| 1 | Neural markers of suppression in impaired binocular vision | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Freya A. Lygo ^{1,2} , Bruno Richard ³ , Alex R. Wade ^{1,5} , | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Antony B. Morland ^{1,5} , Robert F. Hess ⁴ , & Daniel H. Baker ^{1,5,6} | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 1. Department of Psychology, University of York, Heslington, York, UK | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2. Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, University College London, London, UK | | | | | | | | |
| 8 9 | Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Rutgers University–Newark, Newark, New Jersev, USA | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 4. McGill Vision Research, Dept. Ophthalmology, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | 5. York Biomedical Research Institute, University of York, Heslington, York, UK | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | 6. Corresponding author: daniel.baker@york.ac.uk | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Precis (35 words) | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Evidence of atypical interocular suppression in individuals with impaired binocular vision was | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | obtained using EEG and fMRI, with a single experimental paradigm. This may underlie the deficits | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | in stereopsis experienced by treated amblyopes. | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Keywords: interocular suppression; dichoptic; fMRI; SSVEP; V1 | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | Financial support: This work was supported in part by a Wellcome Trust (ref: 105624) grant, | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | through the Centre for Chronic Diseases and Disorders (C2D2) at the University of York. FL was | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | funded by a PhD student from the University of York. The sponsor or funding organization had no | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | role in the design or conduct of this research. | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | Conflict of interest: No conflicting relationship exists for any author | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | Running head: Suppression in impaired binocular vision | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | This article contains additional online-only material. The following should appear online-only: | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | Figure S1, Figure S2. | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | | | | | | | | | |

35 Abstract

36

37 Objective/Purpose: Even after conventional patching treatment, individuals with a history of 38 amblyopia typically lack good stereo vision. This is often attributed to atypical suppression 39 between the eyes, yet the specific mechanism is still unclear. Guided by computational models of 40 binocular vision, we tested explicit predictions about how neural responses to contrast might differ 41 in individuals with impaired binocular vision.

42

43 Design: A 5×5 factorial repeated measures design was used, in which all participants completed 44 a set of 25 conditions (stimuli of different contrasts shown to the left and right eyes).

45

Participants: 25 individuals with a history of amblyopia, and 19 control participants with typicalvisual development, participated in the study.

48

Methods: Neural responses to different combinations of contrast in the left and right eyes, were measured using both electroencephalography (EEG) and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). Stimuli were sinusoidal gratings with a spatial frequency of 3c/deg, flickering at 4Hz. In the fMRI experiment, we also ran population receptive field and retinotopic mapping sequences, and a phase-encoded localiser stimulus, to identify voxels in primary visual cortex (V1) sensitive to the main stimulus.

55

56 Main outcome measures: The main outcome measures were the signal-to-noise ratio of the 57 steady state visual evoked potential, and the fMRI β weights from a general linear model.

58

Results: Neural responses generally increased monotonically with stimulus contrast. When measured with EEG, responses were attenuated in the weaker eye, consistent with a fixed tonic suppression of that eye. When measured with fMRI, a low contrast stimulus in the weaker eye substantially reduced the response to a high contrast stimulus in the stronger eye. This effect was stronger than when the stimulus-eye pairings were reversed, consistent with unbalanced dynamic suppression between the eyes.

65

66 Conclusions: Measuring neural responses using different methods leads to different conclusions 67 about visual differences in individuals with impaired binocular vision. Both of the atypical 68 suppression effects may relate to binocular perceptual deficits, e.g. in stereopsis, and we 69 anticipate that these measures could be informative for monitoring the progress of treatments 70 aimed at recovering binocular vision.

72 Introduction

73

74 The binocular visual system is exquisitely sensitive, and has the ability to detect differences 75 (disparities) between the eyes of well below one minute of arc¹. This results in a vivid perception of depth from stereopsis² that benefits everyday tasks such as fine motor control (e.g. threading 76 77 a needle) and the judgement of relative object distance (e.g. during driving). But in a substantial 78 minority of individuals (around 1.4%³), an optical (e.g. anisometropia) or muscular (e.g. 79 strabismus) asymmetry between the eyes during childhood disrupts the development of binocular 80 vision. This can lead to amblyopia, in which vision through the affected eye is significantly 81 impaired⁴. Such problems can be treated to some extent by orthoptic or surgical interventions, which recover sensitivity in the weaker eye in a proportion of cases⁵. But even if treatment is 82 83 successful in improving vision in the amblyopic eye, binocular vision may not be restored and stereopsis rarely reaches normal levels⁶. An enduring mystery is the identity of the neural 84 85 mechanism that disrupts binocular vision, even in situations where the eyes have similar acuity 86 and sensitivity.

87

88 In clinical practice, binocular visual disturbances in amblyopia are typically attributed to a process 89 of suppression, whereby the fellow eye suppresses signals from the amblyopic eye^{7,8,9}. This 90 suppression could take several different forms. For example, 'tonic' suppression should persist 91 even when there is no input to the fellow eye (e.g. if it is closed, patched or pressure blinded, or 92 simply shown a blank display). This amounts to a fixed attenuation of the signal in the amblyopic eye that is invariant to signals from the fellow eye¹⁰. Alternatively, a more 'dynamic' form of 93 suppression would depend on the current stimulation of the two eyes, such that higher contrasts 94 95 in one eye produce greater suppression of the other eye. Interocular suppression has been widely 96 studied in intact binocular vision, and has several perceptual consequences, such as ocularity 97 invariance (the observation that our general perception of the world is unchanged whether one or both eves are open¹¹) and binocular rivalry (the alternation in perception between conflicting 98 99 images shown to the two eyes¹²). Impaired binocular vision might result from an imbalance of 100 these existing processes of interocular suppression.

101

102 Distinguishing between these, and other, explanations for binocular impairments has proved 103 challenging. In some psychophysical paradigms, such as dichoptic contrast discrimination, similar 104 performance can result even over a wide range of relative amounts of suppression between the eyes¹⁰. In other paradigms, tonic and dynamic suppression are equally able to account for the 105 results¹³. Isolating a direct neural measure of suppression would allow us to distinguish between 106 107 different models, and potentially provide an objective index of binocular impairment that could be 108 used to track improvements during treatment. In the present study we measured visual responses 109 to stimuli of different contrasts directly with two methods: functional magnetic resonance imaging 110 (fMRI) and electroencephalography (EEG). These methods have complementary strengths and 111 weaknesses: fMRI has excellent spatial precision, but poor temporal resolution, whereas EEG 112 has poor spatial precision, but good temporal resolution. Previous work measuring visual 113 responses in amblyopia with one or other of these methods has reported generally weaker responses to stimuli in the amblyopic eye^{14,15}. However, the two techniques have not previously 114 115 been directly compared using common stimuli.

117 Here we use both methods to measure contrast-response functions (Figure 1a) for factorial 118 combinations of contrast shown to the left and right eyes (Figure 2g; see also¹¹). We plot the 119 results as a series of functions, where stimuli of increasing contrast are shown to one eye (the 120 'target' stimuli) in the presence of a fixed-contrast (but otherwise identical) stimulus in the other 121 eye (the 'mask' stimulus). The general character of these functions can be predicted by contemporary models of binocular signal combination^{16,17}, and correspond well to previous 122 123 measurements in intact binocular visual systems using both fMRI¹⁷ and EEG¹⁸. When the mask 124 is absent (0% contrast), the model produces a monotonically increasing monocular contrast 125 response function (left-most curve in Figure 1a). As mask contrast increases, the overall response 126 becomes larger because it combines the target and mask signals together. However, interocular 127 suppression causes a surprising reduction in the response to a high contrast mask when a target of intermediate contrast is added^{11,19}. This produces the u-shaped function shown in the final 128 curve of Figure 1a - the response increase caused by excitation is outweighed by the response 129 130 reduction caused by suppression. Responses therefore go down before they go up, giving a direct 131 measure of interocular suppression.







134 Figure 1: Model predictions and diagrams. Panel (a) shows predictions of the two-stage model (Meese et 135 al., 2006) for different combinations of mask and target contrasts shown to the left and right eyes. The 136 model diagram features multiple stages of gain control (boxes), exponentiation (to powers m, p and q), 137 inhibition (orange arrows), and binocular summation (denoted by Σ). Panel (b) shows a variant of the same 138 model¹⁰, where the input to the left eye is attenuated prior to any other processing (orange box in the 139 diagram). This affects the model's behaviour by reducing the response to the affected (e.g. amblyopic) eye 140 (orange dashed curves). Panel (c) shows a further variant in which there is stronger inhibition from one eye 141 onto the other (red arrow in the diagram). This has no effect for monocular stimulation (leftmost function), 142 but increases suppression with high mask contrasts (rightmost functions). Further model details and 143 equations are given in Appendix 1.

145 We can disrupt the model shown in Figure 1a in two key ways. First, we can implement tonic suppression by attenuating the signal in one eye by a constant factor¹⁰. This reduces the response 146 147 in the affected eve, and also weakens its impact on the fellow eve (Figure 1b). Second, we can 148 implement dynamic suppression by increasing the weight of suppression from one eye onto the 149 other (Figure 1c). This has no effect on monocular presentations (as there is no signal in the 150 opposite eye to cause suppression), but with high-contrast masks there is a much greater 151 reduction in response for intermediate signal contrasts (the u-shaped functions in the right-most 152 plot become deeper). This experimental paradigm therefore has the potential to distinguish 153 between these two types of suppression.

154

155 Our aim in this study was to empirically test specific predictions of these competing models by 156 measuring neural responses with fMRI and EEG to a common set of visual stimuli. In addition to 157 testing control participants with typical binocular vision, we also recruited individuals with a history 158 of binocular disturbance. Although these participants do not all currently meet the diagnostic 159 criteria for amblyopia (owing to successful treatment), they would very likely have done so in 160 childhood and/or had they not been treated. Given the widespread incidence of treatment in countries with developed healthcare systems, understanding the residual binocular deficits in 161 162 treated amblyopes is of substantial clinical importance. To summarise our results, we find 163 attenuated responses to stimuli in the amblyopic eye when measured using EEG, and increased 164 and asymmetrical interocular suppression in individuals with impaired binocular vision when 165 measured using fMRI. Surprisingly this takes the form of stronger suppression of the dominant eye by the weaker eye. 166

167

168 Methods

169 170 Participants

171

172 A total of 44 adult participants completed the EEG experiment, 19 of whom were control 173 participants with no history of binocular visual abnormalities, and clinically normal vision. The 174 remaining 25 participants had been diagnosed with amblyopia, or treated for strabismus during 175 childhood (see Table 1 for further details). Their ages ranged from 17 to 49, with a mean age of 176 23.8 years (SD of 7.7 years). Approximately half of these participants (12/25, highlighted in bold) 177 still met the diagnostic criteria for amblyopia at the time of testing, based on a corrected visual 178 acuity difference of two lines or more between the eyes. The MRI experiments were completed 179 by 10 of the control participants, and 12 of the patients (A1 - A12 in Table 1). Participants gave 180 written informed consent, and received financial compensation for their time (£20 per experiment). 181 The study protocols were approved by the research governance committee of the York 182 Neuroimaging Centre, and were consistent with the original wording of the Declaration of Helsinki.

183

184 Apparatus and stimuli

185

186 In the MRI scanner, stimuli were displayed using a ProPixx DLP projector (VPixx Ltd., Quebec, 187 Canada) with a refresh rate of 120Hz, and a resolution of 1920×1080 pixels. Viewed from a

188 distance of 57cm, there were 36 pixels per degree of visual angle. The projector was driven by a

189 high performance PC. A circular polariser interleaved images intended for the left and right eyes 190 (effective refresh rate of 60Hz per eye). Images were projected onto a custom acrylic display 191 panel that maintained the polarisation, and viewed through a front-silvered mirror and passive 192 stereo polarizer glasses. The maximum luminance was 356cd/m² when viewed through the 193 glasses. In the EEG lab, stimuli were displayed using a gamma-corrected ViewPixx 3D LCD 194 display (VPixx Ltd.) with a refresh rate of 120Hz, and a resolution of 1920×1080 pixels. Viewed 195 from a distance of 57cm, there were 36 pixels per degree of visual angle. The display was driven 196 by a Mac Pro computer. Active stereo shutter goggles (NVidia 3D Vision), synchronised by an 197 infrared signal, allowed segregation of images to the left and right eyes. Through the goggles, the 198 maximum luminance was 26cd/m². Both display systems had low levels of crosstalk, as measured 199 using a photometer²⁰. All experiments were programmed in Matlab, using the Psychophysics Toolbox extensions^{21–23}. 200

201

Table 1: summary of patient demographics, clinical history and acuity measurements. Those highlighted in

bold currently meet the clinical criteria for amblyopia (acuity difference of two lines or more on a Snellen
chart). None of the participants had a residual strabismus.

| Participant | Sex | Amblyopic Eye | R acuity | L acuity | Stereo acuity | Detected | Patching | Surgery | Correction |
|-------------|-----|------------------|----------|----------|------------------|----------|-----------|---------|----------------------|
| A1 | F | Right | 20/32 | 20/25 | None | 18 mo | 1 - 6 y | <18mo | None |
| A2 | М | Right | 20/50 | 20/20 | 80s | 9 у | 9 у | None | None |
| A3 | М | Left | 20/20 | 20/50 | 140s | 4 y | 4 y | None | None |
| A4 | М | Left | 20/20 | 20/32 | 140s | 18 mo | 5 y | 18 mo | None |
| A5 | F | Left | 20/20 | 20/40 | 40s | 5 y | 5 - 6 y | None | LE: -2.5; RE: + 0.75 |
| A6 | М | Left | 20/20 | 20/40 | 80s | 4 y | 4 y | None | None |
| A7 | F | Right | 20/40 | 20/20 | 60s | ~10 y | None | None | None |
| A8 | F | Left | 20/40 | 20/80 | None | 11 y | 11 - 12 y | None | None |
| A9 | F | Left | 20/16 | 20/16 | 400s | 6 y | None | None | None |
| A10 | F | Left | 20/16 | 20/20 | None | 18 mo | 4 y | None | LE: +4; RE:+3.75 |
| A11 | М | Right | 20/20 | 20/20 | 140s | 5 y | 5 y | None | None |
| A12 | F | Right | 20/20 | 20/20 | 400s | 3 у | None | 3 & 4 y | None |
| A13 | F | Left | 20/20 | 20/50 | None | 5 y | 5 - 6 y | None | None |
| A14 | F | Left | 20/25 | 20/32 | 40s | 4 y | 4 - 6 y | None | None |
| A15 | М | Left | 20/16 | 20/32 | None | 20 mo | 4 y | 1 & 7 y | Not known |
| A16 | М | Right | 20/120 | 20/25 | 400s | 9 у | None | None | None |
| A17 | М | Right | 20/100 | 20/16 | None | 4 y | 4 y | None | None |
| A18 | F | Left | 20/16 | 20/16 | None | 7 у | 7 - 10 y | None | None |
| A19 | F | Left | 20/20 | 20/200 | None | 18 mo | 18 mo | None | None |
| A20 | М | Left | 20/50 | 20/50 | 200s | <6 y | 6 y | None | None |
| A21 | F | Right | 20/20 | 20/16 | 40s | 5 y | 5 y | None | LE: -1.25; RE: -1.75 |
| A22 | F | Left | 20/20 | 20/32 | None | ~6 y | 6 - 7 y | ~6 y | LE: +10.5; RE: +9.5 |
| A23 | М | Right | 20/32 | 20/20 | 400s | 5 y | 5 y | 16 y | None |
| A24 | F | Left | 20/20 | 20/40 | 40s | 4 y | 4 - 5 y | None | None |
| A25 | М | Left | 20/16 | 20/20 | 140s | 2 у | 2 - 3 y | None | None |



207 Figure 2: Example stimuli and methodological details. Panels (a,b,c,d,f) show stimuli used in different parts 208 of the study. Panels (a,b) show ring and wedge plaid stimuli used in retinotopic mapping, with black arrows 209 (not presented) indicating the direction of motion. Panel (c) shows the noise bar used in population receptive 210 field (pRF) mapping, which followed the temporal sequence illustrated in panel (e). Panel (d) shows the 211 plaid localiser stimulus, which followed the positional sequence indicated by the arrows (only one plaid was 212 visible in a given 6-second window, and the coloured rings were not shown). Panel (f) shows the sine-wave 213 grating stimuli used to measure contrast response functions. These were presented to the left and right 214 eyes in different contrast combinations, as illustrated in panel (g). The gratings flickered on and off for 12 215 seconds according to a 4Hz sine-wave, as shown in panel (h).

217 Retinotopic mapping involved binocularly presented ring and wedge stimuli constructed from a 218 radial square wave plaid, as illustrated in Figure 2a,b. The plaid had an angular wavelength of 45 219 degrees (i.e. 8 complete cycles in 360 degrees), a radial frequency of 0.8 cycles per degree, and 220 flickered in counterphase at 4Hz. Expanding rings had a width of 1 plaid cycle, and a period of 12 221 seconds per sequence (4 ring positions). Rotating wedges were 45 degrees (1 cycle) wide, with 222 a period of 24 seconds per rotation (8 positions in 45 degree clockwise steps). Population 223 receptive field (pRF) mapping used a drifting bar (0.5×10 degrees) of dynamic 1/f noise, with an 224 RMS contrast of 0.2 (see Figure 2c). The bar drifted at a speed of 0.4 deg/sec, and followed the 225 sequence illustrated in Figure 2e. The pRF stimulus was presented to either the left or right eye 226 in different blocks, with the other eye viewing mean luminance. We used a phase-encoded 227 localiser stimulus, constructed from a radial plaid with a width of 4 degrees (see Figure 2d), 228 presented binocularly. The localiser stimulus counterphase flickered at 4Hz, and changed position 229 every 6 seconds, according to the sequence illustrated in Figure 2d. Each stimulus location had 230 an x-y offset of ±2.34 degrees from fixation. Stimuli for the main experiments were four horizontal 231 sine-wave gratings with a spatial frequency of 3c/deg, a cosine-blurred spatial window, and a 232 width of 4 degrees (see Figure 2f). Five different Michelson contrast values (defined as 100*(Lmax-233 L_{min} /($L_{max}+L_{min}$), where L is luminance) were presented in different combinations (see Figure 2g). 234 The stimuli flickered sinusoidally between 0 and their nominal contrast (on/off flicker) at a 235 frequency of 4Hz (see Figure 2h). The grating stimuli had x-y offsets of ±2.34 degrees from 236 fixation. In all experiments, a static binocular texture was presented to aid fusion. This was 237 constructed from low spatial frequency bandpass filtered noise, and filled the display beyond the 238 central 12 degree stimulus aperture (see Figure 2 for examples).

240 MRI acquisition

241

239

242 All MRI data were acquired using a GE 3T HDx Excite MRI scanner. We collected two high 243 resolution T1-weighted structural scans (TR 7.8 ms; TE 3 ms; voxel size $1 \times 1 \times 1$ mm; 12° flip angle; matrix size 256×256 ; FOV 256 mm), and two T2*-weighted fast gradient recalled echo 244 245 scans (TR 400 ms; TE 4.2 ms; voxel size $1 \times 1 \times 2$ mm; 25° flip angle; matrix size 128×128 ; 246 FOV 260×260 mm), using an 8-channel surface coil (Nova Medical, Wilmington, MA, USA). We 247 acquired functional images using an EPI sequence with a 16-channel posterior surface coil (Nova 248 Medical, Wilmington, MA, USA), to optimize signal-to-noise ratio at the occipital pole. The slice 249 prescription covered the region containing the calcarine sulcus and occipital pole with 39 axial 250 slices (TR 3000 ms; TE 30 ms; voxel size $2 \times 2 \times 2$ mm; 90° flip angle; matrix size 96×96 ; FOV 251 192 imes 192 mm). We also acquired an in-plane proton density scan using the same slice 252 prescription to aid alignment with the structural scans.

253

Participants completed the MRI experiments in two sessions. In the first session, we collected the structural scans, and the retinotopic mapping and pRF data. Each pRF sequence lasted 396 seconds (132 TRs), and either the left or right eye was stimulated. Two repetitions for each eye were completed. The retinotopic mapping (ring and wedge) sequences were collected as a single scan lasting 204 seconds (68 TRs). In the second session, the phase-encoded localiser and contrast response function data were collected. The localiser scan lasted 156 seconds (52 TRs), 260 and consisted of a blank period (12 seconds), followed by 6 repetitions of the localiser sequence. 261 The contrast response function sequence lasted 612 seconds (204 TRs), and tested each of the 262 25 conditions (see Figure 2g) once, with 12-second blank periods between each 12-second trial. 263 This was repeated four times for each participant. During all functional scans, participants 264 performed a fixation task, in which they monitored a grid of 9 squares (3x3, each 0.14 degrees 265 wide) with random luminances in the centre of the screen. They were instructed to press a button 266 whenever the fixation marker was changed by re-randomising the luminances. This occurred at 267 randomly determined times, on average once every 48 seconds (i.e. once every two trials). The 268 task was intended to maintain attention and fixation, and we did not record the responses.

- 269
- 270 MRI analysis

271

272 Primary MRI analysis was conducted in Matlab mrVista toolbox using the (https://github.com/vistalab/vistasoft). Functional data were motion-corrected within and between 273 274 scans, and aligned to the in-plane (proton density) scan, and subsequently to the participant's 275 anatomical space. The first 12 seconds (4 TRs) of each functional scan were discarded to account 276 for magnetic saturation effects. Structural scans were processed using Freesurfer^{24,25} to generate 277 a 3D model of the cortex. We created flat patches of unfolded cortex for each hemisphere (120 278 mm in diameter), centred on the occipital pole (see Figure 3) to facilitate data visualisation and 279 the creation of Regions of Interest (ROIs). The ring and wedge retinotopy and localiser scans were summarised by a coherence (travelling wave) analysis²⁶ to calculate the phase of the BOLD 280 response at the repetition frequency of the stimulus for each voxel. The pRF data were fit by 281 estimating (at each voxel) the parameters of a 2D Gaussian function that best predicted the BOLD 282 283 timecourse, given the position of the bar stimulus²⁷. This was done independently for the left and 284 right eye scans. The contrast response function data were combined across repetition and 285 analysed using a general linear model (GLM), with regressors (β weights) for each of the 25 286 conditions. We used a combination of retinotopy and pRF results to define a V1 ROI on the 287 flattened cortex using the location of the calcarine sulcus and reversals of phase angle. ROIs 288 were further restricted using the localiser data, by retaining voxels with a coherence exceeding 289 0.3. Results were saved as Matlab files, and imported into R for statistical analysis and visualisation. We also converted GLM β weights to MNI space (using tools from FSL²⁸), and 290 291 averaged them across participants for visualisation on an inflated cortex in the Connectome 292 Workbench software²⁹.

293 294 EEG acquisition

295

296 All EEG data were acquired using a 64-channel ANT Neuroscan system, with electrodes 297 positioned in a Waveguard cap according to the 10-20 system. Signals were recorded at 1000Hz. 298 and referenced to the whole-head average. Low-latency digital triggers were sent from the 299 stimulus computer to the EEG amplifier using a parallel cable, and recorded stimulus onset and 300 condition codes to the EEG trace. Participants completed 8 repetitions of the contrast response 301 function experiment. On each repetition, stimuli were presented for trials of 12 seconds, with an 302 intertrial interval of 3 seconds. All 25 conditions (see Figure 2g) were presented once per 303 repetition in a random order, taking 375 seconds per block. Participants were given breaks

between blocks. The same fixation task as described for the MRI experiments was performedthroughout the experiment to maintain attention.

306

307 EEG analysis

308

Raw data were converted to a compressed *csv* format using functions from EEGlab³⁰, and were 309 310 then imported into *R* for analysis. We took the Fourier transform of the EEG waveform at each 311 electrode, for a ten-second window beginning one second after stimulus onset (to avoid onset 312 transients). Fourier spectra were averaged across four occipital electrodes (Oz, POz, O1 and O2), 313 and across repetition, using coherent averaging (i.e. retaining the phase information). We then 314 calculated signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) by dividing the absolute amplitude in the signal bin (4Hz) 315 by the mean of the ten adjacent bins (±0.5Hz in steps of 0.1Hz). These SNRs were averaged 316 across participants, and standard errors were calculated using bootstrapping. To plot the 317 timecourse of SSVEP activity, we repeated the Fourier transform using a sliding one-second 318 window (in steps of 10ms), and scaled by the two adjacent bins (±1 Hz) to calculate the SNR.

319

320 Data and script availability

- 321
- Data, experiment code (in Matlab) and analysis code (in Matlab and R) is available at:
 http://dx.doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/X9ZR8
- 324

325 Results

326

327 We used the results from retinotopic mapping scans with ring and wedge stimuli (Figure 2a,b), 328 and population receptive field (pRF) sequences (Figure 2c,e), to identify primary visual cortex 329 (V1) on flattened discs of occipital cortex for each hemisphere. Example flat maps are shown in 330 Figure 3 for one control participant (see the project repository for equivalent plots for all 331 participants: https://osf.io/x9zr8/). The phase angle of the BOLD response to the ring stimuli, and the pRF eccentricity values, showed a typical central-to-peripheral gradient²⁷, and were highly 332 333 consistent (e.g. across left and right eye pRF sequences). The phase angle across the wedge 334 and pRF scans showed strong hemisphere/hemi-field segregation (i.e. the right hemisphere 335 responded to stimuli in the left hemi-field and vice versa), as well as the expected phase 336 reversals³¹ that were used to determine boundaries between V1, V2 and V3 (shown by the white 337 triangles in each map - the middle triangle is V1). The V1 region-of-interest (ROI) was further 338 restricted using the responses to a phase-encoded localiser stimulus (see Figure 2d). These 339 responses also showed strong hemisphere/hemi-field and dorsal/ventral segregation, and we 340 retained voxels in the V1 ROI that produced responses with a coherence of 0.3 or higher (right-341 most flat maps in Figure 3). This resulted in a mean total V1 ROI size (combined across 342 hemispheres) of 601 voxels, and no significant difference in ROI size between patients and 343 controls (t(20)=0.54, p=0.60).



345



356

357 The localiser-restricted V1 ROIs for each participant were then used to estimate neural responses 358 to stimuli of different contrasts presented to the two eyes (Figure 2f). The BOLD response in this 359 ROI had a typical timecourse³², which was modulated by stimulus contrast (see Figure 4a). We 360 fitted a general linear model (GLM) to the full timecourse to estimate a β coefficient for each 361 stimulus condition at each voxel. The β weights were strongly modulated by stimulus contrast at 362 the occipital pole (red shading in Figure 4b). In a separate experiment using identical stimuli, we 363 also recorded steady-state visual evoked potentials (SSVEPs) using EEG. These showed clear 364 modulation of signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) with stimulus contrast at the flicker frequency of the 365 stimuli (4Hz, Figure 2g), but with a less sluggish timecourse than the BOLD response (see Figure 366 4c). The responses were well-isolated in the Fourier amplitude spectrum (see Figure 4d), and 367 localised to occipital electrodes (Figure 4d inset). We therefore used the fMRI β weights averaged 368 across the ROI, and the SSVEP SNRs averaged across four occipital electrodes (black points in 369 the Figure 4d inset) to calculate contrast response functions for each experiment. Exploratory 370 analyses in V2 and V3, and using different localiser thresholds to define the V1 ROI, produced 371 very similar functions (not shown), as did using raw amplitude values for the EEG experiment 372 (rather than SNR values).



375 Figure 4: Timecourses and topographies of visual responses measured using fMRI and EEG. Panel (a) 376 shows the BOLD timecourse in the localiser-restricted V1 ROI, for binocular presentation at five stimulus 377 contrasts (see legend). The grey rectangle adjacent to the x-axis indicates the period when the stimulus 378 was presented, and error bars indicate ±1SE across participants (N=22). Panel (b) shows averaged beta 379 weights (unthresholded) from the general linear model, projected on a posterior view of each hemisphere, 380 for the non-zero stimulus contrasts averaged across all participants (subtracting the 0% condition as a 381 baseline). Panel (c) shows the SSVEP timecourse as a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) at the target flicker 382 frequency (4Hz), calculated using a 1000ms sliding window (centred at the time indicated on the x-axis). 383 Shaded regions indicate bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals of the median, calculated across 384 participants (N=44). The grey shaded rectangle represents the period when the stimulus was presented. 385 Panel (d) shows the Fourier spectrum for a 96% contrast binocular target, averaged across all participants 386 (N=44), for 10-second windows of stimulation. Clear peaks in SNR are apparent at the stimulus flicker 387 frequency (4Hz) and its harmonics (especially 8Hz). The grey shaded region indicates 95% confidence 388 intervals of the median. The inset scalp topography shows that responses were strongest at posterior 389 electrode sites over early visual areas. For panels (c,d), signals were averaged across the electrodes 390 indicated in black on the scalp plot (Oz, POz, O1 and O2).

374

392 Figure 5 shows contrast response functions from both experiments, split by participant group 393 (control participants in Figure 5a.c, patients in Figure 5b.d). The first contrast response function 394 in each row (circle symbols) is for monocular stimulus presentation, and shows the expected 395 monotonic increase for each data set. As predicted by our computational models (see Figure 1), 396 as mask contrast increased, the functions rose from baseline across the plot. Statistically, there 397 were significant main effects of both target and mask contrast, and significant interactions, for all 398 data sets (see Table 2). For the patients there was a very slight reduction of response in the 399 amblyopic eye (orange circles) compared with the fellow eye (blue circles) at the highest target 400 contrast in the fMRI data (Figure 5b), though this was not significant (t(11)=1.20, p=0.26, d=0.35). 401 The difference was more pronounced in the SSVEP data (Figure 5d), and was significant at 24% 402 target contrast (t(24)=2.91, p<0.01, d=0.58), though not at 96% contrast (t(24)=1.96, p=0.06, 403 d=0.39).

405 For the control participants, there was evidence of interocular suppression (a u-shaped function) 406 for the highest mask contrast when measured using fMRI (final function in Figure 5a), though this 407 was not statistically significant (paired samples t-test comparing 0% and 6% target contrast 408 conditions when a 96% contrast mask was present, t(9)=1.8 p=0.10, d=0.57, mean difference of 409 0.13 β units). For the control EEG data interocular suppression occurred at a higher target 410 contrast (96%, see final function in Figure 5c), but was also not significant (t(18)=0.96, p=0.35, 411 d=0.22, mean difference of 0.44 SNR units). The u-shaped function was more pronounced in the 412 patients (Figure 5b,d). For the fMRI data, suppression was more substantial when the mask was 413 shown to the fellow eye (orange inverted triangles comparing 0% and 6% target levels with a 96% 414 mask; t(11)=3.25, p=0.008, d=0.94, mean difference of 0.46 β units) than the amblyopic eye (blue 415 inverted triangles; t(11)=2.51, p=0.029, d=0.72, mean difference of 0.22 β units). A very subtle 416 suppression effect was qualitatively apparent for the SSVEP data (Figure 5d), but this did not 417 reach statistical significance for either eye (both p>0.05). SSVEP responses at the second 418 harmonic frequency (8Hz) were broadly similar to those at the fundamental (see Supplementary 419 Figure S1).

420

| Data set | Effect | F-ratio (df) | <i>p</i> -value | Effect size (ω^2) |
|---------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Control fMRI | Left eye contrast | 18.82 (4,36) | <0.001 | 0.27 |
| Control fMRI | Right eye contrast | 19.56 (4,36) | <0.001 | 0.22 |
| Control fMRI | Interaction | 2.91 (16,144) | <0.001 | 0.18 |
| Patient fMRI | Fellow eye contrast | 12.80 (4,44) | <0.001 | 0.14 |
| Patient fMRI | Amblyopic eye contrast | 8.47 (4,44) | <0.001 | 0.14 |
| Patient fMRI | Interaction | 2.92 (16,176) | <0.001 | 0.15 |
| Control SSVEP | Left eye contrast | 29.93 (4,72) | <0.001 | 0.31 |
| Control SSVEP | Right eye contrast | 27.21 (4,72) | <0.001 | 0.28 |
| Control SSVEP | Interaction | 6.43 (16,288) | <0.001 | 0.14 |
| Patient SSVEP | Fellow eye contrast | 34.88 (4,96) | <0.001 | 0.38 |
| Patient SSVEP | Amblyopic eye contrast | 19.26 (4,96) | <0.001 | 0.17 |
| Patient SSVEP | Interaction | 2.96 (16,384) | <0.001 | 0.04 |
| | | | | |

421 Table 2: ANOVA results for contrast response functions.



Figure 5: Contrast response functions measured using fMRI and EEG. Data for control participants (panels a,c) are averaged across complementary conditions for the left and right eyes. Data for patients (panels b,d) are plotted considering the fellow eye as the 'target' eye (blue) and also considering the amblyopic eye as the 'target' eye (orange). These data are identical, but are re-ordered to aid interpretation. Error bars in each plot indicate ±1SE across participants.

431 To further investigate the interocular suppression effect, we plotted full BOLD timecourses for the 432 condition where the mask only was shown (96% contrast mask to one eye, 0% contrast target to 433 the other), and the condition where the same mask was paired with a 6% contrast target in the 434 other eye (see Figure 6). Interocular suppression is clear in each data set, as the white points 435 appear below the black points over much of the function. Our computational model (see right-436 most functions in Figure 1a,c) predicts that this happens because the excitatory impact of the 6% 437 contrast stimulus is outweighed by its suppression of the response to the 96% contrast stimulus 438 in the other eye: overall activity goes down instead of up. However this effect is much more 439 substantial for the fellow eye of the patients (Figure 6b) than for the amblyopic eye (Figure 6c). 440 consistent with our finding from the β weights (Figure 5b). The cortical meshes along the upper 441 row of Figure 6 show the difference in β weights between conditions, with blue shading indicating 442 stronger suppression. Suppression is apparent at the occipital pole, and is again strongest for the 443 fellow eye of the patients (Figure 6b).

444



445

446 Figure 6: Timecourse and spatial distribution of interocular suppression measured using fMRI, and polar 447 plots of SSVEP responses to monocular stimuli. Upper plots show the difference of β weights at each voxel 448 (unthresholded), between a monocular condition where one eye saw 96% contrast, and a dichoptic 449 condition where the eves saw 96% and 6% contrast. Blue shading indicates a suppressive effect (and red 450 shading a facilitatory effect) of the 6% component. Lower panels show the timecourse of % signal change 451 for the same two conditions. Data are shown for (a) control participants, (b) the 96% contrast mask in the 452 fellow eye of the patients, and (c) the 96% contrast mask in the amblyopic eye of the patients. Error bars 453 indicate ±1SE across participants, and grey shaded rectangles show the duration of stimulus presentation. 454 Panels (d,e) show SSVEP responses for monocularly presented stimuli at 24% (d) and 96% (e) contrast. 455 This representation shows a phase lag (i.e. angular difference) between the amblyopic (orange) and fellow 456 (blue) eyes. Shaded regions indicate ±1SE, calculated independently for amplitude and phase values.

The lower two panels of Figure 6 show polar plots comparing monocular SSVEP responses to stimuli of 24% contrast (Fig 6d), and 96% contrast (Fig 6e). There is a phase lag between the fellow and amblyopic eye in both panels. For the 24% contrast target, this is approximately 112 degrees, which corresponds to a lag of around 78 ms at the 4Hz flicker frequency used here. For the 96% contrast, the lag is around 28 degrees (20 ms). This latter estimate corresponds well with

- 462 previously reported phase lags using a similar paradigm in magnetoencephalography (MEG)³³.
- 463

464 Discussion

465

466 We measured neural responses to different combinations of contrast in the left and right eyes, 467 using both EEG and fMRI. In participants with atypical binocular vision, we found reduced 468 responses in the amblyopic eve using EEG, and increased suppression between the eves 469 (compared with controls) in V1 using fMRI. These different effects are consistent with greater 470 tonic and dynamic suppression (respectively) in individuals with impaired binocular vision, and 471 may be responsible for the deficits in stereopsis experienced by the majority of these participants 472 (see Table 1). We now discuss why the results differ across measurement methods, what these 473 findings tell us about amblyopic suppression, and how treatments might be targeted towards the 474 development of functioning binocular vision.

- 475
- 476 Comparison of EEG and fMRI measures
- 477

This is the first study to use both EEG and fMRI to investigate contrast processing in impaired 478 479 binocular vision. Previous studies using either EEG or MEG^{14,33} have typically found larger amblyopic deficits in the monocular response than those using fMRI^{34,35} (though some work has 480 shown substantial fMRI deficits³⁶), mirroring our results here (left-most functions of Figure 5b,d). 481 Considering only this previous work, heterogeneity of stimuli and participants across studies might 482 483 well have explained the differences. However in the present experiments we used identical 484 stimuli, and the same participants completed both experiments (Supplementary Figure S2 shows 485 the EEG data for only the participants who completed the MRI experiments). The reduction in 486 response amplitude to stimuli in the weaker eye is clearer using SSVEP than using fMRI. 487 However, differences in dynamic interocular suppression are only apparent when measured with 488 fMRI (right-most functions in Figure 5a,b; Figure 6a-c). 489

490 Analogous differences between these two methods have recently been reported in the study of attention. Itthipuripat et al.³⁷ found that spatial attention produces a change in baseline response 491 492 when measured using fMRI, but not when measured using EEG (including evoked potentials and 493 SSVEPs). Instead fMRI, which measures global neural activity indirectly via oxygen consumption, 494 appears to be more closely related to late ERP components and alpha band oscillations recorded using EEG³⁷, rather than the stimulus onset transients detected by SSVEP and early ERP 495 496 components. Although our contrast response functions do not involve baseline shifts, the other 497 differences between our fMRI and EEG results are consistent with different features of neural 498 activity being probed by these two methods.

500 One possible explanation for the differences in monocular response between methods is that the 501 firing of visual neurons responsive to the amblyopic eye might be desynchronised. This would 502 have a greater effect on phase-locked SSVEP responses - which depend upon synchronised 503 firing - than on fMRI BOLD responses, which are a proxy for overall neural activity. Instead, 504 asynchronous activity in higher frequency bands (50 – 200Hz) shows a closer correspondence with the BOLD response³⁸, and these signals can be detected with extracranial techniques such 505 506 as MEG³⁹. In terms of the differences in suppression, this could reflect processing in different 507 layers of cortex. Evoked responses measured using EEG correspond most closely to activity in 508 the more superficial (supragranular) layers of cortex, whereas much inhibitory processing involves deeper (granular) layers⁴⁰. Future work using laminar fMRI at higher field strength (7T or above⁴¹), 509 or multi-unit electrophysiology^{42,43}, could allow dissociation of excitatory and inhibitory responses 510 511 in amblyopia. In addition, these methods can resolve ocular dominance columns in V1, allowing 512 eye-specific inputs to be measured directly.

513

514 What is amblyopic suppression?

515

516 Suppression in amblyopia is measured very differently in clinical practice compared with the 517 methods used in lab-based neuroscience research. The most common clinical measures are the 518 Worth 4-dot test, and Bagolini striated lenses, both of which give a gualitative indication of whether 519 one eye's image is substantively suppressed by the other eye during binocular viewing. Lab-520 based measures involve a variety of paradigms, including psychophysical approaches such as dichoptic masking^{10,44–46}, or assessing binocular fusion of edges⁴⁷ or gratings⁴⁸, and more direct 521 neurophysiological estimates of suppression in animal models^{49,50}. However, because both eyes 522 523 are being stimulated during testing, clinical suppression could in principle be explained by either 524 tonic or dynamic suppression, and most psychophysical work also cannot distinguish between 525 these possibilities. Many of our patients (around half) no longer met the clinical criterion for 526 amblyopia, yet as a group they still exhibited greater dynamic interocular suppression than our 527 control participants, as well as tonic suppression of one eye. The finding that both types of 528 suppression are apparent, even in individuals who have received patching or surgical 529 interventions, strongly suggests that both will also be present in untreated amblyopes. Amblyopic 530 suppression might therefore involve a combination of these two processes.

531

532 One feature that remains to be determined is whether one type of suppression is a primary cause 533 of amblyopia, and the other a later consequence. Cortical suppression, characterised as a process of gain control⁵¹, is a dynamic, adaptive process that acts to optimise the sensory 534 response⁵². It is clear that binocular vision is particularly plastic, as the relative weighting of the 535 two eyes can be altered following a brief period of occlusion⁵³, and this may be the mechanism 536 537 by which clinical patching treatment improves vision. Our finding of increased suppression of the 538 fellow eye by the amblyopic eye could be an attempt to rebalance an asymmetrical system. If so, 539 this might influence the development of novel treatments geared towards modulating interocular 540 suppression.

- 541
- 542 Perceptual consequences of suppression, and potential for targeted treatment
- 543

544 It is generally assumed that clinical suppression results in viewing the world 'through' the fellow 545 eye, with signals from the amblyopic eye being completely suppressed. However, other work has shown that when signals in the amblyopic eve are boosted by an appropriate amount, information 546 is still summed binocularly⁵⁴. Indeed, the principle of ocularity invariance (that the world does not 547 548 change when one eye is closed) makes it very difficult to distinguish between suppression and 549 fusion outside of the laboratory or clinic. However, even if the amblyopic eye still contributes to 550 perception, stereopsis is extremely sensitive to imbalances between the eyes, and breaks down 551 when one eye receives a stronger input⁵⁵. The two types of suppression we identify here would 552 likely unbalance signals in exactly this way, which may contribute to the poorer stereopsis for 553 most of our patients (see Table 1).

554

555 Consistent with this idea, several treatments have recently been proposed that aim to reduce suppression between the eyes. For example, antisuppression therapy⁵⁶ involves presenting dot 556 motion stimuli, in which signals are shown to one eye, and noise distractors to the other. To 557 558 perform the task, patients must favour information from the signal (amblyopic) eve. Performance 559 improves over time, implying that suppression is reduced. This approach also improves acuity 560 and stereopsis, even in amblyopic adults far beyond the critical period (in childhood) for traditional treatment. Related treatments that involve playing dichoptic video games⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹, or watching 561 dichoptic movies⁶⁰, may work in a similar way. Measuring the two types of suppression identified 562 563 here throughout treatment would reveal causal relationships between suppression and visual 564 function, potentially allowing clinicians to optimise treatment schedules and monitor progress.

565 566

Appendix 1 – details of computational models

567
568 The two stage model of Meese et al.¹⁶ comprises an intial stage of monocular gain control,
569 followed by binocular summation, defined as:

570

 $binsum = \frac{C_L^m}{S + C_L + \omega_R C_R} + \frac{C_R^m}{S + C_R + \omega_L C_L}$

572

573 where m = 1.3, S = 1, and $\omega_R = \omega_L = 1$, C_L and C_R are the input contrasts to the left and right eyes. 574 The output of the model follows a further nonlinearity:

576
$$resp = \frac{binsum^p}{Z + binsum^q}$$
577

578 where p = 8, q = 6.5, and Z = 0.1. The predictions shown in Figure 1a are the output of the model 579 for different combinations of C_L and C_R . To predict the effects of attenuating one eye's input 580 (Figure 1b), an attenuator parameter¹⁰ is added to one eye's input:

581

582
$$binsum = \frac{aC_L^m}{S + aC_L + \omega_R C_R} + \frac{C_R^m}{S + C_R + \omega_L aC_L}$$

584 where a = 0.5. Finally, to assess the impact of unbalanced interocular suppression (Figure 1c), 585 we set $\omega_R = 2$, but left $\omega_L = 1$ (and set a = 1). Precise parameter values, e.g. of exponents, are 586 not essential to produce the overall model behaviour.

588 References

589 590

591

- 1. Coutant BE, Westheimer G. Population distribution of stereoscopic ability. Ophthalmic and Physiological Optics 1993;13:3-7.
- 592 2. Julesz B. Stereoscopic vision. Vision Res 1986;26:1601–1612.
- 3. Fu Z, Hong H, Su Z, et al. Global prevalence of amblyopia and disease burden projections through 593 594 2040: a systematic review and meta-analysis. British Journal of Ophthalmology 2020;104:1164–1170.
- 595 4. Hess RF. Contrast sensitivity assessment of functional amblyopia in humans. Trans Ophthalmol Soc U K 1979;99:391-397. 596
- 597 5. Levi DM. Rethinking amblyopia 2020. Vision Research 2020;176:118-129.
- 598 6. Levi DM, Knill DC, Bavelier D. Stereopsis and amblyopia: A mini-review. Vision Research 599 2015;114:17-30.
- 600 7. Jampolsky A. Characteristics of Suppression in Strabismus. Archives of Ophthalmology 1955;54:683-601 696.
- 602 8. Pratt-Johnson JA, Tillson G. Suppression in strabismus--an update. British Journal of Ophthalmology 603 1984;68:174-178.
- 9. Travers T aB. Suppression of vision in squint and its association with retinal correspondence and 604 605 amblyopia. British Journal of Ophthalmology 1938;22:577-604.
- 606 10. Baker DH, Meese TS, Hess RF. Contrast masking in strabismic amblyopia: attenuation, noise, 607 interocular suppression and binocular summation. Vision Res 2008;48:1625-1640.
- 608 11. Baker DH, Meese TS, Georgeson MA. Binocular interaction: contrast matching and contrast 609 discrimination are predicted by the same model. Spatial Vision 2007;20:397-413.
- 610 12. Levelt WJM. The alternation process in binocular rivalry. British Journal of Psychology 1966;57:225-611 238.
- 612 13. Ding J. Levi DM. Rebalancing binocular vision in amblyopia. Ophthalmic and Physiological Optics 613 2014:34:199-213.
- 614 14. Baker DH, Simard M, Saint-Amour D, Hess RF. Steady-State Contrast Response Functions Provide 615 a Sensitive and Objective Index of Amblyopic Deficits. Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science 616 2015;56:1208-1216.
- 617 15. Barnes GR, Hess RF, Dumoulin SO, et al. The cortical deficit in humans with strabismic amblyopia. 618 The Journal of Physiology 2001;533:281–297.
- 619 16. Meese TS, Georgeson MA, Baker DH. Binocular contrast vision at and above threshold. J Vis 620 2006;6:1224-1243.
- 621 17. Moradi F, Heeger DJ. Inter-ocular contrast normalization in human visual cortex. J Vis 2009;9:13.1-622 22.
- 623 18. Baker DH, Wade AR. Evidence for an Optimal Algorithm Underlying Signal Combination in Human 624 Visual Cortex, Cerebral Cortex 2017:27:254-264.
- 625 19. Baker DH, Meese TS, Georgeson MA. Paradoxical Psychometric Functions ("Swan Functions") are 626 Explained by Dilution Masking in Four Stimulus Dimensions. i-Perception 2013;4:17–35.
- 627 20. Baker DH, Kaestner M, Gouws AD. Measurement of crosstalk in stereoscopic display systems used 628 for vision research. Journal of Vision 2016;16:14.
- 629 21. Brainard DH. The Psychophysics Toolbox. Spat Vis 1997;10:433–436.
- 630 22. Kleiner M, Brainard DH, Pelli DG. What's new in Psychtoolbox-3? Perception 2007;36(S):14.
- 631 23. Pelli DG. The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: transforming numbers into movies. 632 Spat Vis 1997;10:437-442.
- 633 24. Dale AM, Fischl B, Sereno MI. Cortical surface-based analysis. I. Segmentation and surface 634 reconstruction. Neuroimage 1999;9:179-194.
- 635 25. Fischl B. FreeSurfer. Neuroimage 2012;62:774-781.
- 636 26. Engel SA, Rumelhart DE, Wandell BA, et al. fMRI of human visual cortex. Nature 1994;369:525.

- 637 27. Dumoulin SO, Wandell BA. Population receptive field estimates in human visual cortex. NeuroImage
 638 2008;39:647–660.
- 639 28. Jenkinson M, Beckmann CF, Behrens TEJ, et al. FSL. Neuroimage 2012;62:782–790.
- 640
 641
 29. Marcus DS, Harwell J, Olsen T, et al. Informatics and data mining tools and strategies for the human connectome project. Front Neuroinform 2011;5:4.
- 30. Delorme A, Makeig S. EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG dynamics
 including independent component analysis. J Neurosci Methods 2004;134:9–21.
- 644 31. Sereno MI, Dale AM, Reppas JB, et al. Borders of Multiple Visual Areas in Humans Revealed by
 645 Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging. Science 1995;268:889–893.
- 646 32. Boynton GM, Engel SA, Glover GH, Heeger DJ. Linear systems analysis of functional magnetic
 647 resonance imaging in human V1. J Neurosci 1996;16:4207–4221.
- 648 33. Chadnova E, Reynaud A, Clavagnier S, Hess RF. Latent binocular function in amblyopia. Vision
 649 Research 2017;140:73–80.
- 650 34. Conner IP, Odom JV, Schwartz TL, Mendola JD. Monocular activation of V1 and V2 in amblyopic
 651 adults measured with functional magnetic resonance imaging. J AAPOS 2007;11:341–350.
- 35. Li X, Dumoulin SO, Mansouri B, Hess RF. Cortical Deficits in Human Amblyopia: Their Regional
 Distribution and Their Relationship to the Contrast Detection Deficit. Investigative Opthalmology &
 Visual Science 2007;48:1575.
- 36. Hess RF, Li X, Lu G, et al. The contrast dependence of the cortical fMRI deficit in amblyopia; a
 selective loss at higher contrasts. Human Brain Mapping 2010;31:1233–1248.
- 37. Itthipuripat S, Sprague TC, Serences JT. Functional MRI and EEG Index Complementary Attentional
 Modulations. The Journal of Neuroscience 2019;39:6162–6179.
- 38. Hermes D, Nguyen M, Winawer J. Neuronal synchrony and the relation between the blood-oxygen level dependent response and the local field potential. PLOS Biology 2017;15:e2001461.
- 39. Kupers ER, Wang HX, Amano K, et al. A non-invasive, quantitative study of broadband spectral
 responses in human visual cortex. PLOS ONE 2018;13:e0193107.
- 40. Bruyns-Haylett M, Luo J, Kennerley AJ, et al. The neurogenesis of P1 and N1: A concurrent
 EEG/LFP study. NeuroImage 2017;146:575–588.
- 41. de Hollander G, van der Zwaag W, Qian C, et al. Ultra-high resolution fMRI reveals origins of
 feedforward and feedback activity within laminae of human ocular dominance columns. BioRxiv
 preprint; 2020. Available at: http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.05.19.102186.
- 42. Hirsch JA, Martinez LM, Pillai C, et al. Functionally distinct inhibitory neurons at the first stage of
 visual cortical processing. Nature Neuroscience 2003;6:1300–1308.
- 43. Martinez LM, Wang Q, Reid RC, et al. Receptive field structure varies with layer in the primary visual cortex. Nature Neuroscience 2005;8:372–379.
- 44. Harrad RA, Hess RF. Binocular integration of contrast information in amblyopia. Vision Res
 1992;32:2135–2150.
- 45. Huang P-C, Baker DH, Hess RF. Interocular suppression in normal and amblyopic vision: Spatio temporal properties. Journal of Vision 2012;12:29–29.
- 46. Zhou J, Reynaud A, Yao Z, et al. Amblyopic Suppression: Passive Attenuation, Enhanced Dichoptic
 Masking by the Fellow Eye or Reduced Dichoptic Masking by the Amblyopic Eye? Investigative
 Opthalmology & Visual Science 2018;59:4190.
- 47. Spiegel DP, Baldwin AS, Hess RF. The Relationship Between Fusion, Suppression, and Diplopia in
 Normal and Amblyopic Vision. Investigative Opthalmology & Visual Science 2016;57:5810.
- 48. Ding J, Klein SA, Levi DM. Binocular combination in abnormal binocular vision. Journal of Vision 2013;13:14.
- 49. Sengpiel F, Blakemore C. Interocular control of neuronal responsiveness in cat visual cortex. Nature
 1994;368:847–850.
- 50. Shooner C, Hallum LE, Kumbhani RD, et al. Asymmetric Dichoptic Masking in Visual Cortex of Amblyopic Macaque Monkeys. The Journal of Neuroscience 2017;37:8734–8741.
- 51. Carandini M, Heeger DJ. Normalization as a canonical neural computation. Nat Rev Neurosci 2012;13:51–62.
- 52. Westrick ZM, Heeger DJ, Landy MS. Pattern Adaptation and Normalization Reweighting. J Neurosci 2016;36:9805–9816.
- 53. Lunghi C, Burr DC, Morrone C. Brief periods of monocular deprivation disrupt ocular balance in human adult visual cortex. Current Biology 2011;21:R538–R539.

- 54. Baker DH, Meese TS, Mansouri B, Hess RF. Binocular Summation of Contrast Remains Intact in
 Strabismic Amblyopia. Investigative Opthalmology & Visual Science 2007;48:5332.
- 55. Legge GE, Gu YC. Stereopsis and contrast. Vision Res 1989;29:989–1004.
- 696 56. Hess RF, Mansouri B, Thompson B. A binocular approach to treating amblyopia: antisuppression
 697 therapy. Optom Vis Sci 2010;87:697–704.
- 57. Backus BT, Dornbos BD, Tran TA, et al. Use of virtual reality to assess and treat weakness in human stereoscopic vision. Electronic Imaging 2018;2018:109-1-109–6.
- 58. Li J, Thompson B, Deng D, et al. Dichoptic training enables the adult amblyopic brain to learn.
 Current Biology 2013;23:R308–R309.
- 59. Vedamurthy I, Nahum M, Bavelier D, Levi DM. Mechanisms of recovery of visual function in adult
 amblyopia through a tailored action video game. Scientific Reports 2015;5. Available at:
 http://www.nature.com/articles/srep08482.
- 60. Bossi M, Tailor VK, Anderson EJ, et al. Binocular Therapy for Childhood Amblyopia Improves Vision
 Without Breaking Interocular Suppression. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2017;58:3031–3043.
- 707

708 **Online Supplemental materials**

709





Figure S1: SSVEP data for the second harmonic (2F) response. The main trends are the same as in Figure 5c,d, though the SNRs are overall lower (note y-axis scaling). Panel (a) shows data from control participants (N=19), and panel (b) shows data from patients (N=25).

714



715

Figure S2: SSVEP data for only the participants who completed the fMRI experiment. The main trends are the same as in Figure 5c,d. Panel (a) shows data from control participants (N=10), and panel (b) shows data from patients (N=12).