Irving Biederman

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	The sizable difficulty in matching unfamiliar faces differing only moderately in orientation in depth is a function of image dissimilarity. Vision Research, 2022, 194, 107959.	1.4	0
2	Geons. , 2021, , 526-535.		0
3	Visual noise consisting of X-junctions has only a minimal adverse effect on object recognition. Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics, 2020, 82, 995-1002.	1.3	0
4	Vision: A Product of a Society of Independent Experts. Current Biology, 2020, 30, R1043-R1045.	3.9	0
5	Pigeons spontaneously form three-dimensional shape categories. Behavioural Processes, 2019, 158, 70-76.	1.1	5
6	A face in a (temporal) crowd. Vision Research, 2019, 157, 55-60.	1.4	8
7	The Capacity for Face Perception is Independent of the Capacity for Face Memory. Journal of Vision, 2019, 19, 139a.	0.3	0
8	Congenital Prosopagnosics Show Reduced Configural Effects in an Odd-Man-Out Detection Task. Journal of Vision, 2019, 19, 22c.	0.3	0
9	The cognitive neuroscience of person identification. Neuropsychologia, 2018, 116, 205-214.	1.6	7
10	What Is Actually Affected by the Scrambling of Objects When Localizing the Lateral Occipital Complex?. Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 2017, 29, 1595-1604.	2.3	12
11	Can Familiar Faces be Negatively Detected at RSVP Rates?. Journal of Vision, 2017, 17, 1027.	0.3	2
12	What is the Perceptual Deficit in Developmental Prosopagnosia?. Journal of Vision, 2017, 17, 619.	0.3	3
13	The Lateral Occipital Complex shows no net response to object familiarity. Journal of Vision, 2016, 16, 3.	0.3	12
14	Effective signaling of surface boundaries by L-vertices reflect the consistency of their contrast in natural images. Journal of Vision, 2016, 16, 15.	0.3	1
15	The Neural Correlates of Humor Creativity. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 2016, 10, 597.	2.0	36
16	An estimate of the prevalence of developmental phonagnosia. Brain and Language, 2016, 159, 84-91.	1.6	15
17	An applet for the Gabor similarity scaling of the differences between complex stimuli. Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics, 2016, 78, 2298-2306.	1.3	19
18	Using the reassignment procedure to test object representation in pigeons and people. Learning and Behavior, 2015, 43, 188-207.	1.0	0

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Developmental phonagnosia: Neural correlates and a behavioral marker. Brain and Language, 2015, 149, 106-117.	1.6	16
20	Ha Ha! Versus Aha! A Direct Comparison of Humor to Nonhumorous Insight for Determining the Neural Correlates of Mirth. Cerebral Cortex, 2015, 25, 1405-1413.	2.9	72
21	A neurocomputational account of the face configural effect. Journal of Vision, 2014, 14, 9-9.	0.3	11
22	Neural Correlates of Face Detection. Cerebral Cortex, 2014, 24, 1555-1564.	2.9	10
23	Greater sensitivity to nonaccidental than metric shape properties in preschool children. Vision Research, 2014, 97, 83-88.	1.4	17
24	Geons. , 2014, , 338-346.		0
25	Cortical Representation of Medial Axis Structure. Cerebral Cortex, 2013, 23, 629-637.	2.9	61
26	Greater sensitivity to nonaccidental than metric changes in the relations between simple shapes in the lateral occipital cortex. NeuroImage, 2012, 63, 1818-1826.	4.2	20
27	Predicting the psychophysical similarity of faces and non-face complex shapes by image-based measures. Vision Research, 2012, 55, 41-46.	1.4	48
28	Sensitivity to nonaccidental properties across various shape dimensions. Vision Research, 2012, 62, 35-43.	1.4	38
29	The neural basis for shape preferences. Vision Research, 2011, 51, 2198-2206.	1.4	34
30	Loci of the release from fMRI adaptation for changes in facial expression, identity, and viewpoint. Journal of Vision, 2010, 10, 36-36.	0.3	51
31	A cross-cultural study of the representation of shape: Sensitivity to generalized cone dimensions. Visual Cognition, 2010, 18, 50-66.	1.6	6
32	Representation of Shape in Individuals From a Culture With Minimal Exposure to Regular, Simple Artifacts: Sensitivity to Nonaccidental Versus Metric Properties. Psychological Science, 2009, 20, 1437-1442.	3.3	28
33	Adaptation to objects in the lateral occipital complex (LOC): Shape or semantics?. Vision Research, 2009, 49, 2297-2305.	1.4	56
34	Adaptation in the fusiform face area (FFA): Image or person?. Vision Research, 2009, 49, 2800-2807.	1.4	47
35	Biederman and Cooper's 1991 Paper. Perception, 2009, 38, 809-825.	1.2	17
36	Pigeons and humans are more sensitive to nonaccidental than to metric changes in visual objects. Behavioural Processes, 2008, 77, 199-209.	1.1	27

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	17000 Years of Depicting the Junction of Two Smooth Shapes. Perception, 2008, 37, 161-164.	1.2	18
38	The deleterious effect of contrast reversal on recognition is unique to faces, not objects. Vision Research, 2007, 47, 2134-2142.	1.4	46
39	Recent Psychophysical and Neural Research in Shape Recognition. , 2007, , 71-88.		8
40	Effects of varying stimulus size on object recognition in pigeons.. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 2006, 32, 419-430.	1.7	24
41	What makes faces special?. Vision Research, 2006, 46, 3802-3811.	1.4	88
42	Neural evidence for intermediate representations in object recognition. Vision Research, 2006, 46, 4024-4031.	1.4	84
43	Do Humans and Baboons Use the Same Information When Categorizing Human and Baboon Faces?. Psychological Science, 2006, 17, 599-607.	3.3	39
44	Representation of Regular and Irregular Shapes in Macaque Inferotemporal Cortex. Cerebral Cortex, 2005, 15, 1308-1321.	2.9	73
45	Making the ineffable explicit: estimating the information employed for face classifications. Cognitive Science, 2004, 28, 209-226.	1.7	126
46	Making the ineffable explicit: estimating the information employed for face classifications. Cognitive Science, 2004, 28, 209-226.	1.7	44
47	Less impairment in face imagery than face perception in early prosopagnosia. Neuropsychologia, 2003, 41, 421-441.	1.6	27
48	Shape Tuning in Macaque Inferior Temporal Cortex. Journal of Neuroscience, 2003, 23, 3016-3027.	3.6	108
49	Effects of Illumination Intensity and Direction on Object Coding in Macaque Inferior Temporal Cortex. Cerebral Cortex, 2002, 12, 756-766.	2.9	45
50	Learning an object from multiple views enhances its recognition in an orthogonal rotational axis in pigeons. Vision Research, 2002, 42, 2051-2062.	1.4	23
51	On the Relation between Kanizsa's Bias Towards Convexity and the Gestaltists PrÃgnanz from the Perspective of Current in Shape Recognition. Axiomathes, 2002, 13, 329-346.	0.6	0
52	Invariance of long-term visual priming to scale, reflection, translation, and hemisphere. Vision Research, 2001, 41, 221-234.	1.4	47
53	Size tuning in the absence of spatial frequency tuning in object recognition. Vision Research, 2001, 41, 1931-1950.	1.4	22
54	Discrimination of geons by pigeons: The effects of variations in surface depiction. Learning and Behavior, 2001, 29, 97-106.	3.4	23

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Inferior Temporal Neurons Show Greater Sensitivity to Nonaccidental than to Metric Shape Differences. Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 2001, 13, 444-453.	2.3	87
56	Seeing things from a different angle: The pigeon's recognition of single geons rotated in depth.. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 2000, 26, 115-132.	1.7	24
57	Recognizing depth-rotated objects: A review of recent research and theory. Spatial Vision, 2000, 13, 241-253.	1.4	74
58	Differing views on views: response to Hayward and Tarr (2000). Vision Research, 2000, 40, 3901-3905.	1.4	18
59	Accurate identification but no priming and chance recognition memory for pictures in RSVP sequences. Visual Cognition, 2000, 7, 511-535.	1.6	44
60	Subordinate-level object classification reexamined. Psychological Research, 1999, 62, 131-153.	1.7	62
61	One-shot viewpoint invariance in matching novel objects. Vision Research, 1999, 39, 2885-2899.	1.4	172
62	Neurocomputational bases of object and face recognition. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 1997, 352, 1203-1219.	4.0	217
63	The pigeon's recognition of drawings of depth-rotated stimuli.. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1996, 22, 205-221.	1.7	29
64	To what extent can matching algorithms based on direct outputs of spatial filters account for human object recognition?. Spatial Vision, 1996, 10, 237-271.	1.4	47
65	Viewpoint-dependent mechanisms in visual object recognition: Reply to Tarr and BÃ¼lthoff (1995).. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 1995, 21, 1506-1514.	0.9	195
66	Size Invariance in Visual Object Priming of Gray-Scale Images. Perception, 1995, 24, 741-748.	1.2	40
67	Recognizing depth-rotated objects: Evidence and conditions for three-dimensional viewpoint invariance.. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 1993, 19, 1162-1182.	0.9	495
68	Metric invariance in object recognition: A review and further evidence.. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1992, 46, 191-214.	0.8	98
69	Size invariance in visual object priming.. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 1992, 18, 121-133.	0.9	337
70	Dynamic binding in a neural network for shape recognition.. Psychological Review, 1992, 99, 480-517.	3.8	987
71	Priming contour-deleted images: Evidence for intermediate representations in visual object recognition. Cognitive Psychology, 1991, 23, 393-419.	2.2	381
72	Evidence for Complete Translational and Reflectional Invariance in Visual Object Priming. Perception, 1991, 20, 585-593.	1.2	352

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	Surface versus edge-based determinants of visual recognition. Cognitive Psychology, 1988, 20, 38-64.	2.2	575
74	Recognition-by-components: A theory of human image understanding.. Psychological Review, 1987, 94, 115-147.	3.8	4,803
75	Scene perception: Detecting and judging objects undergoing relational violations. Cognitive Psychology, 1982, 14, 143-177.	2.2	971
76	Pattern goodness and pattern recognition.. , 0, , 73-95.		8