

1 **Perceptual constancy of pareidolias across paper and** 2 **digital testing formats in neurodegenerative diseases.**

3 **Gajanan S. Revankar^{1,2*}, Tatsuhiko Ozono², Maki Suzuki³, Hideki Kanemoto⁴, Kota**
4 **Furuya¹, Kazue Kamae^{4,9}, Kenji Yoshiyama⁴, Yuki Yamamoto^{4,10}, Issei Ogasawara⁵,**
5 **Natsuki Yoshida⁵, Susumu Iwasaki^{5,11}, Chizu Saeki², Yoshiyuki Nishio³, Daisaku**
6 **Nakatani¹, Kanako Asai², Yuta Kajiyama⁸, Mikito Shimizu², Tatsuya Hayashi⁵, Seira**
7 **Taniguchi², Yu Suzuki², Rino Inada⁶, Tomoya Taminato⁶, Yoshitaka Nagai⁶, Mamoru**
8 **Hashimoto⁷, Manabu Ikeda^{4,10}, Etsuro Mori^{3,10}, Hideki Mochizuki², and Ken Nakata^{1,5}**

9 ¹Center for Global Health, Department of Medical Innovation, Osaka University Hospital,
10 Osaka, Japan

11 ²Department of Neurology, Graduate School of Medicine, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan

12 ³Department of Behavioral Neurology and Neuropsychiatry, United Graduate School of Child
13 Development, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan

14 ⁴Department of Psychiatry, Graduate School of Medicine, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan

15 ⁵Department of Health and Sport Sciences, Graduate School of Medicine, Osaka University,
16 Osaka, Japan

17 ⁶Department of Neurology, Kindai University Faculty of Medicine, Osaka, Japan

18 ⁷Department of Psychiatry, Kindai University Faculty of Medicine, Osaka, Japan

19 ⁸Department of Neurology, Kawasaki Medical School, Okayama, Japan

20 ⁹Department of Psychiatry, Asakayama General Hospital, Osaka, Japan

21 ¹⁰Department of Psychiatry, Nippon Life Hospital, Osaka, Japan

22 ¹¹Department of Health and Human Performance, Fort Lewis College, Durango Colorado, USA.

23

24 ***Correspondence:**

25 Gajanan S. Revankar

26 Center for Global Health, Dept. of Medical Innovation,

27 Graduate School of Medicine, Osaka University Hospital

28 2-1, Yamadaoka, Suita, Osaka, Japan – 5650871

29 Phone: + 81-6-6879-4128

30 Email: revankar@neuro.med.osaka-u.ac.jp

31 **Running title:** Perceptual constancy in pareidolias

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 **Abstract**

39 Pareidolias refer to visual perceptual deficits where ambiguous shapes take on meaningful
40 appearances. In neurodegenerative diseases, pareidolias are examined via a paper-based
41 neuropsychological tool called the noise pareidolia test. In this study, we present initial findings
42 regarding the utilization of pareidolia test on a digital format to analyze variations between
43 paper-based and digital testing approaches. We performed our experiments on healthy controls,
44 patients diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease (AD), Dementia with Lewy body disease (DLB)
45 and Parkinson’s disease (PD). Baseline MMSE assessments were conducted, followed by
46 pareidolia testing using both paper-based tools and smartphones. Bland-Altman analysis was
47 performed to evaluate the agreement between the two methods. We found that the illusionary
48 phenomenon of pareidolia is consistent across paper and digital modalities of testing; that
49 perceptual constancy is maintained across patient groups despite variations in image sizes; and
50 pareidolic misperceptions, to some extent, are stabilized on a digital format. Our findings
51 demonstrate a practical way of testing pareidolias on smartphones without compromising on the
52 functionality of the test.

53

54

55

56

57 **Introduction**

58 Pareidolias are visual misperceptions wherein ambiguous forms appear meaningful¹. These
59 perceptual errors are a natural phenomenon occurring in normal healthy individuals and reflect a
60 transient mismatch between bottom-up sensory information and internally generated top-down
61 visual processing². Pareidolias can manifest in various forms, of which face-pareidolia stands out
62 as the most prevalent and consistently defined phenomenon in literature³.

63 Although pareidolias appear innocuous among the healthy, they serve as important markers for
64 neuropsychiatric disorders. Clinically, with the loss of insight, pareidolias act as early behavioral
65 markers for psychosis in Alzheimer's disease (AD)^{4,5}, Dementia with Lewy body disease
66 (DLB)^{6,7} and Parkinson's disease (PD)⁸⁻¹⁰ establishing it as a significant prognostic indicator for
67 disease progression⁷.

68 Pareidolias are quantitatively evaluated using the Noise pareidolia test (NPT), a simple, paper-
69 based neuropsychological test comprising of black-and-white images of noise with faces
70 embedded in them¹¹. The NPT prompts a visuo-perceptual demand, necessitating the redirection
71 of attention based on the sensory prominence displayed by the target stimuli^{6,12}. We previously
72 demonstrated neural correlates that affect frontal cortex network and attentional dynamics in PD
73 patients using the NPT on a PC monitor screen, with screen dimensions like that of a paper-
74 test^{12,13}. Nevertheless, it remains uncertain whether alterations in the viewing distances or sizes
75 of these images impact visual perception, especially in the absence of any eye-related
76 pathologies.

77 It is known that our perception maintains the size of an object as relatively constant, even when
78 there are alterations in the size, shape, or color of its retinal image due to variations in viewing

79 distance^{14,15}. This ‘perceptual constancy’ is suggested to be affected in neurodegenerative
80 disorders like AD, PD, DLB or frontotemporal dementia, dependent much on the temporal
81 course of the disease^{10,16–18}. Since pareidolias affects visual processing encoded at multiple
82 cortical levels at different stages of the disease⁸, we posited that perceptual tasks necessitating
83 high-level vision and object recognition may affect perceptual constancy.

84 The aim of the study was, therefore, to clarify whether patients with neurodegenerative disease
85 maintain a stable perception of NPT despite variations in image size and distance on different
86 surfaces. To that end, we performed the NPT on two formats – one on paper and the other on a
87 smartphone and outlined the qualitative and quantitative differences between the two.

88 Practically, the outcomes of this study will allow smartphone-based evaluation of pareidolias in
89 terms of clinical research.

90

91 **Methods**

92 **General information**

93 11 Healthy controls (HC), 30 AD, 26 DLB and 5 PD participants were prospectively enrolled for
94 the study (Study start: Nov 2022). We recruited patients in their early to moderate stage of the
95 disease. HC were sampled from a single center, and patients were recruited from 3 different
96 hospitals across Osaka, Japan. Inclusion criteria for patients were (i) ≥ 40 years of age, and (ii)
97 diagnosed as AD, DLB or PD according to their respective clinical diagnostic criteria^{19–21}.
98 Patients with any of the following conditions were excluded: (i) if the attending
99 physician/experimenter judged if a patient had severe behavioral or motor impairment hampering
100 the usage of a smartphone, (ii) known eye-related pathologies, (ii) those on antipsychotic
101 medications (olanzapine, risperidone, clozapine), (iii) major psychiatric diagnosis that affected
102 activities of daily living, and (iv) uncontrolled major medical illness such as seizures or
103 cardiovascular diseases. Healthy participants HC were ≥ 40 years of age, without any past or
104 present neurological problems. Participants were tested with a near-vision Snellen chart
105 integrated in the smartphone to include normal or corrected-to-normal vision subjects only. All
106 participants provided written informed consent. The Osaka University institution review board
107 cleared the protocol for the study to be performed in the Department of Neurology and the
108 Department of Psychiatry, Osaka University, Nippon Life Hospital and Asakayama General
109 Hospital all located in Osaka, Japan in accordance with the ethical standards of the Declaration
110 of Helsinki (IRB Approval number – 22307). Clinical and neuropsychological assessments were
111 conducted by a clinical psychologist or a neurologist, all performed in a single out-patient visit.

112

113 **Experiment flow**

114 Following informed-consent, participants underwent 3 tests in the following order – i) Paper Noise
115 pareidolia test (pNPT)¹¹, ii) Mini-mental State Examination, Japanese version (MMSE-J)²² and iii)
116 the smartphone Noise pareidolia test (sNPT). The pNPT comprises of 40 black and white images,
117 with a face embedded in 8 of the 40 images. Participants must locate and identify faces accurately,
118 and any misidentification of noisy areas as faces are marked as pareidolia. The images on pNPT
119 were administered on A4-sized pages, placed flat on a desk with the participant viewing these
120 images at approx. 40 to 50cms. Participants needed to exhibit 2 or more pareidolias in the test to
121 be classified as pareidolia positive.

122 Pareidolia images in sNPT were the same as pNPT but were randomized to prevent a learning
123 effect, although this effect is known to be minimal or non-existent²³. Participants performed the
124 sNPT test on an Android smartphone [Samsung A32 with screen dimensions 164mm (h) x 76mm
125 (w), portrait mode], that was fixed on a smartphone mount, with participants sitting at 20-30 cm
126 from the screen. Screen resolution and brightness were maintained at a constant level across all
127 participants. Although participants were motivated to perform the sNPT independently, examiners
128 aided when requested. The total test time for all the 3 tests were approx. 30 min.

129 **Data Collection and Statistical analysis**

130 All clinical data were stored in paper-based case report forms. Digital data from sNPT were saved
131 on a database in a cloud server (AWS) with the processing and readouts done offline. Statistical
132 analysis was performed on JASP (version 0.18.2). Outcome variables included pareidolia scores
133 (false-positives), missed responses (false-negatives) and correct responses (true-positives and true-

134 negatives) for pNPT and sNPT. To report significant differences between groups, the statistical
135 value was set to $p < 0.05$.

136 For 2-group comparison, Welch's t-test or Mann Whitney-U test were performed depending on
137 satisfactory assumptions of normality. For correlational analysis, Spearman's rho coefficient was
138 reported for continuous data, and Chi-squared tests for binary/categorical variables. Due to the
139 nature of NPT, pareidolia scores are almost always positively skewed distributions^{12,23}. Scores
140 were therefore log-transformed for Bland-Altman (BA) analysis to evaluate the agreement
141 between paper and digital methods²⁴. A mean bias line for BA plots were shown to identify
142 systematic difference between the measurement methods. Limits of Agreement (LOA) were set at
143 2 SD's of the mean difference²⁵ and confidence intervals reported for both mean bias line and
144 LOA's. A regression line (proportional bias) was plotted to ascertain whether the bias remained
145 consistent across the test.

146 Data analyzed in this study will be made available from the corresponding author upon reasonable
147 request. The paper version of NPT is available under an open license for research use. The software
148 code used for this work has dependencies on internal tooling and infrastructure, is under patent
149 protection (application number: JP2022-179766). The data are not publicly available due to
150 privacy or ethical restrictions.

151

152

153

154

155

156 Results

157 General overview

158 72 participants (11 healthy controls (HC) and 61 patients; 34F and 38M) were consecutively
159 enrolled. Their characteristics are summarized in Table-1. One AD and one DLB patient could not
160 complete the digital version (sNPT) of the test due to fatigue and were excluded from analysis.
161 One HC exceeded the cut-off for pareidolia score (=2).

162 **Table 1. Participant characteristics**

Demography	HC (N = 11)	AD (N = 29)	DLB (N = 25)	PD (N = 5)	Without pareidolia (AD + DLB + PD, N = 24)	With pareidolia (AD + DLB + PD, N= 35)
Age (years)	62.1 ± 9.5	73.4 ± 6.4	73.7 ± 5.5	66.6 ± 11.3	72.8 ± 6.2	73.1 ± 7.1
Sex (F:M)	3:8	18:11	6:19	1:4	12:13	14:22
First Symptom (years)	-	3.1 ± 1.6	3.8 ± 1.4	3.6 ± 1.7	3.7 ± 1.8	3.3 ± 1.4
Confirmed diagnosis (years)	-	1.9 ± 1.3	2.6 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.5	1.9 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.4
MMSE-J	29.1 ± 1.5	18.3 ± 5.2	20.4 ± 4.8	26.4 ± 4.4	21.8 ± 5.7	18.5 ± 4.8
History of hallucinations	-	0% (0 of 29)	84% (21 of 25)	40% (2 of 5)	24% (6 of 24)	51% (18 of 35)
Pareidolia score on NPT	-	4.3 ± 6.3	8.1 ± 10.3	6.4 ± 8.6	0 ± 0.2	10.2 ± 8.8

163

164 Table 1 Legend

165 HC = Healthy controls

166 AD = Alzheimer's disease

167 DLB = Dementia with Lewy body disease

168 PD = Parkinson's disease

169 MMSE-J = Mini mental state examination, Japanese version

170 NPT = Noise pareidolia test

171 All scores are presented as means \pm standard deviation.

172

173 Across patient groups [N=59, Aged= 73yr \pm 6.7, (Mean, SD)], at the time of our testing, the
174 duration of first appearance of symptoms was 3.5yrs \pm 1.5 and the duration of getting a definitive
175 clinical diagnosis using the diagnostic criteria was 2.3yrs \pm 1.4. Approx. 60% (35 of 59) of the
176 evaluated patients exhibited pareidolias on the pNPT, and around 51% of them had a history of
177 hallucination. The presence of pareidolia on pNPT showed a positive correlation to history of
178 hallucinations ($X^2(1, N=59) = 4.09, p = 0.043$).

179 Pareidolia scores correlated negatively with MMSE ($r = -0.37, p = 0.004$), but not to age ($r = 0.01,$
180 $p = 0.93$) or disease duration / first symptom ($r = 0.03, p = 0.80$). Patients with pareidolias had a 3-
181 point lower MMSE score compared to those without pareidolia ($U = 584.0, p = 0.011$, rank biserial
182 effect size = 0.39). In DLB patients, the pareidolia score exhibited significant correlations with
183 MMSE scores in comparison to AD (Supplementary figure -1).

184

185

186

187

188 **Paper vs Digital testing**

189 Figure-1A provides a summary of correlational measures for test outcomes between paper (pNPT)
190 and digital measurements (sNPT) for 70 participants (HC=11 and patients=59). Scores correlated
191 significantly for pareidolias, missed images and correct answers (true positive + true negatives)
192 variables.

193 BA plots (Figure-1B) indicated strong agreement between pNPT and sNPT, with the confidence
194 intervals (CI) falling within the mean bias line close to zero for all the 3 outcome variables.
195 Furthermore, over 95% of the values for all three variables were within the limits of agreement
196 (LOA) (Table-2).

197 For pareidolias, a positive trend was observed proportional to the magnitude of their scores, i.e. a
198 greater spread in the measurements between pNPT and sNPT for low and mid-range scores. High
199 pareidolia scores remained unaffected between the measurement modalities. Variability was also
200 consistent across the graph with the scatter around the bias line being fairly constant. Missed
201 responses generally did not show major trends and were similar between pNPT and sNPT. For
202 lower levels of correct responses, the agreement limits seem to widen, while the bias decreases
203 significantly for higher levels of correct responses, characterized by a dense scatter.

204

205

206

207

208

209 **Fig 1. Outcome measures of pareidolia test performed on paper versus smartphone.**

210 A. Shows a column of correlation plots for pareidolia, missed and correct responses between
211 the 2 modalities. Regression line is shown in solid gray, with confidence intervals (CI) in
212 dashed gray. Spearman's rho and p values are defined within the graphs.

213 B. Bland Altman plots column show the mean and difference of measurements in x and y axes
214 respectively following log transformation of raw data. Solid black line represents the mean
215 bias with dashed black lines representing the limits of agreement (LOA) (2SD's). Black
216 dotted depict CI's for the bias and LOA. Solid gray and dashed gray lines illustrate the
217 proportionality bias.

218

219 **Table-2. BA values for outcome variables.**

Responses	Bias (CI's)	Lower LOA	Upper LOA	BA statistic	p-value
Pareidolia	-0.03 (-0.09 to 0.02)	-0.52	0.45	t = -1.1, dF =69	0.30
Missed	-0.05 (-0.10 to 0.00)	-0.48	0.39	t = -1.8, dF =69	0.08
Correct	0.01 (-0.00 to 0.03)	-0.13	0.15	t = 1.1, dF =69	0.30

220

221 Intuitively, following BA analysis, we binned pareidolia-positive patients into 3 distributions, ≥ 2
222 and ≤ 4 , ≥ 5 and ≤ 10 , and ≥ 11 pareidolias with 11, 12 and 11 samples respectively. A visual
223 representation of this effect is shown in Figure-2 which demonstrates a tighter distribution for
224 sNPT compared to pNPT. Levene's test showed a significant difference of variances between
225 sNPT and pNPT groups for low and mid-range pareidolia scores.

226 **Fig 2. Distribution of pareidolia scores between paper (pNPT) and smartphone (sNPT)**

227 Fig 2. shows raincloud plots for pNPT and sNPT represented in green and orange respectively.
228 The differences between pNPT and sNPT scores across 3 distribution bins are described via means
229 and SD'S shown above the box plots. For ≤ 10 pareidolias on sNPT, the variances were much less
230 compared to pNPT. However, ANOVA tests did not achieve statistical significance for the binned
231 groups.

232

233 **Discussion**

234 We investigated whether pareidolic perception is altered in patients with neurodegenerative
235 diseases when tested across different-sized formats. We found that: (i) the visuo-perceptual
236 phenomenon of pareidolia is consistent across paper and digital modalities of testing, (ii) size
237 constancy is maintained across participant groups despite variations in image sizes, and (iii)
238 pareidolic misperceptions, to some extent, are stabilized on a digital format.

239 Prior studies have reported pareidolias to occur in up to 30% of individuals with AD^{4,5}, around
240 50% of those with PD^{8,9}, and up to 80% of individuals diagnosed with DLB⁶, establishing it as a
241 significant prognostic indicator for disease progression⁷. We noticed similar characteristics
242 among our group of patients, along with a considerable delay in confirming a definitive
243 diagnosis (around 14 months), and a connection between hallucinations and worsening cognitive
244 abilities in the presence of pareidolias.

245 In this study, our primary goal was to verify the potential utilization of digital pareidolia (sNPT)
246 testing and address any differences with paper-based methods (pNPT). Pareidolia quantification

247 on the NPT is an active search-and-detect paradigm requiring integration of both bottom-up
248 sensory input with a stronger top-down, knowledge-based modulation^{1,12}. Illusory responses to
249 the NPT may further manifest in several forms - of objects, of animals and so on - although a
250 greater attentional demand is required for preferential selection of faces. Furthermore, pareidolias
251 are highly context dependent and represent an endogenous bias in patients^{6,7}. With respect to these
252 mechanistic characteristics, we speculate that the brain employs a combination of perceptual and
253 cognitive mechanisms, including top-down processing, contextual cues, and size constancy, to
254 interpret and maintain consistency across different surfaces despite variations in image size or
255 distance. This "stable misperception", without any visual pathologies, might result from factors
256 other than perception itself. Such factors could include dysfunctional attentional control¹², a lack
257 of insight with abnormal inferences⁶, and suggestibility⁷, characteristic of AD and DLB
258 pathophysiology²⁶ which could be device agnostic (e.g. smartphones, monitors etc). Our former
259 studies incorporating NPT on a 20" monitor screen^{12,13} and the current experiment on 3"x3"
260 smartphone screens strengthens this assertion.

261 Another observation we made in the digital format was that the scores for pareidolia on the sNPT
262 showed a reduced dispersion compared to the pNPT, particularly noticeable for both low and mid-
263 range pareidolia scores in the sNPT. This effect could be attributed to several factors. Performance
264 differences have been reported in studies reviewing reading and comprehension paradigms
265 between display monitors and on paper, although the effects are inconclusive, and one may not be
266 better than the other^{27,28}. Reallocation of visual processing resources from perceptual to cognitive
267 domains (working memory, executive function) is suggested to affect performance in such
268 modalities²⁸. We speculate device-related changes in contrast sensitivity, resolution and brightness
269 may affect sensory inputs impacting visual processing pathways^{29,30}. Secondly, with respect to the

270 study design, sNPT was always performed after pNPT. It is likely that some form of adaptation in
271 terms of individual preferences (use of smartphone) and prior experience may have affected user
272 performance²³.

273 **Limitations**

274 Isolation of early levels of visual processing such as color vision, stereoacuity, contrast sensitivity
275 may not have been adequately characterized in this study. The severity of dementia among patients
276 were also not strictly controlled (MCI-level, moderate-level, and so on) as the patients were
277 consecutively enrolled. At the time of testing, most patients were on Donepezil and/or Levodopa
278 with a combination of other non-neurological medication. The effect of medication on visuo-
279 perception should be carefully studied in the future. As observed in our sample, quantification of
280 pareidolias alone do not have sufficient sensitivity to distinguish between different types of
281 neurodegenerative diseases⁵. Given the current findings, it may be pertinent to reevaluate
282 pareidolia cut-off scores that is specific for digital devices. We specifically evaluated a solitary
283 visuo-perceptual phenomenon and correlation with other functional neuropsychological testing
284 domains would be relevant. Within group differences (e.g. AD with and without pareidolias, etc.)
285 may be of significant interest but were not formally evaluated because of low sample sizes. It
286 would be justified to explore these aspects in future studies.

287 In conclusion, qualitative and quantitative differences of the NPT on different formats are minimal.
288 The results of this study may open a practical / simpler way of testing pareidolias on smartphone
289 format without compromising on the functionality of the test.

290

291

292 **Acknowledgements**

293 Our sincere thanks to the patients who participated in the study, to the Codemonk team for the
294 software development and maintenance of the app. Our thanks to Dr. Ryo Takahashi, Dr.
295 Manabu Sakaguchi, Dr. Junya Kobayashi, Dr. Seema Nachankar, Ms. Arya Revankar, Dr. Karen
296 Fortuna, Dr. Vinamrita Singh, Ms. Julia Hill, Ms. Atsuko Masuda, and Mr. Nityanand Vernekar
297 for their assistance with development in an earlier phase of the project.

298

299 **References**

- 300 1. Liu, J. *et al.* Seeing Jesus in toast: Neural and behavioral correlates of face pareidolia. *Cortex*
301 **53**, 60–77 (2014).
- 302 2. Salge, J. H., Pollmann, S. & Reeder, R. R. Anomalous visual experience is linked to
303 perceptual uncertainty and visual imagery vividness. *Psychol Res* **85**, 1848–1865 (2021).
- 304 3. Pavlova, M. A., Romagnano, V., Fallgatter, A. J. & Sokolov, A. N. Face pareidolia in the
305 brain: Impact of gender and orientation. *PLOS ONE* **15**, e0244516 (2020).
- 306 4. Linszen, M. M. J. *et al.* Understanding hallucinations in probable Alzheimer’s disease: Very
307 low prevalence rates in a tertiary memory clinic. *Alzheimer’s & Dementia: Diagnosis,*
308 *Assessment & Disease Monitoring* **10**, 358–362 (2018).
- 309 5. Hamilton, C. A. *et al.* Utility of the pareidolia test in mild cognitive impairment with Lewy
310 bodies and Alzheimer’s disease. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* **36**, 1407–1414 (2021).
- 311 6. Uchiyama, M. *et al.* Pareidolias: complex visual illusions in dementia with Lewy bodies.
312 *Brain* **135**, 2458–2469 (2012).

- 313 7. Yokoi, K. *et al.* Hallucinators find meaning in noises: pareidolic illusions in dementia with
314 Lewy bodies. *Neuropsychologia* **56**, 245–254 (2014).
- 315 8. Nishio, Y. *et al.* Deconstructing psychosis and misperception symptoms in Parkinson’s
316 disease. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry* **88**, 722–729 (2017).
- 317 9. O’Brien, J. *et al.* Visual hallucinations in neurological and ophthalmological disease:
318 pathophysiology and management. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry* **91**,
319 512–519 (2020).
- 320 10. Weil, R. S. *et al.* Visual dysfunction in Parkinson’s disease. *Brain* **139**, 2827–2843 (2016).
- 321 11. Mamiya, Y. *et al.* The Pareidolia Test: A Simple Neuropsychological Test Measuring Visual
322 Hallucination-Like Illusions. *PLoS ONE* **11**, e0154713 (2016).
- 323 12. Revankar, G. S. *et al.* Ocular fixations and presaccadic potentials to explain pareidolias in
324 Parkinson’s disease. *Brain Commun* **2**, fcaa073 (2020).
- 325 13. Revankar, G. *et al.* Pre-stimulus low-alpha frontal networks are associated with pareidolias
326 in Parkinson’s disease. *Brain Connectivity* (2021) doi:10.1089/brain.2020.0992.
- 327 14. Sedgwick, H. A. J. J. Gibson’s “Ground Theory of Space Perception”. *i-Perception* **12**,
328 20416695211021111 (2021).
- 329 15. Kaufman, L. *et al.* Perceptual distance and the constancy of size and stereoscopic depth. *Spat*
330 *Vis* **19**, 439–457 (2006).
- 331 16. Ffytche, D. H., Blom, J. D. & Catani, M. Disorders of visual perception. *Journal of*
332 *Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry* **81**, 1280–1287 (2010).
- 333 17. Kurylo, D. D., Corkin, S., Rizzo III, J. F. & Growdon, J. H. Greater relative impairment of
334 object recognition than of visuospatial abilities in Alzheimer’s disease. *Neuropsychology* **10**,
335 74–81 (1996).

- 336 18. Li, X., Rastogi, P., Gibbons, J. A. & Chaudhury, S. Visuo-cognitive skill deficits in
337 Alzheimer's disease and Lewy body disease: A comparative analysis. *Ann Indian Acad*
338 *Neurol* **17**, 12–18 (2014).
- 339 19. Jack Jr., C. R. *et al.* Introduction to the recommendations from the National Institute on
340 Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's
341 disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* **7**, 257–262 (2011).
- 342 20. McKeith, I. G. *et al.* Diagnosis and management of dementia with Lewy bodies: Fourth
343 consensus report of the DLB Consortium. *Neurology* **89**, 88–100 (2017).
- 344 21. Goetz, C. G. *et al.* Movement Disorder Society-sponsored revision of the Unified
345 Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS): Process, format, and clinimetric testing
346 plan. *Mov Disord* **22**, 41–47 (2007).
- 347 22. Ideno, Y., Takayama, M., Hayashi, K., Takagi, H. & Sugai, Y. Evaluation of a Japanese
348 version of the Mini-Mental State Examination in elderly persons. *Geriatrics & Gerontology*
349 *International* **12**, 310–316 (2012).
- 350 23. Watanabe, H. *et al.* Negative mood invites psychotic false perception in dementia. *PLoS One*
351 **13**, (2018).
- 352 24. Bland, J. M. & Altman, D. G. Measuring agreement in method comparison studies. *Stat*
353 *Methods Med Res* **8**, 135–160 (1999).
- 354 25. Giavarina, D. Understanding Bland Altman analysis. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)* **25**, 141–151
355 (2015).
- 356 26. Mori, E. *et al.* Visuo-perceptual impairment in dementia with Lewy bodies. *Arch Neurol* **57**,
357 489–493 (2000).

- 358 27. Wästlund, E., Reinikka, H., Norlander, T. & Archer, T. Effects of VDT and paper
359 presentation on consumption and production of information: Psychological and physiological
360 factors. *Computers in Human Behavior* **21**, 377–394 (2005).
- 361 28. Mayes, D. K., Sims, V. K. & Koonce, J. M. Comprehension and workload differences for
362 VDT and paper-based reading. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* **28**, 367–378
363 (2001).
- 364 29. Zhuang, X., Tran, T., Jin, D., Philip, R. & Wu, C. Aging effects on contrast sensitivity in
365 visual pathways: A pilot study on flicker adaptation. *PLOS ONE* **16**, e0261927 (2021).
- 366 30. Skeel, R. L., Schutte, C., van Voorst, W. & Nagra, A. The Relationship Between Visual
367 Contrast Sensitivity and Neuropsychological Performance in a Healthy Elderly Sample.
368 *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology* **28**, 696–705 (2006).

369

370

371 **Supporting information**

372 **S1 Fig. Correlation between pareidolia and MMSE scores for AD and DLB**

373

374 S1 Fig. shows data with regression line in solid black with CI's in solid gray, with Spearman's
375 correlation coefficient values within the graph. MMSE-J = Mini-mental state examination,
376 Japanese version. DLB patients had a strong negative correlation between Pareidolia and MMSE
377 scores contributing significantly to the patient group.

378

379 **Author contributions**

380 Conceptualization: GSR, MI, EM, HM

381 Methodology: GSR, TO, MS, HK, KF, YK, MH, MI, EM, HM, KN

382 Software: GSR, IO, CS, YK

383 Investigation: GSR, TO, MS, HK, KF, KK, KY, YY, IO, SI, CS, YN, DK, KA, NY, YK, MiS,

384 TH, TT, ST, YS, RI, YNa, MH, MI, EM.

385 Validation: GSR, TO, YK, YNa, MH, MI, EM, HM, KN

386 Formal analysis: GSR, EM

387 Resources: GSR, TO, MS, HK, KF, KK, KY, IO, YN, DK, YN, MH, MI, EM, HM, KN

388 Data Curation: GSR, TO

389 Writing - Original Draft: GSR

390 Writing - Review & Editing: TO, MS, HK, KF, KK, KY, YY, IO, SI, CS, YN, DK, KA, NY,

391 YK, MS, ST, YS, RI, YN, MH, MI, EM, HM, KN

392 Visualization: GSR, EM

393 Supervision: GSR, MI, EM, HM, KN

394 Project administration: GSR

395 Funding acquisition: GSR

396

397 **Conflict of Interest statement**

398 The authors have no conflict of interest to report.

399

400


401

402


A. Correlation plots

B. Bland-Altman plots

Pareidolia score




Pareidolia score




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.2402504>; this version posted February 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).


Missed responses



Missed responses



Correct responses



Correct responses






Figure-1

sNPT Pareidolia scores 2 to 4



sNPT Pareidolia scores 5 to 10



sNPT Pareidolia scores >11




Figure-2