## Decoupling conscious access from sensory processing with the attentional blink and retrospective cues

Jessye Clarke, Samuel Noorman\*, Claire Sergent Université Paris Cité, INCC UMR 8002, CNRS, F-75006 Paris, France \*Contact: sgnoorman@gmail.com

#### Introduction

- Previous studies have revealed a "retro-perception" phenomenon: cues presented several hundred milliseconds after target offset can drastically improve target detection (e.g., Sergent et al., 2013).
- This phenomenon suggests that conscious access mechanisms can be decoupled from sensory processing, which would allow us to cleanly compare the two (Sergent, 2018).
- Recently, Rimsky-Robert et al. (2024) studied the limits of retro-perception. When visually masked words were followed by a semantically related auditory word (the retro-cue), participants were better at reporting the masked word's identity (high-level feature), but unable to report its visual (low-level) features (e.g., upper vs. lower case).



• The attentional blink blocks consciousness at a late stage, leaving sensory processing intact (e.g., Vogel et al., 1998) In this pilot study, we are investigating whether after the attentional blink both high and low-level features can be perceived retrospectively.

### Methods

• N = 14

- Short T1-T2 SOAs cause the attentional blink
- Retro-perception: performance is greater after a congruent cue than an incongruent cue
- We are piloting multiple trial designs that differ in their low-level feature. Here, we show upper vs. lower case and dark vs. light.

# Distractors

## **Pilot results**

- The datasets from the two trial designs did not differ from each other and were therefore combined
- After the attentional blink, congruent retro-cues improved word identification, but not low-level feature discrimination



#### Trial design 1





∠ 'Dress
> (incon)



#### Discussion

- We expected to observe retro-perception of low-level visual features after the attentional blink. However, as after masking, the retro-cues only improved word identification.
- The visual similarity of the distractors to T2 might have interfered with lowlevel feature reactivation. Moreover, the cue might be too specific to word identification.
- However, we did observe retro-perception, so we will adapt this design to decouple and compare conscious access and sensory processing using magnetoencephalography.

#### References

- Rimsky-Robert, D., Lisi, M., Nguy, K., Jannin, R., Sergent, C. (2024). Consciously detecting and recognizing a past visual word after its sensory trace is gone. [Manuscript submitted for publication].
- Sergent, C. (2018). The offline stream of conscious representations. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 373(1755). https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0349
- Sergent, C., Wyart, V., Babo-Rebelo, M., Cohen, L., Naccache, L., & Tallon-Baudry, C. (2013). Cueing attention after the stimulus is gone can retrospectively trigger conscious perception. *Current Biology: CB*, 23(2), 150–155.
- Vogel, E. K., Luck, S. J., & Shapiro, K. L. (1998). Electrophysiological evidence for a postperceptual locus of suppression during the attentional blink. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Human Perception and Performance*, 24(6), 1656–1674.