

Spatial frequency processing in the central and peripheral visual field: Effects of gaze-contingent filter strength and size

Anke Cajar, Jochen Laubrock, and Ralf Engbert
University of Potsdam, Germany

Key words: Eye movements, scene viewing, spatial frequencies, processing difficulty

Address correspondence to:

Anke Cajar
Department Psychology
Universität Potsdam
Karl-Liebknecht-Str. 24-25
14476 Potsdam, Germany

Email: cajar@uni-potsdam.de
Phone: +493319772127
Fax: +493319772793

Abstract

Visuo-spatial attention and gaze control depend on the interaction of foveal and peripheral processing. The foveal and peripheral compartments of the visual field are differentially sensitive to parts of the spatial frequency spectrum. In two experiments, we investigated how the selective attenuation of spatial frequencies in the central or the peripheral affects eye-movement behavior during real-world scene viewing. Gaze-contingent low-pass or high-pass filters with varying filter cutoffs (Experiment 1) or filter size (Experiment 2) were applied. Compared with unfiltered control conditions, mean fixation durations increased more with central high-pass and peripheral low-pass filtering than with central low-pass and peripheral high-pass filtering. Increasing filter size and filter level progressively increased fixation durations in half of the conditions, but had no effect with the other conditions. The effects suggest that fixation durations prolong with increasing processing difficulty as long as the available information is useful. When fixation durations were unaffected by increasing processing difficulty, saccade amplitudes were modulated instead, indicating a trade-off between saccade timing and saccadic selection. Taken together, interactions of perception and gaze control are compatible with a perceptual economy account. (181 words)

Introduction

Why do we move our eyes? Due to sensory and cognitive limitations, high-acuity vision is restricted to the central 2° of the visual field, the fovea, whereas the visual periphery looks rather blurry (Strasburger, Rentschler, & Jüttner, 2011; Wertheim, 1894). As a consequence, high-velocity saccades shift the gaze about three times each second to bring regions of interest from the low-resolution periphery into the fovea for closer inspection. Two tasks are accomplished during the following fixation—fine-grained foveal information is analyzed to identify objects and details, and coarse-grained peripheral information is analyzed to select the next saccade target among competing regions of interest. Thus, visual information in the central and the peripheral visual field serve different tasks (Gilchrist, 2011).

How does the different sensitivity of foveal and peripheral regions of the visual field affect the selection of when and where to move our eyes? The present study investigates how the two tasks of foveal analysis and peripheral selection are accomplished during real-world scene viewing when different parts of the spatial frequency spectrum are selectively attenuated in the foveal or peripheral visual field. Inherently, this also sheds light on the question to what degree central and peripheral vision contribute to spatial and temporal aspects of eye-movement behavior. The issue can be tackled by attenuating high or low spatial frequencies in the central or the peripheral visual field. High spatial frequencies carry the fine-grained information of an image and low spatial frequencies carry the coarse-grained information of an image. For removing information selectively in the central or the peripheral part of the visual field a gaze-contingent window of arbitrary size can be applied that moves with the current gaze position of the viewer in real time during scene inspection (McConkie & Rayner, 1975; Rayner & Bertera, 1979). Spatial frequencies are filtered either inside or outside the gaze-contingent window with central or peripheral filtering, respectively, while the other region of the scene remains unchanged.

Previous research on this topic is rather scant and has mostly focused on the effects of peripheral low-pass filtering (i.e., attenuating high spatial frequencies, but preserving low spatial frequencies) on eye movements. Studies consistently show that viewers prefer unfiltered scene regions as saccade targets. Peripheral filtering shortens mean saccade amplitudes as viewers tend to keep their gaze inside the unfiltered central region and avoid longer saccades to the filtered periphery (Cajar, Schneeweiß, Engbert, & Laubrock, 2015; Foulsham, Tetzka, & Kingstone, 2011; Laubrock, Cajar, & Engbert, 2013; Loschky & McConkie, 2002; Loschky, McConkie, Yang, & Miller, 2005; Nuthmann, 2013, 2014; Shioiri & Ikeda, 1989); blurring the central visual field, on the other hand, lengthens mean saccade amplitudes as viewers tend to place fewer short saccades inside the filtered center and make more long saccades to the periphery (Cajar et al., 2015; Laubrock et al., 2013; Nuthmann, 2014). With both central and peripheral filtering, the effects get larger with increasing filter size and filter level (Loschky & McConkie, 2002; Nuthmann, 2013, 2014). Thus, saccadic selection is modulated more and more as processing difficulty increases. Ait has been shown

that this change in saccade amplitudes goes along with a corresponding change in visuo-spatial attention (Cajar et al., 2015).

Fixation duration also varies with visual-cognitive processing and usually increases as the acquisition of information from the scene becomes more difficult (Cornelissen, Bruin, & Kooijman, 2005; Henderson, 2003; Nuthmann, Smith, Engbert, & Henderson, 2010), e.g., when scene luminance (Henderson, Nuthmann, & Luke, 2013; Loftus, 1985; Walshe & Nuthmann, 2014) or contrast (van Diepen, 2001) decrease, when spatial frequencies are filtered from the entire scene (Glaholt, Rayner, & Reingold, 2013; Groner, Groner, & Mühlénen, 2008; Henderson, Olejarczyk, Luke, & Schmidt, 2014; Mannan, Ruddock, & Wooding, 1995), or when scene information is completely or partly masked (Glaholt, Rayner, & Reingold, 2012; Shioiri, 1993; van Diepen & Wampers, 1998). Consequently, most studies with gaze-contingent spatial frequency filtering show that fixation durations increase with central low-pass filtering (Cajar et al., 2015; Nuthmann, 2014) and with peripheral low-pass filtering (Laubrock et al., 2013; Loschky & McConkie, 2002; Loschky et al., 2005; Nuthmann, 2013, 2014; Parkhurst, Culurciello, & Niebur, 2000; van Diepen & Wampers, 1998); fixations also increasingly prolong with increasing filter size (Nuthmann, 2013, 2014; Parkhurst et al., 2000). However, Loschky and colleagues found that increasing filter level with detectable peripheral low-pass filtering hardly affected fixation durations (Loschky & McConkie, 2002; Loschky et al., 2005). Altogether, previous research suggests that eye movement behavior is increasingly impaired as visual-cognitive processing difficulty in terms of spatial frequency filtering increases.

In contrast, we recently found evidence in two studies (Cajar et al., 2015; Laubrock et al., 2013) that fixation durations increase with processing difficulty when the information left after filtering is still useful enough for processing, but that durations are unaffected when processing becomes too difficult. In both experiments, high-pass filters (attenuating low spatial frequencies, but preserving high spatial frequencies) or low-pass filters were applied to either the central or the peripheral part of the visual field during the viewing of color (Laubrock et al., 2013) or gray-scale (Cajar et al., 2015) real-world scenes. Assuming that processing difficulty affects fixation durations, they should increase most with central low-pass filtering and peripheral high-pass filtering (compared with central high-pass and peripheral low-pass filtering), as these conditions strongly attenuate the critical spatial frequencies for foveal analysis (high spatial frequencies) and peripheral target selection (low spatial frequencies) and are therefore associated with higher processing difficulty. In both experiments, however, mean fixation durations increased most with central high-pass and peripheral low-pass filtering, which were expected to be less disruptive for processing; central low-pass and peripheral high-pass filtering, on the other hand, involved shorter mean fixation durations that were in most cases similar to the fixation duration in the unfiltered control condition. This suggests that viewers invested more processing time when the information left after filtering was useful enough to accomplish the task at hand (foveal analysis, peripheral selection) in a reasonable amount

of time. Saccade timing adapted default (control condition) timing when visual-cognitive processing became too difficult to make an investment of more processing time worthwhile, which was interpreted as perceptual economy. To account for these effects, we developed a computational model in which fixation durations are controlled by the dynamic interaction of foveal and peripheral processing (Laubrock et al., 2013). The model assumes that foveal and peripheral information processing evolve in parallel and independently from one another during fixation, a notion that was recently corroborated by an experimental study (Ludwig, Davies, & Eckstein, 2014). Model simulations reproduced the experimental effects and indicate a similar mechanism for saccade timing for the unfiltered control condition and the difficult filter conditions (central low-pass filtering, peripheral high-pass filtering), but delayed saccade timing for the easier filter conditions (central high-pass and peripheral low-pass filtering).

Present study

Since the findings of our previous studies disagree with the notion that fixation durations increase with increasing processing difficulty, the aims of the present study were to replicate these findings and to investigate whether they also hold when processing difficulty is varied in other ways than by different filter types (low-pass, high-pass). We therefore applied low-pass or high-pass filters to the central or the peripheral visual field during real-world scene viewing in two experiments. In Experiment 1, the level of filtering was varied so that low-pass or high-pass filters were either weak, moderate, or strong, depending on the amount of spatial frequencies they preserved. In Experiment 2, filter level was held constant, but the size of the filter was varied so that the central or the peripheral filter was either of small, medium, or large size. Both experiments tested for the effects of filtering on fixation durations and saccade amplitudes. In line with previous research, we expected viewers to prefer unfiltered scene regions as saccade targets and to adapt saccade amplitudes to processing difficulty. Therefore, amplitudes should monotonically increase with central filtering and monotonically decrease with peripheral filtering as filters become larger or stronger. For fixation durations, we expected to replicate our previous findings regarding filter type (Cajar et al., 2015; Laubrock et al., 2013). With respect to effects of filter strength and filter size, expectations were less clear. Generally, fixation durations are expected to increase with both filter level and filter size, as long as these lead to increases in processing difficulty within a range of difficulties in which the stimulus is still perceptible. If, however, (too) strong or large filters attenuate too much relevant information from the scene, then based on our earlier results and interpretation that default saccade timing is adapted under such conditions, fixation durations should become similar to the unfiltered control condition.

Experiment 1

Participants inspected real-world scenes in preparation for a memory task while high or low spatial frequencies were filtered either in the central or the peripheral

visual field. The level of filtering varied between trials, using weak, moderate, or strong high- or low-pass filters. Thus, processing difficulty increased from weak to strong filters. Filter level or strength was changed by varying cut-off frequency, so that weak low-pass filters preserved a relatively wide band of low and medium spatial frequencies, whereas strong low-pass filters only preserved low spatial frequencies. Similarly, weak high-pass filters preserved a wider band of medium and high spatial frequencies, whereas strong high-pass filters only preserved high spatial frequencies. Gaze-contingent filtering was compared with control conditions that presented scenes either unfiltered or entirely low-pass or high-pass filtered.

We expected saccade amplitudes to increasingly deviate from normal viewing behavior with increasing processing difficulty. Compared with unfiltered scene viewing, amplitudes were expected to increase with central and decrease with peripheral filtering, particularly when more useful spatial frequencies are attenuated (i.e., with central low-pass filtering and peripheral high-pass filtering). These effects were expected to grow with filter level, predicting increasing amplitudes as central filters become stronger and decreasing amplitudes as peripheral filters become stronger. For fixation durations, we expected an increase as long as useful spatial frequencies are preserved and when information uptake is relatively easy, i.e., with central high-pass and peripheral low-pass filtering (cf. Cajar et al., 2015; Laubrock et al., 2013). Furthermore, durations were expected to increase as filters became stronger; however, default timing might be adapted with strong filters that attenuate most useful spatial frequencies and strongly impede information uptake.

Method

Participants. Thirty-two students from the University of Potsdam (10 male, mean age: 21.9 years) received course credit or fifteen Euro for participation in the experiment. All participants had normal or corrected-to-normal vision and normal color discrimination.

Apparatus. Stimuli were presented on a 20" Mitsubishi DiamondPro 2070 monitor at a resolution of 1024×768 pixels and a refresh rate of 120 Hz. A head-chin rest ensured stability of the head and a constant viewing distance of 60 cm. While viewing was binocular, gaze position of the right eye was recorded using an EyeLink 1000 tower mount system (SR Research, Ontario, Canada) at a sampling rate of 1000 Hz. Stimulus presentation was controlled with MATLAB[®] (version 2009b; The Mathworks, Natick, MA) using the OpenGL-based Psychophysics Toolbox (PTB3; Brainard, 1997; Kleiner, Brainard, & Pelli, 2007; Pelli, 1997) and the EyeLink Toolbox (Cornelissen, Peters, & Palmer, 2002).

Stimuli. In two sessions, 240 different color photos showing outdoor real-world scenes were presented (120 scenes per session). Scenes were displayed at a resolution of 1024×768 pixels and a size of $38.7^\circ \times 29.0^\circ$. They were low-pass filtered in one session and high-pass filtered in the other session. The filtered version of each

scene was prepared in advance. Filtering was realized in the frequency domain after a Fourier transform of the stimulus, and the filtered image was backtransformed into the spatial domain. Butterworth filters with cutoff frequencies of 1.26 cycles/deg, 3.16 cycles/deg, and 7.94 cycles/deg were used for the three filter levels; spatial frequencies were attenuated above these thresholds for low-pass filtering and below these thresholds for high-pass filtering. Weak filters preserved a relatively wide band of spatial frequencies and strong filters preserved a relatively narrow band of spatial frequencies; moderate filters were in between. For low-pass filtering, the weak filter had a cutoff frequency of 7.94 cycles/deg and the strong filter had a cutoff frequency of 1.26 cycles/deg; for high-pass filtering, the assignment was reversed. All filters were above detection threshold (cf. Loschky et al., 2005).

For gaze-contingent filtering in the central or the peripheral visual field, a foreground and a background image were merged in real-time using alpha blending. With peripheral high-pass filtering, for example, the foreground image was the original scene and the background image was the high-pass filtered version of the scene. A 2D hyperbolic tangent with a slope of 0.06 was used as a blending function for creating the alpha mask. The inflection point of the function corresponded to the radius of the gaze-contingent window, which was 3.75° . The alpha mask was centered at the current gaze position and gave the transparency, i.e. the weighting, of the central foreground image at each point. At the point of fixation, only the foreground image was visible; with increasing eccentricity, the peripheral background image was weighted more strongly until it was fully visible. Example stimuli are illustrated in Figure 1.

Design. The experiment consisted of two sessions, one for each filter type (low-pass, high-pass). As each participant completed both sessions, session order was counterbalanced so that half of the participants started with the low-pass session and the other half with the high-pass session. In each session, two filter locations (central visual field, peripheral visual field) were crossed with three filter levels (weak, moderate, strong), yielding six experimental conditions. Two control conditions were added as a lower and upper baseline, presenting scenes either without any filtering (unfiltered control) or entirely filtered (filtered control). For the filtered control condition, the moderate filter was used. A Latin square design assured counterbalancing of condition–image assignments across participants. Images were presented in random order.

Procedure. Data were collected in two one-hour sessions. The eye-tracker was calibrated at the beginning of a session and after every fifteen trials. Each trial started with a fixation point in the center of the screen. The scene was revealed after the point had been fixated for at least 150 ms within two seconds from trial start; otherwise a recalibration was automatically scheduled. Each session started with four practice trial in order to acquaint participants with the gaze-contingent display. Each scene was presented for twelve seconds in one of the eight filter conditions.



Figure 1. Illustration of four experimental conditions of Experiment 1. The yellow cross illustrates the current gaze position of the viewer. Filter level increases from top to bottom. (*Upper left*) Central high-pass filtering with weak filter. (*Upper right*) Peripheral high-pass filtering with weak filter. (*Lower left*) Central high-pass filtering with moderate filter. (*Lower right*) Peripheral high-pass filtering with moderate filter.

Viewers were asked to explore each scene carefully and in preparation for a content question with three response alternatives, presented after the trial. The questions on scene content were constructed to be rather difficult to answer, thus encouraging participants to inspect the scenes carefully throughout the entire twelve seconds of scene presentation. There were no questions regarding colors in a scene.

Data preparation. Saccades were detected in the raw time series of gaze positions using a velocity-based adaptive algorithm (Engbert & Kliegl, 2003; Engbert & Mergenthaler, 2006). A total of 480 trials (6%) were removed owing to poor recording or too much data loss. Single fixations and saccades were removed if they neighbored eye blinks or were outside of the monitor area. The first and the last event of a trial were also excluded from analyses, since they were associated with scene onset and offset. Glissades following a saccade were assigned to the saccade; if more than one

glissade followed a saccade, the glissades and their adjacent fixation and saccade were removed. In total, 273,716 fixations and 283,692 saccades were left for analyses.

Data analyses. Data from both sessions of the experiment were merged for the analyses. Fixation durations and saccade amplitudes were analyzed using linear mixed-effects models (LMM) as implemented in the *lmer* program of the *lme4* package (Bates, Maechler, Bolker, & Walker, 2014); this package is supplied in the *R* system for statistical computing (version 3.1.2; R Core Team, 2014). In addition to fixed effects for the experimental manipulations, LMMs also account for random effects due to differences between subjects and items (i.e., images), which reduces unexplained variance. Fixed-effects parameters were estimated via a contrast matrix testing for eight main effects and seven interaction effects for the three experimental factors (filter type, filter location, filter level) and the two control conditions. All LMM analyses yielded regression coefficients, standard errors, and *t*-values. Although the degrees of freedom are not known exactly for a LMM, for large data sets as in the present experiment the *t*-distribution has converged to the standard normal distribution for all practical purposes. Consequently, *t*-statistics of an absolute value of 1.96 or larger can be considered significant on the two-tailed 5% level (Baayen, Davidson, & Bates, 2008, Note 1).

As distributions of fixation durations and saccade amplitudes were positively skewed, both variables were transformed before model fitting to approximate normally distributed model residuals. To find a suitable transformation, the optimal λ -coefficient for the Box-Cox power transformation (Box & Cox, 1964) was estimated with the *boxcox* function of the *MASS* package (Venables & Ripley, 2002), with $y(\lambda) = (y^\lambda - 1)/\lambda$, if $\lambda \neq 0$ and $\log(y)$, if $\lambda = 0$. For fixation durations, $\lambda = 0.02$ was near zero, so the log-transformation was chosen; for saccade amplitudes, $\lambda = 0.22$ was used.

Results

Task performance. Mean proportion of correct answers to the control questions about the scene content are illustrated in Figure 2a. Task performance decreased when the scene was partly or entirely filtered, $b = 0.255$, $SE = 0.094$, $z = 2.725$, $p = .006$. Also, performance decreased significantly with moderate and strong filters compared to weak filters, $b = 0.211$, $SE = 0.074$, $z = 2.842$, $p = .004$. An interaction between filter type and moderate versus strong filters ($b = 0.174$, $SE = 0.084$, $z = 2.079$, $p = .0377$) occurred because strong filters interfered more with task performance than moderate filters with low-pass filtering, but not with high-pass filtering. There were no other significant effects.

Fixation durations. Mean fixation durations for all conditions are illustrated in Figure 2b. Consistent with the notion that fixation durations adapt to visual-cognitive processing difficulty, mean fixation durations increased when the scene was partly or entirely filtered, $b = -0.044$, $SE = 0.002$, $t = -18.5$. Interestingly, filtering only the

central or the peripheral part of the visual field increased mean fixation durations more than filtering of the entire scene did ($b = -0.011$, $SE = 0.002$, $t = -4.6$), possibly suggesting some processing cost of switching between filter levels—with central high-pass filters eliciting longer fixations than the filtered control, and peripheral low-pass filters eliciting longer fixations than the filtered control (see Figure 2. Comparing the filtered controls showed longer fixation durations with low-pass than with high-pass filtered scenes, $b = -0.024$, $SE = 0.006$, $t = 4.3$, in accordance with Mannan et al. (1995).

Regarding gaze-contingent central and peripheral filtering, significant main effects of filter type, $b = 0.023$, $SE = 0.004$, $t = 6.3$, and filter location, $b = -0.016$, $SE = 0.002$, $t = -8.5$, indicated longer fixation durations with low-pass than with high-pass and with peripheral than with central filtering. These main effects, however, were qualified by a strong interaction of filter type and filter location, $b = -0.028$, $SE = 0.002$, $t = -15.2$. First, filter type had almost no effect with central filtering, but a strong effect with peripheral filtering where fixation durations increased markedly with low-pass, but not with high-pass filtering. Second, central filtering provoked longer fixations than peripheral high-pass, but shorter fixations than peripheral low-pass filtering.

Main effects of filter level indicated longer fixation durations with stronger filters, suggesting that fixation durations prolong with increasing processing difficulty—fixations were longer with moderate and strong filters than with weak filters, $b = -0.022$, $SE = 0.002$, $t = -11.3$, and longer with strong filters than with moderate filters, $b = -0.009$, $SE = 0.002$, $t = -4.0$. These effects of filter level, however, were only pronounced with low-pass filtering, as indicated by interactions of filter type and filter level: $b = -0.018$, $SE = 0.002$, $t = -9.4$ for weak versus moderate and strong filters and $b = -0.008$, $SE = 0.002$, $t = -3.7$ for moderate versus strong filters. Interestingly, filter level had nearly no effect with high-pass filtering, regardless of filter location. Filter level had the biggest effect with peripheral low-pass filtering, where mean fixation durations increased markedly from weak to moderate and strong filters. Therefore, an interaction of filter location and filter level indicated a stronger increase of fixation durations from weak to moderate and strong filters with peripheral filtering than with central filtering, $b = 0.009$, $SE = 0.002$, $t = 4.5$.

All LMM effects can be found in Table 1.

Saccade amplitudes. Mean saccade amplitudes for all conditions are illustrated in Figure 2c. As expected, there was a strong main effect of filter location, $b = 0.081$, $SE = 0.001$, $t = 73.54$; mean saccade amplitudes were longer with central than with peripheral filtering. More precisely, central filtering elicited longer saccades than the filtered and unfiltered control conditions, whereas peripheral filtering elicited shorter saccades than the control conditions. This indicates a preference for unfiltered scene regions as saccade targets. Due to this opposing viewing behavior with central and peripheral filtering, there was no main effect of filter level, but strong




Figure 2. Results of Experiment 1. (a) Mean proportion of correct answers to the control questions. (b) Mean fixation durations. (c) Mean saccade amplitudes. Error bars are 95% within-subject confidence intervals. The boxes at the bottom of the plots illustrate the different filter conditions—the gray area indicates the filtered part and the white area indicates the unfiltered part of the visual field; the gray level from light to dark indicates the level of filtering from weak to strong.

interactions of filter level and filter location ($b = -0.036$, $SE = 0.001$, $t = -31.33$ for weak versus moderate and large filters, and $b = -0.027$, $SE = 0.001$, $t = -19.48$ for moderate versus strong filters)—as the filter became stronger, amplitudes increasingly prolonged with central filtering, but increasingly shortened with peripheral filtering. Thus, saccade target selection deviated more and more from normal as processing difficulty increased. Accordingly, low-pass filtering led to longer saccades than high-pass filtering with both filter locations, $b = 0.013$, $SE = 0.003$, $t = 3.98$,

showing that saccade amplitudes deviated more from normal viewing behavior when the available spatial frequency information was less useful for processing. The difference between low-pass and high-pass filters was more pronounced with peripheral than with central filtering, leading to an interaction of filter type and filter location, $b = 0.010$, $SE = 0.001$, $t = 9.13$. With peripheral filtering, filter level had a similar effect on saccade amplitudes with low-pass and high-pass filtering; with central filtering, on the other hand, filter level had a stronger effect with low-pass than with high-pass filtering. This is reflected by three-way interactions between filter type, filter location and filter level, with $b = -0.010$, $SE = 0.0012$, $t = -8.62$ for weak versus moderate and strong filters, and $b = -0.007$, $SE = 0.0014$, $t = -5.45$ for moderate versus strong filters.

Saccade amplitudes in the filtered control conditions were similar to amplitudes in the unfiltered control, with low-pass filtered scenes provoking slightly longer saccades than its unfiltered control and high-pass filtered scenes provoking slightly shorter saccades than its unfiltered control (see Figure 2c). Compatible with the results for central and peripheral filtering, completely low-pass filtered scenes led to longer saccades than high-pass filtered scenes, $b = 0.024$, $SE = 0.0055$, $t = 4.3$.

All effects can be found in Table 1.

Discussion

Central and peripheral spatial frequency filtering with varying filter strengths had notable effects on eye-movement behavior. Fixation durations largely adapted to visual-cognitive processing difficulty and increased when spatial frequencies were filtered from the scene. Confirming previous results (Cajar et al., 2015; Laubrock et al., 2013), fixation durations were markedly longer with peripheral low-pass filtering than with peripheral high-pass filtering, indicating that more processing time is invested when the available information is more useful for processing. This preference for processing useful information was absent with central filtering, though, as mean fixation durations were similar for low-pass and high-pass filtering. Thus, fixation durations were particularly sensitive to the kind of available spatial frequency information in the peripheral, but not in the central visual field. Consequently, filter level had a stronger effect with peripheral than with central low-pass filtering. Moderate and strong peripheral low-pass filters even prolonged fixation durations more than low-pass filtering of the entire scene did—apparently, switching between a (rather strongly) filtered and an unfiltered scene region produces additional processing costs. Yet, peripheral information left even with the strongest low-pass filter was still useful enough to choose a reasonable saccade target from, making the investment of more processing time worthwhile. Surprisingly, filter level had almost no effect on fixation duration with central or peripheral high-pass filtering. Thus, fixation durations did not increase with visual-cognitive processing difficulty in terms of filter level, but adapted default timing; instead, viewing behavior was adapted to increasing filter level by a modulation of saccade amplitudes.

Table 1: LMM fixed effects for Experiment 1. *Estimate* denotes the regression coefficients and *SE* their standard errors. *t*-values of an absolute value of 1.96 or larger were considered significant.

Condition	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>
Fixation durations			
Unfiltered control low-pass vs.high-pass	0.020	0.0054	3.7
Unfiltered controls vs. all filtered conditions	-0.044	0.0024	-18.5
Filtered control low-pass vs.high-pass	0.024	0.0055	4.3
Filtered controls vs. central/peripheral filters	-0.011	0.0024	-4.6
Filter type	0.023	0.0036	6.3
Filter location	-0.016	0.0018	-8.5
Weak vs. other filters	-0.022	0.0019	-11.3
Moderate vs. strong filter	-0.009	0.0023	-4.0
Filter type \times filter location	-0.028	0.0018	-15.2
Filter type \times weak vs. other filters	-0.018	0.0019	-9.4
Filter type \times moderate vs. strong filter	-0.008	0.0023	-3.7
Filter location \times weak vs. other filters	0.009	0.0019	4.5
Filter location \times moderate vs. strong filter	-0.0003	0.0023	-0.1
Filter type \times filter location \times weak vs. other filters	0.013	0.0019	6.9
Filter type \times filter location \times moderate vs. strong filter	0.006	0.0023	2.5
Saccade amplitudes			
Unfiltered control low-pass vs.high-pass	-0.012	0.0041	-2.92
Unfiltered controls vs. all filtered conditions	-0.002	0.0014	1.11
Filtered control low-pass vs.high-pass	-0.024	0.0041	5.73
Filtered controls vs. central/peripheral filters	0.013	0.0015	9.08
Filter type	0.013	0.0033	3.98
Filter location	0.081	0.0011	73.54
Weak vs. other filters	0.0001	0.0012	0.06
Moderate vs. strong filter	0.003	0.0014	1.96
Filter type \times filter location	0.010	0.0011	9.13
Filter type \times weak vs. other filters	-0.007	0.0012	-5.53
Filter type \times moderate vs. strong filter	-0.001	0.0014	-0.47
Filter location \times weak vs. other filters	-0.037	0.0012	-31.33
Filter location \times moderate vs. strong filter	-0.027	0.0014	-19.48
Filter type \times filter location \times weak vs. other filters	-0.010	0.0012	-8.62
Filter type \times filter location \times moderate vs. strong filter	-0.007	0.0014	-5.45

Effects of spatial frequency filtering on saccade amplitudes turned out as expected. Saccades prolonged with central filtering and shortened with peripheral filtering compared with the control conditions. This replicates previous findings (Foulsham et al., 2011; Laubrock et al., 2013; Loschky & McConkie, 2002; Loschky et al., 2005; Nuthmann, 2013, 2014; van Diepen & Wampers, 1998) and indicates that viewers prefer unfiltered scene regions as saccade targets. As expected, low-pass filtering produced longer mean amplitudes than high-pass filtering both with central and peripheral filtering. Processing of peripheral information was easier when low spatial frequencies were preserved, allowing to select saccade targets that were further away from the current fixation point. In the central visual field, however, low-pass filtering impairs the analysis of details, thus reducing the amount of short inspection saccades in the central field. Effects of both central and peripheral filtering scaled with filter level in the expected directions. Saccade target selection was least affected by weak low-pass or high-pass filters, showing that these filters preserved a sufficient amount of high and low spatial frequencies for near-normal spatial viewing behavior. As filter level increased, amplitudes lengthened with central filtering and shortened with peripheral filtering—the stronger the filter, the higher the urge to avoid the filtered region.

Thus, in most cases, saccade amplitudes and fixation durations were increasingly modulated as processing difficulty in terms of filter level increased—however, fixation durations were largely unaffected by filter level with central and peripheral high-pass filtering.

Experiment 2

In Experiment 2 participants viewed real-world scenes in preparation for a memory task while high or low spatial frequencies were filtered in the central or the peripheral visual field. In contrast to Experiment 1, filter level was constant, but the size of the filter was varied—the filter either subtended a small, medium, or large region of the central or the peripheral visual field. For this purpose, the size of the gaze-contingent window was varied so that it roughly extended to the foveal, the parafoveal, or the peripheral visual field. Small central filters only degraded foveal vision whereas large central filters degraded foveal and parafoveal vision. Small peripheral filters, on the other hand, only degraded peripheral vision whereas large peripheral filters degraded peripheral and parafoveal vision.

Like in Experiment 1, we assumed that saccade amplitudes should increase with central filtering and decrease with peripheral filtering, particularly when more useful spatial frequencies are attenuated. Furthermore, effects should become stronger as filter size increased. Fixation durations were expected to increase more when useful spatial frequencies are preserved and processing is easier, i.e., with central high-pass filtering and peripheral low-pass filtering. As with filter level in Experiment 1, fixation durations were expected to increase with increasing filter size, but to adapt default timing when filtering interferes too much with central or peripheral processing.

Method

Participants. Thirty-two students from the University of Potsdam (11 male, mean age: 22.1 years) received course credit or fifteen Euro for participation in the experiment. All had normal or corrected-to-normal vision and normal color discrimination. None of them participated in Experiment 1.

Apparatus. The apparatus was the same as in Experiment 1.

Stimuli. In general, stimuli and stimulus presentation were the same as in Experiment 1. In Experiment 2, filter level was constant with a cutoff frequency of 1.0 cycles/deg for low-pass filtering and 10.0 cycles/deg for high-pass filtering, spatial frequencies at which the parvo and magno cells of the lateral geniculate nucleus are near their peak contrast sensitivity (Derrington & Lennie, 1984). The size of the filtered region was varied by varying the radius of the gaze-contingent window, with values of 1.75° for the small gaze-contingent window, 3.75° for the medium-sized gaze-contingent window, and 5.75° for the large gaze-contingent window. These window sizes roughly extend to the foveal, the parafoveal, and the peripheral visual field (see Larson & Loschky, 2009). Increasing window size from small to large had opposing effects on filter size with central and peripheral filtering—increasing the size of the gaze-contingent window increased the size of the filtered scene region when the central visual field was filtered, but decreased the size of the filtered region when the peripheral visual field was filtered (see Figure 3).

Design. The design was the same as in Experiment 1. For each session (low-pass filtering, high-pass filtering), two filter locations (central visual field, peripheral visual field) were crossed with three filter sizes (small, medium, large), resulting in six experimental conditions. Two control conditions presented scenes either without any filtering (unfiltered control) or entirely filtered (filtered control).

Procedure. The procedure was the same as in Experiment 1.

Data preparation. Data were prepared as in Experiment 1. A total of 478 trials (6%) were removed owing to poor recording or too much data loss. In total, 256,711 fixations and 266,912 saccades were left for analyses.

Data analyses. Data analyses were performed as in Experiment 1. Fixation durations were log-transformed ($\lambda = 0.06$) and saccade amplitudes were power-transformed with $\lambda = 0.18$ to approximate normally distributed model residuals. LMM contrasts were coded with filter size as an experimental factor, with small filter size corresponding to small gaze-contingent windows with central filtering and large gaze-contingent windows with peripheral filtering, medium filter size corresponding to medium windows with both filter locations, and large filter size corresponding to large windows with central filtering and small windows with peripheral filtering.




Figure 3. Illustration of four experimental conditions of Experiment 2. The yellow cross illustrates the current gaze position of the viewer. Filter size increases from top to bottom. (*Upper left*) Central high-pass filtering with small filter. (*Upper right*) Peripheral high-pass filtering with small filter. (*Lower left*) Central high-pass filtering with large filter. (*Lower right*) Peripheral high-pass filtering with large filter.

Results

Task performance. Mean proportion of correct answers to the control questions about the scene content are illustrated in Figure 4a. Compared with unfiltered scene viewing, task performance significantly decreased when the scene was partly or entirely filtered, $b = 0.290$, $SE = 0.091$, $z = 3.196$, $p = .001$, with the decrease being stronger when the entire scene was filtered, $b = -0.633$, $SE = 0.086$, $z = -7.393$, $p < .001$. Furthermore, task performance decreased significantly with increasing filter size. This is reflected in two main effects of filter size: $b = 0.287$, $SE = 0.072$, $z = 3.964$, $p < .001$ for small versus medium and large filters, and $b = 0.178$, $SE = 0.081$, $z = 2.192$, $p < .028$ for medium versus large filters. There were no other significant effects.

Fixation durations. Mean fixation durations for all conditions are illustrated in Figure 4b. Experiment 2 replicated several effects of Experiment 1. Mean fixation durations increased when the scene was partly or entirely filtered compared with the unfiltered control conditions, $b = -0.054$, $SE = 0.0002$, $t = -21.76$. Comparing the filtered controls revealed longer fixation durations with low-pass filtering than with high-pass filtering, $b = 0.019$, $SE = 0.0058$, $t = 3.31$. In contrast to Experiment 1, completely filtered scenes provoked longer mean fixation durations than central or peripheral filtering did, $b = 0.032$, $SE = 0.0027$, $t = 12.09$, but fixation durations were again longer with peripheral than with complete low-pass filtering when the filter was large (see Figure 4b).

With central and peripheral spatial frequency filtering the LMM revealed similar effects as in Experiment 1. Main effects of filter type ($b = 0.030$, $SE = 0.0035$, $t = 8.44$) and filter location ($b = -0.017$, $SE = 0.0019$, $t = -8.74$) emerged, indicating longer mean fixation durations with low-pass filtering than with high-pass filtering and longer mean fixation durations with peripheral filtering than with central filtering. These main effects were qualified by a strong interaction of filter type and filter location, $b = -0.054$, $SE = 0.0019$, $t = -27.96$, as fixation durations were longer with central high-pass and peripheral low-pass filtering than with central low-pass and peripheral high-pass filtering. This replicates Cajar et al. (2015); Laubrock et al. (2013). Consistent with Experiment 1, the difference between low-pass and high-pass filtering was larger with peripheral than with central filtering.

Main effects of filter size indicate that fixation durations increased with increasing filter size ($b = -0.038$, $SE = 0.0020$, $t = -18.64$ for small versus medium and large filters, and $b = -0.047$, $SE = 0.0024$, $t = -19.77$ for medium versus large filters). Interestingly, fixation durations increased with increasing filter size only with peripheral filtering—particularly from medium to large filters; with central filtering, filter size had no effect on fixation durations. This is reflected in two strong interactions of filter location and filter size, $b = 0.046$, $SE = 0.0020$, $t = 23.05$ for small versus medium and large filters, and $b = 0.044$, $SE = 0.0024$, $t = 18.66$ for medium and large filters. Figure 4b shows that, similar to Experiment 1, fixation durations were closest to the unfiltered control condition with central low-pass filtering, peripheral high-pass filtering, and peripheral low-pass filtering with the smallest filter. Peripheral high-pass filtering with small and medium-sized filters surprisingly provoked fixation durations to drop even below the unfiltered control condition.

All effects can be found in Table 2.

Saccade amplitudes. Mean saccade amplitudes for all conditions are illustrated in Figure 4c. Results largely turned out as in Experiment 1 and showed adaptation of saccade amplitudes to increasing processing difficulty. A strong main effect of filter location occurred ($b = 0.099$, $SE = 0.0009$, $t = 115.88$) because saccade amplitudes were longer with central filtering and shorter with peripheral filtering compared to the unfiltered control conditions. A main effect of filter type with $b = 0.012$, $SE =$




Figure 4. Results of Experiment 2. (a-c) Mean proportion of correct answers to the control questions (a), mean fixation durations (b), and mean saccade amplitudes (c). Error bars are 95% within-subject confidence intervals. The boxes at the bottom of the plots illustrate the different filter conditions—the dark area indicates the filtered part and the white area indicates the unfiltered part of the visual field. (d-e) Distributions of saccade amplitudes for peripheral low-pass filtering (d) and peripheral high-pass filtering (e), note that the abscissa is log-scaled. Lines represent kernel density estimates using a Gaussian kernel, as implemented in the R function *density*. The area under each curve adds up to one.

0.0023, $t = 5.00$ reflected longer saccades with low-pass filtering than with high-pass filtering. This difference between filter types was stronger with central than with peripheral filtering, $b = 0.020$, $SE = 0.0009$, $t = 23.49$, because saccade amplitudes were similar with low-pass and high-pass filtering for peripheral filters of small or medium size. Compatible with this main effect of filter type, completely low-pass filtered scenes provoked longer saccade amplitudes than completely high-pass filtered scenes, $b = 0.045$, $SE = 0.0031$, $t = 14.56$.

Main effects of filter size showed increasing mean saccade amplitudes with increasing filter size, i.e., longer amplitudes with medium and large filters than with small filters, $b = -0.010$, $SE = 0.0009$, $t = -11.37$, and longer amplitudes with medium than with large filters, $b = -0.004$, $SE = 0.0011$, $t = -4.15$. However, these main effects were largely due to the effects of central filtering on saccade amplitudes and were therefore qualified by interactions of filter size and filter location ($b = -0.032$, $SE = 0.0009$, $t = -35.09$ for small versus medium and large filters, and $b = -0.010$, $SE = 0.0011$, $t = -9.03$ for medium versus large filters). Interestingly, saccade amplitudes were not notably affected by filter size with peripheral filtering. Thus, amplitudes adapted to increasing processing difficulty in terms of filter size with central filtering, but were largely unaffected by increasing filter size with peripheral filtering. With central filtering, the increase of saccade amplitudes with increasing filter size was more pronounced with low-pass than with high-pass filters, $b = -0.010$, $SE = 0.0009$, $t = -11.32$ for small versus medium and large filters, and $b = -0.007$, $SE = 0.0011$, $t = -6.24$ for medium versus large filters. Inspecting the distributions of saccade amplitudes for peripheral low-pass and high-pass filtering (Figures 4d and 4e) sheds light on the absent effect of filter size. As expected, the modes of the distributions are shifted toward the respective radius of the gaze-contingent window, and the amount of short saccades increased with increasing window size, indicating that viewers programmed a higher amount of saccades inside or to the border of the unfiltered central region with increasing filter size. With low-pass filtering, this effect was counteracted by an increasing amount of long saccades from small to large filters—causing the effect of decreasing mean saccade amplitudes with increasing filter size to disappear. The effects might reflect a viewing strategy where smaller parts of the scene are inspected through a series of short saccades inside the unfiltered central region, followed by long saccades that target new parts of the scene.

All effects can be found in Table 2.

Discussion

Central and peripheral spatial frequency filtering with varying filter size clearly modulated eye-movement behavior. Fixation durations increased in most filter conditions compared with unfiltered scene viewing. Replicating our previous findings (Cajar et al., 2015; Laubrock et al., 2013), central high-pass and peripheral low-pass filtering elicited longer fixation durations than central low-pass and peripheral

Table 2: LMM fixed effects for Experiment 2. *Estimate* denotes the regression coefficients and *SE* their standard errors. *t*-values of an absolute value of 1.96 or larger were considered significant.

Condition	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>
Fixation durations			
Unfiltered control low-pass vs. high-pass	0.013	0.0055	2.36
Unfiltered controls vs. all filtered conditions	-0.054	0.0025	-21.76
Filtered control low-pass vs. high-pass	0.019	0.0058	3.31
Filtered controls vs. central/peripheral filters	0.032	0.0027	12.09
Filter type	0.030	0.0035	8.44
Filter location	-0.017	0.0019	-8.74
Small vs. other filters	-0.038	0.0020	-18.64
Medium vs. large filter	-0.047	0.0024	-19.77
Filter type \times filter location	-0.054	0.0019	-27.96
Filter type \times small vs. other filters	-0.004	0.0020	-1.80
Filter type \times medium vs. large filter	-0.008	0.0024	-3.30
Filter location \times small vs. other filters	0.047	0.0020	23.05
Filter location \times medium vs. large filter	0.044	0.0024	18.66
Filter type \times filter location \times small vs. other filters	0.008	0.0020	3.78
Filter type \times filter location \times medium vs. large filter	0.002	0.0024	1.04
Saccade amplitudes			
Unfiltered control low-pass vs. high-pass	-0.009	0.0030	-2.96
Unfiltered controls vs. all filtered conditions	-0.004	0.0011	-3.53
Filtered control low-pass vs. high-pass	0.045	0.0031	14.56
Filtered controls vs. central/peripheral filters	0.014	0.0012	11.60
Filter type	0.012	0.0023	5.00
Filter location	0.099	0.0009	115.88
Small vs. other filters	-0.010	0.0009	-11.37
Medium vs. large filter	-0.004	0.0011	-4.15
Filter type \times filter location	0.020	0.0009	23.49
Filter type \times small vs. other filters	-0.010	0.0009	-11.32
Filter type \times medium vs. large filter	-0.007	0.0011	-6.24
Filter location \times small vs. other filters	-0.032	0.0009	-35.09
Filter location \times medium vs. large filter	-0.010	0.0011	-9.03
Filter type \times filter location \times small vs. other filters	-0.009	0.0009	-9.59
Filter type \times filter location \times medium vs. large filter	0.00002	0.0011	0.02

high-pass filtering. This suggests that more processing time was invested when the available spatial frequency information matched the task the viewer has to accomplish in the respective region of the visual field (center: analysis of details, periphery: saccade target selection). Consistent with Experiment 1, mean differences in fixation durations between filter types were larger with peripheral filtering than with central filtering, suggesting that peripheral vision is more sensitive to the kind of available spatial frequencies than central vision with respect to saccade timing. Another noticeable difference between central and peripheral filtering was the effect of filter size on fixation durations, as filter size had an effect with peripheral, but not with central filtering. With peripheral filtering, fixation durations monotonically increased with increasing filter size (replicating Loschky & McConkie, 2002; Loschky et al., 2005; Nuthmann, 2013, 2014; Parkhurst et al., 2000). With the largest low-pass filter, mean fixation duration exceeds the one for the entirely filtered scene, replicating the result of Experiment 1 with filter level. Furthermore, fixation durations were similar to or shorter than the unfiltered control condition with medium and large peripheral high-pass filters, indicating default saccade timing when processing became too difficult. Presumably, foveal and parafoveal scene information could be processed rather efficiently in these conditions, while little time was invested for saccade target selection in an apparently uniform gray field in the periphery, where the extraction of useful information was rather difficult. Surprisingly, mean fixation durations were not at all affected by filter size with central filtering. Compared with unfiltered scene viewing, fixations increased when spatial frequencies were attenuated in the foveal region, because filtering impaired the identification and detailed analysis of fixated objects; a further extension of the low-pass or high-pass filter to the parafovea, however, did not inhibit saccade timing any more than the small foveal filter did. This implies that with central filtering, fixation durations were mainly controlled by processing difficulty in the foveal, but not the parafoveal region. Taken together, results on fixation durations are compatible with the view that foveal processing dominates control of fixation durations under normal viewing conditions, but that increasing peripheral processing difficulty by just the right amount of low-pass filtering can cause peripheral processing to dominate fixation durations.

Effects of spatial frequency filtering on saccade amplitudes largely turned out as expected. Compared with the unfiltered control condition, saccade amplitudes increased when the central visual field was filtered and decreased when the peripheral visual field was filtered. Furthermore, saccades were longer with low-pass than with high-pass filtering. With small central or peripheral filters, however, mean saccade amplitudes did not differ between low-pass and high-pass filtering, indicating similar saccade target selection with both filter types. Since viewers avoided filtered scene regions as saccade targets, saccade amplitudes lengthened with increasing filter size in the central visual field with both filter types (see also Nuthmann, 2014). Interestingly, however, there was no clear effect of filter size on mean saccade amplitudes with peripheral filtering. This result is in contrast to previous studies that demonstrated

a shortening of mean amplitudes with increasing filter size (Nuthmann, 2013, 2014). The amplitude distributions reveal that filter size indeed affected saccade amplitudes in the expected direction, but that this effect was counteracted by a slightly increasing amount of long saccades as the filter became larger. This might reflect a viewing strategy where smaller parts of the scene are inspected inside the unfiltered central region through a series of short saccades, followed by long saccades that target new parts of the scene.

Effects of filter size are pronounced in either temporal or spatial aspects of eye movements, but not both. With peripheral filtering, filter size had clear effects on mean fixation durations, but not on mean saccade amplitudes; with central filtering, the pattern was reversed. This suggests a trade-off between temporal and spatial aspects of eye-movement behavior. It appears to indicate that under normal viewing conditions, foveal processing dominates fixation durations, and peripheral processing dominates saccade amplitudes. However, the balance is delicate, since by applying a moderate amount of spatial frequency filtering to regions of the visual field can lead to a different regime.

General discussion

The present study investigated how the availability of different spatial frequencies in the central or the peripheral visual field affects eye-movement behavior during real-world scene viewing. For this purpose, high-pass or low-pass filters were gaze-contingently applied either inside or outside a moving window while the respective other region remained unfiltered. Additionally, the filter strength was varied in Experiment 1, and filter size was varied in Experiment 2. Results demonstrate that temporal as well as spatial aspects of eye movements are modulated by the type, size, and level of filtering.

Of particular interest was how fixation durations adapt to visual-cognitive processing difficulty in terms of spatial frequency filtering. Generally, fixation durations are assumed to reflect difficulty in visual-cognitive processing of the current stimulus. When scene processing is impaired because critical information for foveal analysis or peripheral target selection is not available, fixation durations usually increase, indicating a slow-down of visual-cognitive processing. Consistent with this reasoning, prior research shows increased fixation durations when spatial frequencies are filtered from the central or the peripheral visual field during scene viewing (Loschky & McConkie, 2002; Loschky et al., 2005; Nuthmann, 2013, 2014; Parkhurst et al., 2000; van Diepen & Wampers, 1998), with the effects getting stronger when filter size increases (Nuthmann, 2013, 2014; Parkhurst et al., 2000). Based on previous findings (Cajar et al., 2015; Laubrock et al., 2013), the present study in partial contrast assumed that fixation durations do not necessarily increase with higher processing difficulty, but only when difficulty is somewhat, but not too much increased, i.e., when useful spatial frequency information is still available in the respective region of the visual field. If on the other hand processing appears to be too hard to bother, default timing takes

over. Present results indeed corroborate this hypothesis. We found increased fixation durations when low or high spatial frequencies were filtered from the scene. They were more pronouncedly increased fixation with central high-pass and peripheral low-pass filtering than with central low-pass and peripheral high-pass filtering. These effects replicate our previous findings (Cajar et al., 2015; Laubrock et al., 2013), thus disagreeing with the notion that fixation durations monotonically increase with higher processing difficulty. High spatial frequencies are useful in the high-acuity fovea for identifying the stimulus of current interest and analyzing it in detail, whereas high spatial frequencies cannot be resolved in the low-resolution periphery (Banks, Sekuler, & Anderson, 1991; Hilz & Cavonius, 1974; Robson & Graham, 1981) and are therefore hardly useful for saccade target selection. Assuming that fixation durations increase with higher processing difficulty, one would expect fixations to be longer with central low-pass and peripheral high-pass filtering, which attenuate spatial frequencies that are most beneficial for foveal analysis and peripheral selection. Our result of shorter fixation durations in these more detrimental filter conditions rather indicates that the gaze is held longer at the current fixation location when more useful visual information is still available in the scene; when processing becomes too difficult and thus time-consuming, fixations do not prolong any further. In this sense, viewing behavior appears to be quite economical.

Extending our previous findings, we also found fixation durations to be unaffected by increasing processing difficulty in terms of filter level and filter size in several conditions. Fixation durations increased as the filter became larger with peripheral filtering (see also Loschky & McConkie, 2002; Nuthmann, 2013, 2014; Parkhurst et al., 2000), but were unaffected by filter size with central filtering (contrary to Nuthmann, 2014). Furthermore, fixation durations prolonged with increasing filter level with central and peripheral low-pass filtering, but were rather unaffected by the level of filtering with central and peripheral high-pass filtering.

Interestingly, fixation durations were much more strongly affected by increasing processing difficulty in the peripheral visual field than in the central visual field. Mean differences in fixation durations between filter types were notably larger with peripheral filtering in both experiments, suggesting that the kind of available spatial frequency information is more important in the peripheral than in the central visual field. This is reasonable as the fovea and parafovea are sensitive to a larger band of spatial frequencies than the periphery and can thus cope better with missing frequencies when processing the scene. Another rather surprising difference between central and peripheral filtering was that foveal analysis was less affected by processing difficulty in terms of filter size and filter level than peripheral selection. With both low-pass and high-pass filtering, fixation durations increased with central filtering, but were not at all affected by the size of the central filter and only increased little as filter level became stronger. From this, we can first conclude that filtering of the foveal visual field slowed down processing, but additional filtering of the parafoveal visual field had no effect. This suggests that, apart from the periphery, the fovea is

critical for the control of fixation durations, but the parafovea does not play a prominent role. Second, the level of degradation of the foveal stimulus only had little effect on fixation durations. With peripheral filtering, however, filter level and filter size had considerable effects on fixation durations. Mean durations increased as the unfiltered central region became smaller and the filtered part of the scene became larger, thus making saccade target selection increasingly difficult. With peripheral low-pass filtering, fixation durations also increased with increasing level of filtering, but with peripheral high-pass filtering, filter level had no effect on mean fixation durations. With medium and small filters, peripheral high-pass filtering even involved mean fixation durations that were near or below the one for the unfiltered control condition. These results for filter size and filter level again suggest that more processing time is only invested if it is worthwhile or necessary to accomplish the task at hand—more time is invested for selecting reasonable saccade targets when the peripheral filter level increases with low-pass filtering (where the information is still useable), but not with high-pass filtering. Fixation durations, however, increase with both filter types when the size of the filter increases with peripheral filtering because saccade target selection becomes extremely difficult when only the foveal visual field is left unfiltered.

Peripheral low-pass filtering with moderate and strong filters (Experiment 1) and with large filters (Experiment 2) provoked mean fixation durations that were longer than the mean duration for the filtered control condition where the entire scene was low-pass filtered. Thus, there are switching costs between the filtered peripheral and the unfiltered central scene region when the filter is strong or large enough. Reingold and Loschky (2002) found similar effects, with longer saccade latencies to a peripheral target when only the peripheral visual field was low-pass filtered compared to low-pass filtering of the entire scene. They reasoned that low-pass filtering of only part of the visual field increases the saliency of the unfiltered region. This, in turn, increases the competition for attention between the filtered and unfiltered scene region and thus prolongs fixation durations compared to viewing entirely low-pass filtered scenes.

Saccadic behavior was largely adapted to the processing difficulty of the stimulus. Compared with normal viewing behavior when the scene was presented unfiltered, mean saccade amplitudes prolonged considerably with central filtering and shortened with peripheral filtering. This replicates previous findings (Cajar et al., 2015; Foulsham et al., 2011; Laubrock et al., 2013; Loschky & McConkie, 2002; Nuthmann, 2013, 2014; Reingold & Loschky, 2002; van Diepen & Wampers, 1998) and is evidence for a gaze behavior favoring unfiltered scene regions as saccade targets. Central filtering elicits a bias for targeting scene regions that are farther away from the current fixation point and avoiding the filtered foveal and parafoveal region. Peripheral filtering, on the other hand, elicits a bias for tunnel vision where the gaze is more focused in the unfiltered central region and filtered peripheral regions are avoided. This opposing viewing behavior with central and peripheral filtering increased as scene processing became more difficult. First, saccades got longer with central filtering as filter level

and filter size increased (see also Nuthmann, 2014), while saccades got shorter with peripheral filtering as filter level increased (see also Loschky & McConkie, 2002). Second, saccade amplitude increased more pronouncedly when the central visual field was low-pass filtered than when it was high-pass filtered, whereas it decreased more pronouncedly when the peripheral visual field was high-pass filtered than when it was low-pass filtered. This demonstrates that saccade target selection is more difficult when spatial frequencies that the respective region of the visual field is most sensitive to are unavailable for processing. Small inspection saccades often made to analyze scene details near the current fixation point are not as reasonable with central low-pass filtering, where objects are blurred, as they are with central high-pass filtering, where fine details and edges are still available for processing. On the other hand, fine details cannot be resolved in the visual periphery, making the informed selection of saccade targets far away from the current fixation point rather difficult when the periphery is high-pass filtered. Overall, most conditions show that saccade target selection is progressively impaired by increasing processing difficulty.

Surprisingly, mean saccade amplitudes were largely unaffected by increasing processing difficulty in terms of filter size with peripheral filtering. Mean fixation duration, however, increased with increasing filter size in the periphery. With central filtering, on the other hand, saccade amplitudes increased markedly with increasing filter size, but fixation durations were unaffected. Varying filter size therefore provoked a viewing behavior with a trade-off between fixation durations and saccade amplitudes (see Jacobs, 1986), with opposing effects for central and peripheral filtering. Increasing filter size in the central visual field lengthened saccade amplitudes, but left fixation durations unaffected, whereas increasing filter size in the peripheral visual field prolonged fixation durations, but left saccade amplitudes unaffected. This trade-off is also evident with increasing processing difficulty in terms of filter level—as filter level increased with peripheral high-pass filtering, fixation durations were unaffected, but saccade amplitudes increasingly shortened. Also, fixation durations were similar to or even below the control condition with medium and large peripheral high-pass filters (i.e., default saccade timing is adapted), while saccade amplitudes shortened. This is a reasonable strategy. High-pass filtering inherently attenuates contrast and color information of the stimulus, which grays the high-pass filtered part of the scene more and more as filter level increases. This reduces the salience of the filtered scene region and hinders the segregation of peripheral objects from their background; with a strong filter, the peripheral scene resembles a uniform gray background. Thus, selecting saccade targets from strongly high-pass filtered peripheral scene regions was probably too difficult, causing saccade targets to be chosen either from a smaller part of the scene centered on fixation (hence shorter saccade amplitudes), or less carefully from the periphery. Both strategies can reduce the time needed to select the next saccade target and thus shorten mean fixation durations as observed. When the gaze-contingent window gets so small that the peripheral high-pass filter approaches foveal vision, the analysis not only of the peripheral, but also

of the central stimulus is affected and probably slows down, explaining the increase of mean fixation duration with peripheral high-pass filtering up to the values for central high-pass filtering in this case (while mean saccade amplitudes do not change). With central filtering and increasing window size mean fixation durations did not change, because instead of investing more time for processing the increasingly filtered center, subjects avoided this region more and more by making longer saccades in the unfiltered peripheral part of the visual field and reducing the amount of short inspection saccades in the unfiltered central region.

Altogether, central and peripheral spatial frequency filtering modulated both fixation durations and saccade amplitudes. Fixation durations usually increased with filtering, while saccade amplitudes shortened with peripheral and lengthened with central filtering. Increasing filter and filter size often modulated only either fixation durations or saccade amplitudes. Thus, selectively attenuating spatial frequencies affects temporal and spatial aspects of eye-movement behavior, but with a further increase of processing difficulty, resources are often preserved by adapting either saccade timing or saccadic selection, but not both.

Conclusions

The present study demonstrates that eye-movement behavior during real-world scene viewing is impaired with increasing processing difficulty in terms of type, size, and level of spatial frequency filtering in the central or the peripheral visual field. The adaptation to increasing processing difficulty is particularly evident in the modulation of saccade target selection, i.e., saccade amplitudes. Saccade timing, however, is often not adapted to processing difficulty, showing that when visual-cognitive processing becomes too time-consuming, fixation durations are not further delayed, but instead default saccade timing is adapted. This might be the consequence of a reasonable trade-off between the saving of computational resources, physiological energy, and time against the informational gain to produce behavior that is as optimal and efficient as possible.

References

- Baayen, R. H., Davidson, D. J., & Bates, D. M. (2008). Mixed-effects modeling with crossed random effects for subjects and items. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *59*, 390–412.
- Banks, M. S., Sekuler, A. B., & Anderson, S. J. (1991). Peripheral spatial vision: Limits imposed by optics, photoreceptors, and receptor pooling. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, *8*, 1775–1787.
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2014). *lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using Eigen and S4*. R package version 1.0-6.
- Box, G. E. P., & Cox, D. R. (1964). An analysis of transformations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, *26B*, 211–252.
- Brainard, D. H. (1997). The Psychophysics Toolbox. *Spatial Vision*, *10*, 433–436.

- Cajar, A., Schneeweiß, P., Engbert, R., & Laubrock, J. (2015). Coupling of attention and saccades when viewing scenes with central and peripheral degradation.
- Cornelissen, F. W., Bruin, K. J., & Kooijman, A. C. (2005). The influence of artificial scotomas on eye movements during visual search. *Optometry and Vision Science*, *82*, 27–35.
- Cornelissen, F. W., Peters, E. M., & Palmer, J. (2002). The EyeLink Toolbox: Eye tracking with MATLAB and the Psychophysics Toolbox. *Behavioral Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, *34*, 613–617.
- Derrington, A. M., & Lennie, P. (1984). Spatial and temporal contrast sensitivities of neurones in lateral geniculate nucleus of macaque. *The Journal of Physiology*, *357*, 219–240.
- Engbert, R., & Kliegl, R. (2003). Microsaccades uncover the orientation of covert attention. *Vision Research*, *43*, 1035–1045.
- Engbert, R., & Mergenthaler, K. (2006). Microsaccades are triggered by low level retinal image slip. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *103*, 7192–7197.
- Foulsham, T., Teszka, R., & Kingstone, A. (2011). Saccade control in natural images is shaped by the information visible at fixation: Evidence from asymmetric gaze-contingent windows. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, *73*, 266–283.
- Gilchrist, I. D. (2011). Saccades. In S. P. Liversedge, I. D. Gilchrist, & S. Everling (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of eye movements* (pp. 85–94). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Glaholt, M. G., Rayner, K., & Reingold, E. M. (2012). The mask-onset delay paradigm and the availability of central and peripheral visual information during scene viewing. *Journal of Vision*, *12(1):9*, 1–19, <http://www.journalofvision.org/content/12/1/9>, doi:10.1167/12.1.9.
- Glaholt, M. G., Rayner, K., & Reingold, E. M. (2013). Spatial frequency filtering and the direct control of fixation durations during scene viewing. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, *75*, 1761–1773.
- Groner, M. T., Groner, R., & Mühlhelen, A. von. (2008). The effect of spatial frequency content on parameters of eye movements. *Psychological Research*, *72*, 601–608.
- Henderson, J. M. (2003). Human gaze control during real-world scene perception. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *7*, 498–504.
- Henderson, J. M., Nuthmann, A., & Luke, S. G. (2013). Eye movement control during scene viewing: Immediate effects of scene luminance on fixation durations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *39*, 318–322.
- Henderson, J. M., Olejarczyk, J., Luke, S. G., & Schmidt, J. (2014). Eye movement control during scene viewing: Immediate degradation and enhancement effects of spatial frequency filtering. *Visual Cognition*, 486–502.
- Hilz, R., & Cavonius, C. R. (1974). Functional organization of the peripheral retina: Sensitivity to periodic stimuli. *Vision Research*, *14*, 1333–1337.
- Jacobs, A. M. (1986). Eye-movement control in visual search: How direct is visual span control? *Perception & Psychophysics*, *39*, 47–58.
- Kleiner, M., Brainard, D. H., & Pelli, D. G. (2007). What’s new in Psychtoolbox-3? *Perception*, *36(Suppl.)*, 14.
- Larson, A. M., & Loschky, L. C. (2009). The contributions of central versus pe-

- ripheral vision to scene gist recognition. *Journal of Vision*, *9(10)*:6, 1–16, <http://journalofvision.org/9/10/6/>, doi:10.1167/9.10.6.
- Laubrock, J., Cajar, A., & Engbert, R. (2013). Control of fixation duration during scene viewing by interaction of foveal and peripheral processing. *Journal of Vision*, *13(12)*:11, 1–20, <http://www.journalofvision.org/content/13/12/11>, doi:10.1167/13.12.11.
- Loftus, G. R. (1985). Picture perception: Effects of luminance on available information and information-extraction rate. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *114*(3), 342–356.
- Loschky, L. C., & McConkie, G. W. (2002). Investigating spatial vision and dynamic attentional selection using a gaze-contingent multiresolutional display. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, *8*, 99–117.
- Loschky, L. C., McConkie, G. W., Yang, J., & Miller, M. E. (2005). The limits of visual resolution in natural scene viewing. *Visual Cognition*, *12*, 1057–1092.
- Ludwig, C. J. H., Davies, J. R., & Eckstein, M. P. (2014). Foveal analysis and peripheral selection during active visual sampling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *111*, E291–E299.
- Mannan, S., Ruddock, K. H., & Wooding, D. S. (1995). Automatic control of saccadic eye movements made in visual inspection of briefly presented 2-D images. *Spatial Vision*, *9*(3), 363–386.
- McConkie, G. W., & Rayner, K. (1975). The span of the effective stimulus during a fixation in reading. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *17*, 578–586.
- Nuthmann, A. (2013). On the visual span during object search in real-world scenes. *Visual Cognition*, *21*, 803–837.
- Nuthmann, A. (2014). How do the regions of the visual field contribute to object search in real-world scenes? Evidence from eye movements. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *40*, 342–360.
- Nuthmann, A., Smith, T. J., Engbert, R., & Henderson, J. M. (2010). CRISP: A computational model of fixation durations in scene viewing. *Psychological Review*, *117*, 382–405.
- Parkhurst, D., Culurciello, E., & Niebur, E. (2000). Evaluating variable resolution displays with visual search: Task performance and eye movements. In A. T. Duchowski (Ed.), *Proceedings of the eye tracking research and applications symposium 2000* (pp. 105–109). New York: Association of Computing Machinery.
- Pelli, D. G. (1997). The videotoolbox software for visual psychophysics: Transforming numbers into movies. *Spatial Vision*, *10*, 437–442.
- R Core Team. (2014). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. URL: <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Rayner, K., & Bertera, J. H. (1979). Reading without a fovea. *Science*, *206*, 468–469.
- Reingold, E. M., & Loschky, L. C. (2002). Saliency of peripheral targets in gaze-contingent multiresolutional displays. *Behavioral Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, *34*, 491–499.
- Robson, J. G., & Graham, N. (1981). Probability summation and regional variation in contrast sensitivity across the visual field. *Vision Research*, *21*, 409–418.
- Shioiri, S. (1993). Postsaccadic processing of the retinal image during picture scanning.

- Perception & Psychophysics*, 53(3), 305–314.
- Shioiri, S., & Ikeda, M. (1989). Useful resolution for picture perception as a function of eccentricity. *Perception*, 18, 347–361.
- Strasburger, H., Rentschler, I., & Jüttner, M. (2011). Peripheral vision and pattern recognition: A review. *Journal of Vision*, 11(5):13, 1–82, <http://www.journalofvision.org/content/11/5/13>, doi:10.1167/11.5.13.
- van Diepen, P. M. J. (2001). Foveal stimulus degradation during scene perception. In F. H. Columbus (Ed.), *Advances in psychology research* (Vol. 2, pp. 89–115). Huntington, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- van Diepen, P. M. J., & Wampers, M. (1998). Scene exploration with Fourier-filtered peripheral information. *Perception*, 27, 1141–1151.
- Venables, W. N., & Ripley, B. D. (2002). *Modern applied statistics with S*. New York: Springer.
- Walshe, R. C., & Nuthmann, A. (2014). Asymmetrical control of fixation durations in scene viewing. *Vision Research*, 100, 38–46.
- Wertheim, T. (1894). über die indirekte Sehschärfe. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane*, 7, 121–187.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (grants LA 2884/1 to J.L. and EN 471/10 to R.E.). We thank Petra Schienmann and our student assistants for their help during data collection.