

# Guiding Machine Perception with Psychophysics

Justin Dulay\*, *Student Member, IEEE*, Sonia Poltoratski†, Till S. Hartmann†, Samuel E. Anthony†, and Walter J. Scheirer\*, *Senior Member, IEEE*  
University of Notre Dame\*  
Perceptive Automata, Inc.†

## INTRODUCTION

**G**USTAV Fechner’s 1860 delineation of psychophysics, the measurement of sensation in relation to its stimulus, is widely considered to be the advent of modern psychological science. In psychophysics, a researcher parametrically varies some aspects of a stimulus, and measures the resulting changes in a human subject’s experience of that stimulus; doing so gives insight to the determining relationship between a sensation and the physical input that evoked it. This approach is used heavily in perceptual domains, including signal detection, threshold measurement, and ideal observer analysis. Scientific fields like vision science have always leaned heavily on the methods and procedures of psychophysics, but there is now growing appreciation of them by machine learning researchers, sparked by widening overlap between biological and artificial perception [1]–[5]. Machine perception that is guided by behavioral measurements, as opposed to guidance restricted to arbitrarily assigned human labels, has significant potential to fuel further progress in artificial intelligence.

In essence, psychophysical measurements of human behavior represent a richer source of information for supervised machine learning. What has been missing thus far from algorithms that learn from labeled data is a reflection of the patterns of error (*i.e.*, the difficulty) associated with each data point used at training time. With knowledge of which samples are easy and which are hard, some measure of consistency can be achieved between the model and the human reference point. The true advantage of doing this stems from the human ability to solve perceptual tasks such as object recognition in an astonishingly fast and accurate way [6]. Human visual ability developed over millennia with changes in evolutionary genetic predisposition and thousands of hours of “pre-training” for object recognition tasks during development. By leveraging a more powerful learning system — the brain — it is possible to improve machine learning training in new ways.

In this *Point of View* article, we advocate for an alternative to traditional supervised learning that operationalizes the science of psychophysics. We can view the choice of a psychophysical measurement type as a hyperparameter, and the psychophysical measurements themselves as additional labels for data points to be used during training. In traditional supervised learning, performance is limited by the arbitrary labels reflecting class membership, which are the only source of information providing guidance on how to treat individual samples during training. Psychophysically-informed supervised learning is a more complete learning pipeline because of

the measured behavioral information. This is, in some ways, akin to the idea of regularization. However, regularization is typically not associated with detailed measurements of human behavior attached to individual data points.

In the rest of this article, we will take a brief tour of psychophysics for machine learning, including the problem space of perception where these ideas apply, as well as the expanding body of work related to psychophysically-informed machine learning. To highlight the feasibility of gathering and using behavioral measurements in a new machine learning domain, we demonstrate how this training regime works in practice with a series of experiments related to handwritten character classification. As we will see, we are just scratching the surface of what can be achieved with this exciting interdisciplinary area of psychophysically-informed machine learning.

## PSYCHOPHYSICS FOR MACHINE LEARNING

**The Problem Space of Perception.** Hans Moravec’s famous AI paradox pointed out that the perceptual tasks which humans accomplish effortlessly have been among the most challenging to model. As he wrote, “it is comparatively easy to make computers exhibit adult level performance on intelligence tests or playing checkers, and difficult or impossible to give them the skills of a one-year-old when it comes to perception and mobility” [7]. Indeed, recent advances in computational power have yielded tremendous advances in cognitive tasks that require extensive mental effort for human participants, like advanced strategy games [8] or machine translation [9]. However, machine learning has continued to struggle to perform perceptual tasks that appear intuitive to humans but may have ambiguous or ill-defined “ground truth,” like medical image interpretation [10] or pro-social driving behavior [11].

We argue that in many cases, both human perceptual science and machine learning intend to resolve the latent space of representational features that yield an observed space. Classification models derive complex latent representations from data without the need for rule-based assignment and can leverage psychophysical data alongside of a class label. For instance, given a photo of a chair, an additional psychophysical measurement associated with the photo would relate information about the latent space of “chairness” to complement the extracted features and human assigned label of “chair.” This approach is particularly powerful in a machine learning context in which the correct label or solution is conceptually defined by humans, rather than an absolute ground truth. An

## Psychophysically-Informed Supervised Learning: Complete Learning Pipeline




Fig. 1. When performing similar visual tasks, humans and machine agents both solve for some latent representation of features. But at present, the human capacity for this is superior. The central component of psychophysically informed learning is collecting quantifiable latent information from human experiments on visual recognition tasks and augmenting the *training* regime of machine learning models with it. A learning agent with a closer representational space to humans for a visual task, which is learned from the psychophysical measurements, solves that task in a way that is better than an agent without access to those measurements.

example of this would be a model of the subjective assignment of “first impressions” made about the personality of a face in an image [1].

### Informing Machine Learning with Psychophysical Data.

The goal of psychophysically-informed data collection is to reveal additional information about the underlying latent representational space that yields the traditional annotations or labels that humans produce for machine learning datasets. This can be done by measuring information about each label’s difficulty, confusability of label pairs, or integration of information over time. To cover the latent space effectively, experimental stimuli should effectively cover the sample space of the task, and experiments constructed from the stimuli should span a range of difficulty. Then, experimenters should select a response modality best matched to the machine learning goal and provide careful instructions that focus participant performance on the critical measurement. For example, a task utilizing reaction time would yield more accurate data from keypresses than mouseclicks, and if participants are explicitly instructed to “perform the task as quickly and accurately as possible, without taking breaks during trials.” In recent years, psychologists have effectively ported many in-lab study protocols to online crowd-sourcing sites like Amazon Mechanical Turk, demonstrating that data quality can be comparable [12] while allowing for rapid data collection from large numbers of participants [13].

Psychophysical labeling of the data provides an extra dimension beyond the usual supervised label. In a classification mode, a loss function can use this information to improve the learning process. For example, psychophysical labels can be incorporated into the loss to force the learning process to have more consistency with human perception. Consider a loss function where data points with associated low latency in response time result in high error for incorrect model predictions and data points with high latency yield lower error for mistakes. In other words, the model should not make

mistakes on easy samples, but is allowed to miss some of the hard ones in the same pattern humans do. Alternatively, there could be some advantage to leveraging the psychophysical information in a way that is *inconsistent* with human behavior, but still improves model performance. One way would be to reverse the error emphasis, so that the training regime puts a higher priority on getting difficult samples correct.


In a regression mode, Likert-scale data could be used to directly inform training to match human judgement, with additional psychophysical labels for the loss function as needed. For example, a neural network-based regressor can make direct use of averaged Likert scale response scores. As with experimental design in psychology, the options for modeling here are numerous.

### Domains that Have Benefited from This Approach.

Several domains have been investigated by researchers looking for ways to use psychophysics in machine learning (Fig. 2). A loss function able to use measurements from crowd-sourced psychophysics experiments was first introduced by Scheirer et al. [2] for the domain of human biometrics. They conducted a series of behavioral experiments using the psychology crowd-sourcing platform TestMyBrain.org where participants were presented with a two-alternative forced choice question about whether or not a face was present in a given stimulus. Two-alternative forced choice is a common way to gather psychophysical data for recognition-based tasks because the operative step of recognition is binary — selecting a given positive sample type in a relative latent representation space and rejecting a given negative sample [17]. Stimuli were designed to test the impact of different controllable conditions such as noise and occlusion on face detection, which provides increased coverage of the full difficulty and scope of the problem compared to unperturbed labeling, maximizing the size of an informative label space. Different from the typical treatment of labeled samples in supervised machine learning, they found that difficult samples (e.g., a heavily occluded face)




## Handwritten Document Transcription



## Affective Computing



## Object Recognition



## Robotics



Fig. 2. Psychophysical labels have been utilized in multiple domains. Supervised model training for Handwritten Document Transcription benefits from measurements of human reading behavior collected via crowd-sourcing site workers or expert readers [5]. Affective Computing tasks can leverage forms of annotation like Likert-scale ratings [14]. Machine learning algorithms for Object Recognition also benefit from psychophysical evaluation and conditioning [4], [15]. The field of robotics, especially pertaining to autonomous vehicles, benefits from labels derived from behavioral measurements when considering social settings like pedestrian crossings [16]. In general, when considering a perceptual task, a supervised learning model can always benefit from a larger label space.

where the participants chose correctly after a relatively long period provided additional information for training Support Vector Machine (SVM) classifiers with a loss function applying penalties based on perceptual measurements. Adding psychophysical measurements increased the robustness of the *label space*, which led to a state-of-the-art model for face detection.

In the domain of handwritten document transcription, loss functions incorporating psychophysical data for artificial neural network training have also been explored. Grieggs et al. [5] measured the reaction time of expert readers for documents of varying age and language, and used those measurements as labels in different loss functions that could emphasize easy or difficult samples. Observations were made about differences in reader behavior between expert and novice groups, with implications for other data labeling tasks. As with the original SVM work, this strategy was able to yield state-of-the-art performance for handwritten document transcription.

It has been demonstrated that humans adeptly make complex judgements about personality traits in miniscule amounts of time [18]. In the domain of affective computing, using two-alternative forced choice or Likert scale ratings and regression models, it is possible to model this phenomenon using machine learning. The ChaLearn Looking at People First Impressions Challenge Competition [19] focused on models for the Big 5 personality traits (Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism). McCurrie et al. [14] looked at a set of different traits, including Trustworthiness, Dominance, IQ and Estimated Age. Work by Rojas et al. has looked at modeling some of these traits in a classification mode [1]. This research is a natural extension of laboratory testing in social psychology, and is facilitated by psychophysical measurements.

In the domain of object recognition, an agent attempts disentangle a learned manifold on some latent representation space of learned data [6]. Psychophysical evaluation has played an important role in evaluating biological and artificial vision, including their similarities and differences. Perturbed stimuli (e.g., rotated objects) activate neurons at different

levels than canonical object views of the same stimuli. This same effect was observed in artificial neural networks [20]. But there are also differences between models and biological reference points. For instance, while some artificial neural networks generalize better than humans on some types of noise, humans outperform them on many noisy recognition tasks [21], [22]. This work demonstrates that the incorporation of human behavioral measurements within the label space of specific recognition tasks where the artificial agent typically fails poorly can be beneficial. Richard Webster et al. introduced a framework to evaluate different types of image perturbations (blurring, rotation, resolution) and their effects on both artificial and human performance for object [20] and face recognition [15] tasks. Zhang et al. [4] have suggested the use of human gaze measurements for improving performance in various object-related tasks, especially in a reinforcement learning context.

Finally, in the domain of robotics, psychophysics has been positioned as a means to create more generalizable embodied intelligence in robotic systems [23]. By simulating an artificial environment with many potential scenarios using perturbed inputs, a robotic system can generalize by learning to perform on stimuli that could potentially appear in the wild. This borrows from human-in-the-loop learning for autonomous systems, but remains distinct in that the measurements for the scenarios are taken from people before the model is trained. Furthermore, it has also been suggested that the models used for autonomous driving can benefit from the human perception of pedestrians in uncertain situations (e.g., a pedestrian at a crosswalk who is not in motion, but may intend to cross), which reveals more information about the situation at hand [16].

### CASE STUDY: OPTICAL CHARACTER RECOGNITION WITH PSYCHOPHYSICAL PARAMETERIZATION

Optical character recognition (OCR) is a popular supervised learning task where the objective is to classify the characters within images of text. Sometimes those images are of poor quality, rendering the task more challenging to the learning agent while providing a representative example of text in

the wild. Humans, equipped with a rich latent understanding of text recognition, typically outperform artificial agents on nontrivial OCR tasks. In this case study, we conducted a series of human behavioral measurements in crowd-sourced experiments to operationalize the training stage of a supervised deep learning agent with psychophysical data.

**Dataset Preparation and Behavioral Experiments.** We implemented both the psychophysical tasks and the OCR machine learning task using a subset of the Omniglot dataset [24]. The dataset contains images of handwritten characters from hundreds of typesets, many of which a typical crowd-sourced study participant would be unfamiliar with. In order to prepare a stimulus dataset for the human behavioral experiments, we selected 100 random classes from the original Omniglot dataset. To augment this data, we generated a counterpart sample for each image with a deep convolutional generative adversarial network (DCGAN) to increase intraclass variance and the sample size per class. This resulted in a dataset of 100 classes with 40 instances per class for the psychophysical stimulus dataset to be used by the participants.

We conducted a series of four different psychophysical behavioral experiments on variations of a two-alternative forced choice task with human participants. For each experiment of this particular task, the participant viewed two different images from the stimulus dataset with a prompt asking whether the images represent the same symbol or not. The first image of the pair was chosen at random, while the second was chosen from the same class or a different one with a probability of 0.5.

- The first experiment was a control experiment where the images from the original stimulus dataset were not perturbed. As a baseline, this task presented instructional prompts that were not tailored to psychophysics tasks, but rather asked participants for standard machine learning labels. Users made their responses using a cursor, which is typical in labeling tasks but does not yield reliable reaction-time estimates.
- The second experiment was the same as the control experiment, but we modified the instructional prompts following best practices in psychophysics — for example, participants were instructed to complete the task “as quickly and accurately as possible” and they were allowed to complete the task by pressing an *F* or *J* key. Both of these modifications are standard in psychophysics tasks that collect response time data.
- The third experiment incorporated the condition of Gaussian blur. A randomly chosen image from one of the 100 classes was blurred using one of five different kernels (also chosen randomly with respect to the level of perturbation), and the other image that was paired with it was left unaltered. We expanded the range of experiment difficulty to avoid a ceiling effect, a form of scale attenuation in which maximum performance measured does not reflect the true maximum of the independent variable. In this case, we expect a measurement ceiling if the task was too easy for participants and maximally-accurate responses lose their relationship to task difficulty.
- The fourth experiment was conducted like the third



Fig. 3. *Are these the same character?* An example two-alternative forced choice OCR task as seen from the participant’s view. Labels (d) and (f) represent character pairs where the class labels differ; the rest represent the same class pairing. The blurred and noisy images lead to more informative psychophysical labels for operationalization within the machine learning task during training.

experiment, but with Gaussian noise instead of blurring. Likewise, there were five different levels of Gaussian noise that could be applied, selected at random. Refer to Fig. 3 for sample depictions of this task.

Participants for the behavioral experiments were recruited on Amazon Mechanical Turk. Each participant completed 100 two-alternative forced choice trials, and each of the four experiments had 1000 participants. The reaction time for each task was recorded by measuring the interval between the first presentation of the stimuli and the participant’s recorded response. Each experiment formed a psychophysically annotated dataset that was used later in the machine learning task. The resulting four datasets included all of the image pairs shown in each two-alternative forced choice instance, the responses of the participants, the average accuracy of participants on each image pairing, and the average reaction time of participants on each image pairing. Each image pairing was distributed approximately evenly across all participants in each experiment. The averaged accuracies and reaction times per pairing were calculated across all responses for that instance, where the number of responses per pairing varied slightly but not significantly. Spam and incomplete response sets were manually pruned.

**Loss Function Formulation.** The psychophysical loss utilized data collected from the human behavioral experiments in addition to traditional supervised learning data. It expanded upon a traditional supervised learning pipeline. In this case study, we made use of a standard ResNet50 deep neural network model, which is ubiquitous in many computer vision classification tasks, and cross entropy loss. For all experiments, we used the same hyperparameters for the model.

Cross entropy loss is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L} = - \left( \sum_j y_j \log(\hat{y}_j) \right)$$

where  $\hat{y}_j$  is a model prediction and  $y_j$  is the traditional class label associated with it. In order to incorporate the psychophysical labels into cross entropy loss, we normalized and



scaled the measurements to fit within the expected range of the loss function values. Further, we only considered modifying the behavior of the loss function on model outputs where the prediction was incorrect. We made use of the averaged reaction times and averaged accuracies separately from one another; we did not combine the two in a given loss function. To make use of these labels, we defined a psychophysical penalty:

$$z_i = m - r_i$$

where  $z_i$  is the penalty,  $m$  is the maximum value for either reaction time or accuracy, and  $r_i$  is the psychophysical label (either reaction time or accuracy). Next, we incorporate  $z_i$  into cross entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L} = - \left( \sum_j y_j (\log(\hat{y}_j) z_i c) \right)$$

where  $c$  is a scaling factor for the psychophysical penalty.

**OCR Classifier Experiments.** The study concluded that psychophysical loss improves the top-1 accuracy of the dataset by 1.1% on average — a substantial improvement for a machine learning endeavour. The ResNet50 architecture used in these experiments was pre-trained on ImageNet. We trained three models based on this architecture for each of the four psychophysical datasets from the behavioral experiments: a set of equally unperturbed images (control experiment), re-worded prompts for the control experiment set, blurred images, and noisy images.

- The first model was a standard ResNet50 with normal cross entropy loss.
- The second model substituted regular cross entropy loss for the psychophysical loss using accuracy.
- The third model substituted regular cross entropy loss for the psychophysical loss using reaction time.

We trained each model for 20 epochs. In order to report accuracy fairly, we repeated model training five times with a different random seed. The results reported in Table I reflect the mean accuracy of each run along with standard error. In addition, we conducted a three-way ANOVA between the reaction time, accuracy, and cross-entropy sets in this experiment.

For each instance, reaction time labels generally improved supervised model performance. In contrast, accuracy labels did not always outperform the control. Therefore, when integrating these new labels into machine learning training, it remains important to assess effectiveness for the task. In this case, reaction time was the more informative measurement type. This has been shown in the literature for training artificial neural networks using psychophysical data [5]. However, there is not guarantee that this will generalize to all tasks. A two-way ANOVA between the reaction time and control test result distributions established statistical significance.

## CONCLUSION

Psychophysical labels from human behavioral experiments have been shown to improve the performance of supervised learning models in many different domains in the literature.

Control experiment	Train Accuracy	Test Accuracy	95% C.I.
Cross Entropy	0.741 ±0.005	0.705 ±0.004	0.078
Averaged Accuracy	0.743 ±0.005	0.692 ±0.008	0.055
<b>Reaction Time</b>	<b>0.754 ±0.005</b>	<b>0.719 ±0.004</b>	<b>0.055</b>
Different Prompts	Train Accuracy	Test Accuracy	95% C.I.
Cross Entropy	0.732 ±0.005	0.705 ±0.004	0.078
Averaged Accuracy	0.723 ±0.003	0.697 ±0.008	0.062
<b>Reaction Time</b>	<b>0.731 ±0.005</b>	<b>0.729 ±0.005</b>	<b>0.062</b>
Blurred Images	Train Accuracy	Test Accuracy	95% C.I.
Cross Entropy	0.691 ±0.005	0.642 ±0.005	0.062
Averaged Accuracy	0.643 ±0.008	0.542 ±1.005	0.107
<b>Reaction Time</b>	<b>0.710 ±0.003</b>	<b>0.668 ±0.006</b>	<b>0.068</b>
Noisy Images	Train Accuracy	Test Accuracy	95% C.I.
Cross Entropy	0.672 ±0.006	0.602 ±0.005	0.062
Averaged Accuracy	0.641 ±0.007	0.592 ±0.016	0.110
<b>Reaction Time</b>	<b>0.732 ±0.004</b>	<b>0.680 ±0.005</b>	<b>0.062</b>

TABLE I

THE TEST TIME ACCURACY FOR TOP@1 ACCURACY REFLECTS SUBSTANTIAL BENEFIT IN USING REACTION TIME AS AN ADDITIONAL LABEL. THE RESULTS HAVE A P-VALUE FROM ANOVA OF  $2.02 \cdot 10^{-6}$ , INDICATING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE PERFORMANCES WHEN USING REACTION TIME AS A PSYCHOPHYSICAL LABEL IN THE MODEL. LIKEWISE, THE CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR EACH SET OF EXPERIMENTS REMAINS WITHIN EXPECTED BOUNDS OF EFFICACY FOR CONSISTENT PERFORMANCE ACROSS FOLDS. USING THE AVERAGED ACCURACY SCORE AS A LABEL RARELY YIELDED SUBSTANTIAL BENEFIT. HOWEVER, WE SEE IMPROVED PERFORMANCE WHEN USING REACTION TIME AS A PSYCHOPHYSICAL PARAMETER IN ALL CASES.

We conducted a case study to demonstrate how quickly this strategy can be adapted to a new domain. More work needs to be done to develop similar strategies for different modes of learning, including unsupervised and reinforcement learning. By improving training regimes or policy estimators in these fields, generalization may be achieved more effectively than with traditional strategies. In all, we hope this work inspires future conversation and research at the intersection of psychology and computer science.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was partially funded by the US National Science Foundation under grant BCS:1942151.

## DATA AND CODE AVAILABILITY

All data and code used in this paper can be found at: <https://github.com/dulayjm/PyTorch-Psychophysics-Learning>.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Rojas Q., D. Masip, A. Todorov, and J. Vitria, "Automatic prediction of facial trait judgments: Appearance vs. structural models," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 6, no. 8, p. e23323, 2011.
- [2] W. J. Scheirer, S. E. Anthony, K. Nakayama, and D. D. Cox, "Perceptual annotation: Measuring human vision to improve computer vision," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 8, pp. 1679–1686, 2014.
- [3] S. Escalera, X. Baró, J. Gonzalez, M. A. Bautista, M. Madadi, M. Reyes, V. Ponce-López, H. J. Escalante, J. Shotton, and I. Guyon, "ChaLearn looking at people challenge 2014: Dataset and results," in *ECCV Workshops*, 2014, pp. 459–473.
- [4] R. Zhang, Z. Liu, L. Zhang, J. A. Whritner, K. S. Muller, M. M. Hayhoe, and D. H. Ballard, "AGIL: Learning attention from human for visuomotor tasks," in *ECCV*, 2018, pp. 663–679.
- [5] S. Grieggs, B. Shen, G. Rauch, P. Li, J. Ma, D. Chiang, B. Price, and W. Scheirer, "Measuring human perception to improve handwritten document transcription," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2021.

- [6] J. J. DiCarlo, D. Zoccolan, and N. C. Rust, "How does the brain solve visual object recognition?" *Neuron*, vol. 73, no. 3, pp. 415–434, 2012.
- [7] H. Moravec, *Mind Children: The Future of Robot and Human Intelligence*. Harvard University Press, 1988.
- [8] O. Vinyals, I. Babuschkin, W. M. Czarnecki, M. Mathieu, A. Dudzik, J. Chung, D. H. Choi, R. Powell, T. Ewalds, P. Georgiev *et al.*, "Grandmaster level in StarCraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning," *Nature*, vol. 575, no. 7782, pp. 350–354, 2019.
- [9] Y. Wu, M. Schuster, Z. Chen, Q. V. Le, M. Norouzi, W. Macherey, M. Krikun, Y. Cao, Q. Gao, K. Macherey *et al.*, "Google's neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08144*, 2016.
- [10] M. I. Razzak, S. Naz, and A. Zaib, "Deep learning for medical image processing: Overview, challenges and the future," *Classification in BioApps*, pp. 323–350, 2018.
- [11] N. Lacetera, M. Macis, and R. Slonim, "Will there be blood? Incentives and displacement effects in pro-social behavior," *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 186–223, 2012.
- [12] L. Germine, K. Nakayama, B. C. Duchaine, C. F. Chabris, G. Chatterjee, and J. B. Wilmer, "Is the web as good as the lab? Comparable performance from web and lab in cognitive/perceptual experiments," *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 847–857, 2012.
- [13] N. Stewart, J. Chandler, and G. Paolacci, "Crowdsourcing samples in cognitive science," *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 736–748, 2017.
- [14] M. McCurrie, F. Beletti, L. Parzianello, A. Westendorp, S. Anthony, and W. J. Scheirer, "Predicting first impressions with deep learning," in *IEEE FG*, 2017, pp. 518–525.
- [15] B. RichardWebster, S. Y. Kwon, C. Clarizio, S. E. Anthony, and W. J. Scheirer, "Visual psychophysics for making face recognition algorithms more explainable," in *ECCV*, 2018, pp. 252–270.
- [16] M. Milford, S. Anthony, and W. Scheirer, "Self-driving vehicles: Key technical challenges and progress off the road," *IEEE Potentials*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 37–45, 2019.
- [17] N. Prins and F. Kingdom, *Psychophysics: A Practical Introduction (Second Edition)*. Academic Press, 2016.
- [18] J. Willis and A. Todorov, "First impressions: Making up your mind after a 100-ms exposure to a face," *Psychological Science*, vol. 17, no. 7, pp. 592–598, 2006.
- [19] V. Ponce-López, B. Chen, M. Oliu, C. Corneanu, A. Clapés, I. Guyon, X. Baró, H. J. Escalante, and S. Escalera, "Chalearn LAP 2016: First round challenge on first impressions-dataset and results," in *ECCV Workshops*, 2016, pp. 400–418.
- [20] B. R. Webster, S. E. Anthony, and W. J. Scheirer, "Psyphy: A psychophysics driven evaluation framework for visual recognition," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 41, no. 9, pp. 2280–2286, 2018.
- [21] R. Geirhos, C. R. Temme, J. Rauber, H. H. Schütt, M. Bethge, and F. A. Wichmann, "Generalisation in humans and deep neural networks," *NeurIPS*, 2018.
- [22] H. Jang, D. McCormack, and F. Tong, "Noise-trained deep neural networks effectively predict human vision and its neural responses to challenging images," *PLoS biology*, vol. 19, no. 12, p. e3001418, 2021.
- [23] N. Sünderhauf, O. Brock, W. Scheirer, R. Hadsell, D. Fox, J. Leitner, B. Upcroft, P. Abbeel, W. Burgard, M. Milford *et al.*, "The limits and potentials of deep learning for robotics," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 37, no. 4-5, pp. 405–420, 2018.
- [24] B. M. Lake, R. Salakhutdinov, and J. B. Tenenbaum, "Human-level concept learning through probabilistic program induction," *Science*, vol. 350, no. 6266, pp. 1332–1338, 2015.