

Università degli Studi di Padova

Padua Research Archive - Institutional Repository

Brain activity during facial processing in autism spectrum disorder: an activation likelihood estimation (ALE) meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available at: 11577/3405764 since: 2021-11-10T14:55:30Z

Publisher:

Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Published version:

DOI: 10.1111/jcpp.13412

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions applicable to Open Access Guidelines, as described at <http://www.unipd.it/download/file/fid/55401> (Italian only)

(Article begins on next page)

1 **Brain activity during facial processing in autism spectrum disorder: an activation likelihood**
2 **estimation (ALE) meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies**

3 Cristiano Costa¹, Ioana Alina Cristea², Elisa Dal Bò¹, Caterina Melloni, Claudio Gentili^{1*}

4

5 Cristiano Costa, BA Psych^{1§}: cristiano.costa@studenti.unipd.it

6 Ioana Alina Cristea, Ph.D^{2§}: ioana.alina.cristea@gmail.com

7 Elisa Dal Bò, MA Psych¹: elisa.dalbo2@gmail.com

8 Caterina Melloni, BA Psych¹: caterina.melloni@studenti.unipd.it

9 Claudio Gentili, MD, Ph.D^{1,3*}: c.gentili@unipd.it

10

11 1. Department of General Psychology, University of Padua, Italy

12 2. Department of Brain and Behavioral Sciences, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy

13 3. Padova Neuroscience Center (PNC), University of Padua, Padua, Italy

14

15 * Corresponding author:

16 Claudio Gentili, MD, Ph.D.

17 Department of General Psychology – University of Padova

18 Via Venezia 8, 35135, Padova Italy.

19 § These two authors contributed equally

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background:** Though aberrant face processing is a hallmark of autistic spectrum disorder (ASD),
26 findings on accompanying brain activity are divergent. Therefore, we conducted an activation
27 likelihood estimation (ALE) meta-analysis of studies examining brain activity during face
28 processing.

29 **Methods:** We searched PubMed and PsycINFO using combinations of terms as ‘fMRI’, ‘Autism
30 Spectrum Disorder’, ‘Face Perception’. Eligible studies reported on DSM-diagnosed ASD patients,
31 compared to controls (HC), using face stimuli presented in fMRI and reporting whole-brain analysis
32 coordinates. We compared two approaches: “convergence of differences” (primary analysis) using
33 study-level coordinates from ASD vs. HC contrasts, and “differences in convergence” (secondary)
34 pooling coordinates within each group separately, and contrasting the resultant ALE-maps.

35 **Results:** Thirty-five studies (655 ASD and 668 HC) were included. Primary analysis identified a
36 cluster in amygdala/parahippocampus where HC showed greater convergence of activation.
37 Secondary analysis yielded no significant results.

38 **Conclusions:** Results suggest that ASD dysfunction in face processing relies on structures involved
39 in emotional processing rather than perception. We also demonstrate that the two ALE
40 methodologies lead to divergent results.

41 **Key words: fmri, face perception, autism, ALE-Meta-analysis**

42

43

44 **1. INTRODUCTION**

45 Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) circumscribes a set of heterogeneous and lifelong
46 neurodevelopmental disorders, defined by deficits in social communication and social interaction,
47 and restricted, stereotyped and highly repetitive behaviours, interests or activities (*Diagnostic and*
48 *statistical manual of mental disorders* □: *DSM-5*, 2013).

49 Sensory deficits, already present in early developmental stages (Baranek et al., 2013), are
50 cardinal characteristics of ASD and strong predictors of social communication and social interaction
51 impairments (Turner-Brown et al., 2013), as well as of stereotyped and repetitive behaviour (Boyd
52 et al., 2010). Specifically, ASD individuals show substantial deficits in face perception (Grelotti et
53 al., 2002), owing to abnormal face processing strategies (Hobson et al., 1988), possibly caused by
54 perceptual abnormalities, such as a locally oriented rather than global visual analysis (Morin et al.,
55 2015), or more complex alterations of the social brain network (Pelphrey et al., 2014; Schultz et al.,
56 2003). Impaired face perception could also underpin social interaction difficulties (Bi and Fang,
57 2017). Several studies (Dawson et al., 2005; Harms et al., 2010; Hileman et al., 2011) suggested
58 that, compared to developmentally typical individuals, ASD patients show reduced accuracy and
59 longer reaction times for identity or expression recognition.

60 Face perception is a highly sophisticated process subtended by two systems: the ‘core
61 system’ and the ‘extended system’ (Haxby et al., 2000). The ‘core system’ is mainly related to visual
62 face processing. The ‘extended system’ includes non-visual areas extracting information from faces,
63 such as the amygdala, insula, other limbic structures implicated in the emotional response to faces
64 and other areas involved in autobiographic memory. Research on face perception in ASD suggested
65 alterations in both systems, though findings were often inconsistent (Baron-Cohen et al., 2000;
66 Robertson and Baron-Cohen, 2017). Abnormal brain activity in ASD individuals, specifically a
67 reduced neural response, was identified in regions related to social cognition and face processing,
68 such as the orbitofrontal cortex, superior temporal gyrus, amygdala (Baron-Cohen et al., 1999) and

69 fusiform gyrus (Deffke et al., 2007). Yet despite a wealth of neuroimaging studies on sensory
70 deficits in ASD, findings were inconsistent, revealing a multitude of abnormalities in early visual
71 (Robertson and Baron-Cohen, 2017) or face-perception related areas (Weigelt et al., 2012), as well
72 as in structures involved in emotional processing (Baron-Cohen et al., 2000).

73 Activation likelihood estimation (ALE) meta-analyses aim to summarize and identify
74 consistency across neuroimaging findings. Briefly, this method computes the agreement of
75 statistically significant foci across experiments in terms of probability distributions centered at the
76 each set of focus coordinates (Eickhoff et al., 2009). Though it can only quantify convergence
77 probabilities and not magnitude of activations, this method is particularly useful for fields with a
78 suite of diverse and often inconsistent findings such as mental disorders, as it can theoretically parse
79 out the most robust alterations in brain activity (Goodkind et al., 2015; Muller et al., 2017).

80 Two previous fMRI meta-analyses (Aoki et al., 2015; Nickl-Jockschat et al., 2015)
81 examined emotional face processing in autism: one reported ASD-related hyperactivation in
82 bilateral thalamus, caudate, and right precuneus, and ASD-related hypoactivation in the
83 hypothalamus (Aoki et al., 2015). While, the other a cluster in the left fusiform gyrus due to reduce
84 activations in ASD at single study level (Nickl-Jockschat et al., 2015). However, these meta-
85 analysis used a small number of studies (13), including those relying on ROI analysis, a practice
86 recently criticized (Eickhoff et al., 2016; Gentili et al., 2018; Müller et al., 2018).

87 Consequently, we conducted a systematic review and (ALE) meta-analysis of neuroimaging
88 studies of face-related stimuli in individuals with ASD, with the aim of highlighting the more
89 consistent neurobiological alterations. We also tested whether findings diverged depending on the
90 two possible ALE meta-analysis approaches (Müller et al., 2018) (i.e., “differences in convergence”
91 vs “convergence of differences”).

92

93

94 **2 METHODS**

95 **2.1 Study selection**

96 Eligible studies were identified by searching the National Library of Medicine/PubMed and
97 PsycINFO bibliographic databases from inception until 4th of July 2019. We used combinations of
98 database-specific terms as ‘fMRI’, ‘Autism’, ‘Face’, ‘Facial’, ‘Visual Attention’, ‘Visual
99 Processing’ ‘Fusiform Gyrus’ (figure 1 and Supplementary Material for the exact search string).
100 Eligible studies were: (1) neuroimaging studies using functional magnetic resonance imaging
101 (fMRI) in (2) participants of any age diagnosed with ASD according to DSM IV, IV-TR or 5,
102 including comorbid disorders, (3) compared to a matched healthy control group (HC), (4) in a task
103 employing faces or face parts (5) within the same experimental paradigm for both ASD and HC, (6)
104 and conducting a direct univariate comparison of brain activation between ASD and HC (i.e., $HC >$
105 ASD and/or $ASD > HC$), (7) for which 3D coordinates of peak activations in stereotactic space of
106 the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) or Talairach were reported, (8) employing whole brain
107 and not just to Region of Interest (ROI) analysis. Patients could be undergoing any kind of therapy
108 (e.g., psychological, pharmacological). Reviews and meta-analyses were excluded. Two authors
109 (CM, CG) independently screened and selected studies.

110

111 **2.2 Data extraction**

112 From each paper the following information as extracted: (1) participant gender and mean
113 age; (2) diagnosis; (3) comorbidity; (4) concurrent treatments; (5) type of task and stimuli; (6) brain
114 activation coordinates for the direct comparison between ASD and HC; (7) where available,
115 activation coordinates within each single group (ASD and HC). Data were extracted independently
116 by two researchers (CC, CM).

117

118 **2.3 Study Quality**

119 The quality and Risk of Bias (RoB) of included studies were evaluated with a modified
120 version of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale (NOS)(Wells, 2001), (mNOS), adapted to fMRI data (Gentili
121 et al., 2018). This version uses a different set of items adapted to fMRI studies (e.g., use of
122 appropriate statistical corrections). Scores on the mNOS range from 0 to 11, with 0 to 3 considered
123 indicative of high risk, 4 to 7 as intermediate and 8 to 11 as low risk. RoB was independently
124 assessed by two researchers (CM, EDB). Inter-rater agreement was measured with the Kappa
125 statistic, and disagreements were subsequently resolved by discussion with a third author (CG).

126

127 **2.3 ALE meta-analysis**

128 Stereotactic coordinates (x, y, z) were extracted from the studies, to be used in the
129 Activation Likelihood Estimation (ALE) Meta-Analysis. The ALE algorithm was used as
130 implemented in the GingerALE 2.3.6 software (Eickhoff et al., 2009). We used the correction for
131 multiple comparisons derived from the same dataset implemented in GingerALE (Turkeltaub et al.,
132 2012). Sample size for each foci experiment has been used to calculate the Full-Width
133 Half-Maximum (FWHM) of the Gaussian function used to blur the foci. Coordinates in the MNI
134 152 standard space were converted into the Talairach space using the GingerALE foci converter
135 tool.

136 Two approaches can be employed in an ALE meta-analysis of two groups. The first
137 (“convergence of activation differences”) uses coordinates from the contrast ‘patients vs. controls’
138 (i.e., patients > controls and controls > patients). The second (“differences in convergence”) pools
139 the activation reported within each group separately, and subsequently computes a contrast between
140 the resultant ALE-maps. The two approaches have never been compared directly on the same data.

141 We used convergence of activation differences as the primary analysis because it used data
142 from all included studies. We computed two independent meta-analysis (one for HC > ASD and the
143 other for ASD > HC). Statistical significance was assessed and corrected for multiple comparisons

144 using the cluster-wise method embedded in GingerALE: $p < 0.001$ cluster forming threshold, $p <$
145 0.01 cluster corrected FWE and $N = 2,000$ permutations.

146 To check the robustness of the findings, we also performed two sensitivity analyses. The
147 first was a pooled analysis across ASD>HC and HC>ASD. This analysis might reflect a better
148 summary of group differences as differences between analysis approaches and control conditions
149 between single studies may have influenced the direction of group differences. Given the
150 heterogeneity of tasks employed, we performed a second analysis limited to studies using solely
151 face perception as task (see supplementary methods).

152 For the secondary analysis (differences in convergence), we computed a meta-analysis for
153 activations of controls and ASD separately and contrasted them in a meta-analysis. For the single
154 group meta-analysis, we used the same parameters described above, while to compute the
155 differences of convergence, we used an uncorrected p value < 0.001 , $N=10000$ permutations and a
156 cluster threshold of 100 mm^3 . Gaussian smoothing for each meta-analysis was independently
157 calculated by the software (Eickhoff et al., 2009).

158 This secondary analysis was restricted to studies that reported single group results, which
159 were only a share of the entire pool. Therefore, differences between the primary and secondary
160 analysis could be due to the different number of included studies and not to genuine divergences
161 between the methods. To account for this possibility, we also conducted sensitivity analyses, in
162 which the primary method (convergence of differences) was limited to the studies reporting the
163 single group activations (Figure 1 and Supplementary Methods). To maintain consistency with the
164 main analysis, we excluded one study (Zürcher et al., 2013) in which the contrast used in the single
165 group analysis was different from that used in the convergence of difference. For each study we
166 included coordinates for single groups analysis for the same contrasts used in the convergence of
167 differences analysis or, if there was no such overlap, the most similar contrast (e.g. faces vs.
168 baseline used in single group analysis and faces vs. objects and houses used in HC vs ASD
169 analysis).

170 Finally, as post-hoc analysis, we examined whether results obtained with each of the two
171 meta-analysis methods were also mirrored by the single studies. Specifically, for each included
172 study, we checked whether (1) activation was reported in a cluster or region overlapping the one
173 resulting from the meta-analysis and (2) if activation was present, whether it was discussed in the
174 paper.

175

176

177

178 **3 RESULTS**

179 **3.1 Study selection**

180 The search produced 1109 entries (900 after removal of duplicates), 755 of which were
181 excluded based on the abstract, i.e., failing to specify the method for diagnosing ASD or
182 inadequately describing imaging methods. The remaining 146 were retrieved and full-texts were
183 assessed. A total of 111 articles were excluded due to (1) lack of direct univariate comparison
184 between ASD and HC (n=18), or comparison restricted to functional connectivity analysis (n=5) or
185 no significant results for the comparison (n=1); (2) lack of reporting of coordinates for contrasts
186 (n=6) or ROI only reported (n=44); and (3) re-analyses of previous, already included, studies (n=2);
187 (4) lack of face stimuli in the task (n=22); (5) lack of fMRI use (n=4); (6) lack of ASD individual
188 (e.g. use of autistic trait in HC) (n=9). A total of 35 articles (describing 36 experiments) were
189 included in the meta-analysis, as described in the PRISMA flow diagram (figure 1).

190

191 **3.2 Characteristics of included studies (Table 1, Table S1, Supplementary Results)**

192 The 36 experiments included 1323 subjects (655 ASD and 668 HC). All studies performed
193 whole-brain analyses: 17 reported both contrasts HC > ASD and ASD > HC, 15 the HC > ASD
194 contrast only, whereas three the ASD > HC contrast only. Twenty-one studies also reported single
195 group analyses (figure 1). Due to the limited number of studies including participants with
196 comorbidities or concomitant medication and to the reduced number of patients with these
197 characteristics within these studies, we could not conduct further sensitivity analyses
198 (Supplementary materials).

199

200 **3.2 Study quality (Supplementary Results, Figure S1, Table S2)**

201 The overall Cohen kappa (Mean \pm SD) was 0.88 ± 0.12 ranging from 1 to 0.63. Consensus and
202 Cohen kappa for each item of the mNOS were reported in Table S2 and Figure S1. The lower

203 agreement was for definition (0.63) and selection (0.69) of controls. Three studies were considered
204 as low RoB, twenty-nine as intermediate risk, and three as high risk of bias. A detailed description
205 of the quality of each study is presented in the supplementary results.

206

207 **3.3 Primary analysis: convergence of differences**

208 For the voxel-wise whole-brain analysis all the 36 experiments were considered. For the HC
209 > ASD meta-analysis we included 32 experiments and the simulation obtained a minimum cluster
210 size was 920 mm³ while for the ASD > HC meta-analysis we included 20 experiments and a cluster
211 size of 688 mm³. We identified a single significant cluster in which the difference for the contrast
212 HC > ASD showed a significant convergence. The cluster mainly belonged to left amygdala
213 (64.4%) extending to the parahippocampus (Table 2, Figure 2). Post-hoc analysis revealed that
214 twelve studies reported amygdala activation for the contrast HC vs. ASD, comprising of a left-
215 lateralized cluster in 6 and a bilateral cluster in 5, while only one paper reported a right-lateralized
216 cluster.). Only one paper discussed the possible meaning of lateralization (Critchley et al., 2000).

217

218 **3.4 Secondary analysis: difference in convergences**

219 A total of 21 experiments reported coordinates for single group analyses although two were
220 excluded leading to 19 studies included in this analysis (19 for HC and 16 for ASD) (see
221 Supplementary Methods and table S3). Results for the meta-analysis within each group are reported
222 in the Supplement (Table S4, Figure S2). No significant clusters were identified for either (HC >
223 ASD, ASD > HC) contrast.

224

225 **3.5. Sensitivity analyses for the primary analysis**

226 **3.5.1. 'Pure' face perception**

227 The results were significant in the right amygdala for the HC > ASD (21 experiments)
228 (Table S5 and Figure S3). For the ASD > HC meta-analysis (11 experiments) we did not find
229 significant results.

230

231 **3.5.2. Pooled analysis**

232 The pooled analysis found a convergence of differences in the two amygdalae (table S6 and
233 Figure S4)

234

235 **3.6. Sensitivity analyses for the secondary analysis**

236 No significant cluster was evidenced for the ASD > HC meta-analysis (11 studies) using the
237 same threshold of primary analysis. However, with a more liberal threshold ($p < 0.01$ uncorrected)
238 we found a significant cluster of convergence in a cluster including in the left amygdala and
239 parahippocampus, largely overlapping with that in the primary analysis. (Table S7, Figure S5). The
240 HC > ASD meta-analysis (18 experiments) did not yield significant results.

241

242 **4 DISCUSSION**

243 **4.1 ALE meta-analysis results**

244 In this voxel-wise whole-brain ALE meta-analysis, we did not uncover differences in
245 convergence in the “core system” for face perception, particularly the fusiform gyrus, contradicting
246 previous single studies (e.g.(Deffke et al., 2007)). However, our findings support a crucial role for
247 the “extended system”, confirmed the involvement of limbic and subcortical structures, such as the
248 amygdala and parahippocampal gyrus. Specifically, in the primary analysis including all studies
249 reporting direct comparisons between HC and ASD, we found differences in convergence in the left
250 amygdala extended to the parahippocampal gyrus. Findings were supported in the pooled analysis,
251 which revealed a bilateral amygdala cluster. Another sensitivity analysis limited to ‘pure’ face
252 perception tasks also highlighted the altered activity of the amygdala, although with a different
253 location (contralateral – right – amygdala). Examination of single studies indicated this difference
254 was related to a higher activation of these regions in controls versus ASD patients, during visual
255 processing of face stimuli.

256 The amygdala is crucial for emotional processing. Its abnormal activity may contribute to
257 impairments in social interactions, face and emotional recognition (Donovan and Basson, 2017).
258 Both structural and functional amygdala alterations were often reported in ASD patients (Donovan
259 and Basson, 2017; Kemper and Bauman, 1993). For instance, adults with ASD showed no
260 amygdala activation during the ‘*Judging the Mind in the Eyes*’ task, whereas healthy participants
261 showed activation of the left amygdala (Baron-Cohen et al., 1999). In an in-depth examination of
262 the included studies, we discovered that one third reported a unilateral amygdala activation, which
263 was left localized in eight studies, and right localized in four. However, only one study included a
264 discussion of lateralization (Baron-Cohen et al., 1999) (Table S8). Differences in convergence in
265 the left amygdala lends further support to the oft-cited notion that the two amygdalae underpin
266 different functions (Gainotti, 2018; Gläscher and Adolphs, 2003; Zalla et al., 2000), with the left
267 involved in more “cold” cognitive and detailed processing of emotions (Dyck et al., 2011; Gainotti,

268 2018; Gläscher and Adolphs, 2003). As we included all studies involving faces as stimuli regardless
269 of the task, our findings offer additional evidence for the specific involvement of the left amygdala
270 in the ability of inferring mental state from complex visual stimuli (e.g., eyes region), frequently
271 impaired in ASD (Baron-Cohen et al., 1999; Ketter et al., 1996).

272 Our data fails to replicate the results of two previous meta-analysis (Aoki et al., 2015; Nickl-
273 Jockschat et al., 2015) which found ASD-related hyperactivation in thalamus, caudate, and
274 precuneus, and ASD-related hypoactivation in the hypothalamus (Aoki et al., 2015) in one case and
275 a ASD-related hypoactivation in the fusiform gyrus in the other (Nickl-Jockschat et al., 2015). We
276 believe that the small number of studies included and the different inclusion criteria (e.g. using
277 ROIs) account for most of the differences.

278

279 **4.2 “Convergence of differences” OR “differences in convergence”?**

280 From a methodological standpoint, we report on the first, to our knowledge, comparison
281 within the same dataset of the two current ALE meta-analysis approaches: convergence of
282 differences, which combines study-level activations for the contrast of ASD and HC, and,
283 respectively, differences in convergence, which combines study-level activations within each group
284 to compute two separate meta-analyses, one for ASD and one for HC, and subsequently contrasts
285 these single group results (Müller et al., 2018). Such meta-analytic contrast highlighted the
286 locations where in one group stronger convergence is found compared to the other.

287 We demonstrate that the two approaches yield highly divergent results. The first resulted
288 into a significant cluster of convergence of differences in the left amygdala, whereas the second
289 yielded no differences between groups. However, the second approach was limited to studies that
290 reported results within single groups and consequently relied on fewer studies. To test for the
291 possibility that divergences between the two methods would be explained by differences in the
292 number of included studies, we conducted a sensitivity analysis applying the first method to the
293 pool of studies used in the second. To test for the possibility that divergences between the two

294 methods would be explained by differences in the number of included studies, we conducted a
295 sensitivity analysis applying the first method to the pool of studies used in the second: a single
296 cluster was evidenced, consistent with the primary findings.

297 Despite the limitation of this analysis (lower threshold and small number of experiments
298 included – 11), it is unlikely that the divergent findings yielded by the two methods can be
299 attributed to variations in the number of included studies. Rather, the discrepancy is probably
300 grounded within the structure of ALE meta-analysis, which combines activations reported as
301 significant within each study into a measure of convergence, i.e. declaring higher convergence if
302 more studies reported activations in the same area. Unavoidably, the method draws heavily on the
303 data analysis approach employed in each single study. For instance, a study with a more lenient or
304 even inappropriate correction for the statistical threshold of activation will still contribute to
305 convergence results. This problem is likely enhanced in meta-analyses examining convergence of
306 single group activations (i.e., the 2nd method) rather convergence of reported differences in
307 activation. For instance, assuming an fMRI study uses 20 patients and 20 matched controls
308 performing the same task, comparisons in brain activation between the two groups rely on more
309 participants and therefore have more power than the examination of task-related activations within
310 each group.

311 Moreover, examining convergence resulting from activations within single groups (e.g.,
312 patients or controls) rather than convergence resulting from contrasts between groups might obscure
313 important differences, as well as elevate marginal ones. For instance, using the differences in
314 convergence approach, we found no differences in the activation of the amygdala between ASD and
315 controls, despite the fact one third of the studies reported significant activation for this contrast.
316 This result is probably explained by the fact that the amygdala was activated, albeit differentially in
317 the two groups resulting in a significant convergence within both ASD and HC. While difference in
318 magnitude of activations are significant at a single experiment level in many cases, difference of
319 convergence may not be significant.

320

321 **4.3 Limitations and conclusions**

322 One important limitation regards a considerable number of studies (n=73) that were
323 excluded for not reporting between groups contrasts for the face perception task (n=18), performing
324 only a comparison of functional connectivity (n=5), not providing brain activation coordinates for a
325 contrast (n= 6), or reporting only ROI analyses (n=44). Since studies were not prospectively
326 registered, the decision to not report or selectively report contrast data might have hinged on
327 statistical significance, with negative or inconsistent findings suppressed. Although the final
328 number of included studies are enough, some sensitivity analysis (e.g. those with less than 13
329 studies) is underpowered and needs to be considered as preliminary (Eickhoff et al., 2016).
330 Furthermore, though all included studies used faces, tasks were heterogeneous and differences
331 among them could account for the few significant findings reported in this meta-analysis. This is an
332 unavoidable limitation of the ALE approach, which aims to highlight the commonalities across
333 studies. However, given the limited number of experiments using ASD patients and faces, stricter
334 inclusion criteria would have resulted into a restricted pool of studies and considerably reduced the
335 power to reliably detect any differences. Another limit related to ALE approach as to every
336 coordinate based meta-analysis is the risk of information lost as compared to maps meta-analysis
337 (Salimi-Khorshidi et al., 2009): more differences between ASD and HC could be found in the
338 original spatial maps and lost using this technique. However, coordinate-based meta-analysis
339 represents a good trade-off given the relatively low amount of available original data. Finally, lack
340 of pre-registration of the present meta-analysis is an important limitation.

341 Using ALE meta-analysis, we found support for a key role of amygdala dysfunctions in
342 underpinning face processing in patients with autism spectrum disorders. Our findings would
343 suggest that the core alteration of ASD relies on brain structures involved in emotional processing
344 rather than perception, particularly since we did not report any significant differences in the core
345 face perception system. Combining participant-level unthresholded maps from all eligible studies

346 could offer a more definitive answer on brain activity alterations in ASD patients. Furthermore, we
347 demonstrate that the two current ALE meta-analysis approaches can lead to highly divergent results.
348 Neither represents a meta-analysis in a strict sense (Müller et al., 2018), since essential features
349 such weighting of included studies or quantification of heterogeneity are absent (Higgins and
350 Green, 2011) from the ALE methodology- or indeed any neuroimaging meta-analysis. Hence, both
351 methods should be viewed as tools for descriptively summarizing neuroimaging literature.
352 Crucially, only statistically significant results are combined in an ALE meta-analysis, leading to an
353 unavoidably biased summary of the literature. These limitations notwithstanding, the approach
354 based on the convergence of differences appears to mirror single study findings more closely and is
355 thus probably better suited for summarizing available data. The more complex question as to
356 whether either method describes ‘real’ rather than spurious differences in brain activity remains
357 open.
358

359 Figure legends:

360 Figure 1: Prisma flow-chart illustrating the selection process of the present meta-analysis

361 Figure 2: Significant results for the HC > ASD contrast of interest ($p < 0.01$ corrected). Amy:

362 amygdala. ALE p-value: Activation likelihood estimation probability

363

364

365 **Author Contributions:** Dr Gentili had full access to all the data in the study and takes
366 responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

367 *Study concept and design:* Gentili, Cristea

368 *Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data:* Costa, Dal Bò, Melloni, Gentili

369 *Statistical analysis:* Gentili, Costa, Melloni, Dal Bò

370 *Study supervision:* Gentili

371 *Manuscript Draft:* Costa, Gentili, Cristea

372 *Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content:* Gentili, Cristea

373 *Review of the final version of the manuscript:* all

374

375

376 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** None reported.

377 **Funder/Sponsor:** None reported.

378

379

380 **Table 1.** Characteristics of the studies included in the meta-analysis

Study	Autism spectrum disorder						Healthy controls			Task & stimuli ⁵	Type of face (Database) ⁶
	N	M/F	Age (SD) ¹	Diagnosis ²	Comorbidity ³	Medication ⁴	N	M/F	Age (SD) ¹		
Baron-Cohen 1999	6	4/2	26.3 (2.1)	ASD	?	?	12	6/6	25.5 (2.8)	Mental state & gender identification	NS (NS)
Bolte 2015	32	30/2	19.3 (range 14-33)	ASD (10 Au, 14 Asp, 8 PDD-NOS)	-	1 AAP	25	4/21	19.7 (range 14-27)	Face affect recogn	N,H,D,F,Su,S,A (KFDE)
Brandenburg-Goddard 2014	17	17/0	12.41 (1.94)	ASD	?	?	19	19/0	12.03 (2.36)	Face match & em label	NS (KFDE)
Ciaramidaro 2018	33	31/2	18.76 (4.98)	ASD (10 Au, 15 Asp, 8 PDD-NOS)	?	?	25	21/4	19.68 (3.45)	Em recogn	A,F (KFDE)
Corbett 2009	12	0/12	9.01 (1.60)	HFA	-	?	15	13/2	9.17 (1.44)	Face em & identity match	N,H,S,A,Af (NimStim)
Critchley 2000	9	9/0	37 (7)	HFA (2 Au, 7 Asp)	-	?	9	9/0	27 (7)	Gender & em discrim	N,H,A (E&F)
Dalton 2005 St 1	14	14/0	15.9 (4.71)	Au (1 non-vb; 2 min vb)	?	?	17	17/0	17.1 (2.78)	Em recogn	N,H,F,A (KFDE)
Dalton 2005 St 2	16	16/0	14.5 (4.60)	Au (2 min vb)	?	?	16	16/0	14.5 (4.56)	Face recogn	Fam & unfam (ad hoc)
Dapretto 2013	10	9/1	12.05 (2.50)	ASD	?	?	10	9/1	12.38 (2.22)	Observe/imitate em express	N,H,S,F,A (NS)
Davies 2011	16	14/2	11.69 (2.71)	ASD	?	?	16	14/2	12.30 (1.88)	Passive view (direct/averted gaze)	N,H,A,F [§] (NimStim)
Deeley 2007	9	9/0	34 (10)	Asp	-	-	9	9/0	27 (5)	Gender discrim	N,H,S,D,F (FEEST)
Doyle-Thomas 2013	18	18/0	14.94 (1.55)	ASD	5 ADHD, 1 CAPD, 1 VLPD, 1 Enc	5 MNS	16	16/0	14.69 (1.70)	Em match	N,H,S,A (NimStim, E&F)
Duerden 2013	19	14/5	26.8 (5.7)	ASD	-	-	20	15/5	33.7 (9.6)	Faces Go/NoGo	H,S (NimStim)
Greimel 2012	13	13/0	15.9 (3.0)	ASD (7 Asp, 5 HFA, 1AtA)	1 ADHD, 1 CTD	1 AAP	13	13/0	14.2 (2.8)	Recall Memory task	N (FEBA)
Griemel 2010	15	15/0	15 (1.4)	ASD	-	1 AAP, 1 TAP, 2 Ato	15	15/0	14.9 (1.6)	Infer em state & empathize	N,H,S (ad-hoc)
Hadjikhani 2014	36	33/3	23.5 (8.7)	ASD	?	?	31	28/3	22.5 (7.5)	Passive view (video)	N, P (ad-hoc)
Herrington 2015	12	12/0	13.4 (4.2)	ASD	?	?	19	19/0	13.4 (3.5)	1-back (faces & houses)	H (Endl 1998)

bioRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.074351>; this version posted May 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under aCC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Holt 2014	49	33/16	M: 14.66 (1.6) F: 14.45 (1.95)	ASD/HFA	-	-	40	20/20	M: 15.27 (1.62) F: 14.85 (1.66)	'Reading the Mind in the Eyes'	'Reading the Mind in the Eyes' set
Ishitobi 2011	9	8/1	23.2 (6.9)	ASD	?	?	24	12/12	23.1 (4.4)	Em valence discrim	H,D,S,A (ad-hoc)
Kim 2015	17	16/1	10.89 (2.06)	ASD	-	7 Met, 1 Ato, 1 Met and Val	24	17/7	10.18 (2.04)	Passive view (attention to gender)	N,H,F (IAPS)
Klapwijk 2016	23	23/0	17.0 (1.2)	ASD (3 Au, 11 Asp, 9 PDD-NOS)	4 ADHD, 2 Dys, 1 MDD	3 AAT, 3 PS, 3 SSRI, 3 MM	33	33/0	17.1 (1.2)	Em recogn or judge own em	N,A,F (RFD)
Koshino 2008	10	10/0	24.5 (10.2)	ASD	?	4 Tgr, Alb, Fluv, Bec ^o	10	10/1	28.7 (10.9)	N-back	NS (RMT)
Lassalle 2017	27	27/0	23.63 ± 9.86	ASD	?	?	21	21/0	19.70 (7.74)	Passive view	N,H,F,A (NimStim)
Loveland 2008	5	4/1	219 (15.9) mths	ASD	-	?	4	3/1	212 (13.7) (mths)	Em congr	H,F,A,D,S,Su (E&F)
Morita 2012	15	14/1	23.7 ± 4.3	ASD (15 Au, 5 Asp)	?	?	15	13/2	23.3 (3.6)	Rating face fotogenicity (self & others)	NS (NS)
Perlman 2011	12	11/1	25.5±7.47	ASD	?	?	7	7/0	28.57 (5.74)	Passive view	F (NimStim)
Rahko 2012	25	17/8	14.8±1.6	ASD	-	-	27	18/9	14.5±1.5	Passive view	H,F (TKK)
Sabatino 2013	15	13/2	26.3±9.4	ASD (2 Asp 13 HFA)	?	?	17	12/5	24.3 (3.7)	Odd-ball target detect	N (NimStim)
Scherf 2015	20	20/0	14.1±2.23*	HFA	?	?	12	12/0	13.8±2.40*	Image repetition detect	NS (NimStim, KFDE)
Shafritz 2015	20	17/3	18.1	HFA (14 Au, 6 Asp)	-	3 SSRI, 1 Alp, 1 Ven, 2 Arip, 1 Clom, 1 Lith, 1 Gua	18	15/3	18.4	Faces Go/NoGo	N,H,F (E&F)
Stanfield 2017	28	22/6	39.5 ± 11.6	Au/Asp	-	2 AP	33	23/10	36.5 (9.3)	Social judge & gender discrim	H,F,A,D,S,Su (E&F)
Velasquez 2017	19	13/6	25.84 ± 4.39	ASD	?	?	22	16/6	29.03 (9.40)	Faces Go/NoGo	H,S (NimStim)
Weng 2012	22	17/5	14.36 ± 1.70	ASD (6 Au, 3 Asp, 13 PDD-NOS)	?	12 PTM ^{oo}	20	19/1	14.97 (1.95)	Gender discrim	N,H,S,F (NimStim)
Whyte 2016	14	13/1	15 (2)	HFA	?	NS ^{ooo}	14	13/1	15 (2)	N-Back with human & animal faces	N,H,F (NimStim, oth [#])
Zurcher 2013a	22	19/3	27.6 (7.7)	ASD	?	?	22	19/3	23.7 (5.9)	Passive view (diff gazes)	F (NimStim)
Zurcher 2013b	16	13/3	23.5 (6.8)	ASD (7 Au, 7 Asp, 2 PDD-NOS)	?	?	18	16/2	25.8 (5.3)	Thatcher illusion	NS (SFD)

381 Note.

382 ¹ Age in years unless otherwise specified. Mths, months

383 ² ASD, Autism Spectrum Disorder; Au, Autism Disorder; Asp, Asperger Syndrome; HFA, High Functioning Autism; AtA, Atypical Autism; Non-vb, Non-verbal; PDD-NOS,
384 Pervasive Developmental Disorder, Not Otherwise Specified; Vb, Verbal

385 *standard deviation was calculated: in the paper the ages of each participant were presented

386 ³?, comorbidity was not declared; -, comorbidity was an exclusion criteria; ADHD, Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder; CAPD, Central Auditory Processing Disorder;
387 VPLD, Visual Perceptual Learning Disorder; Enc, Encopresis, CTD, Chronic Tic Disorder; Dys, Dysthymia; MDD, Major Depressive Disorder

388 ⁴?, the medication status of the subjects was not described; - ongoing medication was an exclusion criteria AAP, Atypical AntiPsychotic; MNS, Medication type not specified;

389 TAP, Typical AntiPsychotic; Ato, Atomoxetine; Met, Methylphenidate; Val, Valporate; PS, Psychostimulant; SSRI, Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitor; MM: Multiple

390 Medication; Tgr, Tegretol; Alb, Abluterol; Fluv, Fluvoxamine, Bec, Beclometasone; Alp, Alprazolam; Ven, Venlafaxine; Arip, Aripiprazole; Clom, Clomipramine; Lith,

391 Lithium; Gua, Guanfacine; AP, AntiPsychotic; PTM, psychotropic medication; NS Not Specified

392 ° Four subjects were under the specified medications but is not specified whether each subject was tacking only one drug

393 °° Twelve subjects were under medication with a not specified combination of the following (2 SSRI, 10 medication for ADHD, 4 AAP, 1 anxiolytic medication)

394 °°° In the paper was only stated that "... participants were not asked to withhold medication prior to testing"

395 ⁵ Congr, congruence; Detect, Detection; Diff, Different Discrim, Discrimination; Em, Emotion(al) ; Express, Expression; Fam, Familiar; Judge, Judgement; Label, Labelling;

396 Match, Matching; Non-fam, Non-familiar; Recogn, Recognition

397 ⁶N: Neutral; H: Happy; S: Sad; F: Fearful; Su: Surprised; D: Disgusted; P: painful; A: Angry; Af: afraid; NS: Not Specified; E&F: Ekman and Friesen face dataset; KFDE:

398 Karolinska Directed Emotional Faces; FEEST: Facial expressions of emotion: stimuli and tests; FEBA: Facial Emotions for Brain Activation; IAPS: International Affective Picture

399 System; Oth, Othes; RFD: Radboud Faces Database; RMT: Recognition Memory Test; TKK: Helsinki University of Technology video sequence collection.

400 [§] Only negative faces were used

401 [#]Langer 2010; Thomaz & Giraldi, 2010; pics.stir.ac.uk

402

403 **Table 2.** Significant clusters for the comparison between autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and healthy controls (HC) using the primary analysis
 404 convergence of difference method ($p < 0.01$ corrected).

405
 406

Contrast	Hemi- sphere	Region	BA	Center of mass			Peak			Peak ALE p value	Volume (mm ³)
				x	y	z	x	y	z		
HC > ASD											
	L	Amygdala		-25.3	-1.4	-12.1	-28	-4	-10	0.021	1112
	L	PHG	34				-24	0	-14	0.020	

407

408 *Note.* ASD: Autism Spectrum Disorder; HC: Healthy controls; L: left; R: right; PHG: Parahippocampal Gyrus

409

410

411

412 **References:**

- 413 Aoki, Y., Cortese, S., Tansella, M., 2015. Neural bases of atypical emotional face processing in autism: A
414 meta-analysis of fMRI studies. *World J. Biol. Psychiatry Off. J. World Fed. Soc. Biol. Psychiatry*
415 16, 291–300. <https://doi.org/10.3109/15622975.2014.957719>
- 416 Baranek, G.T., Watson, L.R., Boyd, B.A., Poe, M.D., David, F.J., McGuire, L., 2013. Hyporesponsiveness to
417 social and nonsocial sensory stimuli in children with autism, children with developmental delays,
418 and typically developing children. *Dev. Psychopathol.* 25, 307–320.
419 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579412001071>
- 420 Baron-Cohen, S., Ring, H.A., Bullmore, E.T., Wheelwright, S., Ashwin, C., Williams, S.C., 2000. The
421 amygdala theory of autism. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 24, 355–364.
- 422 Baron-Cohen, S., Ring, H.A., Wheelwright, S., Bullmore, E.T., Brammer, M.J., Simmons, A., Williams,
423 S.C.R., 1999. Social intelligence in the normal and autistic brain: an fMRI study: *Social intelligence*
424 *in the normal and autistic brain*. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 11, 1891–1898. [https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1460-](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1460-9568.1999.00621.x)
425 [9568.1999.00621.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1460-9568.1999.00621.x)
- 426 Bi, T., Fang, F., 2017. Impaired Face Perception in Individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder: Insights on
427 Diagnosis and Treatment. *Neurosci. Bull.* 33, 757–759. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12264-017-0187-1>
- 428 Boyd, B.A., Baranek, G.T., Sideris, J., Poe, M.D., Watson, L.R., Patten, E., Miller, H., 2010. Sensory
429 features and repetitive behaviors in children with autism and developmental delays. *Autism Res.* n/a-
430 n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aur.124>
- 431 Critchley, H.D., Daly, E.M., Bullmore, E.T., Williams, S.C.R., Van Amelsvoort, T., Robertson, D.M., Rowe,
432 A., Phillips, M., McAlonan, G., Howlin, P., Murphy, D.G.M., 2000. The functional neuroanatomy of
433 social behaviour. *Brain* 123, 2203–2212. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/123.11.2203>
- 434 Dawson, G., Webb, S.J., McPartland, J., 2005. Understanding the Nature of Face Processing Impairment in
435 Autism: Insights From Behavioral and Electrophysiological Studies. *Dev. Neuropsychol.* 27, 403–
436 424. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326942dn2703_6
- 437 Deffke, I., Sander, T., Heidenreich, J., Sommer, W., Curio, G., Trahms, L., Lueschow, A., 2007. MEG/EEG
438 sources of the 170-ms response to faces are co-localized in the fusiform gyrus. *NeuroImage* 35,
439 1495–1501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.01.034>
- 440 Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5, 2013. . Fifth edition. Arlington, VA:
441 American Psychiatric Publishing, [2013] ©2013.
- 442 Donovan, A.P.A., Basson, M.A., 2017. The neuroanatomy of autism - a developmental perspective. *J. Anat.*
443 230, 4–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12542>
- 444 Dyck, M., Loughhead, J., Kellermann, T., Boers, F., Gur, R.C., Mathiak, K., 2011. Cognitive versus automatic
445 mechanisms of mood induction differentially activate left and right amygdala. *NeuroImage* 54,
446 2503–2513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.10.013>
- 447 Eickhoff, S.B., Laird, A.R., Grefkes, C., Wang, L.E., Zilles, K., Fox, P.T., 2009. Coordinate-based activation
448 likelihood estimation meta-analysis of neuroimaging data: A random-effects approach based on
449 empirical estimates of spatial uncertainty. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* 30, 2907–2926.
450 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.20718>
- 451 Eickhoff, S.B., Nichols, T.E., Laird, A.R., Hoffstaedter, F., Amunts, K., Fox, P.T., Bzdok, D., Eickhoff,
452 C.R., 2016. Behavior, sensitivity, and power of activation likelihood estimation characterized by
453 massive empirical simulation. *NeuroImage* 137, 70–85.
454 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.04.072>
- 455 Gainotti, G., 2018. A historical review of investigations on laterality of emotions in the human brain. *J. Hist.*
456 *Neurosci.* 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0964704X.2018.1524683>
- 457 Gentili, C., Messorotti Benvenuti, S., Lettieri, G., Costa, C., Cecchetti, L., 2018. ROI and phobias: The effect
458 of ROI approach on an ALE meta-analysis of specific phobias. *Hum. Brain Mapp.*
459 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24492>
- 460 Gläscher, J., Adolphs, R., 2003. Processing of the Arousal of Subliminal and Supraliminal Emotional Stimuli
461 by the Human Amygdala. *J. Neurosci.* 23, 10274–10282. [https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.23-](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.23-32-10274.2003)
462 [32-10274.2003](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.23-32-10274.2003)
- 463 Goodkind, M., Eickhoff, S.B., Oathes, D.J., Jiang, Y., Chang, A., Jones-Hagata, L.B., Ortega, B.N., Zaiko,
464 Y.V., Roach, E.L., Korgaonkar, M.S., Grieve, S.M., Galatzer-Levy, I., Fox, P.T., Etkin, A., 2015.

- 465 Identification of a common neurobiological substrate for mental illness. *JAMA Psychiatry* 72, 305–
466 315. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2014.2206>
- 467 Grelotti, D.J., Gauthier, I., Schultz, R.T., 2002. Social interest and the development of cortical face
468 specialization: What autism teaches us about face processing. *Dev. Psychobiol.* 40, 213–225.
469 <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.10028>
- 470 Harms, M.B., Martin, A., Wallace, G.L., 2010. Facial Emotion Recognition in Autism Spectrum Disorders:
471 A Review of Behavioral and Neuroimaging Studies. *Neuropsychol. Rev.* 20, 290–322.
472 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-010-9138-6>
- 473 Haxby, J.V., Hoffman, E.A., Gobbini, M.I., 2000. The distributed human neural system for face perception.
474 *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 4, 223–233. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(00\)01482-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01482-0)
- 475 Higgins, J., Green, S. (Eds.), 2011. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version*
476 *5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration.*
- 477 Hileman, C.M., Henderson, H., Mundy, P., Newell, L., Jaime, M., 2011. Developmental and Individual
478 Differences on the P1 and N170 ERP Components in Children With and Without Autism. *Dev.*
479 *Neuropsychol.* 36, 214–236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87565641.2010.549870>
- 480 Hobson, R.P., Ouston, J., Lee, A., 1988. What's in a face? The case of autism. *Br. J. Psychol.* 79, 441–453.
481 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1988.tb02745.x>
- 482 Kemper, T.L., Bauman, M.L., 1993. The Contribution of Neuropathologic Studies to the Understanding of
483 Autism. *Neurol. Clin.* 11, 175–187. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0733-8619\(18\)30176-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0733-8619(18)30176-2)
- 484 Ketter, T.A., Andreason, P.J., George, M.S., Lee, C., Gill, D.S., Parekh, P.I., Willis, M.W., Herscovitch, P.,
485 Post, R.M., 1996. Anterior Paralimbic Mediation of Procaine-Induced Emotional and Psychosensory
486 Experiences. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* 53, 59–69.
487 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1996.01830010061009>
- 488 Morin, K., Guy, J., Habak, C., Wilson, H.R., Pagani, L., Mottron, L., Bertone, A., 2015. Atypical Face
489 Perception in Autism: A Point of View? *Autism Res. Off. J. Int. Soc. Autism Res.* 8, 497–506.
490 <https://doi.org/10.1002/aur.1464>
- 491 Müller, V.I., Cieslik, E.C., Laird, A.R., Fox, P.T., Radua, J., Mataix-Cols, D., Tench, C.R., Yarkoni, T.,
492 Nichols, T.E., Turkeltaub, P.E., Wager, T.D., Eickhoff, S.B., 2018. Ten simple rules for
493 neuroimaging meta-analysis. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 84, 151–161.
494 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.11.012>
- 495 Muller, V.I., Cieslik, E.C., Serbanescu, I., Laird, A.R., Fox, P.T., Eickhoff, S.B., 2017. Altered Brain
496 Activity in Unipolar Depression Revisited: Meta-analyses of Neuroimaging Studies. *JAMA*
497 *Psychiatry* 74, 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2016.2783>
- 498 Nickl-Jockschat, T., Rottschy, C., Thommes, J., Schneider, F., Laird, A.R., Fox, P.T., Eickhoff, S.B., 2015.
499 Neural networks related to dysfunctional face processing in autism spectrum disorder. *Brain Struct.*
500 *Funct.* 220, 2355–2371. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-014-0791-z>
- 501 Pelphrey, K.A., Yang, D.Y.-J., McPartland, J.C., 2014. Building a social neuroscience of autism spectrum
502 disorder. *Curr. Top. Behav. Neurosci.* 16, 215–233. https://doi.org/10.1007/7854_2013_253
- 503 Robertson, C.E., Baron-Cohen, S., 2017. Sensory perception in autism. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 18, 671–684.
504 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn.2017.112>
- 505 Salimi-Khorshidi, G., Smith, S.M., Keltner, J.R., Wager, T.D., Nichols, T.E., 2009. Meta-analysis of
506 neuroimaging data: a comparison of image-based and coordinate-based pooling of studies.
507 *NeuroImage* 45, 810–823. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.12.039>
- 508 Schultz, R.T., Grelotti, D.J., Klin, A., Kleinman, J., Van der Gaag, C., Marois, R., Skudlarski, P., 2003. The
509 role of the fusiform face area in social cognition: implications for the pathobiology of autism. *Philos.*
510 *Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* 358, 415–427. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2002.1208>
- 511 Turkeltaub, P.E., Eickhoff, S.B., Laird, A.R., Fox, M., Wiener, M., Fox, P., 2012. Minimizing within-
512 experiment and within-group effects in activation likelihood estimation meta-analyses. *Hum. Brain*
513 *Mapp.* 33, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.21186>
- 514 Turner-Brown, L.M., Baranek, G.T., Reznick, J.S., Watson, L.R., Crais, E.R., 2013. The First Year
515 Inventory: a longitudinal follow-up of 12-month-old to 3-year-old children. *Autism* 17, 527–540.
516 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361312439633>
- 517 Weigelt, S., Koldewyn, K., Kanwisher, N., 2012. Face identity recognition in autism spectrum disorders: A
518 review of behavioral studies. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 36, 1060–1084.
519 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.12.008>

- 520 Wells, G., 2001. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of non randomised studies in
521 meta-analyses. [Httpwww Ohri Caprogramsclinicalepidemiologyoxford Asp](http://www.Ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp).
- 522 Zalla, T., Koechlin, E., Pietrini, P., Basso, G., Aquino, P., Sirigu, A., Grafman, J., 2000. Differential
523 amygdala responses to winning and losing: a functional magnetic resonance imaging study in
524 humans: Amygdala response to winning and losing. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 12, 1764–1770.
525 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1460-9568.2000.00064.x>
- 526 Zürcher, N.R., Donnelly, N., Rogier, O., Russo, B., Hippolyte, L., Hadwin, J., Lemonnier, E., Hadjikhani,
527 N., 2013. It's All in the Eyes: Subcortical and Cortical Activation during Grotesqueness Perception
528 in Autism. *PLoS ONE* 8, e54313. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0054313>
529

530

531



