

09 PH  
D7982



# COMPARING MODELS OF SYMMETRY PERCEPTION

Matthew James Dry

B.A. (Drama Studies), B.A. (Hons. Psychology)

Submitted for the award of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in the School of Psychology  
University of Adelaide

29-11-06

## Abstract

It has been suggested that the perception of visual regularities plays a fundamental role in structuring the visual world. One form of regularity that has attracted a great deal of research in the visual perception literature is mirror symmetry. In human vision symmetry appears to play an important role in the low-level processing of visual scenes, object recognition, and shape representation. Although a large number of empirical studies have investigated symmetry perception it is as yet unclear how the human visual system manages to perform this process as quickly and efficiently as it does. One way that researchers have attempted to understand the processes underlying symmetry perception is through the use of formal models, or computer simulations. Models can be thought of as theories or explanations for a given psychological phenomena and are potentially useful because they force researchers to be highly specific about the types of processes underlying the phenomena of interest.

In the field of computational geometry one of the most powerful tools for describing spatial relations is Voronoi tessellation. Psychophysical and physiological evidence is reviewed suggesting that the visual system may be employing a process similar to Voronoi tessellation to extract the spatial relations necessary for the organisation of visual stimuli. Against this background a Voronoi tessellation based model of symmetry perception is outlined. The Voronoi model was developed in response to three key findings from the human symmetry perception literature: that symmetry perception is a graded response; that the perception of symmetry is more salient at, or close to, the axis of symmetry; and that the processes underlying symmetry perception can be generalised to other similar structure and regularity detection tasks.

A major weakness of previous papers outlining models of symmetry perception has been the lack of comparison between model output and empirical data sets. Furthermore, little effort has been made to compare the performance of different models and, where this has occurred, the comparisons have been qualitative rather than quantitative. This study addresses these weaknesses by employing Bayesian model selection to compare the performance of a number of models across a range of previously published and new empirical data sets.

The results of the model comparisons indicate that the Voronoi model is able to match and, for the most part, beat the performance of the rival models of symmetry perception. However, there are a number of problems with the Voronoi model that suggest that it provides an insufficient explanation for the processes underlying symmetry perception. The comparisons also provide useful insight into how the Voronoi model and the alternative models might be modified to address their specific weaknesses and suggest the need for a number of new empirical studies.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	ix
List of Figures .....	xi
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Why study symmetry? .....	1
1.2. Comparing models of symmetry perception.....	2
1.3. Aims.....	5
2. Perceptual Organisation and Relational Structure .....	7
2.1. The perception of regularity and structure.....	7
2.2. Voronoi tessellation .....	10
2.3. Perceptual support for Voronoi tessellation and the medial axis.....	13
2.4. Delaunay triangulation.....	19
2.5. Perceptual support for Delaunay triangulation. ....	23
2.6. Advantages of a Voronoi based approach to perceptual organisation.....	29
2.7. Summary .....	31
3. A Voronoi Model of Symmetry Perception.....	33
3.1. Key characteristics of symmetry perception.....	33
3.2. A Voronoi model of symmetry perception .....	36
3.3. Potential strengths and weaknesses of the Voronoi model.....	42
3.4. Summary .....	48
4. Model Selection .....	51
4.1. What are models?.....	51
4.2. Types of formal models .....	51
4.3. Model comparison .....	54
4.4. Evaluation criteria.....	56
4.5. Bayesian model selection.....	60
4.6. An example application of Bayesian model selection .....	61
4.7. Fundamentals of Bayesian model selection.....	64
4.8. Summary .....	66
5. Study 1 .....	67
5.1. Introduction.....	67
5.2. The empirical data sets. ....	68
5.3. The models.....	72
5.3.1. The Voronoi model.....	72

5.3.2. Barlow & Reeves' (1979) model.....	74
5.3.3. Dakin & Watt's (1996) filter models.....	77
5.4. The decision process.....	80
5.5. General methods.....	82
5.6. Experiment 1: Discriminating distorted symmetry from random noise.....	83
5.6.1. Stimuli.....	83
5.6.2. Results.....	83
5.7. Experiment 2: Discriminating symmetry with added noise from random noise.....	86
5.7.1. Stimuli.....	86
5.7.2. Results.....	87
5.8. Experiment 3: Discriminating symmetry with added noise from perfect symmetry.....	91
5.8.1. Stimuli.....	91
5.8.2. Results.....	91
5.9. Experiment 4: Central symmetry strip in noise vs. noise.....	94
5.9.1. Stimuli.....	94
5.9.2. Results.....	94
5.10. Experiment 5- Central symmetry strip in noise vs. symmetry.....	97
5.10.1. Stimuli.....	97
5.10.2. Results.....	97
5.11. Experiment 6: Central noise strip in symmetry vs. noise.....	100
5.11.1. Stimuli.....	100
5.11.2. Results.....	100
5.12. Model evaluation overview.....	103
5.12.1. Model generality.....	103
5.12.2. Range of parameter values.....	105
5.13. Discussion.....	108
5.13.1. Model response to perfect symmetry.....	110
5.13.2. Model detection region.....	113
5.13.3. Conclusions.....	116
6. Study 2.....	119
6.1. Introduction.....	119
6.2. Empirical replication of Experiments 2 and 3.....	121
6.2.1. Method.....	122
6.2.2. Results.....	123
6.2.3. Summary.....	125
6.3. Model modifications.....	125
6.3.1. Range and number of model parameter values.....	125
6.3.2. Detection region.....	127
6.3.3. Additive noise.....	131
6.3.4. Voronoi model symmetry calculation.....	132
6.4. Symmetry model comparison.....	135
6.4.1. The alternative models.....	135
6.4.2. Voronoi model.....	145
6.5. Discussion.....	153
6.5.1. The spatial extent of the detection region.....	155
6.5.2. The addition of noise to the decision-making process.....	156
6.5.3. Goodness-of-fit, complexity and generalisability.....	158
6.6. Summary.....	159

7. Study 3 .....	161
7.1. Introduction.....	161
7.2. The effect of stimulus density on symmetry perception.....	162
7.2.1. Method.....	163
7.2.2. Results.....	164
7.3. Symmetry model comparison .....	168
7.4. Discussion.....	180
8. Discussion.....	185
8.1. The Voronoi model.....	185
8.1.1. The Voronoi representation and other models of symmetry perception .....	186
8.1.2. Limitations of the Voronoi model .....	189
8.2. The alternative models.....	193
8.2.1. The feature alignment models.....	193
8.2.2. The Barlow and Reeves model .....	195
8.2.3. The cross-correlation models.....	197
8.3. The decision mechanism.....	199
8.4. Bayesian model selection.....	201
8.5. Conclusions.....	204
References.....	207