

2016

# Relative Pitch Perception and the Detection of Deviant Tone Patterns

Denham, SL

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/8207>

---

10.1007/978-3-319-25474-6\_43

PHYSIOLOGY, PSYCHOACOUSTICS AND COGNITION IN NORMAL AND IMPAIRED  
HEARING

Springer International Publishing

---

*All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.*

Dear Author/Editor,

Here are the proofs of your chapter as well as the metadata sheets.

### **Metadata**

- Please carefully proof read the metadata, above all the names and address.
- In case there were no abstracts for this book submitted with the manuscript, the first 10-15 lines of the first paragraph were taken. In case you want to replace these default abstracts, please submit new abstracts with your proof corrections.

### **Page proofs**

- Please check the proofs and mark your corrections either by
  - entering your corrections online
  - or
  - opening the PDF file in Adobe Acrobat and inserting your corrections using the tool "Comment and Markup"
  - or
  - printing the file and marking corrections on hardcopy. Please mark all corrections in dark pen in the text and in the margin at least  $\frac{1}{4}$ " (6 mm) from the edge.
- You can upload your annotated PDF file or your corrected printout on our Proofing Website. In case you are not able to scan the printout, send us the corrected pages via fax.
- Please note that any changes at this stage are limited to typographical errors and serious errors of fact.
- If the figures were converted to black and white, please check that the quality of such figures is sufficient and that all references to color in any text discussing the figures is changed accordingly. If the quality of some figures is judged to be insufficient, please send an improved grayscale figure.

# Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Book Title	Physiology, Psychoacoustics and Cognition in Normal and Impaired Hearing	
Chapter Title	Relative Pitch Perception and the Detection of Deviant Tone Patterns	
Copyright	The Author(s) 2016	
Corresponding Author	Prefix	
	Family name	<b>Denham</b>
	Particle	
	Given name	<b>Susan L.</b>
	Suffix	
	Division	Cognition Institute and School of Psychology
	Organization	Plymouth University
	Address	Plymouth, UK
	Email	sdenham@plymouth.ac.uk
Author	Prefix	
	Family name	<b>Coath</b>
	Particle	
	Given name	<b>Martin</b>
	Suffix	
	Division	Cognition Institute and School of Psychology
	Organization	Plymouth University
	Address	Plymouth, UK
	Email	martin.coath@plymouth.ac.uk
Author	Prefix	
	Family name	<b>Háden</b>
	Particle	
	Given name	<b>Gábor P.</b>
	Suffix	
	Division	Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience and Psychology
	Organization	Research Centre for Natural Sciences, Hungarian Academy of Sciences
	Address	Budapest, Hungary
	Email	haden@cogpsyphy.hu
Author	Prefix	
	Family name	<b>Murray</b>
	Particle	
	Given name	<b>Fiona</b>
	Suffix	
	Division	School of Psychology
	Organization	Plymouth University
	Address	Plymouth, UK
	Email	fiona.murray@students.plymouth.ac.uk
Author [Aff 1]	Prefix	
	Family name	<b>Winkler</b>
	Particle	
	Given name	<b>István</b>
	Suffix	
	Division	Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience and Psychology
	Organization	Research Centre for Natural Sciences, Hungarian Academy of Sciences
	Address	Budapest, Hungary

	Email	winkler.istvan@ttk.mta.hu
Author [Aff 2]	Prefix	
	Family name	<b>Winkler</b>
	Particle	
	Given name	<b>István</b>
	Suffix	
	Division	Institute of Psychology
	Organization	University of Szeged
	Address	Szeged, Hungary
Abstract		<p>Most people are able to recognise familiar tunes even when played in a different key. It is assumed that this depends on a general capacity for relative pitch perception; the ability to recognise the pattern of inter-note intervals that characterises the tune. However, when healthy adults are required to detect rare deviant melodic patterns in a sequence of randomly transposed standard patterns they perform close to chance. Musically experienced participants perform better than naïve participants, but even they find the task difficult, despite the fact that musical education includes training in interval recognition.</p> <p>To understand the source of this difficulty we designed an experiment to explore the relative influence of the size of within-pattern intervals and between-pattern transpositions on detecting deviant melodic patterns. We found that task difficulty increases when patterns contain large intervals (5–7 semitones) rather than small intervals (1–3 semitones). While task difficulty increases substantially when transpositions are introduced, the effect of transposition size (large vs small) is weaker. Increasing the range of permissible intervals to be used also makes the task more difficult. Furthermore, providing an initial exact repetition followed by subsequent transpositions does not improve performance. Although musical training correlates with task performance, we find no evidence that violations to musical intervals important in Western music (i.e. the perfect fifth or fourth) are more easily detected. In summary, relative pitch perception does not appear to be conducive to simple explanations based exclusively on invariant physical ratios.</p>
Keywords		Relative pitch perception - Musical intervals - Oddball paradigm - Pattern detection - Deviant detection - Translation-invariant perception

# Relative Pitch Perception and the Detection of Deviant Tone Patterns

Susan L. Denham, Martin Coath, Gábor P. Hádén, Fiona Murray  
and István Winkler

1  
2 **Abstract** Most people are able to recognise familiar tunes even when played in a  
3 different key. It is assumed that this depends on a general capacity for relative pitch  
4 perception; the ability to recognise the pattern of inter-note intervals that charac-  
5 terises the tune. However, when healthy adults are required to detect rare deviant  
6 melodic patterns in a sequence of randomly transposed standard patterns they per-  
7 form close to chance. Musically experienced participants perform better than naïve  
8 participants, but even they find the task difficult, despite the fact that musical educa-  
9 tion includes training in interval recognition.

10 To understand the source of this difficulty we designed an experiment to explore  
11 the relative influence of the size of within-pattern intervals and between-pattern  
12 transpositions on detecting deviant melodic patterns. We found that task difficulty  
13 increases when patterns contain large intervals (5–7 semitones) rather than small  
14 intervals (1–3 semitones). While task difficulty increases substantially when trans-  
15 positions are introduced, the effect of transposition size (large vs small) is weaker.  
16 Increasing the range of permissible intervals to be used also makes the task more  
17 difficult. Furthermore, providing an initial exact repetition followed by subsequent

---

S. L. Denham (✉) · M. Coath  
Cognition Institute and School of Psychology, Plymouth University, Plymouth, UK  
e-mail: sdenham@plymouth.ac.uk

M. Coath  
e-mail: martin.coath@plymouth.ac.uk

G. P. Hádén · I. Winkler  
Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience and Psychology, Research Centre for Natural Sciences,  
Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary  
e-mail: haden@cogpsyphy.hu

F. Murray  
School of Psychology, Plymouth University, Plymouth, UK  
e-mail: fiona.murray@students.plymouth.ac.uk

I. Winkler  
Institute of Psychology, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary  
e-mail: winkler.istvan@ttk.mta.hu

© The Author(s) 2016  
P. van Dijk et al. (eds.), *Physiology, Psychoacoustics and Cognition in Normal and Impaired Hearing*, Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology 894,  
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25474-6\_43

18 transpositions does not improve performance. Although musical training correlates  
19 with task performance, we find no evidence that violations to musical intervals im-  
20 portant in Western music (i.e. the perfect fifth or fourth) are more easily detected.  
21 In summary, relative pitch perception does not appear to be conducive to simple  
explanations based exclusively on invariant physical ratios.

22  
23 **Keywords** Relative pitch perception · Musical intervals · Oddball paradigm ·  
Pattern detection · Deviant detection · Translation-invariant perception

## 24 1 Introduction

25  
26 Most people easily recognise well known melodies even when they are transposed  
27 to a different key. The invariant property of transposed melodies is the preserved  
28 pitch ratio relationship between notes of the melody; i.e. pitch intervals of the melody  
29 remain the same despite changes in absolute pitch. For this reason, it is assumed  
30 that the ability to recognise pitch relationships (relative pitch perception) is rather  
31 robust and commonly found in the population. Recognition of preserved pitch in-  
32 terval patterns irrespective of absolute pitch is an auditory example of translation-  
33 invariant object perception (Kubovy and Van Valkenburg 2001; Griffiths and War-  
34 ren 2004; Winkler et al. 2009).

35 The robustness of the ability to recognise tone patterns has been supported by  
36 recent findings showing that listeners can detect random tone patterns very quickly  
37 (after ca. 1.5 repetitions) within rapidly presented tone sequences, even if the pat-  
38 terns are quite long (up to 20 tones in a pattern) (Barascud 2014). The human brain  
39 is also sensitive to pattern violations, with regular to random transitions (Chait  
40 et al. 2007) being detected within about 150 ms (~3 tones) from deviation onset  
41 (Barascud 2014). However, in these examples tone patterns were always repeated  
42 exactly, i.e. without transposition, so it is not clear whether listeners were remem-  
43 bering absolute pitch sequences or relative pitch relationships.

44 In support of the assumed generality of relative pitch perception, it has been  
45 shown that violations of transposed pitch patterns elicit discriminative brain re-  
46 sponses in neonates (Stefanics et al. 2009) and young infants (Tew et al. 2009). So  
47 it is surprising that relative pitch perception can be rather poor (e.g. see (Foster and  
48 Zatorre 2010; McDermott et al. 2010)), especially if contour violations and tonal  
49 melodies are excluded (Dowling 1986). McDermott et al. (2010), commenting on  
50 the poor pitch interval discrimination threshold they found, suggested that the im-  
51 portance of pitch as an expressive musical feature may rest more on an ability to  
52 detect pitch differences between tones, rather than an ability to recognise complex  
53 patterns of pitch intervals.

54 Some years ago, in a pilot experiment we noticed that an oddball interval (e.g. a  
55 tone pair separated by 7 semitones) did not pop out as expected within a randomly  
56 transposed series of standard intervals (e.g. 3 semitones). We subsequently ran a se-  
57 ries of experiments in which we maintained a standard pitch contour, but varied the

58 number of repetitions of the standard phrase (2 or 3), the number of tones in a phrase  
59 (2–6), the size of the deviance (1–3 semitones), and the tonality of the short melo-  
60 dies (Coath 2008). Most listeners, including those with musical education, found it  
61 very difficult to detect an oddball melodic phrase in a sequence of randomly trans-  
62 posed standard phrases, performing close to chance. The source of the surprising  
63 difficulty of the task was not clarified by this experiment, as the variables tested  
64 only weakly influenced performance. Here we report another attempt to discover  
65 what makes this task so hard.

66 Consistent with Gestalt grouping principles (Köhler 1947), auditory stream-  
67 ing experiments show that featural separation (such as pitch differences) promote  
68 segregation and conversely that featural similarity promotes integration (Bregman  
69 1990; Moore and Gockel 2012). It is also known that within-stream (within-pattern)  
70 comparisons are far easier to make than between stream comparisons; (e.g. (Breg-  
71 man 1990; Micheyl and Oxenham 2010)). Therefore, we hypothesized that if the  
72 standard pattern satisfied Gestalt grouping principles and could thus be more easily  
73 grouped, this would facilitate pattern comparisons, and that deviations within such  
74 patterns would be easier to detect. Another possibility is that confusion between  
75 within-pattern intervals and between-pattern transpositions may make individual  
76 patterns less distinctive, and so increase the task difficulty. Therefore, we also in-  
77 vestigated the effects of transposition size and interactions between transposition  
78 size and within-phase intervals. Finally, the predictive coding account of perception  
79 (Friston 2005) suggests that the precision with which perceptual discriminations  
80 can be made is inversely related to stimulus variance, suggesting that task difficulty  
81 would increase with variance of standard phrase pitch intervals.

82 Our specific hypotheses were:

- 83 1. Small within-pattern intervals will promote grouping and thus improve perfor-  
84 mance (Gestalt proximity/similarity);
- 85 2. Small transpositions, especially when within-pattern intervals are large, may  
86 make individual patterns less distinctive, and thus impair performance;
- 87 3. Exact repetitions with no transposition will result in very good performance;
- 88 4. One exact repeat (i.e. pattern 1 = pattern 2) before introducing transpositions  
89 may allow a better pattern representation to be built and used as a template for  
90 subsequent patterns, and so improve task performance;
- 91 5. Smaller variance in the intervals within a pattern (either only small or only large  
92 intervals) will increase the predictability of the pattern and allow the formation  
93 of a more precise representation of the pattern. Therefore, task performance will  
94 decrease with increasing interval variance.
6. Musical training and experience will facilitate task performance.

## 95 2 Methods

96 The study was approved by the ethical review board of Plymouth University. Par-  
97 ticipants either received credits in a university course for their participation, or vol-  
98 unteered to take part.

## 2.1 Participants

Data were collected from 54 participants in total (32 females, 22 males; age range 19–65 years, median 20.5 years). The majority were undergraduate Psychology students at Plymouth University. Additional participants recruited from a doctoral programme and the University orchestra. All participants confirmed they had normal hearing. Details of musical training (years of formal tuition) and playing experience (years playing) were recorded for each participant. Four participants' data were excluded from the analysis as they achieved less than 30% in at least one experimental block (chance level being 50%), suggesting that they may not have understood the task correctly.

## 2.2 Materials

The experiment was conducted using a bespoke Matlab programme. Participants listened to the stimuli using Sennheiser HD215 headphones, individually adjusted to a comfortable sound level during the initial practice trial. The absolute level selected by each participant was not recorded.

### 2.2.1 Stimuli

Each trial consisted of four patterns separated by 700 milliseconds (ms) silence, and each pattern consisted of six tones. Three of the patterns had the same sequence of pitch intervals (standard pattern); the last pitch interval of either the final or the penultimate pattern of the trial deviated from the other three. A different standard pattern was delivered on each trial and no pattern was used more than once in the experiment. Patterns were generated by randomly selecting a set of five intervals, with the restrictions that each interval should only occur once within a pattern, and two intervals with same magnitude but opposite sign should not follow each other immediately in the sequence (to prevent the occurrence of repeated tones in the pattern).

All tones making up the pitch sequences were harmonic complexes, consisting of the first four harmonics of the nominal pitch, exponentially decreasing in amplitude (1:1/2:1/4:1/8) to give an oboe-like timbre. Tone duration was 110 ms, with 5 ms onset and offset linear ramps and 40 ms silence between tones, giving a tone onset to onset interval of 150 ms. Deviant intervals were always four semitones. Since standard pattern intervals were chosen from the set {1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 semitones}, depending on the condition (see Table 1), the difference between the standard and the deviant pitch interval was always 1, 2 or 3 semitones. The first tone of the first pattern always had a pitch of 450 Hz. To avoid the use of pitches which may not be clearly audible to everyone despite reporting normal hearing, all pitches were restricted to lie between 100 and 3200 Hz.



**Table 1** Details of the within-pattern and transposition intervals used and the number of trials in each test block

Block	Within-pattern intervals	Transposition intervals	Number of trials
1	Big	None	10
2	Big	One exact repeat, then two big transpositions	10
3	Small	Small	20
4	Small	Big	20
5	Big	Small	20
6	Big	Big	20
7	All: 1, 2,3,5,6,7 ST	Big	20

136 The experiment consisted of one practice block and seven test blocks, each dis-  
 137 tinguished by the set of intervals used, as detailed in Table 1. Intervals were nomi-  
 138 nally divided into two sets: *small* {1, 2, 3} semitones, and *big* {5, 6, 7} semitones.

139 The practice block consisted of 10 trials. The first four were very easy with no  
 140 transpositions and small within pattern intervals. The next four were slightly harder  
 141 with two exact repeats of the pattern before two transpositions, with small within-  
 142 pattern intervals and small transpositions. The final two examples were similar to  
 143 trials in block 3 with small within-pattern intervals and small transpositions. Partici-  
 144 pants were given feedback after each trial (the response button briefly turned green  
 145 for correct and red for incorrect) and a final practice score.

### 146 2.2.2 Procedure

147 Participants were required to indicate using two on-screen response buttons (la-  
 148 belled ‘2nd Last’ and ‘Last’) whether the penultimate or last pattern was different  
 149 from the rest. They were told that any difference was in the last interval of the pat-  
 150 tern.

151 Participants began by entering their personal details and then continued with the  
 152 practice block. They were encouraged to repeat the practice block as many times as  
 153 they needed to familiarize themselves with the task; 1–3 repetitions were judged to  
 154 suffice in all cases.

155 Following the practice block, participants were presented with seven test blocks,  
 156 with no feedback. Blocks as detailed in Table 1 were presented in random order.  
 157 Once they had completed all the test blocks, participants were presented with a bar  
 158 graph showing their score in each block. Each 20-trial block took 3–4 min to com-  
 159 plete and the experiment lasted roughly 30 min.

### 160 2.2.3 Analysis

161 In all cases confidence was assessed at the .05 level. Score distributions in each test  
 162 block were compared against chance using the t-test. The effect of block was as-  
 163 sessed using a 1-way ANOVA with all test blocks. The effect of transposition was

164 assessed by contrasting block 1 with the average of blocks 5 and 6. The effect of  
 165 one exact repetition was assessed by contrasting block 2 with block 6. The effect of  
 166 variance in interval range was assessed by contrasting block 7 with the average of  
 167 blocks 4 and 6. The effects of within-phrase intervals and between-phrase transposi-  
 168 tions on performance were assessed using a two way ANOVA on data from blocks  
 169 3–6. The effect of interval variance was also tested using correlation analysis on  
 170 data from blocks 3–7. The effect of final interval size of performance was tested  
 171 using correlation analysis on data from all test blocks. The influence of musical  
 172 experience was tested using correlation analysis on data from all test blocks. Corre-  
 173 lation analysis was carried out using Spearman's correlation coefficient as the data  
 174 were not normally distributed.

### 175 3 Results

176 Figure 1 shows the score distributions for each block for the participants.

177 Performance in all blocks was found to be significantly different from chance  
 178 (shown by dotted line in the figure;  $p < 0.05$ ).

179 There was a main effect of block ( $F(6,294) = 41.61, p < 0.001, \epsilon = 0.790$ , partial  
 180  $\eta^2 = 0.459$ ). The effect of transposition (contrasting block 1 with the average of  
 181 blocks 5 and 6) was significant ( $t = -10.36, p < 0.001$ ). The effect of one exact repe-  
 182 tition (contrasting block 2 with block 6) was not significant ( $t = 0.59, p = 0.559$ ). The  
 183 effect of variance in interval range (contrasting block 7 with the average of blocks 4  
 184 and 6) was significant ( $t = 3.20, p = 0.002$ ). The more detailed trial-level correlation  
 185 analysis showed performance correlated negatively with the variance of the pattern  
 186 intervals (correlation coefficient  $= -0.336, p < 0.001$ ). There was no significant corre-  
 187 lation between the magnitude of the final interval and performance (correlation  
 188 coefficient  $-0.298, p = 0.147$ ). Posthoc multiple comparison analysis showed per-  
 189 formance for musically important final intervals (perfect fourth and fifth, 5 and 7  
 semitones, respectively) was significantly lower than that for 1 semitone.




Fig. 1 Distribution of percentage correct scores in each block for all participants




Fig. 2 The influence of musical experience on task performance

191 The two-way ANOVA assessing the effect of within-pattern and transposition intervals showed a significant main effect of within-pattern intervals ( $F(1,49)=37.45$ ,  $p<0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2=0.433$ ) and transposition size ( $F(1,49)=12.16$ ,  $p=0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2=0.199$ ) but their interaction was not significant ( $F(1,49)=1.45$ ,  $p=0.235$ , partial  $\eta^2=0.029$ ). A posthoc multiple comparison analysis showed that there was a tendency for large transpositions to impair performance more than small transpositions.

198 Performance correlated positively with musical experience; years of formal training (correlation coefficient = 0.342,  $p=0.015$ ), as well as years of playing (correlation coefficient = 0.435,  $p=0.002$ ).

201 The influence of musical training on task performance is illustrated in Fig. 2.

## 202 4 Discussion

203 In this study we investigated some of the potential sources of difficulty in detecting a pattern with a deviant pitch interval amongst transposed repetitions of a standard pattern, a task that is assumed to depend on relative pitch perception. Our results are consistent with a number of previous studies, e.g. (McDermott and Oxenham 2008), showing that relative pitch perception may be more limited than is commonly assumed. Performance is best when the standard phrase is repeated exactly with no transpositions (block 1), but falls substantially when transpositions are introduced (block 1 versus the average of blocks 3–7). Without transpositions, the task can be performed by direct comparisons between pitches, rather than using the interval relationships between successive pitches. Performance is not helped by one exact repetition of the standard pattern (block 2 versus block 6). This shows that although listeners may become sensitive to a repeating pattern after only 1.5

215 repetitions (Barascud 2014), they are unable to use this pattern for comparison with  
 216 transposed versions of the pattern.

217 When patterns are transposed, then performance is best for standard patterns  
 218 consisting of small intervals. This is consistent with the notion that grouping is pro-  
 219 moted by featural similarity, and that representations of phrases consisting of small  
 220 intervals are more easily formed, suggesting that comparisons between patterns  
 221 may be facilitated by having a more coherent representation of the standard. With  
 222 transpositions, large within-pattern intervals make the task very difficult. However,  
 223 contrary to our hypothesis, large transpositions impaired performance more than  
 224 small transpositions. This suggests that comparisons between pitch interval patterns  
 225 are facilitated by proximity in pitch space. Increasing the variance in the pattern  
 226 intervals, as predicted, impairs performance.

227 The idea that relative pitch perception depends solely on detecting a pattern of  
 228 invariant pitch intervals is not supported by our results. Although the invariant prop-  
 229 erty of the patterns in each trial is the sequence of pitch intervals defining the stan-  
 230 dard, listeners often could not use this information in the current experiment. Our  
 231 results are compatible with the notion that in constructing object representations,  
 232 the tolerance of the representation is a function of the variance in the pattern, i.e.  
 233 increasing variance in object components lead to more permissive representations.  
 234 This makes sense when the general problem of perceptual categorisation is consid-  
 235 ered; e.g. the variability of the spoken word.

236 Relative pitch perception has been likened to translation invariant object recog-  
 237 nition in vision (Kubovy and Van Valkenburg 2001). Interestingly the literature  
 238 on visual perceptual learning has shown that learning can be surprisingly specific  
 239 to the precise retinal location of the task stimulus (Fahle 2005). The most influen-  
 240 tial model of translation invariant object recognition is the so-called trace model  
 241 (Stringer et al. 2006), which assumes that this ability actually depends on learning  
 242 the activity caused by the same stimulus being shown at many different locations;  
 243 invariant recognition then emerges at a higher level by learning that these different  
 244 activations are caused by the same object. Perhaps this is what happens when we  
 245 learn a tune. The categorisation of the tune depends on hearing it at many different  
 246 pitch levels within a context that provides clear links between the various repeti-  
 247 tions (e.g. within the same piece of music, or same social context).

248 **Acknowledgments** We would like to thank Dávid Farkas for help with the statistical analysis. IW  
 249 was supported by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Lendület project, LP36/2012). GPH was  
 250 supported by a post-doctoral research fellowship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

## 251 References

- 252 Barascud N (2014). Auditory pattern detection. PhD thesis, University College London (Univer-  
 253 sity of London), London
- 254 Bregman AS (1990) Auditory scene analysis: the perceptual organization of sound. MIT Press, Cambridge
- 255 Chait M, Poeppel D, de Cheveigne A, Simon JZ (2007) Processing asymmetry of transitions be-  
 256 tween order and disorder in human auditory cortex. *J Neurosci* 27(19):5207–5214. doi:10.1523/  
 257 JNEUROSCI.0318-07.2007

- 258 Coath M, Háden GP, Winkler I, Denham SL (2008). Are short tone sequences memorable? Paper  
259 presented at the British Society of Audiology Annual Conference, Leeds
- 260 Dowling WJ (1986) Context effects on melody recognition: scale-step versus interval representa-  
261 tions. *Music Percept* 3(3):281–296
- 262 Fahle M (2005) Perceptual learning: specificity versus generalization. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*  
263 15(2):154–160. doi:10.1016/j.conb.2005.03.010
- 264 Foster NE, Zatorre RJ (2010) A role for the intraparietal sulcus in transforming musical pitch in-  
265 formation. *Cereb Cortex* 20(6):1350–1359. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhp199
- 266 Friston K (2005) A theory of cortical responses. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 360(1456):815–  
267 836. doi:10.1098/rstb.2005.1622
- 268 Griffiths TD, Warren JD (2004) What is an auditory object? *Nat Rev Neurosci* 5(11):887–892.  
269 doi:10.1038/nrn1538
- 270 Köhler W (1947) *Gestalt psychology: an introduction to new concepts in modern psychology.*  
271 Liveright Publishing Corporation, New York
- 272 Kubovy M, Van Valkenburg D (2001) Auditory and visual objects. *Cognition* 80(1–2):97–126
- 273 McDermott JH, Oxenham AJ (2008) Music perception, pitch, and the auditory system. *Curr Opin*  
274 *Neurobiol* 18(4):452–463. doi:10.1016/j.conb.2008.09.005
- 275 McDermott JH, Keebler MV, Micheyl C, Oxenham AJ (2010) Musical intervals and relative pitch:  
276 frequency resolution, not interval resolution, is special. *J Acoust Soc Am* 128(4):1943–1951.  
277 doi:10.1121/1.3478785
- 278 Micheyl C, Oxenham AJ (2010) Objective and subjective psychophysical measures of auditory  
279 stream integration and segregation. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 11(4):709–724. doi:10.1007/  
280 s10162-010-0227-2
- 281 Moore BC, Gockel HE (2012) Properties of auditory stream formation. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond*  
282 *B Biol Sci* 367(1591):919–931. doi:10.1098/rstb.2011.0355
- 283 Stefanics G, Haden GP, Sziller I, Balazs L, Beke A, Winkler I (2009) Newborn infants process  
284 pitch intervals. *Clin Neurophysiol* 120(2):304–308. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2008.11.020
- 285 Stringer SM, Perry G, Rolls ET, Proske JH (2006) Learning invariant object recognition in the  
286 visual system with continuous transformations. *Biol Cybern* 94(2):128–142. doi:10.1007/  
287 s00422-005-0030-z
- 288 Tew S, Fujioka T, He C, Trainor L (2009) Neural representation of transposed melody in infants  
289 at 6 months of age. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1169:287–290. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04845.x
- 290 Winkler I, Denham SL, Nelken I (2009) Modeling the auditory scene: predictive regularity represen-  
291 tations and perceptual objects. *Trends Cogn Sci* 13(12):532–540. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2009.09.003

UNCORRECTED PROOF