Cognitive Sciences. 2021;25(9):744-56. 486 487 6. Taylor JC, Downing PE. Division of labor between lateral and ventral extrastriate representations of faces, bodies, and objects. J Cogn Neurosci. 2011;23(12):4122-37. 488 489 7. Taylor JC, Wiggett AJ, Downing PE. Functional MRI analysis of body and body part representations in the extrastriate and fusiform body areas. J Neurophysiol. 2007;98(3):1626-490 491 33. 8. Marrazzo G, Vaessen MJ, de Gelder B. Decoding the difference between explicit and 492 implicit body expression representation in high level visual, prefrontal and inferior parietal 493 cortex. NeuroImage. 2021;243:118545. 494 9. Bugatus L, Weiner KS, Grill-Spector K. Task alters category representations in 495 prefrontal but not high-level visual cortex. NeuroImage. 2017;155:437-49. 496 Bracci S, Daniels N, De Beeck HO. Task context overrules object- And category-497 10. related representational content in the human parietal cortex. Cerebral Cortex. 498 2017;27(1):310-21. 499 500 11. Taylor JC, Wiggett AJ, Downing PE. fMRI-Adaptation Studies of Viewpoint Tuning in the Extrastriate and Fusiform Body Areas. Journal of Neurophysiology. 2010;103(3):1467-501 502 77. 12. Chan AWY, Peelen MV, Downing PE. The effect of viewpoint on body 503 representation in the extrastriate body area. NeuroReport. 2004;15(15). 504 Ewbank MP, Lawson RP, Henson RN, Rowe JB, Passamonti L, Calder AJ. Changes 505 13. in "Top-Down" Connectivity Underlie Repetition Suppression in the Ventral Visual Pathway. 506 The Journal of Neuroscience. 2011;31(15):5635-42. 507

508	14.	Foster C, Zhao M, Bolkart T, Black MJ, Bartels A, Bülthoff I. The neural coding of	
509	face and body orientation in occipitotemporal cortex. NeuroImage. 2022;246:118783.		
510	15. Foster C, Zhao M, Romero J, Black MJ, Mohler BJ, Bartels A, et al. Decoding		
511	subcategories of human bodies from both body- and face-responsive cortical regions.		
512	NeuroImage. 2019;202:116085.		
513	16.	Vangeneugden J, Peelen MV, Tadin D, Battelli L. Distinct Neural Mechanisms for	
514	Body Form and Body Motion Discriminations. The Journal of Neuroscience. 2014;34(2):574		
515	85.		
516	17.	Peelen MV, Atkinson AP, Andersson F, Vuilleumier P. Emotional modulation of	
517	body	-selective visual areas. Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience. 2007;2(4):274-83.	
518	18.	Kanwisher N. The quest for the FFA and where it led. Journal of Neuroscience.	
519	2017;37(5):1056-61.		
520	19.	Bracci S, Ritchie JB, Kalfas I, De Beeck HO. The Ventral Visual Pathway Represents	
521	Animal Appearance over Animacy, Unlike Human Behavior and Deep Neural Networks. The		
522	Journal of Neuroscience. 2019;39(33):6513-25.		
523	20.	Kumar S, Popivanov ID, Vogels R. Transformation of Visual Representations Across	
524	Ventral Stream Body-selective Patches. Cerebral Cortex. 2019;29(1):215-29.		
525	21.	Caspari N, Popivanov ID, De Mazière PA, Vanduffel W, Vogels R, Orban GA, et al.	
526	Fine-grained stimulus representations in body selective areas of human occipito-temporal		
527	corte	x. NeuroImage. 2014;102:484-97.	
528	22.	Bao P, She L, McGill M, Tsao DY. A map of object space in primate inferotemporal	
529	corte	x. Nature. 2020;583(7814):103-8.	
530	23.	Dubois J, de Berker AO, Tsao DY. Single-Unit Recordings in the Macaque Face	
531	Patch System Reveal Limitations of fMRI MVPA. The Journal of Neuroscience.		
532	2015;35(6):2791-802.		
533	24.	Naselaris T, Kay KN, Nishimoto S, Gallant JL. Encoding and decoding in fMRI.	
534	Neur	bimage. 2011;56(2):400-10.	
535	25.	Kay KN, Naselaris T, Prenger RJ, Gallant JL. Identifying natural images from human	
536	brain	activity. Nature. 2008;452(7185):352-5.	
537	26.	Dumoulin SO, Wandell BA. Population receptive field estimates in human visual	
538	cortex. Neuroimage. 2008;39(2):647-60.		
539	27.	Dupré la Tour T, Eickenberg M, Gallant J. Feature-space selection with banded ridge	
540	regre	ssion. Neuroimage. 2022;264:119728.	

28. Nunez-Elizalde AO, Huth AG, Gallant JL. Voxelwise encoding models with non-541 spherical multivariate normal priors. Neuroimage. 2019;197:482-92. 542 29. Santoro R, Moerel M, De Martino F, Goebel R, Ugurbil K, Yacoub E, et al. Encoding 543 of Natural Sounds at Multiple Spectral and Temporal Resolutions in the Human Auditory 544 Cortex. PLOS Computational Biology. 2014;10(1):e1003412. 545 30. Thirion B, Duchesnay E, Hubbard E, Dubois J, Poline JB, Lebihan D, et al. Inverse 546 retinotopy: inferring the visual content of images from brain activation patterns. Neuroimage. 547 2006;33(4):1104-16. 548 549 31. Wandell BA, Dumoulin SO, Brewer AA. Visual field maps in human cortex. Neuron. 2007;56(2):366-83. 550 Moerel M, De Martino F, Formisano E. Processing of natural sounds in human 32. 551 auditory cortex: tonotopy, spectral tuning, and relation to voice sensitivity. The Journal of 552 neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience. 2012;32(41):14205-16. 553 33. Nishimoto S, Vu AT, Naselaris T, Benjamini Y, Yu B, Gallant JL. Reconstructing 554 visual experiences from brain activity evoked by natural movies. Curr Biol. 555 2011;21(19):1641-6. 556 34. Loper M, Mahmood N, Romero J, Pons-Moll G, Black MJ. SMPL: a skinned multi-557 558 person linear model. ACM Trans Graph. 2015;34(6):Article 248. 35. Pavlakos G, Choutas V, Ghorbani N, Bolkart T, Osman AA, Tzionas D, et al., editors. 559 Expressive body capture: 3d hands, face, and body from a single image. Proceedings of the 560 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition; 2019. 561 562 36. Peelen MV, Downing PE. The neural basis of visual body perception. Nature Reviews Neuroscience. 2007;8(8):636-48. 563 564 37. Downing PE, Peelen MV. The role of occipitotemporal body-selective regions in person perception. Cognitive Neuroscience. 2011;2(3-4):186-203. 565 38. Atkinson AP, Vuong QC, Smithson HE. Modulation of the face- and body-selective 566 visual regions by the motion and emotion of point-light face and body stimuli. Neuroimage. 567 2012;59(2):1700-12. 568 39. Haynes JD, Rees G. Decoding mental states from brain activity in humans. Nat Rev 569 Neurosci. 2006;7(7):523-34. 570 Kamitani Y, Tong F. Decoding the visual and subjective contents of the human brain. 40. 571 Nat Neurosci. 2005;8(5):679-85. 572

41. Miyawaki Y, Uchida H, Yamashita O, Sato MA, Morito Y, Tanabe HC, et al. Visual 573 image reconstruction from human brain activity using a combination of multiscale local 574 image decoders. Neuron. 2008;60(5):915-29. 575 42. Naselaris T, Prenger RJ, Kay KN, Oliver M, Gallant JL. Bayesian reconstruction of 576 natural images from human brain activity. Neuron. 2009;63(6):902-15. 577 43. Costantini M, Galati G, Ferretti A, Caulo M, Tartaro A, Romani GL, et al. Neural 578 Systems Underlying Observation of Humanly Impossible Movements: An fMRI Study. 579 Cerebral Cortex. 2005;15(11):1761-7. 580 581 44. Marsh AA, Kozak MN, Wegner DM, Reid ME, Yu HH, Blair RJR. The neural substrates of action identification. Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience. 582 2010;5(4):392-403. 583 45. Moro V, Urgesi C, Pernigo S, Lanteri P, Pazzaglia M, Aglioti SM. The Neural Basis 584 of Body Form and Body Action Agnosia. Neuron. 2008;60(2):235-46. 585 46. Pichon S, de Gelder B, Grèzes J. Threat Prompts Defensive Brain Responses 586 Independently of Attentional Control. Cerebral Cortex. 2012;22(2):274-85. 587 Saxe R, Jamal N, Powell L. My Body or Yours? The Effect of Visual Perspective on 588 47. 589 Cortical Body Representations. Cerebral Cortex. 2006;16(2):178-82. 590 48. de Gelder B, de Borst AW, Watson R. The perception of emotion in body expressions. WIREs Cognitive Science. 2015;6(2):149-58. 591 592 49. Tamietto M, Cauda F, Celeghin A, Diano M, Costa T, Cossa FM, et al. Once you feel it, you see it: Insula and sensory-motor contribution to visual awareness for fearful bodies in 593 594 parietal neglect. Cortex. 2015;62:56-72. Van den Stock J, Hortensius R, Sinke C, Goebel R, de Gelder B. Personality traits 595 50. predict brain activation and connectivity when witnessing a violent conflict. Scientific 596 Reports. 2015;5(1):13779. 597 598 51. Poyo Solanas M, Vaessen M, de Gelder B. Computation-Based Feature Representation of Body Expressions in the Human Brain. Cerebral Cortex. 599 2020;30(12):6376-90. 600 Weiner KS, Grill-Spector K. Not one extrastriate body area: using anatomical 52. 601 landmarks, hMT+, and visual field maps to parcellate limb-selective activations in human 602 lateral occipitotemporal cortex. Neuroimage. 2011;56(4):2183-99. 603 Brainard DH. The Psychophysics Toolbox. Spat Vis. 1997;10(4):433-6. 53. 604 605 54. Kleiner M, Brainard D, Pelli D. What's new in Psychtoolbox-3? 2007.

- 55. Pelli DG. The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: Transforming
 numbers into movies. Spatial vision. 1997;10:437-42.
- 608 56. Jenkinson M, Beckmann CF, Behrens TE, Woolrich MW, Smith SM. Fsl.
- 609 Neuroimage. 2012;62(2):782-90.
- 610 57. Smith SM, Jenkinson M, Woolrich MW, Beckmann CF, Behrens TE, Johansen-Berg
- 611 H, et al. Advances in functional and structural MR image analysis and implementation as
- 612 FSL. Neuroimage. 2004;23 Suppl 1:S208-19.
- 58. Woolrich MW, Jbabdi S, Patenaude B, Chappell M, Makni S, Behrens T, et al.
- Bayesian analysis of neuroimaging data in FSL. Neuroimage. 2009;45(1 Suppl):S173-86.
- 615 59. Fritz L, Mulders J, Breman H, Peters J, Bastiani M, Roebroeck A, et al., editors.
- 616 Comparison of EPI distortion correction methods at 3T and 7T. Annual Meeting of the
- 617 Organization for Human Brain Mapping; 2014.
- 618 60. Talairach J, Tournoux P. Co-planar stereotaxic atlas of the human brain: 3-
- 619 Dimensional proportional system: An approach to cerebral imaging.: Thieme Medical
- 620 Publishers, Inc., New York.; 1988.
- 61. Greve DN, Fischl B. Accurate and robust brain image alignment using boundarybased registration. Neuroimage. 2009;48(1):63-72.
- 623 62. Andersson JL, Jenkinson M, Smith S. Non-linear registration, aka Spatial
- normalisation FMRIB technical report TR07JA2. FMRIB Analysis Group of the Universityof Oxford. 2007;2(1):e21.
- 626 63. Goebel R, Esposito F, Formisano E. Analysis of functional image analysis contest
- 627 (FIAC) data with brainvoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group general
- 628 linear model analysis and self-organizing group independent component analysis. Human
- 629 brain mapping. 2006;27(5):392-401.
- 630 64. Ross P, de Gelder B, Crabbe F, Grosbras M-H. A dynamic body-selective area
- 631 localizer for use in fMRI. MethodsX. 2020;7:100801.
- 632 65. Allen EJ, Moerel M, Lage-Castellanos A, De Martino F, Formisano E, Oxenham AJ.
- Encoding of natural timbre dimensions in human auditory cortex. NeuroImage. 2018;166:60-70.
- 635 66. Watson AB, Ahumada AJ. Model of human visual-motion sensing. J Opt Soc Am A.
 636 1985;2(2):322-42.
- 637 67. Adelson EH, Bergen JR. Spatiotemporal energy models for the perception of motion.
 638 J Opt Soc Am A. 1985;2(2):284-99.

- 639 68. Nishimoto S, Gallant JL. A Three-Dimensional Spatiotemporal Receptive Field
- 640 Model Explains Responses of Area MT Neurons to Naturalistic Movies. The Journal of
- 641 Neuroscience. 2011;31(41):14551-64.
- 642 69. Jones JP, Palmer LA. An evaluation of the two-dimensional Gabor filter model of
- simple receptive fields in cat striate cortex. J Neurophysiol. 1987;58(6):1233-58.
- 644 70. DeAngelis GC, Ohzawa I, Freeman RD. Spatiotemporal organization of simple-cell
- 645 receptive fields in the cat's striate cortex. I. General characteristics and postnatal
- 646 development. J Neurophysiol. 1993;69(4):1091-117.
- 647 71. Hoerl AE, Kennard RW. Ridge Regression: Biased Estimation for Nonorthogonal
- 648 Problems. Technometrics. 1970;12(1):55-67.

649