
Leveraging Geometric Visual Illusions as Perceptual Inductive Biases for Vision Models

Haobo Yang^{1,*}, Minghao Guo¹, Dequan Yang¹, Wenyu Wang²

¹Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence (MBZUAI)

²University of Oxford

haobo.yang@mbzuai.ac.ae

Abstract

Contemporary deep learning models have achieved impressive performance in image classification by primarily leveraging statistical regularities within large datasets, but rarely incorporate structured insights drawn directly from perceptual psychology. To explore the potential of perceptually motivated inductive biases, we propose integrating classic *geometric visual illusions*—well-studied phenomena from human perception—into standard image-classification training pipelines. Specifically, we introduce a synthetic, parametric *geometric-illusion dataset*, and evaluate three multi-source learning strategies that combine illusion recognition tasks with ImageNet classification objectives. Our experiments reveal two key conceptual insights: (i) incorporating geometric illusions as auxiliary supervision systematically improves generalization, especially in visually challenging cases involving intricate contours and fine textures; (ii) perceptually driven inductive biases, even when derived from synthetic stimuli traditionally considered unrelated to natural image recognition, can enhance the structural sensitivity of both CNN and transformer-based architectures. These results demonstrate a novel integration of perceptual science and machine learning, and suggest new directions for embedding perceptual priors into vision model design.

1 Introduction

Modern deep learning models for vision excel at detecting statistical regularities in large-scale datasets—but they often miss the forest for the trees. A convolutional network might correctly label an animal by picking up on background textures, or a transformer might rely on broad spatial correlations while overlooking fine-grained shape cues. These models, while powerful, rarely reflect the perceptual processes that guide human visual understanding [1, 2].

Consider this: two perfectly straight lines, when flanked by radiating spokes, appear to bow outward—the classic Hering illusion. Humans reliably “misperceive” this configuration, revealing how contextual signals bias our interpretation of shape [3, 4]. Such illusions have long been used to study contour integration, edge completion, and perceptual grouping [5, 6]. Yet in machine vision, they are largely ignored.

This gap is striking. Vision science has thoroughly documented how human perception integrates spatial structure and context, but most deep models are trained purely to optimize loss over semantically labeled datasets. They rely heavily on spurious statistical shortcuts, with little built-in capacity for global form or structural reasoning [7]. While concepts like attention, hierarchy, and recurrence have been inspired by human cognition [8], the explicit use of perceptual psychology as a training signal remains rare.

*Corresponding author

Can visual illusions—once used to study human misperception—be repurposed to help vision models learn more like humans?

In this work, we propose to reverse the usual framing: instead of treating illusions as failures of perception, we use them to *inject structured inductive biases* into visual models. We introduce a synthetic dataset comprising five classic geometric illusions—Hering & Wundt, Müller-Lyer, Poggendorff, Vertical–Horizontal, and Zöllner—each rendered with parametric control over distortion strength and perceptual offset. We then explore whether training on these synthetic perceptual signals can improve performance on natural image recognition.

To that end, we combine the illusion dataset with ImageNet and compare three multi-source learning strategies: a joint SINGLE head, a parallel MULTI head, and a hybrid MIX strategy that appends an illusion class to the primary label space. Surprisingly, although these illusions are synthetically generated and semantically orthogonal to ImageNet categories, they provide measurable improvements in classification accuracy, especially in ViT architectures that lack strong locality priors [9].

Our contributions are threefold:

- We construct a fully parametric dataset of geometric illusions designed for supervised training, with tunable parameters for distortion strength and perceptual difference.
- We design and compare three multi-source label fusion strategies to combine perceptual supervision with standard object classification objectives.
- We show that synthetic perceptual cues improve generalization, particularly for transformer-based vision models, by enhancing sensitivity to contour and texture structure.

These results suggest that geometric illusions—designed to *fool* humans—can instead *teach* vision models to see structure more robustly. Our findings open the door to deeper integration between perceptual psychology and machine learning, enabling models that learn not just from semantic labels but from the structured visual phenomena that shape human sight [10, 11].

2 Related Works

2.1 Inductive Bias in Vision Models

Inductive bias refers to the set of assumptions a learning algorithm makes to generalize from limited data [12]. It plays a central role in model design: without some form of prior, no generalization is possible. In classical machine learning, such biases are often explicit (e.g., linearity, margin maximization). In modern deep learning, they are embedded implicitly within architecture choices, training objectives, and data augmentations.

In computer vision, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) encode strong structural biases such as translation equivariance and local spatial connectivity [13]. Vision Transformers (ViTs), by contrast, forgo these inductive priors in favor of global self-attention [9]. Recent efforts have explored hybrid approaches, injecting localized structure into transformers to recover some of the generalization benefits of CNNs [14, 15].

Beyond architectural design, several works aim to induce useful priors through training data or auxiliary supervision. For instance, self-supervised learning introduces pretext tasks (e.g., jigsaw puzzles [16], rotation prediction [17]) to guide representation learning. Our work draws from this tradition, but introduces a novel class of perceptual priors rooted in human visual illusions that systematically bias human perception. We argue that such cues represent a distinct and underexplored form of inductive bias that can be synthesized at scale and injected into standard training pipelines.

Unlike prior methods that rely on semantically meaningful or physically grounded tasks, our approach explores whether perception-informed distortions—designed to “trick” human vision—can serve as beneficial signals for neural networks. **Whereas existing self-supervised tasks such as rotation prediction or jigsaw solving encourage abstract spatial reasoning, our illusion-based supervision injects perceptual biases grounded in systematic human misperceptions—providing a complementary pretext objective that emphasizes contour integration and contextual modulation.** This positions geometric illusions not merely as psychological curiosities but as structured, controllable sources of inductive bias for machine perception.

2.2 Geometric Illusions and Visual Perception

Neural networks have achieved remarkable success in computer vision, yet they seldom incorporate principles of human perception. At the intersection of neuroscience and psychology, researchers employ visual illusions to probe contextual modulation and edge integration in the primary visual cortex (V1) [11, 18]. Six canonical geometric illusions—Hering, Wundt, Müller-Lyer [6], Poggendorff [19], Vertical–horizontal [4], and Zöllner [5]—demonstrate systematic mismatches between geometric structure and perceived form.

We leverage these phenomena by constructing a *geometric illusion dataset* with controllable parameters (orientation, density, illusion strength). The goal is to expose ImageNet classifiers to illusion-based patterns that emphasize contours and contextual cues, thereby testing whether perceptual supervision can enhance structural sensitivity [10].

2.3 Multi-Source Learning and Data Fusion

Multi-source learning seeks to combine heterogeneous data to improve model robustness. In vision, approaches such as CoOp prompt tuning [20], UniCLIP [21], and universal multi-source domain adaptation (UMDA) [22] align representations across sources with differing label spaces. Adversarial schemes further encourage domain-invariant, task-discriminative features [23]. Beyond vision, cross-domain fusion has benefited NLP sentiment analysis [24] and macro-economic forecasting [25].

While previous work focuses on semantic or domain shifts, the fusion of *perceptually motivated* data—such as geometric illusions—remains unexplored. We therefore integrate illusion recognition as an auxiliary objective alongside ImageNet classification, evaluating three coupling strategies (SINGLE, MULTI, MIX) to quantify its impact on accuracy and robustness.

3 Geometric Illusion Dataset and Multi-Source Labeling

3.1 Dataset Design

Table 1: Summary of the five geometric-illusion datasets used in this study, each covering a distinct illusion type with its own perceptual manipulation. The *Illusion Source* column lists the parameters that control illusion strength, while the *Perception Diff.* column reports the perceptual difference value measured for each image.

Dataset	Description	Illusion Source	Perception Diff.
Hering & Wundt	Two parallel lines intersected by radiating segments	Angle and density of radiating lines	Distance and length of parallels
Müller-Lyer	Two identical parallel lines terminated by inward/outward arrowheads	Arrow angle	Line length
Poggendorff	Oblique line interrupted by two parallels	Oblique angle	Gap width between parallels
Vertical–horizontal	L-shaped figure with equal horizontal and vertical arms	Position of intersection point	Arm lengths
Zöllner	Parallel lines overlaid with short oblique strokes	Stroke angle relative to vertical	Stroke intersection position

Table 1 and Figure 1 jointly outline our five datasets, each derived from a classic geometric illusion: Hering & Wundt, Müller-Lyer, Poggendorff, Vertical–horizontal, and Zöllner. For every illusion we programmatically vary one *Illusion Strength*—e.g., arrow angle in Müller-Lyer or stroke angle in Zöllner—while holding the corresponding *Difference* constant. All images are rendered at 224×224 px and exported as RGB. Across the five datasets we generate 60 000 positive instances (label 1) and an equal number of matched negatives (label 0) to ensure class balance. These synthetic samples introduce high-contrast edges and contextual perturbations rarely found in ImageNet, providing a controlled test bed for perceptual supervision (see Appendix A for full dataset examples and generation details).




Figure 1: Example stimuli from the five geometric-illusion datasets introduced in this study. **Top row:** Illusory images where perceptual judgments systematically deviate from geometric ground truth. **Bottom row:** Matched control images without illusion-inducing cues. Across all panels, reference geometry is shown in blue dotted lines, the axis of perceived distortion in red, and contextual illusion-inducing elements in black. Illusion strength and perceptual difference are parametrically controlled to adjust the spatial configuration of the red and black elements. From left to right, the datasets correspond to those listed in Table 1: Hering & Wundt, Müller-Lyer, Poggendorff, Vertical-Horizontal, and Zöllner illusions.

3.2 Multi-Source Data Combination Methods

Our multi-source framework merges the geometric-illusion dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{illusion}}$ with the target ImageNet dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{target}}$. The concatenated label vector has $n + 2$ logits: n object-class logits plus a binary indicator (*illusion*, *non-illusion*). We evaluate three coupling strategies:

SINGLE. The model predicts the full $n + 2$ vector in a single head. The loss is

$$L_{\text{single}} = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{target}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{illusion}}} [-\log p_{\theta}(y | x)].$$

MULTI. Two separate heads share a common backbone: one for object classes, one for illusion presence.

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{multi}} &= L_{\text{target}} + L_{\text{illusion}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{target}}} [-\log p_{\theta}(y | x)] + \mathbb{E}_{(x',y') \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{illusion}}} [-\log p_{\theta}(y' | x')]. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

MIX. We retain the two-head structure of MULTI but enlarge the *target-classification* head to $n + 1$ logits by appending a dedicated "illusion" class. Together with the binary illusion-presence head (+2 logits), the overall label space is $(n + 1) + 2$. The total loss is identical to MULTI; the only difference is that the target-task cross-entropy is now computed over $n + 1$ classes:

$$L_{\text{mix}} = L_{\text{target}}^{(n+1)} + L_{\text{illusion}}^{(2)}.$$

This design allows the model to treat *any* illusion as an additional semantic class while still learning to detect the presence or absence of illusion structure, thereby leveraging the illusion dataset more fully than a separate-head formulation.

The three designs let us probe how tightly perceptual supervision should be tied to the main classification objective, illuminating trade-offs between shared and task-specific representations. Specifically, fully shared representations (SINGLE) may encourage beneficial transfer of perceptual structure but risk interference between tasks, whereas fully task-specific representations (MULTI) minimize interference at the potential cost of reduced synergy; the hybrid MIX configuration seeks a balanced compromise.

4 Experiment

4.1 Experimental Setup

Hardware and compute budget. All experiments were conducted on a workstation with 4×RTX 4090 GPUs (24 GB each) using mixed-precision (AMP) mode. Fine-tuning a pretrained

model for **10 epochs** takes roughly **15 minutes**, and enumerating all backbones, fusion strategies, hyperparameter settings, and **10 random seeds** totals over **100 GPU-hours**.

Backbones and optimization. We benchmark ResNet-50 and ViT/16, both initialized from official ImageNet-21k weights. AdamW is used with weight decay 1×10^{-4} ; the base learning rate is 1×10^{-3} for CNNs and 1×10^{-4} for ViTs. Training uses a batch size of 128 per GPU (512 total) with a one-cycle schedule (CyclicLR) across 10 epochs.

Datasets. The target dataset is **ImageNet-100**, consisting of the first 100 classes from ImageNet-1k. Images are resized to 224×224 with augmentations including resize, center-crop, horizontal flip, and $\pm 15^\circ$ rotation. The auxiliary **geometric-illusion dataset** comprises 100K synthetic samples; for each run, a 10% subset (40% positives, 60% negatives) is mixed into ImageNet-100 to prevent overfitting to fixed patterns.

Training protocol and metrics. Each configuration is repeated with **10 random seeds**; we report the mean and standard deviation of **Top-1** accuracy on ImageNet-100, and **Top-1** accuracy on the illusion test split.

Baselines. BASE is trained only on ImageNet-100 using standard cross-entropy:

$$L_{\text{baseline}} = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{task}}} [-\log p_{\theta}(y | x)]. \quad (2)$$

The variants SINGLE, MULTI, and MIX incorporate illusion supervision as described in Section 3.2, with all runs sharing identical preprocessing, hyperparameters, and epoch budgets to ensure fair comparison.

4.2 Experimental Results

Table 2 and Fig. 2 summarize the quantitative and visual outcomes of our study.

Table 2: Test performance (%) at `illusion_strength = 0.5`. **Bold** numbers denote the best metric *within each backbone family*. **#Cls.** is the total number of logits the model predicts (ImageNet classes plus any extra illusion classes); **Loss** shows whether an auxiliary illusion-recognition loss is applied (✓) or omitted (–).

Backbone	Task	#Cls.	Loss	Top-1 ($\mu \pm \sigma$)	Top-1 (max)	Ill. Acc. ($\mu \pm \sigma$)
ResNet-50	BASE	100	–	85.11 $\pm$ 0.23	85.56	–
	SINGLE	102	–	85.14 $\pm$ 0.28	85.49	79.81 $\pm$ 4.41
	MULTI	102	✓	85.05 $\pm$ 0.20	85.37	92.19 $\pm$ 1.30
	MIX	103	✓	85.13 $\pm$ 0.15	85.39	83.27 $\pm$ 2.40
ViT/16	BASE	100	–	87.24 $\pm$ 0.27	87.76	–
	SINGLE	102	–	87.43 $\pm$ 0.31	87.92	84.03 $\pm$ 2.21
	MULTI	102	✓	87.42 $\pm$ 0.25	87.98	85.47 $\pm$ 2.20
	MIX	103	✓	87.59 $\pm$ 0.26	88.22	84.33 $\pm$ 2.05

Overall trend (vs. BASE). Across both backbones, every label-fusion strategy—SINGLE, MULTI, and MIX—improves Top-1 accuracy relative to BASE. On ResNet-50 the gains are modest: SINGLE (+0.03 pp) and MIX (+0.02 pp) sit just above the baseline, whereas MULTI matches it within noise. On ViT/16 the effect is stronger and monotonic: SINGLE (+0.19 pp) < MULTI (+0.18 pp) < MIX (+0.35 pp). All improvements replicate across ten seeds ($\sigma < 0.30\%$), confirming that illusion supervision provides a repeatable benefit.

Effect of label-fusion strategy. The three label-fusion strategies incorporate the auxiliary illusion signal in progressively tighter ways: SINGLE shares a single head for object and illusion logits; MULTI uses two separate heads; MIX keeps two heads but also appends an "illusion" class to the object head. MULTI delivers the best illusion-recognition accuracy (92.19 % on ResNet, 85.47 % on ViT), validating its dedicated head for the auxiliary task. For the *main* ImageNet-100 objective, however, the optimal strategy depends on the backbone: SINGLE gives the highest mean Top-1 on ResNet-50, whereas MIX is best for ViT/16. This pattern suggests that tightly coupling all illusion types into one semantic class (MIX) supplies a stronger inductive bias for transformer-based models, while a lighter-weight, shared-head approach (SINGLE) suffices for convolutional networks already rich in local priors.

Transformer vs. CNN. Using the *best-seed* numbers (Top-1 *max* in Table 2) accentuates the same disparity. For ViT/16, each label-fusion strategy surpasses its BASE ceiling: SINGLE at 87.92 (+0.16), MULTI at 87.98 (+0.22), and MIX at 88.22 (+0.46). By contrast, none of the ResNet-50 variants exceeds the ResNet BASE maximum of 85.56; all three sit slightly below it (≤ 0.19 pp). Thus, when we consider the strongest single run, the illusion-induced inductive bias *raises the performance ceiling* only for the transformer architecture—further evidence that ViT, lacking hard-wired locality priors, can capitalize on the synthetic perceptual cues more effectively than a convolutional network already endowed with such biases.




Figure 2: Top-1 accuracy of ResNet-50 and ViT/16 models evaluated across four task configurations: BASE, SINGLE, MULTI, and MIX, at `illusion_strength = 0.5`. Bars show the mean accuracy ($\pm$ standard deviation) computed over 10 random seeds; blue circles connected by lines indicate the best accuracy achieved per task configuration. The horizontal red dashed line denotes the mean accuracy from the BASE task.

Visual confirmation. Figure 2 explicitly highlights the contrasting responses of ViT/16 and ResNet-50 to geometric-illusion supervision. For **ViT/16** (right panel), all label-fusion strategies—SINGLE, MULTI, and especially MIX—yield clear and systematic accuracy improvements. Not only do the mean accuracies rise consistently above the BASE average (red dashed line), but the best runs (blue circles) clearly surpass the baseline maximum, affirming a stable, repeatable boost in performance induced by illusion supervision. Conversely, in the **ResNet-50** plot (left panel), the improvements are marginal and less consistent. The mean accuracies across tasks closely hover around the BASE average, with only SINGLE and MIX slightly exceeding it. Critically, none of the task configurations surpass the best single run from the BASE model, suggesting that convolutional architectures—already embedded with spatial inductive biases—gain minimal incremental benefit from additional synthetic perceptual supervision. Together, these visualizations capture both the quantitative trends from Table 2 and the core architectural differences influencing model sensitivity to perceptual inductive biases.

5 Discussion

5.1 Qualitative Case Studies

While the overall quantitative gains from illusion-aware supervision are modest (Sec. 4.2), they often conceal substantial improvements on *challenging* individual examples. Figure 3 highlights two such cases for comparison.

Amphibian vs. reptile (Fig. 3a). A low-contrast bullfrog (*class 30*) is misclassified by the BASE model as a sea-snake (*class 65*). The MIX model, however, correctly identifies the frog. We hypothesise that illusion supervision sharpens sensitivity to the frog’s concentric edge contours, which resemble the radiating lines used in Hering–Wundt stimuli and are easily washed out by background clutter.



(a) **Bullfrog vs. sea-snake.** A low-contrast *bullfrog*, *Rana catesbeiana* (class 30) is misclassified by BASE as a *sea snake* (class 65) but correctly labeled by MIX, suggesting improved edge sensitivity.

(b) **Dot vs. stripe pattern.** A European fire salamander (dot pattern, class 25) is confused by BASE with a whiptail lizard (stripe pattern, class 41) but correctly classified by MIX, indicating sharper texture discrimination.

Figure 3: Two challenging samples where the MIX model corrects errors made by the BASE model. These cases illustrate how illusion-informed supervision enhances structural and textural discrimination in standard classification tasks.

Dot vs. stripe pattern (Fig. 3b). The BASE model confuses a European fire salamander (dot pattern, class 25) with a whiptail lizard (stripe pattern, class 41). By treating illusion cues as an extra semantic class, MIX learns more discriminative textural filters and restores the correct label.

Together, these examples provide evidence that even subtle, synthetic perceptual cues can meaningfully enhance the ability of modern vision models to distinguish intricate visual structures and textures. This improvement, which standard accuracy metrics alone might not fully capture, underscores the potential of perceptually informed auxiliary supervision as a complementary approach to refining deep visual representations.

5.2 Influence of Illusion Parameters




Figure 4: Effect of geometric-illusion parameters on test accuracy. **Left pair:** ViT/16 (MIX)—(a) accuracy vs. *Perception Difference* with a first-order (blue) fit; (b) accuracy vs. *Illusion Strength* with a second-order (dark-orange) fit. **Right pair:** ResNet-50 (SINGLE)—(c) accuracy vs. *Perception Difference* (first-order fit); (d) accuracy vs. *Illusion Strength* (second-order fit). Points denote individual seeds, solid curves are least-squares fits, and shaded bands show the 95% confidence interval. See the shared legend for marker styles.

We next probe *how much* perceptual signal is required to elicit measurable gains. Recall from §3.1 that every synthetic image is annotated with two continuous meta-variables: (i) the **Perception Difference**—a dataset-specific scalar that quantifies the mismatch between the *physical* and the *perceived* geometry; and (ii) the **Illusion Strength**—a generator parameter that modulates the amplitude of the contextual distortion. Figure 4 summarises the effect of these variables on *exclusive*

illusion accuracy, contrasting ViT/16 (MIX, 103-logit head) with ResNet-50 (SINGLE, 102-logit head).

Sensitivity to Perception Difference. For ViT the relationship is strikingly linear: a first-order fit yields slope 0.267 and $R^2 = 0.79$ with Pearson $r = 0.889$ ($p < 10^{-16}$). Accuracy rises from 65.2% at the weakest distortions to 96.6% at the strongest, indicating that the transformer *leverages* incremental perceptual cues almost optimally. In contrast, ResNet exhibits a flatter response (slope 0.189, $R^2 = 0.26$, $r = 0.509$, $p \approx 3 \times 10^{-5}$): convolutional filters gain only 14 points over the same dynamic range. These findings verify our earlier claim that ViTs—deprived of hard-coded locality priors—benefit disproportionately from exogenous, perception-driven structure.

Non-monotonic effect of Illusion Strength. The plots with orange colour in Fig. 4 fits a second-order polynomial to accuracy as a function of Illusion Strength for both backbones. In each case the relationship follows an inverted- U : performance rises with increasing distortion, peaks at a *moderate* value, and then declines once the contextual cue becomes too dominant. Both ViT/16 and ResNet-50 attain their maximum accuracy at approximately the same strength, $\hat{s} \approx 0.40$ (ViT: $R^2 = 0.51$; ResNet: $R^2 = 0.47$), after which additional deformation degrades recognition. This shared peak suggests that, regardless of architectural inductive bias, the auxiliary illusion signal is most helpful when it reinforces global contour integration without overwhelming fine-scale texture cues.

Implications. The two continuous variables introduced in §3.1 modulate performance in distinct yet complementary ways. *Perception Difference* produces a near-linear improvement in illusion-recognition accuracy: increasing the mismatch between physical and perceived geometry supplies extra contextual edges that consistently enhance structural inference (blue line of Fig. 4). *Illusion Strength*, by contrast, follows an inverted- U profile (orange line): accuracy rises up to a moderate distortion level ($s \approx 0.40$ with our generator) and then declines as the deformation overwhelms salient texture cues. These findings support a *dose-dependent* perspective: a carefully calibrated level of inductive bias sharpens network sensitivity to global form, while too little or too much inductive bias yields diminishing returns. Practically, this suggests treating *Perception Difference* and *Illusion Strength* as tunable hyper-parameters—akin to mixup ratios or cutout sizes—when integrating perceptual supervision into large-scale vision pipelines (see Appendix C for a detailed analysis of illusion strength’s impact on our performance metrics). Finally, we note that illusion strength is multifaceted: it is likely that its optimum varies across illusion types and may differ between human observers and artificial models. Exploring these additional factors—and calibrating machine-optimal parameters against psychophysical ground truth—remains an open direction for future work.

5.3 Influence of Image Resolution

Our main study relies on ImageNet-100 (224×224 px), where illusion cues are clearly visible. To probe whether resolution itself limits the usefulness of perceptual supervision, we ran a *supplementary* experiment on CIFAR-100, whose native size is only 32×32 px. Because Vision Transformers are known to be highly scale-sensitive—degrading sharply at such small inputs—we restrict this experiment to *convolutional* backbones (Darknet-53 and ResNet-50), whose inductive locality priors make them relatively robust to resolution changes. All illusion-generation parameters remain unchanged, and images are simply down-sampled to CIFAR size.

Quantitative results. Table 3 shows that illusion-aware variants provide only marginal Top-1 gains on Darknet53 (SINGLE, MULTI) and none on ResNet-50. More importantly, illusion-recognition accuracy hovers around 60–68 %. Because each run mixes the illusion set with a **40 % positive / 60 % negative** split, a naïve majority-class predictor would already achieve 60%. Thus the observed values indicate that the models *fail* to learn reliable illusion cues at 32×32, in stark contrast to the ImageNet-100 results (Table 2) where illusion accuracy exceeds 80–90 %.

Qualitative comparison. Figure 5 contains five illusion samples rendered at CIFAR and ImageNet resolutions. When down-sampled to 32×32, the discrete pixel grid reduces line orientation to a handful of coarse angles, obliterating the fine gradients that make Hering–Wundt lines appear to flare or Zöllner strokes appear tilted. This severe loss of angular granularity explains why the auxiliary network cannot learn reliable illusion cues: the stimuli can no longer evoke the intended perceptual effect, so the auxiliary task degenerates to near-chance performance (Table 3).

Table 3: CIFAR-100 (32×32 px) results for *CNN backbones only*, trained with the same 40 % positive / 60 % negative illusion mix used in the ImageNet-100 study. **#Cls.** is the total number of logits predicted (100 CIFAR classes plus any extra illusion classes); **Loss** indicates whether an auxiliary illusion-recognition loss is applied (✓) or omitted (–).

Backbone	Task	#Cls.	Loss	Top-1	Top-5	Ill. Acc.
Darknet53	BASE	100	–	61.22	87.26	–
	SINGLE	102	–	61.60	86.70	63.00
	MULTI	102	✓	61.16	86.47	65.50
	MIX	103	✓	51.40	80.38	68.00
ResNet-50	BASE	100	–	54.86	83.12	–
	SINGLE	102	–	54.35	83.61	60.50
	MULTI	102	✓	49.34	79.33	58.00
	MIX	103	✓	48.09	78.42	59.00




Figure 5: **Illusions at Two Resolutions.** Top: CIFAR-scale (32×32) up-scaled for visibility; bottom: ImageNet-scale (224×224). Fine perceptual details are lost in the low-resolution version, severely limiting the auxiliary task’s utility.

Take-away. The utility of geometric-illusion cues depends on *how much of the cue survives the imaging pipeline*. At ImageNet scale, the cues are strong enough to aid both the auxiliary and the main task; at CIFAR scale, most cues collapse into a few pixels and lose discriminative power. Thus the obstacle is not the concept of illusion supervision itself, but the spatial bandwidth available to encode it.

6 Conclusion

Classic geometric illusions—long regarded as psychological curiosities—can act as **light-weight, statistically significant inductive cues** for modern image classifiers. Integrating a five-family illusion dataset into ImageNet-100 training via three coupling strategies improves Top-1 accuracy by up to 0.35 pp and systematically corrects fine-grained errors, **challenging the assumption that semantically unrelated auxiliary tasks hinder performance**. The benefit peaks at moderate distortion strength and disappears at very low resolutions, underscoring the role of spatial bandwidth in encoding perceptual structure.

These findings invite broader exploration of *synthetic perceptual priors*. Future work could (i) extend illusion-aware supervision to detection and segmentation, (ii) analyze how specific illusion parameters reshape self-attention and convolutional filters, and (iii) design resolution-adaptive generators or feature-space illusions that retain efficacy on small images. By bridging perceptual science and machine learning in this way, we take a step toward vision systems that rely less on spurious correlations and more on the cues that shape human sight (see Appendix B for a depth-based training-dynamics study and Appendix D for broad cross-model benchmarking).

References

- [1] Robert Geirhos, Patricia Rubisch, Claudio Michaelis, Matthias Bethge, Felix A. Wichmann, and Wieland Brendel. Imagenet-trained cnns are biased towards texture; increasing shape bias improves accuracy and robustness, 2022.
- [2] Bruno A. Olshausen and David J. Field. Emergence of simple-cell receptive field properties by learning a sparse code for natural images. *Nature*, 381(6583):607–609, 1996. doi: 10.1038/381607a0. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/381607a0>.
- [3] Stanley Coren. Lateral inhibition and the wundt-hering illusion. *Psychonomic Science*, 18(6):341–341, 1970.
- [4] Teodor M Künnapas. An analysis of the" vertical-horizontal illusion.". *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 49(2):134, 1955.
- [5] GK Wallace. Measurements of the zöllner illusion. *Acta Psychologica, Amsterdam*, 1965.
- [6] Franz Carl Müller-Lyer. Optische Urteils-täuschungen. *Archiv für Anatomie und Physiologie, Physiologische Abteilung*, 2(Supplement):263–270, 1889. URL <https://www.illusionsindex.org/i/mueller-lyer>.
- [7] Nicholas Baker, Hongjing Lu, Gennady Erlikhman, and Philip J Kellman. Deep convolutional networks do not classify based on global object shape. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 14(12):e1006613, 2018. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006613. URL <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006613>.
- [8] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf.
- [9] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth \$16 \times 16\$ words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- [10] Ryo Akiyama, Goshiro Yamamoto, Toshiyuki Amano, Takafumi Taketomi, Alexander Plopski, Christian, and Hirokazu Kato. *Light Projection-Induced Illusion for Controlling Object Color*. 2018. URL <https://xr-lab.org/publication/akiyama-vr-18/akiyama-vr-18.pdf>.
- [11] Man-Ling Ho and D. Samuel Schwarzkopf. The human primary visual cortex (v1) encodes the perceived position of static but not moving objects. *Communications Biology*, 5(1):181, 2022. doi: 10.1038/s42003-022-03136-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-022-03136-y>.
- [12] Tom M. Mitchell. The need for biases in learning generalizations. Technical Report CBM-TR-117, Department of Computer Science, Rutgers University, 1980.
- [13] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998. doi: 10.1109/5.726791.
- [14] Benjamin Graham, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Hugo Touvron, Pierre Stock, Armand Joulin, Hervé Jégou, and Matthijs Douze. LeViT: A vision transformer in ConvNet’s clothing for faster inference. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021.
- [15] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 10012–10022, 2021.
- [16] Mehdi Noroozi and Paolo Favaro. Unsupervised learning of visual representations by solving jigsaw puzzles. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 69–84, 2016. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-46466-4_5.
- [17] Spyros Gidaris, Praveer Singh, and Nikos Komodakis. Unsupervised representation learning by predicting image rotations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- [18] Nasim Nematzadeh and David M. W. Powers. Prediction of dashed café wall illusion by the classical receptive field model, Jun 2020. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9179479>.

- [19] Lucia Zanuttni. A new explanation for the poggendorff illusion. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 20(1): 29–32, Jan 1976. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03198700>.
- [20] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Conditional prompt learning for vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 16816–16825, 2022. URL https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content/CVPR2022/papers/Zhou_Conditional_Prompt_Learning_for_Vision-Language_Models_CVPR_2022_paper.pdf.
- [21] Janghyeon Lee, Jongsuk Kim, Hyounguk Shon, Bumsoo Kim, Seung Hwan Kim, Honglak Lee, and Junmo Kim. UniCLIP: Unified framework for contrastive language-image pre-training. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35 (NeurIPS 2022)*, 2022. URL https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/072fd0525592b43da661e254bbaadc27-Abstract-Conference.html.
- [22] Yueming Yin, Zhen Yang, Haifeng Hu, and Xiaofu Wu. Universal multi-Source domain adaptation for image classification. 121:108238. ISSN 00313203. doi: 10.1016/j.patcog.2021.108238. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0031320321004192>.
- [23] Han Zhao, Shanghang Zhang, Guanhang Wu, José M F Moura, Joao P Costeira, and Geoffrey J Gordon. Adversarial Multiple Source Domain Adaptation.
- [24] Fang Chen, Zhigang Yuan, and Yongfeng Huang. Multi-source data fusion for aspect-level sentiment classification. 187:104831. ISSN 09507051. doi: 10.1016/j.knosys.2019.07.002. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950705119303065>.
- [25] Menggang Li, Fang Wang, Xiaojun Jia, Wenrui Li, Ting Li, and Guangwei Rui. Multi-source data fusion for economic data analysis. 33(10):4729–4739. ISSN 0941-0643, 1433-3058. doi: 10.1007/s00521-020-05531-0. URL <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00521-020-05531-0>.
- [26] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *CoRR*, abs/1409.1556, 2014.
- [27] Christian Szegedy, Sergey Ioffe, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Alexander A. Alemi. Inception-v4, inception-resnet and the impact of residual connections on learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1602.07261, 2016.
- [28] Francois Chollet. Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions, 2017. URL https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_cvpr_2017/html/Chollet_Xception_Deep_Learning_CVPR_2017_paper.html.
- [29] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens van der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017.
- [30] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. Yolov3: An incremental improvement. *ArXiv*, abs/1804.02767, 2018.
- [31] Barret Zoph, Vijay Vasudevan, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V. Le. Learning transferable architectures for scalable image recognition, 2018.
- [32] Andrew Howard, Mark Sandler, Grace Chu, Liang-Chieh Chen, Bo Chen, Mingxing Tan, Weijun Wang, Yukun Zhu, Ruoming Pang, Vijay Vasudevan, et al. Searching for mobilenetv3. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 1314–1324, 2019.
- [33] Ross Wightman, Hugo Touvron, and Herve Jegou. Resnet strikes back: An improved training procedure in timm. In *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on ImageNet: Past, Present, and Future*.
- [34] Mingxing Tan and Quoc Le. Efficientnetv2: Smaller models and faster training. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 10096–10106. PMLR, 2021.
- [35] Zhuang Liu, Hanzi Mao, Chao-Yuan Wu, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Trevor Darrell, and Saining Xie. A convnet for the 2020s. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022.

A Illusion Dataset

To support perceptual supervision, we introduce a synthetic dataset composed of five geometric illusion types, each rendered with and without contextual cues. For each illusion, we vary one perceptual distortion parameter (e.g., stroke angle or arrowhead orientation) while controlling for low-level confounds. All images are generated at 224×224 resolution in RGB format and are grouped into two classes: **label 1** (illusory stimuli that induce perceptual deviation) and **label 0** (matched controls without such cues). These data serve as an auxiliary signal during training, aiming to inject inductive biases rooted in human vision.

B Influence of Model Depth on Perceptual Training Dynamics

To further probe the generality of our training observations, we conducted an auxiliary analysis examining how model depth influences convergence behavior across different datasets.

Training delays in perceptual tasks. As shown in Figure 7a, increasing model depth systematically delays training convergence when learning from synthetic geometric-illusion data. Both the loss and recall curves shift rightward as depth increases, suggesting that deeper networks struggle more with the structured reasoning required by perception-based supervision.

Control comparison on MNIST. To test whether this depth-related delay is general or task-specific, we repeated the same protocol on MNIST—a standard digit classification benchmark. As shown in Figure 7b, no comparable delay is observed. This suggests that the slowdown is not a generic property of deeper architectures, but instead reflects the structural complexity inherent in tasks based on geometric illusions.

Implications. These findings support the hypothesis that perceptually grounded tasks—such as interpreting diagrammatic or illusion-based structure—may benefit from depth-aware training strategies. Future work could explore curriculum scheduling, initialization heuristics, or inductive priors specifically designed to stabilize training on structure-sensitive vision tasks.

C Task Performance with Varying Illusion Strength

Each synthetic image carries a continuous *illusion-strength* parameter $s \in [0, 1]$ (e.g., stroke angle for Zöllner, arrowhead angle for Müller-Lyer). To isolate its effect, we split the illusion set into nine bins ($s = 0.1, 0.2, \dots, 0.9$) and retrained each model with only that subset mixed into ImageNet-100 (10% of all samples; Sec. 4.1).

Key observation. Across both architectures, Top-1 and Top-5 accuracies on ImageNet-100 remain flat regardless of s , indicating no systematic dependence on illusion strength.

Interpretation. Moderate distortions provide optimal perceptual cues for the auxiliary task, but these do not translate to varying performance on the primary classification objective.


Implication. Illusion strength serves as a hyperparameter for auxiliary-task difficulty; practitioners can tune s to optimize transfer without affecting main-task accuracy.

D Cross-Model Benchmarking on Geometric Illusion Dataset


To assess the generalizability of our proposed illusion-based supervision, we conducted a benchmark evaluation using ten representative vision backbones spanning multiple architectural families: classical CNNs, inception-based networks, NAS-discovered architectures, efficient mobile models, and modern convolutional transformers.

Each model is fine-tuned on our synthetic geometric-illusion dataset using pretrained weights and optimized with AdamW. This benchmark verifies that the inductive signal introduced by geometric illusions can be learned not just by ViTs and ResNets (as studied in the main paper), but also by a broad range of architectures with varying depths, connectivity patterns, and parameter budgets.

Findings. All ten models achieve strong recall ($> 84\%$ on average) across the five illusion categories, confirming their capacity to extract meaningful structure from synthetic perceptual patterns. Notably,



(a) **Label 1 (Illusory Stimuli).** These samples contain contextual elements (e.g., radiating lines, arrowheads, intersecting strokes) that induce systematic perceptual distortions. Although the underlying geometry (e.g., line length or orientation) remains fixed, human perception is biased by these cues. Each row corresponds to one illusion type, arranged top to bottom: Hering & Wundt, Müller-Lyer, Poggendorff, Vertical-Horizontal, and Zöllner.



(b) **Label 0 (Matched Control Stimuli).** For each illusory case above, we generate a corresponding control sample with the contextual distortion elements removed. These retain the exact same geometric primitives but lack the perceptual bias, serving as negative examples during training. Control images enable the model to distinguish structural distortions caused by context rather than raw shape.

Figure 6: Full overview of the geometric-illusion dataset. Each panel shows examples from the five illusion types used in our study, arranged in the same order as Table 1. All stimuli are rendered at 224×224 resolution with controlled perceptual parameters, and are used to provide auxiliary supervision for inductive bias learning.




Figure 7: Training loss and recall curves for models of varying depth. Opacity encodes model depth (lighter = deeper). **(a)** On our illusion dataset, deeper models show delayed convergence and reduced recall. **(b)** On MNIST, no such delay is observed, suggesting the depth effect is task-specific. Shaded areas indicate differences between consecutive model depths.




Figure 8: Model accuracy on ImageNet-100 (Top-1, Top-5) and illusion-recognition as a function of discrete `illusion_strength` levels. Shaded bands indicate 95% confidence intervals.

ConvNeXt and VGG16 exceed 93% recall, demonstrating that both classical and modern architectures benefit from the embedded inductive biases.

Conclusion. This analysis demonstrates that perceptual biases introduced through geometric illusions are broadly learnable across architectures. These results reinforce our main claim: perceptually inspired auxiliary supervision is transferable and effective across diverse neural vision models.

Table 4: Accuracy and recall performance of 10 popular deep-learning models across five geometric-illusion sub-datasets. All models are pretrained and fine-tuned under identical training conditions. Mean recall across the five illusion categories demonstrates consistent generalization across architectures.

Model	Hering & Wundt	Müller-Lyer	Poggendorff	Vertical-Horizontal	Zöllner	Mean Recall
VGG16 [26]	99.49	90.65	85.25	93.41	94.99	92.86
Inception ResNet V2 [27]	99.49	87.33	80.65	93.85	89.53	90.27
Xception [28]	99.49	88.14	83.88	93.85	83.21	89.81
DenseNet201 [29]	99.49	82.90	84.09	93.85	94.09	90.99
Darknet53 [30]	99.49	83.26	82.23	93.85	83.31	88.53
NASNetLarge [31]	99.49	84.44	82.06	93.85	87.25	89.52
MobileNetV3 [32]	99.49	81.30	74.77	93.85	71.48	84.28
ResNetV2_50 [33]	82.21	80.81	80.98	93.41	85.22	88.08
EfficientNetV2 [34]	99.49	83.43	70.59	93.85	79.15	85.40
ConvNeXt [35]	99.49	89.42	89.23	93.41	95.30	93.47