Journal of Visualized Experiments

Defining the role of language in infants' object categorization with eye-tracking paradigms

--Manuscript Draft--

TITLE:

Defining the Role of Language in Infants' Object Categorization with Eye-Tracking Paradigms

AUTHORS:

Alexander LaTourrette[1], Sandra R. Waxman[1,2]

[1]Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA
[2]Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

Corresponding Author:
Alexander LaTourrette   (latourrette@u.northwestern.edu)

Email Addresses of Co-authors**:**
Sandra R. Waxman   (s-waxman@northwestern.edu)

KEYWORDS:

categorization, learning, infants, eye-tracking, language, labels, novelty preference, familiarization

SUMMARY:

Here we present a protocol for familiarization-test paradigms which provide a direct test of infant categorization and help to define the role of language in early category learning.

LONG ABSTRACT:

Assessing infant category learning is a challenging but vital aspect of studying infant cognition. By employing a familiarization-test paradigm, we straightforwardly measure infants' success in learning a novel category while relying only on the passive looking behavior. Moreover, the paradigm can directly measure the impact of different auditory signals on the infant categorization across a range of ages. For instance, we assessed how 2-year-olds learn categories in a variety of labeling environments: in our task, 2-year-olds successfully learned categories when all exemplars were labeled, or the first two exemplars were labeled, but they failed to categorize when no exemplars were labeled or only the final two exemplars were labeled. To determine infants' success in such tasks, researchers can examine both the overall preference displayed by infants in each condition and infants' pattern of looking over the course of the test phase, using an eye-tracker to provide fine-grained time-course data. Thus, we present a powerful paradigm for identifying the role of language, or any auditory signal, in infants' object category learning.

INTRODUCTION:

Categorization is a fundamental building block of human cognition: infants' categorization abilities emerge early in infancy and become increasingly sophisticated with age.[1–3] Research has also revealed a powerful role for the language in infant categorization: from 3 months of age, infants learn categories more successfully when category exemplars are paired with language.[4–6] Moreover, by the end of the first year, infants are attuned to the role of count noun labels in

45 categorization. Pairing category exemplars with a consistent labeling phrase ("This is a vep!")
46 facilitates infants' category learning relative to providing either a distinct label for each exemplar
47 ("This is a vep!" "This is a dax!" etc.) or a non-labeling phrase ("Look at this.").[7–9]
48
49 In infants' everyday experiences, however, the vast majority of objects they encounter will likely
50 remain unlabeled. No caregiver could label every object an infant will see and much less provide
51 the labels which apply to every object (e.g., "malamute," "dog," "pet," "animal"). This presents a
52 paradox: how can we reconcile the power of labels in infant categorization with their relative
53 scarcity in infants' daily lives?
54
55 To answer this question, we developed a protocol to assess how infants learn categories in a
56 variety of different learning environments, including when they receive a mixture of labeled and
57 unlabeled exemplars. Specifically, we propose that receiving even a few labeled exemplars at the
58 beginning of learning can facilitate categorization—by enhancing infants' ability to learn from
59 subsequent, unlabeled exemplars as well. This strategy of using a small number of labeled
60 exemplars as a foundation for learning from a larger number of unlabeled exemplars has been
61 widely implemented in the field of machine learning, spawning a family of *semi-supervised*
62 *learning* (SSL) algorithms[10–12]. Of course, the learning strategies implemented are not identical
63 across different kinds of learners: in machine learning, algorithms typically are exposed to many
64 more exemplars, make explicit guesses about each exemplar, and learn multiple categories
65 simultaneously. Nevertheless, both machine and infant learners may benefit from successfully
66 integrating both labeled and unlabeled data to learn new categories in sparse labeling
67 environments.
68
69 Our design focuses on whether 2-year-old children, in the process of acquiring words for
70 numerous new categories, are capable of this kind of semi-supervised learning. We employ a
71 standard infant categorization measure: a familiarization-test task. In this paradigm, 2-year-olds
72 were exposed to a series of exemplars from a novel category during a familiarization phase. Each
73 exemplar was paired with a different auditory stimulus, depending on the condition (i.e., either
74 a labeling or a non-labeling phrase). Then, at the test, all 2-year-olds saw two new objects
75 presented in silence: one object from the now-familiar category and one from a novel category.
76
77 If the 2-year-olds successfully form the category during the familiarization phase, then they
78 should distinguish between the two exemplars silently presented at the test. Importantly,
79 because a systematic preference for either the novel or familiar test image reflects an ability to
80 distinguish between them, both familiarity and novelty preferences are interpreted as evidence
81 of successful categorization. Note that on a given task, the nature of this preference is a function
82 of infants' processing efficiency for the stimulus materials, with familiarity preferences
83 associated with less efficient stimulus processing [4, 13–17]. Presenting the test phase in silence
84 makes it possible to directly assess infants' success in object categorization and how this success
85 varies according to the information that accompanied the exemplars during familiarization. Thus,
86 this paradigm provides a compelling test of how different types of linguistic environments affect
87 category learning. If labeling enhances category learning in both semi-supervised and fully

supervised environments, then 2-year-olds in these conditions should show stronger test preferences than infants in other environments.

PROTOCOL:

All methods described here have been approved by the Northwestern University Institutional Review Board.

1.   Stimuli Creation

NOTE: The visual stimuli (see **Figure 1**) used in the representative design reported below were originally developed in Havy and Waxman (2016) [18] and are available for download at https://osf.io/n6uy8/.

1.1.   To create a new continuous category, first design a pair of novel digital images. Next, morph the pair of images together, using software (see, e.g., **Table of Materials**) to form a continuum of exemplars between the two original images. Create at least two categories in this way so that one can serve as the category to be learned while the other provides the novel category exemplar for the test trial.

1.2.   Select the familiarization exemplars at evenly spaced intervals from across each learned category's continuum (e.g., the 0%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80%, and 100% exemplars). Select an appropriate number of exemplars (e.g., six). Commensurate with the difficulty of the category and age of the participants.

1.3.   To create the exemplars for the test phase, select the midpoints of the familiar category's continuum and the novel category's continuum (i.e., the 50% exemplar). Then match the color of the novel exemplar to that of the familiar exemplar using an image manipulation program (see, e.g., Table of Materials).

1.4.   Record auditory stimuli produced by a female native English speaker in a soundproof booth. If possible, use the same speaker for both labeling phrases (i.e., "Look at the modi") and non-labeling phrases (i.e., "Look at that!").

1.4.1.   Instruct the speaker to produce all utterances in infant- or child-directed speech.

1.4.2.   Select utterances which are approximately the same length across conditions, likely around 1000 ms per phrase.

2.   Apparatus

2.1.   Use an appropriate eye-tracker. To collect adequate eye-tracking data for a familiarization-test measure, most widely available eye-trackers will suffice: the objects occupy

131 large portions of the screen, and the data analysis investigates performance over a long
132 window, rather than individual, rapidly occurring eye movements such as saccades.

133

134 2.2.   Because this task requires eye-tracking infants, ensure that the system conforms to
135 several requirements.

136

137 2.2.1.   First, use an eye-tracker with a remote tracking mode, which does not require infants to
138 place their heads on a chin-rest. Ensure that the eye-tracker can tolerate relatively large head
139 movements or readjustments.

140

141 2.2.2.   Second, use a relatively large screen to display the images to infants, (e.g., 57 x 45 cm).

142

143 2.2.3.   Third, use an extendable arm mount for the eye-tracker to facilitate data collection by
144 allowing the researcher to adjust the height of the eye-tracker to each infant.

145

146 2.2.4.   Fourth, try to make the eye-tracking equipment unobtrusive, focusing infants' attention
147 solely on the display screen. For instance, some systems integrate the eye-tracking equipment
148 with the display monitor or mount the equipment directly below the monitor.

149

150 2.3.   Note that this task can also be completed by hand-coding high-quality video data of the
151 infants' looking behavior. While hand-coding techniques may pose some challenges for using
152 the more fine-grained time-course analyses, hand-coded data are entirely enough for the
153 aggregate looking analyses.

154

155 **3.   Task Design**

156

157 3.1.   In the eye-tracker's associated software (see, e.g., **Table of Materials**), create four
158 different conditions: Fully Supervised, Unsupervised, Semi-supervised, and Reversed Semi-
159 supervised. Ensure these conditions are separate, so that each infant will see only one
160 condition.

161

162 3.2.   Generate at least two pseudo-random orders of the learning exemplars, with the
163 constraint that no more than two exemplars from the same side of the continuum (0-40% or
164 60-100%) can be shown consecutively.

165

166 3.3.   Create familiarization videos that pair the auditory stimuli with the visual stimuli as
167 appropriate for each condition.

168

169 3.3.1.   Combine the visual and auditory stimuli in video editing software (see, e.g., **Table of**
170 **Materials**). Present all images on the same background. Set the onset of the auditory stimulus
171 to an appropriate range, between 500 ms and 1500 ms after the onset of the visual stimulus.
172 Use this short delay to ease infants' processing load [19].

173

3.3.2. For instance, in the Fully Supervised condition, pair each familiarization exemplar with a labeling phrase.

3.3.3. In the Unsupervised condition, pair each familiarization exemplar with a non-labeling phrase.

3.3.4. In the Semi-supervised condition, pair only the first two exemplars in each order with labeling phrases but the rest with non-labeling phrases.

3.3.5. For the Reversed Semi-supervised condition, pair the final two exemplars with labeling phrases but the first four with non-labeling phrases (see **Figure 1**).

3.3.6. Upload these videos into the eye-tracker software, ordering the familiarization videos as determined by the pseudo-randomized order.

3.4.   Upload a short (10 s or less) attention-grabbing animation displayed in the center of the screen after familiarization: this will ensure that most infants are looking to the center of the screen when the test phase begins.

3.5.   Finally, for each learning category, design two test trials, each featuring two exemplars displayed side-by-side. Ensure that for both test trials, one exemplar will represent the midpoint of the now-familiar category while the other represents the midpoint of the novel category.

3.5.1. Counterbalance the trials so that the left/right positioning of the novel exemplar in the test trial is reversed across videos.

3.5.2. Upload these test trials to the eye-tracker software, positioning them after the post-familiarization attention-getter. Counterbalance these trials' presentation so each infant has an equal chance of seeing a left-novel or right-novel test trial.

3.5.2. Ensure that test trials last at least 5 s, and up to 20 s, in order for children initially looking away to accumulate sufficient looking.

 [Place **Figure 1** here]

3.   Study Procedure

4.1.   Before the infant arrives, set up the eye-tracker.

4.1.1. Randomly assign the infant to a condition and an order.

4.1.2. Open the eye-tracker software and select the assigned condition/order pair.

4.1.3.   Now enter the participant number for this recording.

4.2.   After performing the consent process, bring the infant and the caregiver to the eye-
tracking room. Ensure the room is moderately lit without any distracting decorations on the
walls.

4.3.   Place a chair in front of the eye-tracker at an appropriate distance for the model of eye-
track being used. Seat the caregiver in this chair and the infant on the caregiver's lap. If the
infant does not wish to sit in the caregiver's lap, they may sit on their own, or they may sit in a
car seat.

4.4.   If the infant is sitting on the caregiver's lap, instruct the caregiver not to bias infants'
behavior in any way but to try to keep the infant centered on the caregiver's lap. Provide
caregivers with a pair of blacked-out sunglasses to wear so they cannot see the stimuli.

4.5.   Ask the infant to look at the eye-tracker screen; consider displaying an engaging image
or video to attract their attention. Position the screen so that infants' eyes are within the
calibration window.

4.6.   Perform the eye-tracker's calibration procedure. Use a five-point calibration if possible
but less comprehensive calibrations are also likely to be adequate. Infants often respond better
when the calibration image is an animation with auditory accompaniment.

4.7.   If the infant passes calibration, then begin the experiment. If not, recalibrate until they
are successful. Any infants who cannot be calibrated are excluded.

4.8.   If multiple experiments are run consecutively, or if a single experiment is quite long,
consider re-calibrating after each section.

5.   Data Analysis

5.1.   Use data analysis software to perform this analysis (e.g., see Table of Materials).

5.2.   Create areas of interest (AOIs) around the exemplar positions on the left and right sides
of the screen.

5.3.   For familiarization trials, use the appropriate AOI to assess the time infants spent
looking to the exemplar displayed on each trial. Exclude any infant who does not show
sustained looking for a majority of the exemplars (e.g., require that infants attend to 4 of a
possible 6 familiarization exemplars for at least 25% of those trials).

5.4.   For the test trial, include only infants' first 5 s of accumulated looking. For younger
infants, from 3 to 12 months of age, consider using a longer window such as 10 seconds of

261 accumulated looking. Consider excluding infants who show insufficient sustained looking at test
262 (e.g., accumulating less than 2.5 s of looking) or who fail to look to both of the exemplars.

263

264 5.5.   Now create a preference score for each infant's test trial by dividing the amount of time
265 spent looking to the novel exemplar by the total amount of time looking to both exemplars. To
266 analyze these proportions, transform them first with an empirical logit or arc-sin square-root to
267 make them suitable for analysis with linear models.

268

269 5.6.   For a time-course analysis of infants' looking behavior at the test, separate data into
270 small bins (e.g., between 10 and 100 ms), and calculate a preference score within each bin for
271 each infant. Now conduct t-tests within each bin.

272

273 5.7.   Perform an analysis of the time-course data, testing whether infants' pattern of looking
274 throughout the test trial varies by condition. Note that multiple forms of analysis may answer
275 this question, including a cluster-based permutation analysis[20], as demonstrated here, and
276 growth curve modeling.[21]

277

278 5.7.1. For a cluster-based permutations analysis, select a t-value threshold, corresponding to
279 the desired alpha level (recommended alphas range from .01 to .20; note that this alpha value
280 does not represent the overall test's alpha level, merely the level required for individual time-
281 bins to exceed the threshold). Sum the t-statistics for every consecutive time-bin that surpasses
282 the chosen t-threshold; these cumulative t-statistics indicate the size of the divergences
283 between conditions in the data.

284

285 5.7.2. To determine if these divergences are greater than expected by chance, perform at least
286 1000 simulations with the condition labels randomly shuffled. Evaluate the unshuffled data's
287 divergences against this chance-based distribution.

288

289 NOTE: It is this comparison of the original divergence against the chance-based distribution that
290 determines the false-positive rate of the analysis, rather than the number of time-bins in which
291 t-tests were conducted or even the t-value threshold selected for those initial t-tests. As a
292 result, this analysis provides a conservative alternative to directly reporting the results from
293 multiple t-tests across pre-specified time-bins (e.g., conducting tests every 500 ms).

294

295 **REPRESENTATIVE RESULTS:**

296

297 Using the protocol above, we ran two experiments[22]. Analyses were conducted with the
298 *eyetrackingR* package[23], and the data and code are available at https://github.com/sandylat/ssl-
299 in-infancy. In the first experiment, we contrasted a fully supervised condition (n = 24, M_{age} = 26.8
300 mo), featuring only labeled exemplars, with an unsupervised condition (n = 24, M_{age} = 26.9 mo),
301 featuring only unlabeled exemplars.

302

303 **Fully Supervised vs. Unsupervised environments**

Infants in the Fully Supervised (M = 13.86 s, SD = 3.00) and Unsupervised (M = 14.94 s, SD = 1.91) conditions showed no difference in their attention to the exemplars during familiarization, $t(46)$ = 1.48, p = .14, d = .43.

At test, 2-year-olds in the Fully Supervised condition (M = .59, SD = .15) displayed a significant preference for the novel category exemplar, $t(23)$ = 3.05, p = .006, d = .62, indicating they had successfully formed the category. In contrast, 2-year-olds in the Unsupervised condition (M = .49, SD = .18) looked roughly equally between the objects at test, $t(23)$ = .39, p = .70, d = .08. Performance differed significantly between these conditions, $t(46)$ = 2.27, p = .028, d = .66 (see **Figure 2**). Finally, a cluster-based permutation analysis of the time-course of looking patterns at test revealed a significant divergence between the two conditions, p = .038, from 3450 ms to 3850 ms (see **Figure 3**).

Semi-supervised vs. Reversed Semi-supervised environments
Next, we examined whether 2-year-olds could learn categories in semi-supervised environments by integrating labeled and unlabeled exemplars. We predicted that receiving labeled exemplars at the beginning of familiarization in a Semi-supervised condition (n = 24, M_{age} = 27.3, 12 female), where the labeled exemplars can provide a foundation for learning from the unlabeled exemplars, would facilitate category learning whereas receiving labeled exemplars at the end of familiarization in a Reversed Semi-supervised condition (n = 24, M_{age} = 27.2, 13 female) would not. That is, receiving labeled exemplars first should enable 2-year-olds to learn more from the unlabeled exemplars than receiving those labeled exemplars after seeing the unlabeled exemplars.

Infants in the Semi-supervised condition (n = 24, M = 13.23 s, SD = 3.35) and Reversed Semi-supervised (n = 24, M = 12.58 s, SD = 2.78) conditions showed similar levels of attention to the exemplars during familiarization, $t(46)$ = .73, p = .47, d = .21.

At the test, however, infants in the Semi-supervised condition (M = .59, SD = .14), displayed a significant novelty preference, $t(23)$ = 3.11, p = .005, d = .63, whereas infants in the Reversed Semi-supervised condition (M = .52, SD = .13) performed at chance levels, $t(23)$ = .76, p = .45, d = .16. Infants' preferences were marginally different between the two conditions, $t(46)$ = 1.80, p = .08, d = .52 (see **Figure 2**). Moreover, we also conducted a cluster-based permutation analysis of infants' looking behavior at the test, revealing that the Semi-supervised condition showed a stronger novelty preference than the Reversed SSL condition between 3450ms and 3850ms, p = .047 (see **Figure 3**). This is exactly the same period of time during which the Fully Supervised condition diverged from the Unsupervised condition, suggesting infants were just as successful at learning the category in the Semi-supervised condition as in the Fully Supervised condition.

FIGURE LEGENDS:

Figure 1. Sample task design. The familiarization phase consists of 6 trials, each presenting one category member paired with either a labeling or a non-labeling phrase. The test phase simultaneously presents infants with one exemplar from the now-familiar category and one from

a novel category. Conditions represent the four conditions presented in the representative results section. This figure has been modified from LaTourrette, A., Waxman, S.R. A little labeling goes a long way: Semi-supervised learning in infancy. *Dev. Sci*. e12736 (2018).

Figure 2. Mean preference scores across conditions. Infants in the Fully Supervised and Semi-supervised conditions displayed novelty preferences significantly above chance, *p* < .05. Infants in the Unsupervised and Reversed SSL conditions performed at chance levels. Error bars represent standard errors of the mean. This figure has been modified from[22].

Figure 3. The Infant's looking patterns during test. In the Fully Supervised and Unsupervised conditions (at left) and in the Semi-supervised and Reversed Semi-supervised conditions (at right), infants' pattern of looking to the exemplars diverged between 3450ms and 3850ms. The grey shaded bar in each graph denotes this divergent period. The colored shaded regions around each condition indicate standard error of the mean. This figure has been modified from[22].

DISCUSSION:

Here, we present a procedure for evaluating the role of labeling in categorization. By presenting 2-year-olds with a realistic mix of labeled and unlabeled exemplars, we demonstrate that very young children are capable of learning in semi-supervised environments, extending work with adults and older children[24, 25]. Thus, this method offers a resolution to the paradox posed above: if even a few labeled exemplars can spark category learning, then labels can be both rare and powerful.

Critical aspects of this paradigm include the use of novel artificial stimuli and short trials, both of which make the task appropriately challenging and engaging for 2-year-olds. In addition, using an eye-tracker, rather than hand-coding infant looking behaviors, provides richer and more precise data on participants' eye gaze; this richness and precision enables the implementation of time-course measures such as the cluster-based permutation analysis.

The central advantages of the familiarization-test paradigm are its straightforward assessment of category learning and its simplicity as a passive looking task. That is, the task directly tests category learning, rather than relying on more complex measures like naming behavior or inductive inferences [3, 26, 27]. Moreover, because familiarization-test tasks can be administered across a broad developmental range (e.g., from 3 months to 3 years), they offer an opportunity to identify developmental continuity and change.

Indeed, the familiarization-test paradigm presented here was designed for 2-year-olds, but similar designs have been widely used with infants in their first year of life[4, 6, 7, 9, 28]. For these younger infants, of course, the task must be simplified: longer exposure to the familiarization exemplars, more exemplars, simpler categories, and a longer window of looking at test may all improve the task's sensitivity for younger infants. More broadly, the familiarization-test paradigm employed here can be easily extended to evaluate the effect of any auditory signal on infant cognition, including silence, sine-wave tones, nonhuman primate vocalizations, and other non-linguistic sounds[5, 13, 29, 30].

392

393 Limitations of this task stem primarily from its use of a single outcome variable: infants'
394 preference at the test. This makes the task unsuitable for questions about, for instance, how each
395 familiarization exemplar changes infants' category learning or the particular features infants use
396 to learn the category. Time-course analyses, such as the cluster-based permutation analysis, can
397 substantially enrich the insight offered by this paradigm. However, while these analyses enable
398 us to draw stronger conclusions about when two conditions differ in performance, they also raise
399 important questions about what factors drive infants' attentional patterns throughout the test
400 phase, a promising area for future work.

401

408

409 **DISCLOSURES:**
410 The authors have nothing to disclose.

411

412 **REFERENCES:**

413

414 1.   Eimas, P.D., Quinn, P.C. Studies on the Formation of Perceptually Based Basic-Level
415 Categories in Young Infants. *Child Development*. **65** (3), 903–917, doi: 10.2307/1131427 (1994).
416 2.   Madole, K.L., Oakes, L.M. Making sense of infant categorization: Stable processes and
417 changing representations. *Developmental Review*. **19** (2), 263–296 (1999).
418 3.   Gelman, S.A., Markman, E.M. Categories and induction in young children. *Cognition*. **23** (3),
419 183–209, doi: 10.1016/0010-0277(86)90034-X (1986).
420 4.   Ferry, A.L., Hespos, S.J., Waxman, S.R. Categorization in 3- and 4-month-old infants: An
421 advantage of words over tones. *Child development*. **81** (2), 472–479, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-
422 8624.2009.01408.x (2010).
423 5.   Fulkerson, A.L., Waxman, S.R. Words (but not Tones) Facilitate Object Categorization:
424 Evidence From 6- and 12-Month-Olds. *Cognition*. **105** (1), 218–228, doi:
425 10.1016/j.cognition.2006.09.005 (2007).
426 6.   Balaban, M.T., Waxman, S.R. Do words facilitate object categorization in 9-month-old
427 infants? *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*. **64** (1), 3–26, doi: 10.1006/jecp.1996.2332
428 (1997).
429 7.   Waxman, S.R., Braun, I. Consistent (but not variable) names as invitations to form object
430 categories: New evidence from 12-month-old infants. *Cognition*. **95** (3), B59-68, doi:
431 10.1016/j.cognition.2004.09.003 (2005).
432 8.   Balaban, M.T., Waxman, S.R. An examination of the factors underlying the facilitative effect
433 of word phrases on object categorization in 9-month-old infants. *Proceedings of the 20th
434 Boston University Conference on Language Development*. **1**, 483–493 (1996).

435   9.   Waxman, S.R., Markow, D.B. Words as invitations to form categories: evidence from 12- to
436   13-month-old infants. *Cognitive Psychology*. **29** (3), 257–302, doi: 10.1006/cogp.1995.1016
437   (1995).

438   10. Zhu, X. Semi-supervised learning literature survey (2005).

439   11. Chapelle, O., Scholkopf, B., Zien, A. *Semi-supervised learning: Adaptive computation and*
440   *machine learning*. at <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262033589.001.0001>. The MIT
441   Press. Cambridge, Mass., USA. (2006).

442   12. Zhu, X., Goldberg, A.B. Introduction to semi-supervised learning. *Synthesis lectures on*
443   *artificial intelligence and machine learning*. **3** (1), 1–130 (2009).

444   13. Ferry, A.L., Hespos, S.J., Waxman, S.R. Nonhuman primate vocalizations support
445   categorization in very young human infants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of*
446   *the United States of America*. **110** (38), 15231–15235, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1221166110 (2013).

447   14. Hunter, M.A., Ames, E.W. A multifactor model of infant preferences for novel and familiar
448   stimuli. *Advances in infancy research* (1988).

449   15. Rose, S.A., Feldman, J.F., Jankowski, J.J. Infant visual recognition memory. *Developmental*
450   *Review*. **24** (1), 74–100, doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2003.09.004 (2004).

451   16. Wetherford, M.J., Cohen, L.B. Developmental changes in infant visual preferences for
452   novelty and familiarity. *Child Development*. 416–424 (1973).

453   17. Perone, S., Spencer, J.P. Autonomous visual exploration creates developmental change in
454   familiarity and novelty seeking behaviors. *Frontiers in psychology*. **4**, 648 (2013).

455   18. Havy, M., Waxman, S.R. Naming influences 9-month-olds' identification of discrete
456   categories along a perceptual continuum. *Cognition*. **156**, 41–51, doi:
457   10.1016/j.cognition.2016.07.011 (2016).

458   19. Althaus, N., Plunkett, K. Timing matters: The impact of label synchrony on infant
459   categorisation. *Cognition*. **139**, 1–9, doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2015.02.004 (2015).

460   20. Maris, E., Oostenveld, R. Nonparametric statistical testing of EEG- and MEG-data. *Journal of*
461   *Neuroscience Methods*. **164** (1), 177–190, doi: 10.1016/j.jneumeth.2007.03.024 (2007).

462   21. Raudenbush, S.W., Bryk, A.S. *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis*
463   *Methods*. SAGE. (2002).

464   22. LaTourrette, A., Waxman, S.R. A little labeling goes a long way: Semi-supervised learning in
465   infancy. *Developmental Science*. e12736, doi: 10.1111/desc.12736.

466   23. Dink, J., Ferguson, B. eyetrackingR: An R library for eyetracking data analysis (2015).

467   24. Kalish, C.W., Zhu, X., Rogers, T.T. Drift in children's categories: When experienced
468   distributions conflict with prior learning. *Developmental Science*. **18** (6), 940–956, doi:
469   10.1111/desc.12280 (2015).

470   25. Gibson, B.R., Rogers, T.T., Zhu, X. Human semi-supervised learning. *Topics in Cognitive*
471   *Science*. **5** (1), 132–172, doi: 10.1111/tops.12010 (2013).

472   26. Keates, J., Graham, S.A. Category Markers or Attributes Why Do Labels Guide Infants'
473   Inductive Inferences? *Psychological Science*. **19** (12), 1287–1293, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-
474   9280.2008.02237.x (2008).

475   27. Booth, A.E., Waxman, S.R. A horse of a different color: Specifying with precision infants'
476   mappings of novel nouns and adjectives. *Child development*. **80** (1), 15–22 (2009).

477   28. Perszyk, D.R., Waxman, S.R. Listening to the calls of the wild: The role of experience in
478   linking language and cognition in young infants. *Cognition*. **153**, 175–181, doi:
479   10.1016/j.cognition.2016.05.004 (2016).
480   29. Althaus, N., Mareschal, D. Labels direct infants' attention to commonalities during novel
481   category learning. *PLoS ONE*. **9** (7), e99670, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0099670 (2014).
482   30. Fulkerson, A.L., Haaf, R.A. The influence of labels, non-labeling sounds, and source of
483   auditory input on 9- and 15-month-olds' object categorization. *Infancy*. **4** (3), 349–369, doi:
484   10.1207/S15327078IN0403_03 (2003).
485
486
487

Figure 1

	Familiarization Phase							Test Phase	
								Familiar Category	**Novel Category**
Fully Supervised	"Look at the modi!"	"Look at the modi!"	"Look, it's a modi!"	"Look, it's a modi!"	"Look, it's a modi!"	"Look, it's a modi!"			
Unsupervised	"Look at that!"	"Look at that!"	"Look over here!"	"Look over here!"	"Look over here!"	"Look over here!"			
Semi-supervised	"Look at the modi!"	"Look at the modi!"	"Look over here!"	"Look over here!"	"Look over here!"	"Look over here!"		(silence)	
Reversed SSL	"Look over here!"	"Look over here!"	"Look over here!"	"Look over here!"	"Look at the modi!"	"Look at the modi!"			

Figure 2

Figure 2

Figure 3

Name of Material/ Equipment	Company	Catalog Number	Comments/Description
Final Cut Pro X	Apple	N/A	Video editing, composition software
MorphX	Norrkross	N/A	Image-morphing software
PhotoShop	Adobe	N/A	Image-editing software
R	R Core Team	N/A	Statistical analysis software
T60XL Eyetracker	Tobii Pro	Discontinued	Large, arm-mounted eyetracker suitable for work with infants and chi
Tobii Pro Studio	Tobii Pro	N/A	Software directing eyetracker display, data collection

ildren

JoVE
JOURNAL OF VISUALIZED EXPERIMENTS

1 Alewife Center #200
Cambridge, MA 02140
tel. 617.945.9051
www.jove.com

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

Title of Article: Defining the role of language in infant categorization

Author(s): Alexander LaTourrette, Sandra R. Waxman

Item 1 (check one box): The Author elects to have the Materials be made available (as described at http://www.jove.com/author) via: ☑ Standard Access ☐ Open Access

Item 2 (check one box):

☑ The Author is NOT a United States government employee.

☐ The Author is a United States government employee and the Materials were prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.

☐ The Author is a United States government employee but the Materials were NOT prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

1. <u>Defined Terms</u>. As used in this Article and Video License Agreement, the following terms shall have the following meanings: "**Agreement**" means this Article and Video License Agreement; "**Article**" means the article specified on the last page of this Agreement, including any associated materials such as texts, figures, tables, artwork, abstracts, or summaries contained therein; "**Author**" means the author who is a signatory to this Agreement; "**Collective Work**" means a work, such as a periodical issue, anthology or encyclopedia, in which the Materials in their entirety in unmodified form, along with a number of other contributions, constituting separate and independent works in themselves, are assembled into a collective whole; "**CRC License**" means the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivs 3.0 Unported Agreement, the terms and conditions of which can be found at: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode; "**Derivative Work**" means a work based upon the Materials or upon the Materials and other pre-existing works, such as a translation, musical arrangement, dramatization, fictionalization, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgment, condensation, or any other form in which the Materials may be recast, transformed, or adapted; "**Institution**" means the institution, listed on the last page of this Agreement, by which the Author was employed at the time of the creation of the Materials; "**JoVE**" means MyJove Corporation, a Massachusetts corporation and the publisher of *The Journal of Visualized Experiments*; "**Materials**" means the Article and / or the Video; "**Parties**" means the Author and JoVE; "**Video**" means any video(s) made by the Author, alone or in conjunction with any other parties, or by JoVE or its affiliates or agents, individually or in collaboration with the Author or any other parties, incorporating all or any portion of the Article, and in which the Author may or may not appear.

2. <u>Background</u>. The Author, who is the author of the Article, in order to ensure the dissemination and protection of the Article, desires to have the JoVE publish the Article and create and transmit videos based on the Article. In furtherance of such goals, the Parties desire to memorialize in this Agreement the respective rights of each Party in and to the Article and the Video.

3. <u>Grant of Rights in Article</u>. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to publish the Article, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Sections 4** and **7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Article in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Article into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Article or other Derivative Works (including, without limitation, the Video) or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Article and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. If the "Open Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Article as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

jove
JOURNAL OF
VISUALIZED EXPERIMENTS

1 Alewife Center #200
Cambridge, MA 02140
tel. 617.945.9051
www.jove.com

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

4. <u>Retention of Rights in Article.</u> Notwithstanding the exclusive license granted to JoVE in **Section 3** above, the Author shall, with respect to the Article, retain the non-exclusive right to use all or part of the Article for the non-commercial purpose of giving lectures, presentations or teaching classes, and to post a copy of the Article on the Institution's website or the Author's personal website, in each case provided that a link to the Article on the JoVE website is provided and notice of JoVE's copyright in the Article is included. All non-copyright intellectual property rights in and to the Article, such as patent rights, shall remain with the Author.

5. <u>Grant of Rights in Video – Standard Access.</u> This **Section 5** applies if the "Standard Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above or if no box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby acknowledges and agrees that, Subject to **Section 7** below, JoVE is and shall be the sole and exclusive owner of all rights of any nature, including, without limitation, all copyrights, in and to the Video. To the extent that, by law, the Author is deemed, now or at any time in the future, to have any rights of any nature in or to the Video, the Author hereby disclaims all such rights and transfers all such rights to JoVE.

6. <u>Grant of Rights in Video – Open Access.</u> This **Section 6** applies only if the "Open Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Section 7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Video in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Video into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Video or other Derivative Works or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Video and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. For any Video to which this Section 6 is applicable, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Video as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

7. <u>Government Employees.</u> If the Author is a United States government employee and the Article was prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee, as indicated in **Item 2** above, and any of the licenses or grants granted by the Author hereunder exceed the scope of the 17 U.S.C. 403, then the rights granted hereunder shall be limited to the maximum rights permitted under such

statute. In such case, all provisions contained herein that are not in conflict with such statute shall remain in full force and effect, and all provisions contained herein that do so conflict shall be deemed to be amended so as to provide to JoVE the maximum rights permissible within such statute.

8. <u>Likeness, Privacy, Personality.</u> The Author hereby grants JoVE the right to use the Author's name, voice, likeness, picture, photograph, image, biography and performance in any way, commercial or otherwise, in connection with the Materials and the sale, promotion and distribution thereof. The Author hereby waives any and all rights he or she may have, relating to his or her appearance in the Video or otherwise relating to the Materials, under all applicable privacy, likeness, personality or similar laws.

9. <u>Author Warranties.</u> The Author represents and warrants that the Article is original, that it has not been published, that the copyright interest is owned by the Author (or, if more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, by such authors collectively) and has not been assigned, licensed, or otherwise transferred to any other party. The Author represents and warrants that the author(s) listed at the top of this Agreement are the only authors of the Materials. If more than one author is listed at the top of this Agreement and if any such author has not entered into a separate Article and Video License Agreement with JoVE relating to the Materials, the Author represents and warrants that the Author has been authorized by each of the other such authors to execute this Agreement on his or her behalf and to bind him or her with respect to the terms of this Agreement as if each of them had been a party hereto as an Author. The Author warrants that the use, reproduction, distribution, public or private performance or display, and/or modification of all or any portion of the Materials does not and will not violate, infringe and/or misappropriate the patent, trademark, intellectual property or other rights of any third party. The Author represents and warrants that it has and will continue to comply with all government, institutional and other regulations, including, without limitation all institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy, and all other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, applicable to the Materials, and that all research involving human and animal subjects has been approved by the Author's relevant institutional review board.

10. <u>JoVE Discretion.</u> If the Author requests the assistance of JoVE in producing the Video in the Author's facility, the Author shall ensure that the presence of JoVE employees, agents or independent contractors is in accordance with the relevant regulations of the Author's institution. If more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, JoVE may, in its sole discretion, elect not take any action with respect to the Article until such time as it has received complete, executed Article and Video License Agreements from each such author. JoVE reserves the right, in its absolute and sole discretion and without giving any reason therefore, to accept or decline any work submitted to JoVE. JoVE and its employees, agents and independent contractors shall have

![jove logo] **jove**
JOURNAL OF
VISUALIZED EXPERIMENTS

1 Alewife Center #200
Cambridge, MA 02140
tel. 617.945.9051
www.jove.com

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

full, unfettered access to the facilities of the Author or of the Author's institution as necessary to make the Video, whether actually published or not. JoVE has sole discretion as to the method of making and publishing the Materials, including, without limitation, to all decisions regarding editing, lighting, filming, timing of publication, if any, length, quality, content and the like.

11. <u>Indemnification</u>. The Author agrees to indemnify JoVE and/or its successors and assigns from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, arising out of any breach of any warranty or other representations contained herein. The Author further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless JoVE from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, resulting from the breach by the Author of any representation or warranty contained herein or from allegations or instances of violation of intellectual property rights, damage to the Author's or the Author's institution's facilities, fraud, libel, defamation, research, equipment, experiments, property damage, personal injury, violations of institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy or other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, liabilities and other losses or damages related in any way to the submission of work to JoVE, making of videos by JoVE, or publication in *JoVE* or elsewhere by JoVE. The Author shall be responsible for, and shall hold JoVE harmless from, damages caused by lack of sterilization, lack of cleanliness or by contamination due to the making of a video by JoVE its employees, agents or independent contractors. All sterilization, cleanliness or decontamination procedures shall be solely the responsibility of the Author and shall be undertaken at the Author's

expense. All indemnifications provided herein shall include JoVE's attorney's fees and costs related to said losses or damages. Such indemnification and holding harmless shall include such losses or damages incurred by, or in connection with, acts or omissions of JoVE, its employees, agents or independent contractors.

12. <u>Fees</u>. To cover the cost incurred for publication, JoVE must receive payment before production and publication the Materials. Payment is due in 21 days of invoice. Should the Materials not be published due to an editorial or production decision, these funds will be returned to the Author. Withdrawal by the Author of any submitted Materials after final peer review approval will result in a US$1,200 fee to cover pre-production expenses incurred by JoVE. If payment is not received by the completion of filming, production and publication of the Materials will be suspended until payment is received.

13. <u>Transfer, Governing Law</u>. This Agreement may be assigned by JoVE and shall inure to the benefits of any of JoVE's successors and assignees. This Agreement shall be governed and construed by the internal laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts without giving effect to any conflict of law provision thereunder. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall be deemed to me one and the same agreement. A signed copy of this Agreement delivered by facsimile, e-mail or other means of electronic transmission shall be deemed to have the same legal effect as delivery of an original signed copy of this Agreement.

A signed copy of this document must be sent with all new submissions. Only one Agreement required per submission.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Name: Alexander LaTourrette

Department: Psychology

Institution: Northwestern University

Article Title: Defining the role of language in Infant categorization

Signature: _(signature)_   Date: 10 / 24 / 18

Please submit a <u>signed</u> and <u>dated</u> copy of this license by one of the following three methods:

1) Upload a scanned copy of the document as a pfd on the JoVE submission site;
2) Fax the document to +1.866.381.2236;
3) Mail the document to JoVE / Attn: JoVE Editorial / 1 Alewife Center #200 / Cambridge, MA 02139

For questions, please email submissions@jove.com or call +1.617.945.9051

612542.6

Dear Dr. Bajaj,

Thank you for your constructive revisions of our manuscript, "Defining the role of language in infants' object categorization with eye-tracking paradigms." We are grateful for your guidance in communicating this work clearly and adapting the manuscript to meet the JoVE style. We have addressed all of the comments in the revision, and following these suggestions, we have also attached several new supplementary files. We hope that you will agree that the revised manuscript conveys the method more thoroughly and with a more cohesive story.

Thank you for your attention. We hope that with these revisions we have produced a manuscript that will be published at *JoVE.*

Sincerely,

Alexander LaTourrette & Sandra Waxman

Editorial Comments

1. The editor has formatted the manuscript to match the journal's style. Please retain the same.

We have retained all formatting modifications.

2. Please address all specific comments marked in the manuscript.

We have replied to all specific comments where they are marked in the manuscript.

3. For all the software steps, please include a graphical user interface, button clicks etc if any. Please provide the coding files as supplementary files.

We have attached the analysis code as a new supplementary file.

4. Once done please ensure that the highlighted section is no more than 2.75 pages including headings and spacings.

We have highlighted text occupying slightly less than 2.75 pages.

5. The table of Materials should include the name, company, and catalog number of all relevant materials used in your experiment in separate columns in a .xls/.xlsx file. Please revise the table accordingly and list all the equipment, materials, software used for the present study.

We have attached a revised Table of Materials including the several different software programs used in our experiment, in addition to information on the eye-tracker.

JOHN WILEY AND SONS LICENSE
TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Dec 07, 2018

This Agreement between Alexander LaTourrette ("You") and John Wiley and Sons ("John Wiley and Sons") consists of your license details and the terms and conditions provided by John Wiley and Sons and Copyright Clearance Center.

License Number	4455580216114
License date	Oct 24, 2018
Licensed Content Publisher	John Wiley and Sons
Licensed Content Publication	Developmental Science
Licensed Content Title	A little labeling goes a long way: Semi-supervised learning in infancy
Licensed Content Author	Alexander LaTourrette, Sandra R. Waxman
Licensed Content Date	Sep 18, 2018
Licensed Content Volume	0
Licensed Content Issue	0
Licensed Content Pages	9
Type of use	Journal/Magazine
Requestor type	Author of this Wiley article
Is the reuse sponsored by or associated with a pharmaceutical or medical products company?	no
Format	Electronic
Portion	Text extract
Number of Pages	3
Will you be translating?	No
Title of new article	Defining the role of language in infant categorization: Evidence from a novelty preference eye-tracking task
Publication the new article is in	Journal of Visualized Experiments
Publisher of new article	Journal of Visualized Experiments
Author of new article	Alexander LaTourrette, Sandra Waxman
Expected publication date of new article	Feb 2019
Estimated size of new article (pages)	6
Requestor Location	Alexander LaTourrette 1641 W. Farwell Ave. Apt. 3N CHICAGO, IL 60626 United States Attn: Alexander LaTourrette

| Publisher Tax ID | EU826007151 |
| Total | 0.00 USD |

Terms and Conditions

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

This copyrighted material is owned by or exclusively licensed to John Wiley & Sons, Inc. or one of its group companies (each a"Wiley Company") or handled on behalf of a society with which a Wiley Company has exclusive publishing rights in relation to a particular work (collectively "WILEY"). By clicking "accept" in connection with completing this licensing transaction, you agree that the following terms and conditions apply to this transaction (along with the billing and payment terms and conditions established by the Copyright Clearance Center Inc., ("CCC's Billing and Payment terms and conditions"), at the time that you opened your RightsLink account (these are available at any time at http://myaccount.copyright.com).

Terms and Conditions

- The materials you have requested permission to reproduce or reuse (the "Wiley Materials") are protected by copyright.

- You are hereby granted a personal, non-exclusive, non-sub licensable (on a stand-alone basis), non-transferable, worldwide, limited license to reproduce the Wiley Materials for the purpose specified in the licensing process. This license, **and any CONTENT (PDF or image file) purchased as part of your order,** is for a one-time use only and limited to any maximum distribution number specified in the license. The first instance of republication or reuse granted by this license must be completed within two years of the date of the grant of this license (although copies prepared before the end date may be distributed thereafter). The Wiley Materials shall not be used in any other manner or for any other purpose, beyond what is granted in the license. Permission is granted subject to an appropriate acknowledgement given to the author, title of the material/book/journal and the publisher. You shall also duplicate the copyright notice that appears in the Wiley publication in your use of the Wiley Material. Permission is also granted on the understanding that nowhere in the text is a previously published source acknowledged for all or part of this Wiley Material. Any third party content is expressly excluded from this permission.

- With respect to the Wiley Materials, all rights are reserved. Except as expressly granted by the terms of the license, no part of the Wiley Materials may be copied, modified, adapted (except for minor reformatting required by the new Publication), translated, reproduced, transferred or distributed, in any form or by any means, and no derivative works may be made based on the Wiley Materials without the prior permission of the respective copyright owner.**For STM Signatory Publishers clearing permission under the terms of the STM Permissions Guidelines only, the terms of the license are extended to include subsequent editions and for editions in other languages, provided such editions are for the work as a whole in situ and does not involve the separate exploitation of the permitted figures or extracts,** You may not alter, remove or suppress in any manner any copyright, trademark or other notices displayed by the Wiley Materials. You may not license, rent, sell, loan, lease, pledge, offer as security, transfer or assign the Wiley Materials on a stand-alone basis, or any of the rights granted to you hereunder to any other person.

- The Wiley Materials and all of the intellectual property rights therein shall at all times remain the exclusive property of John Wiley & Sons Inc, the Wiley Companies, or their respective licensors, and your interest therein is only that of having possession of

and the right to reproduce the Wiley Materials pursuant to Section 2 herein during the continuance of this Agreement. You agree that you own no right, title or interest in or to the Wiley Materials or any of the intellectual property rights therein. You shall have no rights hereunder other than the license as provided for above in Section 2. No right, license or interest to any trademark, trade name, service mark or other branding ("Marks") of WILEY or its licensors is granted hereunder, and you agree that you shall not assert any such right, license or interest with respect thereto

- NEITHER WILEY NOR ITS LICENSORS MAKES ANY WARRANTY OR REPRESENTATION OF ANY KIND TO YOU OR ANY THIRD PARTY, EXPRESS, IMPLIED OR STATUTORY, WITH RESPECT TO THE MATERIALS OR THE ACCURACY OF ANY INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE MATERIALS, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY, ACCURACY, SATISFACTORY QUALITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, USABILITY, INTEGRATION OR NON-INFRINGEMENT AND ALL SUCH WARRANTIES ARE HEREBY EXCLUDED BY WILEY AND ITS LICENSORS AND WAIVED BY YOU.

- WILEY shall have the right to terminate this Agreement immediately upon breach of this Agreement by you.

- You shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless WILEY, its Licensors and their respective directors, officers, agents and employees, from and against any actual or threatened claims, demands, causes of action or proceedings arising from any breach of this Agreement by you.

- IN NO EVENT SHALL WILEY OR ITS LICENSORS BE LIABLE TO YOU OR ANY OTHER PARTY OR ANY OTHER PERSON OR ENTITY FOR ANY SPECIAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, INCIDENTAL, INDIRECT, EXEMPLARY OR PUNITIVE DAMAGES, HOWEVER CAUSED, ARISING OUT OF OR IN CONNECTION WITH THE DOWNLOADING, PROVISIONING, VIEWING OR USE OF THE MATERIALS REGARDLESS OF THE FORM OF ACTION, WHETHER FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT, BREACH OF WARRANTY, TORT, NEGLIGENCE, INFRINGEMENT OR OTHERWISE (INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, DAMAGES BASED ON LOSS OF PROFITS, DATA, FILES, USE, BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY OR CLAIMS OF THIRD PARTIES), AND WHETHER OR NOT THE PARTY HAS BEEN ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES. THIS LIMITATION SHALL APPLY NOTWITHSTANDING ANY FAILURE OF ESSENTIAL PURPOSE OF ANY LIMITED REMEDY PROVIDED HEREIN.

- Should any provision of this Agreement be held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be illegal, invalid, or unenforceable, that provision shall be deemed amended to achieve as nearly as possible the same economic effect as the original provision, and the legality, validity and enforceability of the remaining provisions of this Agreement shall not be affected or impaired thereby.

- The failure of either party to enforce any term or condition of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of either party's right to enforce each and every term and condition of this Agreement. No breach under this agreement shall be deemed waived or excused by either party unless such waiver or consent is in writing signed by the party granting such waiver or consent. The waiver by or consent of a party to a breach of any provision of this Agreement shall not operate or be construed as a waiver of or

consent to any other or subsequent breach by such other party.

- This Agreement may not be assigned (including by operation of law or otherwise) by you without WILEY's prior written consent.

- Any fee required for this permission shall be non-refundable after thirty (30) days from receipt by the CCC.

- These terms and conditions together with CCC's Billing and Payment terms and conditions (which are incorporated herein) form the entire agreement between you and WILEY concerning this licensing transaction and (in the absence of fraud) supersedes all prior agreements and representations of the parties, oral or written. This Agreement may not be amended except in writing signed by both parties. This Agreement shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the parties' successors, legal representatives, and authorized assigns.

- In the event of any conflict between your obligations established by these terms and conditions and those established by CCC's Billing and Payment terms and conditions, these terms and conditions shall prevail.

- WILEY expressly reserves all rights not specifically granted in the combination of (i) the license details provided by you and accepted in the course of this licensing transaction, (ii) these terms and conditions and (iii) CCC's Billing and Payment terms and conditions.

- This Agreement will be void if the Type of Use, Format, Circulation, or Requestor Type was misrepresented during the licensing process.

- This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of New York, USA, without regards to such state's conflict of law rules. Any legal action, suit or proceeding arising out of or relating to these Terms and Conditions or the breach thereof shall be instituted in a court of competent jurisdiction in New York County in the State of New York in the United States of America and each party hereby consents and submits to the personal jurisdiction of such court, waives any objection to venue in such court and consents to service of process by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, at the last known address of such party.

WILEY OPEN ACCESS TERMS AND CONDITIONS
Wiley Publishes Open Access Articles in fully Open Access Journals and in Subscription journals offering Online Open. Although most of the fully Open Access journals publish open access articles under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) License only, the subscription journals and a few of the Open Access Journals offer a choice of Creative Commons Licenses. The license type is clearly identified on the article.
The Creative Commons Attribution License
The Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY) allows users to copy, distribute and transmit an article, adapt the article and make commercial use of the article. The CC-BY license permits commercial and non-
Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License
The Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial (CC-BY-NC)License permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.(see below)

Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivs License

The [Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial-NoDerivs License](#) (CC-BY-NC-ND) permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, is not used for commercial purposes and no modifications or adaptations are made. (see below)

Use by commercial "for-profit" organizations

Use of Wiley Open Access articles for commercial, promotional, or marketing purposes requires further explicit permission from Wiley and will be subject to a fee.
Further details can be found on Wiley Online Library
http://olabout.wiley.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-410895.html

Other Terms and Conditions:

v1.10 Last updated September 2015

Questions? customercare@copyright.com or +1-855-239-3415 (toll free in the US) or +1-978-646-2777.

Click here to access/download
Supplemental Coding Files
ssl-in-infancy-analysis-script.Rmd