

Abstract

Face recognition abilities vary widely in the population. While deficits in face recognition have been reported in childhood, it is unclear whether the full spectrum of face recognition skills can be encountered throughout development. This paper presents an in-depth examination of OB, a 14-year-old female with extraordinary face recognition skills: a “super-recognizer”. OB demonstrated exceptional face processing skills across multiple tasks, performing over 6 SDs above the mean for age-matched controls on the CFMT+, and significantly better than her peers on several other tests of face recognition. This level of performance is comparable to previously reported adult SRs. OB’s superior abilities appear to be ~~face-specific~~ specific to face identity: she showed an exaggerated inversion effect on several face recognition tasks, and her superior abilities did not extend to object processing or non-identity aspects of face recognition (emotion, age and gender). Finally, a task monitoring OB’s eye-movements demonstrated that OB spent substantially more time than controls examining the nose region of the face, a pattern previously reported in adult SRs. These results indicate that OB is particularly skilled at extracting and using identity-specific facial cues, supporting the hypothesis that face and object recognition skills are dissociable during development, and exceptional face recognition abilities can be detected prior to adulthood.

Keywords: super recognizers, face recognition, eye movements, individual differences, development, prosopagnosia.

Super Recognition in Development:

A Case Study of an Adolescent with Extraordinary Face Recognition Skills

In the last decade an “individual differences” approach has emerged within the adult face recognition literature. Several studies have presented evidence that facial identity recognition skills can vary substantially within the typical population (Bowles et al., 2009; Wilmer et al., 2012), and this has been attributed to a variety of cognitive, social, personality and genetic influences. This approach has been bolstered by findings that some individuals represent the extremes at the two ends of the face recognition continuum. While reports of individuals with developmental prosopagnosia (DP), who have a severe and relatively selective impairment in face recognition, stretch back ~~almost 30~~over 40 years (see Duchaine, 2011, for a review), much more recent work has identified so-called “super-recognizers” (SRs) who have extraordinarily good face recognition skills (Bobak, Bennetts, Parris, Jansari, & Bate, 2016; Bobak, Dowsett, & Bate, 2016; Bobak, Hancock, & Bate, 2016; Bobak, Parris, Gregory, Bennetts, & Bate, 2017; Robertson, Noyes, Dowsett, Jenkins, & Burton, 2016; Russell, Chatterjee, & Nakayama, 2012; Russell, Duchaine, & Nakayama, 2009).

This latter group of individuals have recently attracted a lot of interest, not only because of their theoretical importance to the advancement of the face recognition literature, but also as they may have a practical role in policing and national security. However, the few papers on super recognition that have been published to date have examined adults. Indeed, to date, very little work has investigated individual differences in face-processing skills during development (although see Bennetts, Murray, Boyce, & Bate, 2017; Croydon, Pimperton, Ewing, Duchaine, & Pellicano, 2014; Dalrymple, Garrido, & Duchaine, 2014; Johnston et al.,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 2011; Weigelt et al. 2014; for some indication of variability in face recognition performance
9
10 across childhood). While instances of DP have been reported in children as young as four
11
12 years old (e.g., Schmalzl, Palermo, Green, Brundson, & Coltheart, 2008; Wilson, Palermo,
13
14 Schmalzl, & Brock, 2010), it remains unclear whether the full spectrum of face recognition
15
16 skills can be encountered prior to adulthood. This is potentially an important question, given
17
18 that it may provide unique insights into the development and maturation of the face-
19
20 processing system. This paper reports an in-depth examination of the face-processing skills of
21
22 an adolescent who firmly meets the adult criteria for super recognition. Initial investigations
23
24 demonstrate the face-specificity of her skills, and a key eye-tracking study demonstrates that
25
26 the ability may be underpinned by a specific scanning strategy that has previously been
27
28 observed in adults SRs.
29
30
31

32 The focus of this investigation addresses a key theoretical debate in the face-
33
34 processing literature: namely, whether developmental changes in face recognition
35
36 performance reflect changes in face-specific processes, or more general cognitive
37
38 development. Most authors agree that specialized strategies and neural systems underpin
39
40 face-processing, and much evidence suggests these mechanisms come online at an early age
41
42 and develop rapidly in the early years of life. In quantitative terms, behavioural work
43
44 indicates a steady improvement in face recognition ability in childhood (5-11 years) (e.g.,
45
46 Bennetts et al., 2017; Croydon et al., 2014; de Heering, Rossion, & Maurer, 2012; Weigelt et
47
48 al., 2014), followed by a levelling-off or dip in abilities during early adolescence (Carey,
49
50 Diamond, & Woods, 1980; Chung & Thompson, 1995; Flin, 1980; Lawrence et al., 2008;
51
52 Picci & Scherf, 2016), and subsequently slower but continued development from adolescence
53
54 to adulthood. It is difficult to pinpoint the exact age at which face processing could be
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 considered “mature”, but several studies suggest that this occurs relatively late in
9
10 adolescence. For example, Picci and Scherf (2016) found significantly worse recognition
11
12 performance in a group of 11-14 year old adolescents when compared to adults (18 to 25
13
14 years old). Likewise, Fuhrmann et al. (2016) examined face memory and face perception
15
16 between the ages of 11 and adulthood, and found a significant difference between early and
17
18 mid-adolescents (11 to 15 years old) when compared to older adolescents (16 to 18 years old)
19
20 and adults. There was no difference between older adolescents and adults, leading the authors
21
22 to conclude that face recognition was mature by 16 years of age. On the other hand, some
23
24 researchers have suggested that face memory continues to develop even in early adulthood,
25
26 perhaps up to the age of 30 (Germine, Duchaine, & Nakayama, 2011; Susilo, Germine, &
27
28 Duchaine, 2013). These findings are supported by neuroimaging evidence that indicates the
29
30 neural face-processing system continues to develop throughout adolescence (Aylward et al.,
31
32 2005) and reaches maturity in adulthood (Golarai et al., 2007; Golarai, Liberman, Yoon, &
33
34 Grill-Spector, 2010; Pallett & Dobkins, 2013; Peters, Vlamings, & Kemner, 2013; Scherf,
35
36 Behrmann, Humphreys, & Luna, 2007; Scherf, Luna, Avidan, & Behrmann, 2011; Scherf,
37
38 Thomas, Doyle, & Behrmann, 2013). Developmental changes in the neural face processing
39
40 system are both structural and functional: for example, adolescents tend to show stronger
41
42 activation of face-selective areas in the fusiform gyrus when compared to children (Aylward
43
44 et al., 2005), but their neural adaptation to faces is not adult-like (Scherf et al., 2011);
45
46 furthermore, the volume and selectivity of face selective areas in the fusiform gyrus increases
47
48 with age throughout adolescence and into adulthood (Golarai et al., 2010; Scherf et al., 2007).
49
50
51
52
53

54 In sum, then, adolescents (particularly those around the age of 14-15 years) are likely
55
56 to show poorer face recognition performance than adults, and this may be explained by
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 immaturity of the neural systems underpinning face processing. However, one limitation to
9
10 the studies presented above – particularly those using behavioural measures – is that many of
11
12 them fail to discriminate between the development of face processing and the development of
13
14 other abilities that might support face recognition (e.g., attention, ability to follow
15
16 instructions, general memory, visual processing). In other words, it is unclear whether this
17
18 pattern of development is face-specific, or reflects more generic cognitive changes. While
19
20 several studies of adolescents have controlled for factors such as IQ (e.g., Fuhrmann et al.,
21
22 2016; Lawrence et al., 2016), this does not preclude the possibility that face recognition
23
24 improves as a by-product of more general object recognition and discrimination skills.
25
26 Therefore, a key approach for examining the developmental trajectory of face-processing has
27
28 been to assess children on both their object and face recognition skills.
29
30
31

32
33 Some reports suggest that face and object memory show different developmental
34
35 trajectories, with face recognition maturing later than object recognition (Carey & Diamond,
36
37 1994; Diamond & Carey, 1977; see also Weigelt et al., 2014). This is known as the late
38
39 maturity hypothesis. While most studies in the area have focused on children (under 12 years
40
41 of age), at least two studies indicate that this developmental difference may continue into
42
43 adolescence and even adulthood. Golarai et al. (2007) found that face memory showed
44
45 continual improvements between childhood, adolescence, and adulthood; in comparison, age-
46
47 related improvements were less pronounced for place memory and absent for object memory.
48
49 De Heering et al. (2012) examined recognition of upright and inverted faces in 6-12 year old
50
51 children and adults, and found that the effect of inversion (a commonly used measure of face-
52
53 specific processing) increased between the oldest children and adults. By this account, face
54
55 recognition in childhood (and even adolescence) relies on weaker, not fully mature face-
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 specific processes, which should make it difficult to identify variability in face-specific
9
10 abilities in this age range. This implies that individual differences (for example, super-
11
12 recognition) that appear prior to adulthood are likely to be driven at least in part by object
13
14 recognition abilities (due to the relative weakness of face-specific processes) – in other
15
16 words, a pre-adult SR should show a limited dissociation between face and object
17
18 recognition. Furthermore, indexes of face-specific processing, such as effects of inversion,
19
20 should be reduced in comparison to adults who show similar levels of face recognition
21
22 ability.
23
24

25
26 However, many studies that support this late maturity hypothesis have been criticized
27
28 for methodological reasons (Crookes & McKone, 2009) – in some cases, floor and ceiling
29
30 effects could have affected the conclusions (e.g., Carey & Diamond, 1994); in others, the lack
31
32 of an appropriate comparison stimulus makes it difficult to determine whether the findings
33
34 are specific to (or, in the case of inversion effects, disproportionate for) faces (Golarai et al.,
35
36 2007; De Heering et al., 2012).
37
38

39
40 By contrast, other studies that have attempted to control for these issues have found
41
42 similar patterns of development for memory of both faces and objects (e.g., Bennetts et al.,
43
44 2017; see Crookes & McKone, 2009, for a review), suggesting that face recognition
45
46 processes are mature quite early in life (before five years of age), and the improvement in
47
48 face memory thereafter reflects the development of general cognitive skills (the early
49
50 maturity hypothesis).
51

52
53 If this is the case, there are two important implications for the super-recognition
54
55 literature: first, individual differences in the face processing system may also be present at an
56
57 early age, and it should be possible to identify children and adolescents who fall outside the
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 typical range of abilities for their age. This idea is supported by case studies of children with
9
10 DP, who show significantly worse face recognition than would be expected at their age (e.g.,
11
12 Dalrymple, Corrow, Yonas, & Duchaine, 2012; Dalrymple et al., 2014; Schmalzl et al., 2008;
13
14 Wilson et al., 2010). Second, if face and object processing dissociate at an early age, it
15
16 suggests that early differences in face recognition abilities will not necessarily be mirrored by
17
18 differences in object recognition abilities. Notably, Dalrymple, Elison, and Duchaine (2016)
19
20 reported several cases of childhood DP with normal object recognition, suggesting that it is
21
22 possible to identify *face-specific* deficits from the age of five years. However, there are no
23
24 studies to date that have attempted to examine whether cases of exceptional face-specific
25
26 abilities – that is, an SR who does not show exceptional object recognition skills, and whose
27
28 abilities can be attributed to face-specific processes – can occur before adulthood. The
29
30 presence of face-specific super-recognition early in life would confirm that the wide range of
31
32 face recognition abilities (e.g., Bowles et al., 2009; Germine et al., 2011) and the dissociation
33
34 between face and object recognition observed in adulthood (e.g., Dennett et al., 2012; Wilmer
35
36 et al., 2012) may also be present during development, and therefore offer support to the idea
37
38 that face recognition can reach mature levels prior to adulthood (in line with the early
39
40 maturity hypothesis).
41
42
43
44

45
46 Interestingly, this issue may be further complicated by findings that suggest different
47
48 developmental trajectories for the memory and perception of facial identity. Behavioural
49
50 studies that have suggested that the development of face recognition continues into adulthood
51
52 (e.g., Germine et al., 2011; Susilo et al., 2013) have focused solely on memory-based tasks,
53
54 leaving open the possibility that face perception is mature quite early. Weigelt et al. (2014)
55
56 found evidence that face perception abilities were mature at an early age, but face memory
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 underwent a more protracted period of development. Further, Dalrymple et al. (2014) recently
9
10 described eight cases of DP in children younger than 13 years, and all had difficulties in
11
12 facial perception as well as memory (in contrast, less than half the adult DPs tested showed
13
14 impairments in face perception). The authors suggest that this may reflect different
15
16 trajectories in the development of face perception and memory, with purely mnemonic
17
18 deficits not being apparent or detectable until a later age, when face memory had developed
19
20 fully. Consequently, it is important to examine both face memory and face perception abilities
21
22 in developmental individual differences research, as it is possible that an individual might
23
24 show exceptional abilities in one, but not the other. Furthermore, if it is the case that a SR
25
26 excels at memory-based, but not perceptual tasks, it may act as an indicator of the age range
27
28 at which the face memory system has matured sufficiently to support the identification of
29
30 reliable individual differences.
31
32
33

34 It is also important to note that face perception can relate to aspects of facial
35
36 information other than identity – for example, recognition of emotional expressions – and
37
38 there is evidence to suggest these other aspects are processed by different mechanisms to
39
40 those involved in identity (Bruce & Young, 1986; Duchaine & Yovel, 2015; Gobbini &
41
42 Haxby, 2007). To date, super-recognition has only been assessed in relation to facial identity
43
44 perception and memory, but examining whether SRs show superior facial expression
45
46 processing in addition to identity processing may determine the locus of their superior face
47
48 processing skills.
49
50
51

52 An alternative means of exploring the maturity of the face recognition system is to
53
54 examine the emergence of critical visual strategies that may underpin super recognition. Eye-
55
56 tracking has been used to examine individual differences in face recognition skills in adults.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Eye movements are thought to be functional during the learning (Henderson, Williams &
9 Falk, 2005) and recognition (Althoff & Cohen, 1999; Luria & Strauss, 1978) of faces.
10
11 Although few papers have examined eye-movement patterns with regard to individual
12 differences in typical face recognition, Sekiguchi (2011) found that participants with better
13 face recognition skills (who were not SRs) focused more on the eye region than those with
14 poorer face recognition skills (who were not DPs), supporting the hypothesis that the eye
15 region is thought to be particularly pivotal for the recognition of facial identity (Schyns,
16 Bonnar & Gosselin, 2002; Slessor, Riby & Finnelly, 2013; Van Belle, Ramon, Lefevre, &
17 Rossion, 2010). According to these findings, one might predict that SRs spend more time
18 looking at the eyes than typical perceivers, given this region seems to contain rich
19 information about facial identity.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 However, a recent paper from our laboratory refutes this hypothesis. Bobak et al.
33 (2017) examined individual differences in eye-movement patterns in typical adults, those
34 with DP and SRs. While we replicated previous findings that people with prosopagnosia
35 (acquired or developmental) tend to avoid the eyes and sometimes spend more time looking
36 at the mouth or external facial features (Bate et al., 2015; Schmalzl et al., 2008; Schwarzer et
37 al., 2007; Stephan & Caine, 2009), the results of two experiments using different paradigms
38 and stimuli sets indicated that SRs preferred to look at the nose. Interestingly, the time spent
39 looking at the nose also correlated with face recognition ability in control participants. This
40 work converges with findings from typical perceivers that identify the nose as an optimal
41 viewing position in face recognition (i.e. the location of the first fixation that a person makes
42 to a face) and preferred landing position (i.e. the location that participants fixate the most)
43 (Hsiao & Cottrell, 2008). Similarly, Peterson and Eckstein (2012) found that the optimal
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 viewing position on a range of face-processing tasks was below the eyes and towards the left
9
10 side of the nose – in a remarkably similar position to that observed by Hsiao and Cottrell.
11
12 Both sets of authors suggest that this viewing position may be the optimal location for
13
14 holistic processing of the entire face to occur. This is an important issue when examining pre-
15
16 adulthood cases of super recognition, as it permits investigation of the emergence of optimal
17
18 processing strategies.
19

20
21 This paper presents an in-depth cognitive and eye-tracking examination of an
22
23 adolescent with extraordinary face recognition skills, OB. First, we report data that confirms
24
25 OB's superior face memory abilities; subsequently, we report a series of experiments that
26
27 further investigate the nature of OB's face and object processing skills. Finally, we examine
28
29 OB's eye movements in order to investigate whether the preference for the nose observed in
30
31 adult SR cases replicates in OB, demonstrating that this strategy can emerge prior to
32
33 adulthood.
34
35

36 37 **Case Report**

38
39 OB is a 14 year-old female who self-reported to our laboratory with exceptional face
40
41 recognition skills, concurred by her mother. The family described many incidents where OB
42
43 recognized people who she had only briefly encountered before, and subsequently viewed in
44
45 very different contexts. For instance, her mother recalled an occasion when the family was
46
47 watching a reality television program and OB recognized a pedestrian, who briefly walked
48
49 past the camera, as a man she has seen in a local shop. OB reports that when she and her
50
51 friends have looked at faces on the internet that have been morphed or disguised in some
52
53 way, OB was the only one able to correctly identify the faces. OB and her sister noted that
54
55 OB will have to take her particularly good face recognition abilities into account into social
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 situations. For example, she may be introduced to someone for the first time that she
9
10 recognizes from a chance sighting but she will have to remember that they will be unlikely to
11
12 recognize her face. No other family members reported superior face recognition skills.

13
14 An initial neuropsychological screen indicated that OB had an estimated IQ of 118
15
16 (two-subtest version of the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence; Wechsler, 1999). In
17
18 all experiments, her performance is compared to a group of 13 female control participants
19
20 matched according to age ($M = 15.04$ years, $SD = 0.8$) and estimated IQ (see Table 1) (note
21
22 that due to some data recording errors and time constraints, not all the control participants
23
24 completed all tasks. The exact number of participants in the control group therefore varies
25
26 between experiments, and is presented in the relevant sections of each investigation or in
27
28 Tables 2 and 3). All participants reported no history of neurological, developmental or
29
30 psychiatric conditions. OB and controls also performed in the normal range on a series of
31
32 tests of basic visual perception (Snellen letter chart, Hamilton-Veale contrast sensitivity test,
33
34 four subtests from the Birmingham Object Recognition Battery; Humphreys & Riddoch,
35
36 1993). These findings suggest that her superior face recognition ability is not a consequence
37
38 of generally better intellectual abilities, or visuospatial processing (see Table 1). Finally, all
39
40 participants were screened for signs of autism spectrum disorder (ASD), as ASD is known to
41
42 affect face recognition (Weigelt, Koldewyn, & Kanwisher, 2012) using the Autism Quotient:
43
44 Adolescent (Baron-Cohen, Hoekstra, Knickmeyer, & Wheelwright, 2006). OB and all
45
46 controls achieved scores within the typical range (< 30) on this measure.
47
48
49
50
51

52 *< Insert Table 1 >*
53

54 A series of experiments were conducted to further investigate the nature of OB's face
55
56 and object processing skills. OB's performance in each experiment is compared to that of
57
58
59
60

controls using the SINGLIMS procedure with one-tailed tests (Crawford & Garthwaite, 2002), or, when comparing her performance across multiple conditions, the Bayesian Standardized Differences Test (BSDT; Crawford and Garthwaite, 2007). The SINGLIMS procedure and the BSDT are modified t-tests designed to compare the scores of an individual case to a control group: each tests whether the case's score (or difference between scores, in the case of the BSDT) is significantly different to that of the controls, and provides an estimate of the abnormality of the score (i.e., the percentage of the population that would be expected to obtain a more extreme score than the case) as well as an estimate of effect size (Crawford, Garthwaite, & Porter, 2010). All research was approved by the institutional ethics review board.

Experiment 1

An initial experiment sought to confirm whether OB's face recognition skills were genuinely above those of her peers. In the adult SR literature, the extended form of the Cambridge Face Memory Test (CFMT+; Russell et al., 2009) is used to detect superior face recognition skills (Bobak, Bennetts, et al., 2016; Bobak, Dowsett et al., 2016, Bobak, Hancock, et al., 2016, Bobak et al., 2017; Russell et al., 2009; 2012). This test is a longer version of the standard Cambridge Face Memory Test (CFMT; Duchaine & Nakayama, 2006), which is a dominant test used worldwide to assess impaired and typical face-processing skills (e.g. Bate & Cook, 2012; Bennetts, Butcher, Lander, Udale, & Bate, 2015; Dalrymple & Palermo, 2016; DeGutis, Cohan, Mercado, Wilmer & Nakayama, 2012; Herzmann, Danthiir, Schacht, Sommer & Wilhelm, 2008; McGugin, Van Gulick & Gauthier, 2016; Yang, Susilo & Duchaine, 2016), and has demonstrated high reliability (Bowles et al.,

2009; Wilmer et al., 2010) and both convergent and divergent validity (Bowles et al., 2009; Dennett et al., 2012; Wilmer et al., 2010, 2012).

Experiment 1 also examined whether OB's skills are face-specific or not, by measuring OB's performance with inverted (upside-down) faces. Inverted faces are generally thought to be processed in a different manner to upright faces – researchers have suggested that it is difficult to process spatial relationships between features, discriminate feature shape information, and integrate information from across the entire face at once (holistic processing) when a face is inverted (Maurer et al., 2002; McKone & Yovel, 2009; Piepers & Robbins, 2012, Richler, Palmeri, & Gauthier, 2012). These skills are thought to contribute to efficient recognition of upright faces (Maurer et al., 2002; McKone & Yovel, 2009), and some would go as far as to call these “face-specific” skills (Rossion, 2013; Yovel & Kanwisher, 2008). Consequently, inverted faces are thought to be processed more like objects (Freire, Lee, & Symons, 2000), and the inversion effect (the difference in performance between upright and inverted faces) has been taken as an index of “face-specific processing” in individuals with impaired face recognition (DeGutis, Cohan, Mercado, Wilmer, & Nakayama, 2012; Marotta, McKeef, & Behrmann, 2002) and those with exceptional face recognition (Bobak, Bennetts, et al., 2016; Russell et al., 2009).

Method: In the traditional version of the CFMT (Duchaine & Nakayama, 2006), participants learn six target faces and in 72 trials are asked to choose which of three simultaneously presented faces is one of the targets. As the test progresses faces are presented from novel viewpoints and under different lighting conditions, and in a final section visual noise is added to the stimuli. The CFMT+ (Russell et al., 2009) replicates the CFMT exactly, but contains an additional 30 trials at the end. These items are particularly challenging:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 participants are tested on a variety of difficult transformations of the faces, including extreme
9
10 viewpoint changes, modifications to emotional expression, and severe cropping of the images
11
12 to exclude external cues to recognition.

13
14 Participants completed the CFMT+ twice: once in its original upright format,
15
16 and then in an inverted format. Identical images are used in each. Participants always
17
18 completed the upright version first, so that any additional exposure to the faces would not
19
20 influence the critical upright score.
21
22

23 **Results:** OB out-performed the age-matched controls on the upright task by 6.04 SDs,
24
25 making only three errors in the entire test (see Table 2). While this is strong evidence that OB
26
27 is substantially better than her peers at face recognition, we were also interested in whether
28
29 her scores are comparable to adult SRs, and whether OB would be considered a SR when
30
31 compared to an adult control group (a more stringent test of her abilities). Consequently, we
32
33 compared OB's performance to a group of six adult SRs who have already been reported in
34
35 the literature (1 female, M age = 28.17 years, SD = 7.39; Bobak, Bennetts, et al., 2016), and
36
37 the adult control group used in that study (N = 30, 15 female, M age = 25.90 years, SD =
38
39 4.50). The adult SRs scored between 92 and 100 on the CFMT+ (M = 97.17, SD = 2.93),
40
41 compared to OB's score of 99. Single case comparisons confirmed that OB performed in a
42
43 similar range to adult SRs, $t(5) = 0.72$, $p = .252$, $Z_{CC} = 0.78$, estimated percentage of adult
44
45 SRs exhibiting a more extreme score = 25.26. OB significantly outperformed the adult
46
47 control sample (M = 68.4, SD = 11.70), $t(29) = 2.57$, $p = .008$, $Z_{CC} = 2.62$, estimated
48
49 percentage of adults exhibiting a more extreme score = 0.77. Given that OB's score exceeded
50
51 both the age-matched control group and the adult control group, and is comparable to adult
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 SRs who have already been reported in the literature (also see Russell et al., 2009), we took
9
10 this as evidence that she clearly reaches the criteria for super recognition.

11
12 < *Insert Table 2* >

13
14 Interestingly, OB's performance was not significantly better than age-matched
15
16 controls when the faces were inverted (see Table 2), resulting in an inversion effect (upright
17
18 score – inverted score) that was significantly greater than the control group, $t(12) = 4.78$, p
19
20 $< .0005$, $Z_{DCC} = 5.56$, estimated percentage of control population exhibiting a more extreme
21
22 difference = 0.02. These findings suggest that OB's superior performance on the upright
23
24 CFMT+ is a consequence of face-specific processing, rather than more general memory or
25
26 visuospatial skills.
27
28

29 30 **Experiment 2**

31
32 Although the results of Experiment 1 provide strong evidence to suggest that OB's
33
34 face recognition skills are superior to those of her peers and most adults, it is possible that
35
36 this reflects a more general proficiency for within-class object identification; or particular
37
38 skill with the CFMT format (as opposed to face recognition in general). Experiment 2
39
40 presents two tests examining these alternate explanations: first, a sequential matching task
41
42 which included three categories of objects (faces, houses, and hands); and second, an object
43
44 memory test matched in format to the CFMT: The Cambridge Cars Memory Test (CCMT;
45
46 Dennett et al., 2012). This allowed us to more directly assess the hypothesis that OB's
47
48 superior recognition skills are restricted to faces, and that her skills are not restricted to a
49
50 single test of face memory.
51
52

53
54 **Method:** OB and controls completed a sequential same/different matching test used
55
56 in previous work (Bate et al., 2015; Bobak, Bennetts, et al., 2016). In all three conditions
57
58
59
60

(faces, houses, hands) the initial image was presented for 250 ms, and the subsequent image remained onscreen until the participant responded. In the face condition, the test images showed two face images from different viewpoints (front and 30-45°). Face images were taken from the CFMT (Aus) (McKone et al., 2011) and the Bosphorous face database (Savran et al., 2008), and were edited to remove external features. Houses were created using Realtime Landscaping Plus (Idea Spectrum Inc., 2012). Each house contained the same number of features (three sets of windows and a door), placed onto a constant background texture. The shape and location of the features, the luminance of the background texture, and the overall shape of the house varied throughout the set. As in the face condition, the test images presented the houses from two different viewpoints (front and 15°). Hand images were extracted from Bosphorus Hand Database (Dutağacı, Yörük & Sankur, 2008), and showed the palm and fingers of a hand. Images were chosen to exclude rings, watches, cuffs, or other identifying features. Test images showed the hands in two different positions (e.g., fingers splayed and fingers together), with the wrist pointing downwards (upright condition). Each category contained 32 pairs of images (16 same identity, 16 different identity). All pairs were presented twice upright and twice inverted. Trials were blocked by stimulus type, with upright and inverted trials presented randomly within each stimulus type. The order of blocks was randomized between participants. OB's performance was compared to the group of 13 control participants. Due to computer errors, only nine control participants completed the face matching condition ($M = 15.36$ years, $SD = 0.39$), whereas all 13 completed the hand and house matching conditions.

The CCMT follows the exact design of the original CFMT, but uses cars as stimuli. The CCMT has fewer trials than the CFMT+ (given it was based on the design of the CFMT),

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 providing a maximum score of 72. The test was administered in upright and inverted formats,
9
10 and again, the upright version was always administered first.

11
12 **Results:** The results of the sequential matching task are shown in Figure 1. Accuracy
13
14 for the same and different trials in each category were combined into a single measure of
15
16 sensitivity, d' (Macmillan & Creelman, 2005). An analysis of performance by control
17
18 participants is presented in the Supplementary materials.
19

20
21 < Insert Figure 1 >
22

23
24 OB performed significantly better than control participants when asked to match
25
26 upright faces, $t(8) = 2.85, p = .011, Z_{CC} = 3.00$, estimated percentage of control population
27
28 exhibiting a more extreme difference = 1.09. Similarly to findings for the CFMT+, OB did
29
30 not differ from controls in the inverted face condition, $t(8) = 0.00, p = .5, ns$. Her inversion
31
32 effect for faces was also significantly greater than controls, $t(8) = 2.01, p = .04, Z_{DCC} = 2.30$,
33
34 estimated percentage of control population exhibiting a more extreme difference = 4.00,
35
36 mirroring the increased inversion effect for the CFMT+. OB did not show a significant
37
38 advantage over controls when asked to match upright or inverted hands or houses, p 's > .1
39
40 (see Figure 1). However, OB did perform above the mean for both object types, and the
41
42 difference between OB's scores for upright faces and other objects was not significantly
43
44 larger than controls, hands: $t(8) = 0.91, p = .194, ns$; houses: $t(8) = 1.12, p = .142, ns$. Once
45
46 again, we compared OB's results to the adult SRs reported in Bobak, Bennetts, et al. (2016).
47
48 The adult SRs had d' scores between 2.09 and 3.5 ($M = 2.83, SD = 0.52$) in the upright faces
49
50 condition; and between 0.52 and 1.24 ($M = 0.73, SD = 0.26$) in the inverted faces condition.
51
52 OB performed at a comparable level to adult SRs in the upright faces condition, $t(5) = 1.02, p$
53
54 = 0.17, ns , and showed a similar sized inversion effect for faces, $t(5) = 1.02, p = 0.18, ns$.
55
56
57
58
59
60

OB achieved a score of 39/72 on the CCMT upright (a score that was more than one SD lower than that of controls), and 40/72 on the inverted test (a score that was very close to the control mean). In contrast to her performance on the CFMT+, OB's performance on the CCMT did not significantly differ to that of controls on either upright or inverted trials (see Table 2). OB's score on the original CFMT can be calculated from her CFMT+ score, permitting direct comparison of the two tests. In contrast to the CCMT test, she scored 72/72 on the upright version of the shorter test, and 39/72 on the inverted version. The difference between OB's performance on the CFMT and CCMT was significantly larger than controls, $t(10) = 4.65, p < .0005, Z_{DCC} = 5.09$, estimated percentage of control population exhibiting a more extreme difference = 0.46.

In sum, the findings from Experiment 2 offer some support for the notion that OB's superior recognition skills are specific to faces (enhanced inversion effect; larger difference between face and cars than controls). However, while OB was significantly better when matching faces than controls, she was also numerically better at matching hands and houses, and the difference between faces and objects was not disproportionate. This is unlikely to be a result of restriction of range, as all scores were substantially below ceiling ($d' = 4.3$). Therefore, it is possible that at least some of OB's performance on the matching test might be attributed to a general proficiency for matching upright objects.

Experiment 3

Experiments 1 and 2 support the prediction that OB has superior facial identity *recognition* skills. However, it is unclear whether her abilities extend to the *perception* of facial identity. That is, if no demands are placed on memory, is OB significantly better than her peers at extracting perceptual information relevant to facial identity? This is a pertinent

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 question given a bulk of evidence suggesting that the two processes are dissociable (Barton,
9
10 2008; Barton, Cherkasova & Hefter, 2004; Bruce & Young, 1986; Davies-Thompson,
11
12 Pancaroglu & Barton, 2014; Tippett, Miller & Farah, 2000), and that individuals at the
13
14 bottom end of the face-processing continuum (i.e. those with prosopagnosia) have been
15
16 separated into different subtypes that allow for spared or impaired facial perception skills
17
18 (e.g. de Renzi, Faglioni, Grossi, & Nichelli, 1991). In the same vein, superior face
19
20 recognition skills may result from enhanced face perception *or* face memory skills – while
21
22 group analyses tend to support the idea that SRs overall show superior face perception, single
23
24 case analyses indicate that not all adult SRs reported in the literature perform exceptionally
25
26 well on face perception tasks (e.g., Bobak, Bennetts, et al., 2016; Bobak, Hancock et al.,
27
28 2016; Russell et al., 2009). Furthermore, there are some reports of individuals who excel
29
30 specifically at associative face memory without any evidence of enhanced perceptual
31
32 processing (Ramon et al., 2016). While the individuals reported by Ramon et al. (2016) are
33
34 not considered SRs, their capacity to excel at some aspects of face identification (i.e., face-
35
36 name associations) but not others (perceptual processing) supports the distinction between the
37
38 different stages of face recognition.
39
40
41
42

43
44 As discussed in the introduction, examination of this question in the context of an
45
46 adolescent SR has particular implications for theories of the developmental course of face-
47
48 processing, due to the proposed developmental dissociation between face perception and
49
50 memory (e.g., Wiegelt et al., 2014). Thus, Experiment 3 examined OB's ability to perceive
51
52 facial identity using the Cambridge Face Perception Test (CFPT; Duchaine, Germine, &
53
54 Nakayama, 2007), a standardized test that has been used widely to examine face perception
55
56 skills in DPs, the general population, and SRs (e.g., Bate & Cook, 2012; Bennetts et al., 2015;
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Bowles et al., 2009; Bobak, Bennetts, et al., 2016; Dalrymple & Palermo, 2016; Russell et al.,
9
10 2009).

11
12 **Method:** In the CFPT, participants are asked to rearrange the order of a set of six test
13 faces based on their similarity to a simultaneously-presented target face. Each of the test faces
14 has been morphed towards the target face by different degrees. The CFPT contains 16 trials;
15 eight are presented in an upright format and eight are inverted. Participants have one minute
16 to sort each set. Scores reflect the deviation of the final arrangement to the correct order (i.e.
17 a higher score indicates worse performance).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 **Results:** OB performed significantly better than controls on the upright trials of the
27 CFPT, outperforming her peers by over two SDs (see Table 2). As found in previous
28 experiments, there was no significant difference between OB and controls on inverted trials.
29 However, unlike in the CFMT+ and sequential matching tasks, OB did not show a
30 disproportionate inversion effect in the CFPT, $t(12) = 1.30, p = .220, ns$. Although her
31 performance was numerically worse, OB's performance on both the upright and inverted
32 conditions of the CFPT was not significantly different to the adult SRs reported in Bobak,
33 Bennetts, et al. (2016) (upright: $M = 18.33, SD = 4.80$; inverted: $M = 54.83, SD = 10.52$),
34 upright $t(5) = 1.86, p = 0.12, ns$, inverted $t(5) = 1.69, p = 0.15, ns$. BSDT revealed that OB's
35 inversion effect was not significantly different to adult SRs, $t(5) = 0.17, p = 0.43, ns$.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Performance on this task, in combination with the findings from the sequential
49 matching task in Experiment 2, provide some evidence that enhanced face perception skills
50 may be underpinning OB's superior face recognition ability. This finding is not unusual –
51 while it is not universal, many SRs show excellent performance on face perception tasks
52 (e.g., Bobak, Bennetts, et al., 2016; Russell et al., 2009), and within the general population
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 scores on the CFPT and CFMT are significantly correlated (Bowles et al., 2009). However,
9
10 OB's superior performance in Experiment 3 is not nearly as pronounced as in Experiment 1 –
11
12 this could suggest that OB excels at mnemonic tasks more than perceptual ones.
13

14 **Experiment 4**

15
16 While at least some evidence of enhanced facial identity perception has been
17
18 presented thus far, it is unclear whether this ability extends to non-identity aspects of face
19
20 perception, such as the processing of emotional expression, age, and gender. In other words,
21
22 does OB show superior abilities for all aspects of face recognition, or is her super-recognition
23
24 specific to identity? To date, no published reports have assessed non-identity aspects of face
25
26 processing in SRs. However, there are numerous reports of individuals with DP who show
27
28 typical recognition of facial expression, age, and gender (e.g., Chatterjee & Nakayama, 2012;
29
30 DeGutis, Chatterjee, Mercado, & Nakayama, 2012; Duchaine, Parker, & Nakayama, 2003;
31
32 Humphreys, Avidan, & Behrmann, 2007), suggesting that identity may be processed
33
34 separately from other, non-identity-based facial cues. Likewise, traditional models of face-
35
36 processing (e.g. Bruce & Young, 1986; Haxby, Hoffman, & Gobbini, 2000) posit at least
37
38 some dissociation between the processing of identity and non-identity cues. However, there
39
40 are also commonalities between different tasks – for example, both expression and identity
41
42 recognition involve some level of holistic processing (e.g., Calder, Young, Keane, & Dean,
43
44 2000; Palermo et al., 2011). Therefore, it is possible that identity and non-identity face tasks
45
46 involve some shared mechanisms or processes which precede separate processing stages
47
48 (Palermo et al., 2011). If these shared mechanisms underpin OB's super-recognition, it may
49
50 be that she shows exceptional performance on all face processing tasks; on the other hand, if
51
52 the locus of her exceptional abilities is after the dissociation between abilities, we would
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 expect OB to show typical non-identity processing. Consequently, Experiment 4 presents a
9
10 series of tests which examine whether OB excels at non-identity face processing.

11
12 We adopted two well-used tests of facial expression recognition: the Ekman 60 Faces
13 test (Young, Perrett, Calder, Sprengelmeyer, & Ekman, 2002) and the Reading the Mind in
14 the Eyes Test (RMITE; Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Hill, Raste, & Plumb, 2001) – a more
15 complex test of expression recognition that involves only the eye region of the face. These
16 tests were chosen because they have both been used frequently to assess individual
17 differences in the recognition of facial expression (Ekman: Habota et al., 2016; Moulier et al.,
18 2016; Unoka, Fogd, Füzy & Csukly, 2011; Verdejo-García, Rivas-Pérez, Vilar-López &
19 Pérez-García, 2007; RMITE: Bate, Parris, Haslam, & Kay, 2010; Peterson & Miller, 2012;
20 Rodrigues, Saslow, Garcia, John, & Keltner, 2009).

21
22 Experiment 4 also included tests of facial age and gender perception. For this
23 investigation we used the age and gender sub-tests from the Philadelphia Face Perception
24 Battery (PFPB; Thomas, Lawler, Olson, & Aguirre, 2008). The measure has been shown to
25 have good test-retest reliability and specificity for internal feature processing, and the
26 subscales have also been demonstrated to have good divergent validity (Thomas et al., 2008).
27 The PFPB has been used to investigate typical (Thomas et al., 2008) as well as impaired
28 (Németh, Zimmer, Schweinberger, Vakli & Kovács, 2014; Thomas et al., 2008) face
29 perception abilities.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50 **Method:** The Ekman 60 Faces test consists of 60 trials in which participants are
51 shown a face and asked to choose which of six basic emotions is being expressed (anger,
52 disgust, fear, happiness, sadness, or surprise). Each face is viewed for 5 seconds, but
53 participants have an unlimited time to make their response.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 The RMITE test has 36 trials, in which participants are shown the eye region of a face
9
10 and asked to choose which of four given thoughts or feelings is being expressed. There is no
11
12 time limit to make a response, and participants are given a definition of each thought or
13
14 feeling if they are unsure of its meaning. The RMITE assesses more subtle emotional states
15
16 than the Ekman 60 Faces test – for example, discriminating between jealous, panicked,
17
18 arrogant, and hateful expressions.
19

20
21 Two sub-tests from the PFPB were selected for use in this task, assessing the facial
22
23 perception of age and gender. In both sub-tests the faces were drawn from a set of computer-
24
25 generated images, and pilot testing was used to select 75 trials that were somewhat
26
27 ambiguous, in order to avoid ceiling effects (see Thomas et al., 2008, for further details). In
28
29 the age sub-test, participants are simultaneously presented with two faces, and are asked to
30
31 select which one appears older. In the gender sub-test, participants are presented with a single
32
33 face and asked to indicate whether the person is male or female. Stimuli remained onscreen
34
35 until participants respond.
36
37

38
39 **Results:** OB achieved a score of 50/60 on the Ekman 60 Faces test, which was less
40
41 than one SD above that of controls (see Table 2). She scored 23/36 on the RMITE test – a
42
43 score that was almost identical to the control mean (see Table 2). These tests indicate that
44
45 OB's expression recognition skills are within the normal range.
46
47

48
49 On the subtests of the PFPB, OB scored 68/75 on the age test (a result that was less
50
51 than one SD above that of controls), and 64/75 on the gender test (a score that was only half a
52
53 SD above control performance) (see Table 2). Overall, these results concur with the findings
54
55 from the two assessments of OB's expression recognition skills. In sum, the results from
56
57 Experiment 4 suggest that OB's exceptional memory for facial identity does not reflect a
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 general enhancement of facial processing. Rather, it appears that OB is particularly good at
9
10 extracting and using identity-specific cues.

11 **Experiment 5: Eye-tracking**

12
13
14 The experiments described above indicate that OB has superior specialised facial
15
16 identity recognition skills that may at least in part be underpinned by enhancements in the
17
18 perception of facial identity. That is, she may be using enhanced perceptual strategies to
19
20 extract information that assists with later identification. However, the work reported so far
21
22 does not tell us anything about the regions of the face from where this information may be
23
24 extracted. Indeed, certain facial areas may hold rich information that is critical to optimal face
25
26 recognition performance (Peterson & Eckstein, 2012), or may represent preferred viewing
27
28 spots from which most information can be extracted (Peterson & Eckstein, 2013). Pertinently,
29
30 existing eye-tracking work has identified two regions of the face that may be particularly
31
32 informative for facial identity recognition: Investigations using both typical participants and
33
34 those with prosopagnosia indicate that the eye region may be critical for recognition (Orban
35
36 de Xivry, Ramon, Lefèvre & Rossion, 2008; Schmalzl et al., 2008), whereas other work
37
38 suggests more central regions (i.e. the nose) may be critical fixation points for optimal face
39
40 recognition (Hsiao & Cottrell, 2008; Orban de Xivry et al., 2008; Peterson & Eckstein, 2012).
41
42 Notably, the optimal points of fixation for identity, expression, and gender discrimination are
43
44 subtly different (Peterson & Eckstein, 2012); furthermore, research using the Bubbles
45
46 technique has shown that typical individuals use different facial information to complete
47
48 different face processing tasks (e.g., Schyns et al., 2002). Therefore, a tendency to fixate
49
50 more consistently or longer on one region of the face (e.g., the region optimal for
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 recognition), might explain why OB excels only at certain aspects of face processing (i.e., the
9
10 same area may not be optimal for expression recognition).

11
12 Our existing work with adult SRs supports the importance of central fixations for face
13 recognition, at least for SRs: these individuals look at the nose to a greater extent than
14 controls (Bobak et al., 2017). Our final experiment therefore sought to investigate whether
15 the same trend will emerge even in an adolescent SR, adopting an eye-tracking paradigm that
16 we have previously used in our work with this age group (Bate et al., 2015) and in adults who
17 meet the criteria for super recognition (Bobak et al., 2017).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Method:** Participants were tested in a quiet environment, whilst sitting approximately
26 60cm from the screen with their heads placed within a chin rest. The Eyelink 1000 system
27 (SR Research Ltd, Canada) was used to record eye movements, using a video-based
28 pupil/corneal reflex tracking device sampled at 2000 Hz with spatial accuracy of between
29 0.25 and 0.5 degree of visual angle. Prior to the experiment eye fixations were calibrated.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Each participant viewed 48 facial images from the Karolinska Directed Emotional
38 Faces (KDEF) database (Lundqvist, Flykt, & Öhman, 1998). Three images were presented
39 for each of 16 individuals (eight male), one displaying a happy expression, one a neutral
40 expression and one a sad expression. Each face was presented in colour on a grey background
41 for 5 seconds and the order of presentation was randomised. As the aim of the experiment
42 was to measure the time spent dwelling on inner features, faces were uncropped (i.e., hair
43 was included in all images) so that this would not cue participants towards these parts of the
44 face. Images were aligned and adjusted to 762 pixels in height and 562 pixels in width. A
45 centrally positioned fixation dot was presented before the stimuli appeared to control the
46 initial point of retinal attention. Faces were then presented in the centre of the screen, where
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 the area below the right eye overlapped with location of the previously presented fixation
9
10 cross. Given this method might direct the first fixation to key regions of interest, first
11
12 fixations were excluded from all analyses.

13
14 Participants were asked to remain attentive to the faces and freely explore them. We
15
16 did not set a specific task because we wanted to mimic natural occurrences when people
17
18 incidentally encounter faces – indeed, inexplicable recognition of incidentally and only
19
20 briefly seen faces is core to the definition of super recognition. Further, the emotional
21
22 expression manipulation was adopted merely to retain participants' attention and to mimic
23
24 natural settings where faces are rarely seen with neutral expressions. Pertinently, previous
25
26 studies investigating the scanning of faces displaying different emotional expressions have
27
28 reported consistent findings regardless of the instructions given to participants. For instance,
29
30 Pelphrey et al. (2002) found similar eye movement patterns in typical participants and those
31
32 with autism spectrum disorder, regardless of whether they were instructed to “look at the
33
34 faces in any manner your wish” or to “identify the emotions portrayed in the faces”. We
35
36 therefore did not require participants to make an explicit judgment about each face in order to
37
38 keep the conditions as naturalistic as possible.

39
40
41
42
43 **Eye Movement Parameters and Statistical Analyses:** Eye movements were
44
45 analysed using Eyelink Data Viewer software (SR Research Ltd), which allows periods of
46
47 fixation to be identified and user-defined areas of interest to be determined within the images.
48
49 Three areas of interest were drawn onto each face, covering the eyes, nose, and mouth (see
50
51 Bate, Haslam, Tree, & Hodgson, 2008). Data were averaged for each facial expression and
52
53 for all trials (see Table 3), and the proportion dwell time elicited to the eye, nose and mouth
54
55 regions was calculated. Control data is taken from an age- matched group of 11 females (M
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 age = 15.1 years, SD = 0.9), as reported in Bate et al. (2015). This work found that typical
9
10 perceivers spent less dwell time on the eyes for happy compared to neutral or sad faces, and
11
12 more dwell time on the mouth for happy compared to neutral or sad faces (see Table 3 for
13
14 descriptive statistics, and for a full report of analyses on the control data see Bate et al.,
15
16 2015).

17
18
19 **Results:** The main analysis focused on dwell time: we examined whether OB spent
20
21 significantly longer examining specific areas of the face (eyes, nose, mouth) than control
22
23 participants for each emotion category. Strikingly, differences between OB and controls were
24
25 only noted for the nose region: OB spent significantly more time examining the nose for
26
27 neutral and sad faces, in addition to the overall analysis (see Table 3). This pattern of findings
28
29 converges with previous work indicating that the nose may be critical in face identification,
30
31 perhaps because it is the optimal viewing position for holistic processing (Hsiao & Cottrell,
32
33 2008; Peterson & Eckstein, 2012).

34
35
36 However, OB's pattern of feature exploration did not differ according to emotional
37
38 expression for the proportion dwell time spent on the eyes and mouth (all $ps > .05$).
39
40 Nevertheless, she did follow the same trend as control participants by spending more time on
41
42 the mouth for happy compared to neutral or sad faces, $F(1,15) = 7.880$, $p = .013$, $\eta_p^2 = .344$.
43
44 This is likely the reason why the happy condition was the only one in which OB did not
45
46 spend significantly more time on the nose than controls (although the mean time she spent on
47
48 the nose was approximately two SDs above that of control participants). It is fairly typical for
49
50 individuals to spend longer looking at the mouth region in happy faces (e.g., Eisenbarh &
51
52 Alpers, 2011). Hence, OB still appears to follow normal trends in her patterns of feature
53
54 exploration according to emotional expression, but retains her overall increased bias towards
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 the nose. This evidence indicates that the nose may be a critical region underpinning superior
9 face recognition, and the bias towards it emerges even in adolescence.

10
11
12 < Insert Table 3 >

13
14 A secondary analysis aimed to reveal whether OB's bias towards the nose was driven
15 only by the first movements of the eyes (which previous work have deemed to be the most
16 critical in face-processing, e.g. Hsiao & Cottrell, 2008; Peterson & Eckstein, 2012) or is
17 evident across the entire time course of scanning. To this end, we examined the sequential
18 distribution of fixations to the nose across all faces. Data showing the frequency with which
19 OB and controls fixated the nose in the first five eye movements made to each face are
20 presented in Table 4 (note: in the present study the first movement of the eyes corresponds to
21 the second fixation, given the location of the fixation cross in this study, and the subsequent
22 removal of all first fixations from analysis. Consequently, Table 4 presents data for fixations
23 two through six). OB directed significantly more second fixations to the nose than control
24 participants, $t(10) = 3.47, p = .003, Z_{CC} = 3.63$, estimated percentage of control population
25 exhibiting a more extreme difference = 0.30, yet this effect disappeared from the third
26 fixation onwards, p 's > .10. It can therefore be concluded that OB's preference to look at the
27 nose is restricted to the critical first eye movement made while viewing a face.

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 < Insert Table 4 >

47 Discussion

48
49 OB shows exceptional face recognition skills across multiple tasks (CMFT+,
50 sequential same/different matching, CFPT). These skills do not appear to extend to low-level
51 visual processing (BORB tests), object recognition (CCMT, sequential matching) or other
52 non-identity aspects of face recognition (emotion, age, gender). Despite the fact that
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 adolescents, on average, tend to perform significantly worse than adults on tests of face
9
10 recognition (e.g., Fuhrmann et al., 2016; Picci & Scherf, 2016), OB's performance on
11
12 multiple tests is in a similar range to other adult SRs who have been reported in the literature
13
14 (e.g., Bobak, Bennetts, et al., 2016; Bobak, Dowsett et al., 2016, Bobak, Hancock, et al.,
15
16 2016; Russell et al., 2009). Furthermore, OB shows an enhanced effect of face inversion
17
18 across several tests (CFMT+, sequential matching), which is comparable in size to inversion
19
20 effects observed in adult SRs. OB's performance on an eye-tracking task is also in line with
21
22 previous results from adult SRs tested in our lab (Bobak et al., 2017) – she spent substantially
23
24 more time than control participants examining the nose region of the face. In short, OB's
25
26 performance across multiple tasks suggests that she is a super-recogniser: the youngest
27
28 reported in the literature to date.
29
30
31

32
33 OB's case may inform us about the development of individual differences in face
34
35 recognition. Despite some evidence that face recognition continues to develop throughout
36
37 adolescence and into adulthood (e.g., Germine et al., 2011; Aylward et al., 2005; Golarai et
38
39 al., 2007, 2010; Pallett & Dobkins, 2013; Peters et al., 2013; Scherf et al., 2007, 2011, 2013),
40
41 the current results, along with research on developmental prosopagnosia in children
42
43 (Dalrymple et al., 2016), suggest that individual differences in face recognition can be
44
45 apparent at a relatively young age. Most pertinently, these individual differences are not
46
47 driven purely by object processing skills or general cognitive skills, as predicted by the late
48
49 maturity hypothesis. Rather, OB's pattern of performance supports the idea that differences in
50
51 face recognition abilities in this age range can be face-specific, in line with the early maturity
52
53 hypothesis.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 The assertion that OB's superior recognition skills are face-specific is supported by
9
10 two sets of results. First, as mentioned above, OB did not perform significantly above
11
12 average on any tests of object recognition (cars, houses, or hands). A caveat to this is that OB
13
14 did perform numerically better than her peers across most of the object matching conditions
15
16 in the sequential matching task, and the comparison between upright faces and objects did not
17
18 reveal disproportionately good performance for faces when compared to houses or hands.
19
20 These results could indicate that OB has a general proficiency for matching upright objects,
21
22 at least in tasks with minimal memory demands. Taken alone, this finding offers some
23
24 support to the idea that individual differences prior to adulthood might be a result of more
25
26 general object recognition skills (in line with late maturity hypothesis). However, OB also
27
28 performed within the normal range when asked to remember, sort, and match inverted faces,
29
30 suggesting that her skills are isolated to upright faces. In line with previous studies on adult
31
32 SRs (e.g., Bobak, Bennetts, et al., 2016; Russell et al., 2009), OB showed an enhanced
33
34 inversion effect (the difference between performance with upright and inverted faces) on
35
36 several face recognition tests (CFMT+, sequential matching), which suggests that face-
37
38 specific skills underpin her super-recognition. Furthermore, OB's inversion effects were
39
40 comparable to adult SRs in all tasks for which comparison data was available, which suggests
41
42 that her face-specific processing skills have already reached adult levels.
43
44
45
46
47

48 What aspects of face processing does OB excel at? Research on adult SRs suggests
49
50 that the cognitive origins of super-recognition, like DP, are likely to be heterogeneous (e.g.,
51
52 Bobak, Bennetts, et al., 2016; Bobak, Hancock, et al., 2016). One way which SRs may differ
53
54 is the locus of their abilities – as discussed in Experiment 3, many researchers have proposed
55
56 a distinction between perceptual and mnemonic processes supporting face recognition (e.g.,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Bruce & Young, 1986; De Renzi et al., 1991; Weigelt et al., 2014). An initial assessment of
9
10 OB's behavioural results would suggest that she performs substantially better than her peers
11
12 and shows a large inversion effect when the task involves a memory component (as in the
13
14 sequential matching task and the CFMT+), but her exceptional face recognition abilities are
15
16 less pronounced for purely perceptual tasks: OB showed much smaller effects in the CFPT
17
18 compared to the CFMT+, and no enhanced inversion effect for the CFPT.
19

20
21 However, a more detailed analysis of OB's results reveals a different picture. While
22
23 OB's performance in the CFPT was not as dramatic as the CFMT+, her results were
24
25 nonetheless significantly better than her peers. Furthermore, OB showed different patterns of
26
27 eye movements to faces, despite the absence of any memory requirement during the eye-
28
29 tracking task. An alternate interpretation of these results is that OB is more efficient than her
30
31 peers at extracting facial information (perhaps due to a more optimal pattern of eye
32
33 movements to faces), but this is only apparent in very challenging tests, such as those that
34
35 require recognition across substantial changes in facial appearance (the CFMT+) or after very
36
37 brief presentation of the face (sequential matching task). In contrast, the CFPT allows
38
39 participants to view the faces for up to a minute. It is possible that the less challenging
40
41 viewing conditions in the CFPT allowed our control participants to "catch up" to OB and
42
43 perform relatively accurately. As we did not instruct participants to respond as quickly as
44
45 possible in the CFPT, it would not be appropriate to compare reaction times on this task,
46
47 however, future work with SRs should incorporate multiple measures to take into account
48
49 potential differences in speed and efficiency of processing, as well as accuracy.
50
51

52
53
54 Notably, OB's proficiency with facial information does not extend to all face
55
56 processing tasks. In contrast to her performance on identity processing tasks, OB scored
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 within one standard deviation of the mean for all non-identity tasks (two emotion processing
9 tasks, age, and gender). This supports the idea that identity and non-identity cues are
10 processed by at least partially separable pathways (Bruce & Young, 1986; Duchaine & Yovel,
11 2015; Gobbini & Haxby, 2007), and the locus of OB's abilities falls after any shared
12 processing mechanisms. However, the current study is the first to examine whether SRs excel
13 at non-identity-based face processing tasks, and this finding does not preclude the possibility
14 that some SRs may also show exceptional abilities for non-identity information – for
15 example, it is possible that an individual could excel at the early stages of face processing
16 (which contribute to both identity and expression recognition). However, while the Ekman
17 60 faces and RMITE are sufficient to determine impairment or examine performance in the
18 typical range of abilities (such as OB and controls in the current study), they are not ideal for
19 detecting exceptional performance (more than 2 SDs above the control mean). Therefore,
20 testing this proposition may require the use of more challenging non-identity tasks such as
21 those developed by Palermo, O'Connor, Davis, Irons, and McKone (2013), or Young et al.
22 (1997).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 This is the second study (after Bobak et al., 2017) to find that SRs spend a longer time
42 than controls looking at the nose region of the face during a free-viewing task. While OB
43 showed the same general tendency as controls to modulate her fixations depending on facial
44 expression, she also demonstrated a general bias towards the nose region. This bias occurred
45 early during viewing: OB was significantly more likely to fixate on the nose region following
46 her first eye movement (i.e., on her second fixation), but this tendency disappeared for
47 subsequent fixations. These results support previous suggestions that the nose region is
48 optimal for integrating identity information across the face (Hsiao & Cottrell, 2008; Peterson
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 & Eckstein, 2012), and reiterate the importance of early fixations for efficient identification.
9
10 Notably, this finding does not detract from other evidence that emphasizes the importance of
11 the eye region for face recognition in typical perceivers (e.g., Sekiguchi, 2011) – in fact, our
12 control participants demonstrated a strong bias towards the eyes in most conditions. Rather, it
13 suggests that those individuals who excel at face recognition may adopt different, potentially
14 more optimal, strategies than typical perceivers (in line with Bobak et al., 2017). However,
15 OB's behavioural results indicate that increasing fixations to the nose does not necessarily
16 improve performance in all face processing tasks (e.g., expression and gender
17 discrimination). This is in accordance with the finding that the optimal fixation point for
18 various tasks is slightly different, and raises the possibility that an over-reliance on
19 information from one area (in this case, the nose) may lead to exceptional performance on
20 some tasks (identity discrimination), without necessarily affecting performance on others
21 (e.g., expression recognition). It would be particularly interesting to examine eye movements
22 from individuals who excel at multiple face processing tasks, compared to those who show
23 very specific abilities (such as OB), and to track eye movements during specific tasks (e.g.,
24 expression or identity processing) to examine whether the bias towards the nose region is
25 modulated or eliminated under different task demands.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 One aspect of these results that remains unclear is how stable these exceptional
46 abilities are. There are relatively few studies on the stability of face recognition between
47 childhood or adolescence and adulthood: some adult cases of DP have recounted difficulties
48 that began in childhood (e.g., de Haan, 1999; Duchaine, Murray, Turner, White, & Garrido,
49 2009; Duchaine, Yovel, Butterworth, & Nakayama, 2006); other cases that have originally
50 been reported as children have shown a consistent deficit when followed up after several
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 years (see Dalrymple et al., 2012). Similarly, adult SRs recount experiences from childhood,
9
10 which suggest their super-recognition arose early in life (e.g., Bobak, Bennetts, et al., 2016;
11 Russell et al., 2009). However, there may be cases where children have simply shown an
12 unusual developmental trajectory, and have gone on to develop relatively normal face
13 recognition skills (see Bennetts et al., 2017; Dalrymple et al., 2014 for discussion). Similarly,
14 it is possible that OB has shown a different developmental trajectory to her peers, in which
15 her face processing matured particularly early. In that case, we would expect her face-specific
16 processing to remain relatively stable in the future. Alternatively, given that face memory and
17 the neural systems underpinning face recognition in the typical population continue to change
18 in adolescence, it is possible that OB's performance might also change with time. If it is the
19 case that OB's abilities develop further (or decline) as she enters adulthood, it would lend
20 support to the idea that the face processing system undergoes a protracted period of plasticity
21 and development that lasts at least until late adolescence, and perhaps adulthood (Germine et
22 al., 2011; Susilo et al., 2013).

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 In sum, OB is an adolescent with exceptional face recognition abilities – a super-
40 recognizer. Her pattern of results in tests of face memory, face perception, and eye-
41 movements to faces mirror those found in adult SRs. This is the first report of a SR prior to
42 adulthood, and confirms that a wide range of individual differences in face recognition are
43 present at a relatively young age, even while the neural systems underpinning face
44 recognition are still maturing. Furthermore, these individual differences are not driven purely
45 by general cognitive abilities – multiple lines of evidence confirm that OB's abilities are face-
46 specific. While OB is the youngest SR reported to date, it is important to note that these
47 individual differences may be apparent even in very young children – the lack of younger
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 cases is likely a result of the fact that children are unlikely to have good insight into whether
9
10 their abilities are “normal” or “exceptional” (even adults have relatively limited insight into
11
12 their face recognition abilities; Palermo et al., 2017), so it is unlikely that they will be able to
13
14 self-identify as super-recognisers. This difficulty is compounded by the relative scarcity of
15
16 developmental individual differences research, combined with a lack of properly normed and
17
18 psychometrically valid tests of face and object processing for young children. Recently,
19
20 though, several child-friendly tests have been developed to identify cases of DP in childhood
21
22 (e.g., Bennetts et al., 2017; Croydon et al., 2014; Dalrymple et al., 2014) – it is possible that
23
24 these resources will make it possible to identify SRs at a much earlier age, and facilitate
25
26 longitudinal studies that examine the stability of individual differences in face recognition
27
28 throughout development.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 Althoff, R. R., & Cohen, N. J. (1999). Eye-movement-based memory effect: a reprocessing
11 effect in face perception. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory,*
12 *and Cognition, 25*(4), 997.
13
14
15
16
17 Aylward, E. H., Park, J. E., Field, K. M., Parsons, A. C., Richards, T. L., Cramer, S. C., &
18 Meltzoff, A. N. (2005). Brain activation during face perception: evidence of a
19 developmental change. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 17*(2), 308-319.
20
21
22
23
24 Baron-Cohen, S., Hoekstra, R. A., Knickmeyer, R., & Wheelwright, S. (2006). The autism-
25 spectrum quotient (AQ)—Adolescent version. *Journal of autism and developmental*
26 *disorders, 36*(3), 343-350.
27
28
29
30 Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Hill, J., Raste, Y., & Plumb, I. (2001). The “Reading the
31 Mind in the Eyes” test revised version: A study with normal adults, and adults with
32 Asperger syndrome or high-functioning autism. *Journal of Child Psychology and*
33 *Psychiatry, 42*(2), 241-251.
34
35
36
37
38
39 Barton, J., (2008). Structure and function in acquired prosopagnosia: lessons from a series of
40 10 patients with brain damage. *Journal of Neuropsychology, 2*, 197–225.
41
42
43
44 Barton, J., Cherkasova, M., Hefter, R., (2004). The covert priming effect of faces in
45 prosopagnosia. *Neurology 63*, 2062–2068
46
47
48
49 Bate, S., Bennetts, R., Mole, J. A., Ainge, J. A., Gregory, N. J., Bobak, A. K., & Bussunt, A.
50 (2015). Rehabilitation of face-processing skills in an adolescent with prosopagnosia:
51 Evaluation of an online perceptual training programme. *Neuropsychological*
52 *Rehabilitation, 25*(5), 733-762.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Bate, S., & Cook, S. J. (2012). Covert recognition relies on affective valence in
9
10 developmental prosopagnosia: Evidence from the skin conductance response.
11
12 *Neuropsychology*, *26*(5), 670.
- 13
14 Bate, S., Cook, S. J., Duchaine, B., Tree, J. J., Burns, E. J., & Hodgson, T. L. (2014).
15
16 Intranasal inhalation of oxytocin improves face processing in developmental
17
18 prosopagnosia. *Cortex*, *50*, 55-63.
- 19
20
21 Bate, S., Haslam, C., Tree, J. J., & Hodgson, T. L. (2008). Evidence of an eye movement-
22
23 based memory effect in congenital prosopagnosia. *Cortex*, *44*(7), 806-819.
- 24
25
26 Bate, S., Parris, B., Haslam, C., & Kay, J. (2010). Socio-emotional functioning and face
27
28 recognition ability in the normal population. *Personality and Individual*
29
30 *Differences*, *48*(2), 239-242.
- 31
32
33 Bennetts, R. J., Butcher, N., Lander, K., Udale, R., & Bate, S. (2015). Movement cues aid
34
35 face recognition in developmental prosopagnosia. *Neuropsychology*, *29*(6), 855.
- 36
37
38 Bennetts, R. J., Murray, E., Boyce, T., & Bate, S. (2017). Prevalence of face recognition
39
40 deficits in middle childhood. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*.
41
42 Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/17470218.2016.1167924
- 43
44
45 Bobak, A. K., Bennetts, R. J., Parris, B. A., Jansari, A., & Bate, S. (2016). An in-depth
46
47 cognitive examination of individuals with superior face recognition skills. *Cortex*.
- 48
49
50 Bobak, A. K., Dowsett, A. J., & Bate, S. (2016). Solving the border control problem:
51
52 evidence of enhanced face matching in individuals with extraordinary face
53
54 recognition skills. *PloS one*, *11*(2), e0148148.
- 55
56
57 Bobak, A. K., Hancock, P. J., & Bate, S. (2016). Super-recognisers in Action: Evidence from
58
59 Face-matching and Face memory tasks. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *30*(1), 81-91.
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Bobak, A. K., Parris, B. A., Gregory, N. J., Bennetts, R. J., & Bate S. (2017). Eye-movement
9 strategies in developmental prosopagnosia and "super" face recognition. *Quarterly*
10 *Journal of Experimental Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:
11
12 10.1080/17470218.2016.1161059
13
14
15
16
17 Bowles, D. C., McKone, E., Dawel, A., Duchaine, B. C., Palermo, R., Schmalzl, L., et al.
18 (2009). Diagnosing prosopagnosia: Effects of ageing, sex, and participant-stimulus
19 ethnic match on the Cambridge Face Memory Test and Cambridge Face Perception
20 Test. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 26, 423-455.
21
22
23
24
25
26 Bruce, V., & Young, A. W. (1986). Understanding face recognition. *British Journal of*
27 *Psychology*, 77, 305-327.
28
29
30 Calder, A. J., Young, A. W., Keane, J., & Dean, M. (2000). Configural information in facial
31 expression perception. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and*
32 *Performance*, 26(2), 527-551.
33
34
35
36
37 Carey, S., & Diamond, R. (1994). Are faces perceived as configurations more by adults than
38 by children? *Visual Cognition*, 2(3), 253-274.
39
40
41 Carey, S., Diamond, R., & Woods, B. (1980). The development of face recognition – a
42 maturational component. *Developmental Psychology*, 16, 257-269.
43
44
45
46 Chatterjee, G., & Nakayama, K. (2012). Normal facial age and gender perception in
47 developmental prosopagnosia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 29(5-6), 482-502.
48
49
50 Crawford, J. R., & Garthwaite, P. H. (2002). Investigation of the single case in
51 neuropsychology: Confidence limits on the abnormality of test scores and test score
52 differences. *Neuropsychologia*, 40(8), 1196-1208.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Crawford, J. R., & Garthwaite, P. H. (2007). Comparison of a single case to a control or
9
10 normative sample in neuropsychology: Development of a Bayesian
11
12 approach. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 24(4), 343-372.

13
14 Crawford, J. R., Garthwaite, P. H., & Porter, S. (2010). Point and interval estimates of effect
15
16 sizes for the case-controls design in neuropsychology: rationale, methods,
17
18 implementations, and proposed reporting standards. *Cognitive*
19
20 *neuropsychology*, 27(3), 245-260.

21
22
23 Crookes, K., & McKone, E. (2009). Early maturity of face recognition: No childhood
24
25 development of holistic processing, novel face encoding, or face-space. *Cognition*,
26
27 *111*, 219-247.

28
29
30 Croydon, A., Pimperton, H., Ewing, L., Duchaine, B. C., & Pellicano, E. (2014). The
31
32 Cambridge Face Memory Test for Children (CFMT-C): A new tool for measuring face
33
34 recognition skills in childhood. *Neuropsychologia*, 62, 60-67.

35
36
37 Chung, M. S., & Thomson, D. M. (1995). Development of face recognition. *British Journal*
38
39 *of Psychology*, 86(1), 55-87.

40
41 Dalrymple, K. A., Corrow, S., Yonas, A., & Duchaine, B. (2012). Developmental
42
43 prosopagnosia in childhood. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 29(5-6), 393-418.

44
45 Dalrymple, K.A., Elison, J.T., & Duchaine, B. (2016). Face-selective and domain-general
46
47 visual processing deficits in children with developmental prosopagnosia. *Quarterly*
48
49 *Journal of Experimental Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:
50
51 10.1080/17470218.2015.1122642
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Dalrymple, K. A., Garrido, L., & Duchaine, B. (2014). Dissociation between face perception
9
10 and face memory in adults, but not children, with developmental
11
12 prosopagnosia. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *10*, 10-20.
- 13
14 Dalrymple, K. A., & Palermo, R. (2016). Guidelines for studying developmental
15
16 prosopagnosia in adults and children. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive*
17
18 *Science*, *7*, 73-87.
- 19
20
21 Davies-Thompson, J., Pancaroglu, R., & Barton, J. (2014). Acquired prosopagnosia:
22
23 structural bias and processing impairments. *Frontiers in Bioscience*. E6, 159–174.
- 24
25 De Haan, E. H. (1999). A familial factor in the development of face recognition
26
27 deficits. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *21*(3), 312-315.
- 28
29
30 de Heering, A., Rossion, B., & Maurer, D. (2012). Developmental changes in face
31
32 recognition during childhood: Evidence from upright and inverted faces. *Cognitive*
33
34 *Development*, *27*, 17–27.
- 35
36
37 De Renzi, E., Faglioni, P., Grossi, D., & Nichelli, P. (1991). Apperceptive and associative
38
39 forms of prosopagnosia. *Cortex*, *27*(2), 213-221.
- 40
41 DeGutis, J., Chatterjee, G., Mercado, R. J., & Nakayama, K. (2012). Face gender recognition
42
43 in developmental prosopagnosia: evidence for holistic processing and use of
44
45 configural information. *Visual Cognition*, *20*(10), 1242-1253.
- 46
47
48 DeGutis, J., Cohan, S., Mercado, R. J., Wilmer, J., & Nakayama, K. (2012). Holistic
49
50 processing of the mouth but not the eyes in developmental prosopagnosia. *Cognitive*
51
52 *Neuropsychology*, *29*, 419-46.
- 53
54
55 Dennett, H. W., McKone, E., Tavashmi, R., Hall, A., Pidcock, M., Edwards, M., & Duchaine,
56
57 B. (2012). The Cambridge Car Memory Test: A task matched in format to the
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Cambridge Face Memory Test, with norms, reliability, sex differences, dissociations
9 from face memory, and expertise effects. *Behavior Research Methods*, 44(2), 587-
10 605.
11

12
13
14 Diamond, R., & Carey, S. (1977). Developmental changes in the representation of
15 faces. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 23(1), 1-22.
16

17
18 Duchaine, B. (2011). Developmental prosopagnosia: Cognitive, neural, and developmental
19 investigations. In A. J. Calder, G. Rhodes, M. H. Johnson, & J. VB. Haxby (Eds.), *The*
20 *Oxford Handbook of Face Perception* (pp. 821-838), New York, NY: Oxford
21 University Press.
22

23
24
25 Duchaine, B., Germine, L., & Nakayama, K. (2007). Family resemblance: Ten family
26 members with prosopagnosia and within-class object agnosia. *Cognitive*
27 *Neuropsychology*, 24(4), 419-430.
28

29
30
31 Duchaine, B., Murray, H., Turner, M., White, S., & Garrido, L. (2009). Normal social
32 cognition in developmental prosopagnosia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 26(7), 620-
33 634.
34

35
36
37 Duchaine, B., & Nakayama, K. (2006). The Cambridge Face Memory Test: Results for
38 neurologically intact individuals and an investigation of its validity using inverted
39 face stimuli and prosopagnosic participants. *Neuropsychologia*, 44(4), 576-585.
40

41
42
43 Duchaine, B. C., Parker, H., & Nakayama, K. (2003). Normal recognition of emotion in a
44 prosopagnosic. *Perception*, 32(7), 827-838.
45

46
47
48 Duchaine, B. & Yovel, G. (2015). A revised neural framework for face processing. *Annual*
49 *Review of Vision Science*, 1: 393-416
50
51

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Duchaine, B. C., Yovel, G., Butterworth, E. J., & Nakayama, K. (2006). Prosopagnosia as an
9
10 impairment to face-specific mechanisms: Elimination of the alternative hypotheses in
11
12 a developmental case. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *23*(5), 714-747.
13
- 14 Dutağacı, H., Yörük, E., & Sankur, B. (2008). Comparative analysis of global hand
15
16 appearance-based person recognition. *Journal of Electronic Imaging*, *17*(1), 011018-
17
18 011018.
19
- 20 Eisenbarth, H., & Alpers, G. W. (2011). Happy mouth and sad eyes: scanning emotional
21
22 facial expressions. *Emotion*, *11*(4), 860.
23
- 24 Flin, R. H. (1980). Age effects in children's memory for unfamiliar faces. *Developmental*
25
26 *Psychology*, *16*(4), 373.
27
- 28 Freire, A., Lee, K., & Symons, L. A. (2000). The face-inversion effect as a deficit in encoding
29
30 of configural information: Direct evidence. *Perception*, *29*, 159–170
31
32
- 33 Fuhrmann, D., Knoll, L. J., Sakhardande, A. L., Speekenbrink, M., Kadosh, K. C., &
34
35 Blakemore, S. J. (2016). Perception and recognition of faces in adolescence. *Scientific*
36
37 *reports*, *6*, 33497.
38
39
- 40 Germine, L. T., Duchaine, B., & Nakayama, K. (2011). Where cognitive development and
41
42 aging meet: Face learning ability peaks after age 30. *Cognition*, *118*(2), 201-210.
43
44
- 45 Gobbini, M. I., & Haxby, J. V. (2007). Neural systems for recognition of familiar faces.
46
47 *Neuropsychologia*, *45*(1), 32-41.
48
49
- 50 Golarai, G., Ghahremani, D. G., Whitfield-Gabrieli, S., Reiss, A., Eberhardt, J. L., Gabrieli, J.
51
52 D., & Grill-Spector, K. (2007). Differential development of high-level visual cortex
53
54 correlates with category-specific recognition memory. *Nature Neuroscience*, *10*(4),
55
56 512-522.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Golarai, G., Liberman, A., Yoon, J. M., & Grill-Spector, K. (2010). Differential development
9 of the ventral visual cortex extends through adolescence. *Frontiers in Human*
10 *Neuroscience*, 3, 43-61. doi: 10.3389/neuro.09.080.2009
11
12
13
14 Habota, T, McLennan, S. N., Cameron, J., Ski, C. F., Thompson, D. R., & Rendell, P. G.
15 (2015). An Investigation of Emotion Recognition and Theory of Mind in People with
16 Chronic Heart Failure. *PLoS One*. 10:e0141607.
17
18
19
20
21 Henderson, J. M., Williams, C. C., & Falk, R. J. (2005). Eye movements are functional
22 during face learning. *Memory and Cognition*, 33(1), 98-106.
23
24
25
26 Herzmann, G., Danthiir, V., Schacht, A., Sommer, W., & Wilhelm, O. (2008). Toward a
27 comprehensive test battery for face cognition: Assessment of the tasks. *Behavior*
28 *Research Methods*, 40, 840–857.
29
30
31
32 Hsiao, J. H., & Cottrell, G. (2008). Two fixations suffice in face recognition. *Psychological*
33 *Science*, 19, 998-1006.
34
35
36
37 Humphreys, K., Avidan, G., & Behrmann, M. (2007). A detailed investigation of facial
38 expression processing in congenital prosopagnosia as compared to acquired
39 prosopagnosia. *Experimental Brain Research*, 176(2), 356-373.
40
41
42
43 Humphreys, G., & Riddoch, M. J. (1993). *Birmingham Object Recognition Battery*. Hove,
44 UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
45
46
47
48 Johnston, P., Kaufman, J., Bajic, J., Sercombe, A., Michie, P., & Karayanidis, F. (2011).
49 Facial emotion and identity processing development in 5- to 15-year-old
50 children. *Frontiers In Psychology*, 2, 26.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Liu, S., Quinn, P. C., Wheeler, A., Xiao, N., Ge, L., & Lee, K. (2011). Similarity and
9 difference in the processing of same-and other-race faces as revealed by eye tracking
10 in 4-to 9-month-olds. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *108*(1), 180-189.
11
12
13
14 Lundqvist, D., Flykt, A., & Öhman, A. (1998). *The Karolinska Directed Emotional Faces*
15 *(KDEF)*. CD-ROM from Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Psychology section,
16 Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden. ISBN 91-630-7164-9.
17
18
19
20
21 Lawrence, K., Bernstein, D., Pearson, R., Mandy, W., Campbell, R., & Skuse, D. (2008).
22 Changing abilities in recognition of unfamiliar face photographs through childhood
23 and adolescence: Performance on a test of non-verbal immediate memory (Warrington
24 RMF) from 6 to 16 years. *Journal of neuropsychology*, *2*(1), 27-45.
25
26
27
28
29
30 Luria, S. M., & Strauss, M. S. (2013). Comparison of eye movements over faces in
31 photographic positives and negatives. *Perception*, *42*(11), 1134-1143.
32
33
34
35 Marotta, J. J., McKeeff, T. J., & Behrmann, M. (2002). The effects of rotation and inversion
36 on face processing in prosopagnosia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *19*(1), 31-47.
37
38
39
40 Maurer, D., Le Grand, R., & Mondloch, C. J. (2002). The many faces of configural
41 processing. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *6*(6), 255-260.
42
43
44 McKone, E., Crookes, K., Jeffery, L., & Dilks, D. D. (2012). A critical review of the
45 development of face recognition: Experience is less important than previously
46 believed. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *29*(1-2), 174-212.
47
48
49
50 McKone, E., Hall, A., Pidcock, M., Palermo, R., Wilkinson, R. B., Rivolta, D., ... &
51 O'Connor, K. B. (2011). Face ethnicity and measurement reliability affect face
52 recognition performance in developmental prosopagnosia: Evidence from the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Cambridge Face Memory Test–Australian. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 28(2), 109-
9 146.
- 10
11
12 McKone, E., & Yovel, G. (2009). Why does picture-plane inversion sometimes dissociate
13 perception of features and spacing in faces, and sometimes not? Toward a new theory
14 of holistic processing. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 16(5), 778-797.
- 15
16
17
18 McGugin, R. W., Van Gulick, A. E., & Gauthier I. (2016). Cortical Thickness in Fusiform
19 Face Area Predicts Face and Object Recognition Performance. *Journal of Cognitive*
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 Moulrier, V., Gaudeau-Bosma, C., Isaac, C., Allard, A.C., Bouaziz, N., Sidhoumi, D., ...
27
28 Janue,l D. (2016). Effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on mood in
29 healthy subjects. *Socioaffective Neuroscience & Psychology*, 17, 29672.
- 30
31
32 Németh, K., Zimmer, M., Schweinberger, S. R., Vakli, P., & Kovács, G. (2014). The
33 background of reduced face specificity of N170 in congenital prosopagnosia. *PLoS*
34
35
36
37
38
39 Or, C. C, Peterson, M. F., & Eckstein, M. P. (2015). Initial eye movements during face
40 identification are optimal and similar across cultures. *Journal of Vision*, 15, 12.
- 41
42
43 Orban de Xivry, J. J., Ramon, M., Lefèvre, P., & Rossion, B. (2008). Reduced fixation on the
44 upper area of personally familiar faces following acquired prosopagnosia. *Journal of*
45
46
47
48
49
50 Palermo, R., O'Connor, K. B., Davis, J. M., Irons, J., & McKone, E. (2013). New tests to
51 measure individual differences in matching and labelling facial expressions of
52 emotion, and their association with ability to recognise vocal emotions and facial
53 identity. *PloS one*, 8(6), e68126.
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Palermo, R., Willis, M. L., Rivolta, D., McKone, E., Wilson, C. E., & Calder, A. J. (2011).
9
10 Impaired holistic coding of facial expression and facial identity in congenital
11
12 prosopagnosia. *Neuropsychologia*, *49*(5), 1226-1235.
13
14 Pallett, P. M., & Dobkins, K. R. (2013). Development of face discrimination abilities, and
15
16 relationship to magnocellular pathway development, between childhood and
17
18 adulthood. *Visual Neuroscience*, *30*(5-6), 251-262.
19
20
21 Pelphrey, K. A., Sasson, N. J., Reznick, J. S., Paul, G., Goldman, B. D., & Piven, J. (2002).
22
23 Visual scanning of faces in autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental*
24
25 *Disorders*, *32*(4), 249-261.
26
27
28 Peters, J. C., Vlamings, P., & Kemner, C. (2013). Neural processing of high and low spatial
29
30 frequency information in faces changes across development: qualitative changes in
31
32 face processing during adolescence. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *37*(9), 1448-
33
34 1457.
35
36
37 Peterson, M. F., & Eckstein, M. P. (2012). Looking just below the eyes is optimal across face
38
39 recognition tasks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
40
41 *States of America*, *109*, E3314-23.
42
43
44 Peterson, M. F., & Eckstein, M. P. (2013). Individual differences in eye movements during
45
46 face identification reflect observer-specific optimal points of fixation. *Psychological*
47
48 *Science*, *24*(7), 1216-1225.
49
50
51 Peterson, E., & Miller, S. F. (2012). The eyes test as a measure of individual differences: how
52
53 much of the variance reflects verbal IQ. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *3*, 220.
54
55
56 Picci, G., & Scherf, K. S. (2016). From caregivers to peers: Puberty shapes human face
57
58 perception. *Psychological Science*, *27*(11), 1461-1473.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Robertson, D. J., Noyes, E., Dowsett, A. J., Jenkins, R., & Burton, A. M. (2016). Face
9
10 Recognition by Metropolitan Police Super-Recognisers. *PloS one*, *11*(2), e0150036.
11
12 Piepers, D. W., & Robbins, R. A. (2012). A review and clarification of the terms
13
14 “holistic,” “configural,” and “relational” in the face perception literature. *Frontiers in*
15
16 *Psychology*, *3*, 559.
17
18 Richler, J. J., Palmeri, T. J., & Gauthier, I. (2012). Meanings, mechanisms, and measures of
19
20 holistic processing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *3*, 553.
21
22
23 Rodrigues, S. M., Saslow, L. R., Garcia, N., John, O. P., & Keltner, D. (2009). Oxytocin
24
25 receptor genetic variation relates to empathy and stress reactivity in
26
27 humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *106*(50), 21437-21441.
28
29
30 Rossion, B. (2013). The composite face illusion: A whole window into our understanding of
31
32 holistic face perception. *Visual Cognition*, *21*(2), 139-253.
33
34 Russell, R., Chatterjee, G., & Nakayama, K. (2012). Developmental prosopagnosia and
35
36 super-recognition: No special role for surface reflectance
37
38 processing. *Neuropsychologia*, *50*(2), 334-340.
39
40
41 Russell, R., Duchaine, B., & Nakayama, K. (2009). Super-recognizers: People with
42
43 extraordinary face recognition ability. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, *16*(2), 252-
44
45 257.
46
47
48 Saether, L., Van Belle, W., Laeng, B., Brennen, T., & Øvervoll, M. (2009). Anchoring gaze
49
50 when categorizing faces' sex: evidence from eye-tracking data. *Vision Research*, *49*,
51
52 2870-80.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Savran, A., Alyüz, N., Dibeklioglu, H., Çeliktutan, O., Gökberk, B., Sankur, B., & Akarun, L.
9
10 (2008). Bosphorus database for 3D face analysis. In *Biometrics and Identity*
11
12 *Management* (pp. 47-56). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
- 13
14 Scherf, K. S., Behrmann, M., Humphreys, K., & Luna, B. (2007). Visual category-selectivity
15
16 for faces, places and objects emerges along different developmental
17
18 trajectories. *Developmental science*, *10*(4), F15-F30.
- 19
20 Scherf, K. S., Luna, B., Avidan, G., & Behrmann, M. (2011). “What” precedes “which”:
21
22 developmental neural tuning in face-and place-related cortex. *Cerebral Cortex*, *21*,
23
24 1963-1980.
- 25
26
27 Scherf, K. S., Thomas, C., Doyle, J., & Behrmann, M. (2013). Emerging Structure–Function
28
29 Relations in the Developing Face Processing System. *Cerebral Cortex*, *24*, 2964-
30
31 2980.
- 32
33
34 Schmalzl, L., Palermo, R., Green, M., Brunsdon, R., & Coltheart, M. (2008). Training of
35
36 familiar face recognition and visual scan paths for faces in a child with congenital
37
38 prosopagnosia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *25*, 704-29.
- 39
40
41 Schwarzer, G., Huber, S., Grüter, M., Grüter, T., Groß, C., Hipfel, M., & Kennerknecht, I.
42
43 (2007). Gaze behaviour in hereditary prosopagnosia. *Psychological Research*, *71*(5),
44
45 583-590.
- 46
47
48 Schyns, P. G., Bonnar, L., & Gosselin, F. (2002). Show me the features! Understanding
49
50 recognition from the use of visual information. *Psychological Science*, *13*(5), 402-
51
52 409.
- 53
54
55 Sekiguchi, T. (2011). Individual differences in face memory and eye fixation patterns during
56
57 face learning. *Acta Psychologica*, *137*(1), 1-9.
- 58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Slessor, G., Riby, D. M., & Finnerty, A. N. (2013). Age-related differences in processing face
9 configuration: The importance of the eye region. *The Journals of Gerontology Series*
10 *B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 68(2), 228-231.
- 11
12
13
14 Stephan, B. C. M., & Caine, D. (2009). Aberrant pattern of scanning in prosopagnosia reflects
15 impaired face processing. *Brain and Cognition*, 69(2), 262-268.
- 16
17
18
19 Susilo, T., Germine, L., & Duchaine, B. (2013). Face recognition ability matures late:
20 Evidence from individual differences in young adults. *Journal of Experimental*
21 *Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 39(5), 1212.
- 22
23
24
25
26 Tippet, L., Miller, L., & Farah, M. J. (2000). Prosopamnesia: A selective impairment in face
27 learning. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 17, 241-255
- 28
29
30 Thomas, A. L., Lawler, K., Olson, I. R., & Aguirre, G. K. (2008). The Philadelphia Face
31 Perception Battery. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 23, 175-87.
- 32
33
34 Turati, C., Di Giorgio, E., Bardi, L., & Simion, F. (2010). Holistic Face Processing in
35 Newborns, 3-Month-Old Infants, and Adults: Evidence From the Composite Face
36 Effect. *Child Development*, 81(6), 1894-1905.
- 37
38
39
40
41 Unoka, Z., Fogd, D., Füzzy, M., & Csukly, G. (2011). Misreading the facial signs: specific
42 impairments and error patterns in recognition of facial emotions with negative valence
43 in borderline personality disorder. *Psychiatry Research*, 189, 419-25.
- 44
45
46
47
48 Van Belle, G., Ramon, M., Lefèvre, P., & Rossion, B. (2010). Fixation patterns during
49 recognition of personally familiar and unfamiliar faces. *Frontiers in*
50 *Psychology*, 1(20), 1-8.
- 51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Verdejo-García, A, Rivas-Pérez, C., Vilar-López, R, & Pérez-García, M. (2007). Strategic
9
10 self-regulation, decision-making and emotion processing in poly-substance abusers in
11
12 their first year of abstinence. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 86, 139-46.
13
14 Weigelt, S., Koldewyn, K., Dilks, D., Balas, B., McKone, E., & Kanwisher, N. (2014).
15
16 Domain-specific development of face memory but not face perception.
17
18 *Developmental Science*, 17(1), 47-58. doi: 10.1016/j.dcn.2014.07.003
19
20
21 Wilmer, J. B., Germine, L., Chabris, C. F., Chatterjee, G., Gerbasi, M., & Nakayama, K.
22
23 (2012). Capturing specific abilities as a window into human individuality: the
24
25 example of face recognition. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 29(5-6), 360-392.
26
27
28 Wilmer, J. B., Germine, L., Chabris, C. F., Chatterjee, G., Williams, M., Loken, E., ... &
29
30 Duchaine, B. (2010). Human face recognition ability is specific and highly
31
32 heritable. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(11), 5238-5241.
33
34
35 Wilson, C. E., Palermo, R., Schmalzl, L., & Brock, J. (2010). Specificity of impaired facial
36
37 identity recognition in children with suspected developmental
38
39 prosopagnosia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 27(1), 30-45.
40
41
42 Yang, H., Susilo, T., & Duchaine, B. (2016). The Anterior Temporal Face Area Contains
43
44 Invariant Representations of Face Identity That Can Persist Despite the Loss of Right
45
46 FFA and OFA. *Cerebral Cortex*, 26, 1096-107.
47
48
49 Young, A. W., Perrett, D. I., Calder, A. J., Sprengelmeyer, R., and Ekman, P. (2002). *Facial*
50
51 *expressions of emotion: Stimuli and tests (FEEST)*. Bury St. Edmunds, U.K., Thames
52
53 Valley Test Company. Ref Type: Computer Program.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Young, A. W., Rowland, D., Calder, A. J., Etcoff, N. L., Seth, A., & Perrett, D. I. (1997).

9
10 Facial expression megamix: Tests of dimensional and category accounts of emotion
11
12 recognition. *Cognition*, 63(3), 271-313.

13
14
15 Yovel, G., & Kanwisher, N. (2008). The representations of spacing and part-based
16
17 information are associated for upright faces but dissociated for objects: Evidence from
18
19 individual differences. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 15(5), 933-939.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: OB's background neuropsychological screen. "BORB" refers to the Birmingham Object Recognition Battery (Humphreys & Riddoch, 1993).

	OB	Age-matched controls			Modified <i>t</i> -test ^a			
		Mean	SD	n	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	% population more extreme than OB	Estimated effect size (Z_{cc})
<i>IQ^b</i>								
Verbal (<i>T</i> score)	59	51.09	7.44	11	1.02	.166	16.60	1.01
Performance (<i>T</i> score)	59	52.82	7.49	11	0.79	.224	22.40	0.82
Full-2 IQ	118	103.18	11.12	11	1.28	.115	11.54	1.33
<i>BORB</i>								
Length Match	27/30	25.28	1.73	12	0.96	.180	18.00	0.99
Size Match	27/30	26.08	1.93	12	0.46	.328	32.79	0.48
Orientation Match	25/30	24.67	2.06	12	0.15	.440	44.02	0.16
Position of Gap Match	35/40	35.50	2.11	12	-0.23	.412	41.20	-0.24

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

^aAll analyses were conducted using Crawford and Garthwaite's (2002) modified *t*-test for single-case comparisons. All results are for one-tailed tests. ^bIQ was assessed for OB and most controls using the two-subtest version of the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (Wechsler, 1999). The IQ of one additional control participant (not included figure in Table 1) was tested using equivalent subtests from the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale IV (Weschler, 2008), and was within the range of our other control participants.

For Peer Review Only

Table 2: OB's performance on tests of face and object processing. "CFMT+" refers to the Cambridge Face memory Test – Long Form (Russell, Duchaine, & Nakayama, 2009), "CCMT" refers to the Cambridge Car Memory Test (Dennett et al., 2012), "CFPT" refers to the Cambridge Face Perception Test (Duchaine et al., 2007), "Ekman 60" refers to the Ekman 60 Faces Test (Young et al., 2002), "RMITE" refers to the Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (Baron-Cohen et al., 2001), and "PFPB" refers to the Philadelphia Face Perception Battery (Thomas et al., 2008).

	OB	Age-matched controls			Modified <i>t</i> -test ^a				
		Mean	SD	n	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> ^b	% population more extreme than OB	Estimated effect size (<i>Z</i> _{CC})	
<i>Face and object memory</i>									
	CFMT+ upright	99/102**	59.08	6.61	13	5.82	<.001	0.01	6.04
	CFMT+ inverted	53/102	46.54	4.89	13	1.27	.114	11.36	1.31
	CFMT+ inversion effect ^c					4.78	<.001	0.02	5.56
	CCMT upright	39/72	47.27	5.66	11	-1.40	.096	9.60	-1.46
	CCMT inverted	40/72	40.18	8.42	11	-0.02	.492	49.20	-0.02
<i>Perception of facial identity</i>									

CFPT upright ^d	28**	39.85	5.57	13	-2.05	.031	3.14	-2.13
CFPT inverted ^d	74	72.62	14.75	13	0.09	.465	53.52	0.09
CFPT inversion effect ^c					1.30	.110	10.99	-1.39
<hr/>								
<i>Non-identity face perception</i>								
Ekman 60	50/60	45.90	6.98	10	.56	.294	29.46	0.59
RMITE	23/36	23.63	3.80	11	-.16	.438	43.85	-0.17
Age perception (PFPB)	68/75	60.30	7.85	10	.94	.187	18.70	0.98
Gender perception (PFPB)	64/75	59.18	8.53	11	.54	.300	30.02	0.57
<hr/>								

^aTests were conducted using the SINGLIMS computer program, which uses methods outlined in Crawford and Garthwaite (2002) and Crawford, Garthwaite, and Porter (2010). ^bResults are for a one-tailed test. ^cInversion effects are calculated by comparing the difference in OB's performance on upright and inverted trials to the difference in control participants' performance on upright and inverted trials, using the Revised Standardized Differences Test (implemented in the RSdT.exe computer program) (Crawford & Garthwaite, 2005). ^dCFPT scores measure deviation from an ideal arrangement, not accuracy. Therefore, a lower score indicates better performance (see Duchaine et al., 2007). **Indicates performance that significantly differs from controls.

Table 3: The proportion of dwell time that OB spent looking at each facial region in the eye-tracking study, compared to age-matched controls.

Cells in bold indicate a significant difference.

	OB	Age-matched controls			Modified <i>t</i> -test ^a			
		Mean	SD	n	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	% population more extreme than XX	Estimated effect size (Z_{CC})
<i>Happy</i>								
Eyes	48.09	49.92	23.97	11	-0.07	.943	47.16	-0.08
Mouth	17.80	19.73	10.12	11	-0.18	.859	42.94	-0.19
Nose	31.28*	14.59	8.75	11	1.83	.098	4.89	1.91
<i>Neutral</i>								
Eyes	53.11	57.72	20.71	11	-0.21	.836	41.78	-0.22
Mouth	9.48	12.37	9.48	11	-0.29	.776	38.82	-0.31
Nose	34.23**	14.70	7.63	11	2.45	.034	1.71	2.56

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

<i>Sad</i>									
	Eyes	50.43	54.17	24.21	11	-0.15	.885	44.27	-0.15
	Mouth	8.42	12.27	8.38	11	-0.44	.669	33.47	-0.46
	Nose	38.63**	15.96	8.48	11	2.56	.028	1.42	2.67

<i>Overall</i>									
	Eyes	50.54	53.94	22.87	11	-0.14	.890	44.48	-0.15
	Mouth	11.90	14.79	9.13	11	-0.30	.768	38.40	-0.32
	Nose	34.71**	15.09	7.87	11	2.39	.038	1.91	2.49

^aAll analyses were conducted using Crawford and Garthwaite’s (2002) modified *t*-test for single-case comparisons. All results are for two-tailed tests. **Indicates performance that significantly differs from controls. *Indicates performance that is approximately two SDs from the control mean but does not reach significance on statistical comparisons.

Table 4: Frequency with which OB and controls fixated the nose during fixations two to six in each trial. Column labels indicate fixation number.

	2 ^a	3	4	5	6
Control Mean	3.00	5.36	2.73	2.64	2.36
Control SD	3.86	4.70	1.76	2.23	2.27
OB	17**	6	2	0	0

^a The first fixation to the face has been removed from all analyses given it overlaps with the location of the initial fixation cross. Consequently, we have only presented data for fixations two through six (i.e., the first five fixations after the initial eye movement made in each trial).

**Indicates performance that significantly differs from controls.




Figure 1: Accuracy (d') of OB and control participants on the object test (Experiment 2). Error bars show ± 1 SEM

147x86mm (150 x 150 DPI)

Supplementary material

Analysis of control participant performance in Experiment 2 (sequential matching of faces and objects)

The d' scores of control participants were entered into a mixed models ANOVA. All main effects and the interaction were significant, object: $F(2,57.4) = 86.43, p < .0005$; orientation: $F(1,56.3) = 17.51, p < .0005$; object*orientation $F(2,56.34) = 28.71, p < .0005$ (see Figure 1). Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons revealed that, averaged across orientation, houses were matched better than hands and faces, $ps < .0005$, and hands were matched better than faces, $p < .0005$. In the upright trials, houses were matched better than hands and faces, $ps < .0005$; whereas faces and hands did not significantly differ, $p = .141$. The inverted trials mirrored the main effect, with houses matched best and hands matched worst, p 's $< .0005$. Comparisons on orientation revealed that faces showed a significant inversion effect, $p < .0005$, hands showed a marginal inversion effect, $p = .093$, and houses did not show an inversion effect, $p = .940$.

Mean sensitivity (d') in the sequential matching task for age-matched control participants. SD in parentheses.

	Faces ^a	Hands ^b	Houses ^b
Upright	1.97 (0.48)	1.47 (0.60)	2.54 (0.55)
Inverted	0.61 (0.07)	1.72 (0.66)	2.55 (0.51)

^aN = 9; ^bN = 13.