

---

# ImageNet-trained CNNs are not biased towards texture: Revisiting feature reliance through controlled suppression

---

Tom Burgert<sup>1,2</sup>, Oliver Stoll<sup>1,2</sup>, Paolo Rota<sup>3</sup>, Begüm Demir<sup>1,2</sup>  
BIFOLD<sup>1</sup>, TU Berlin<sup>2</sup>, University of Trento<sup>3</sup>  
{t.burgert,o.stoll,demir}@tu-berlin.de, paolo.rota@unitn.it

## Abstract

The hypothesis that Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) are inherently texture-biased has shaped much of the discourse on feature use in deep learning. We revisit this hypothesis by examining limitations in the cue-conflict experiment by Geirhos et al. To address these limitations, we propose a domain-agnostic framework that quantifies feature reliance through systematic suppression of shape, texture, and color cues, avoiding the confounds of forced-choice conflicts. By evaluating humans and neural networks under controlled suppression conditions, we find that CNNs are not inherently texture-biased but predominantly rely on local shape features. Nonetheless, this reliance can be substantially mitigated through modern training strategies or architectures (ConvNeXt, ViTs). We further extend the analysis across computer vision, medical imaging, and remote sensing, revealing that reliance patterns differ systematically: computer vision models prioritize shape, medical imaging models emphasize color, and remote sensing models exhibit a stronger reliance towards texture. Code is available at <https://github.com/tomburgert/feature-reliance>.

## 1 Introduction

Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) have played a central role in the development of deep learning models for visual recognition [1], [2], [3], [4]. Their success across a range of computer vision (CV) benchmarks has contributed to the perception that they acquire perceptual representations resembling those of humans [5], [6], [7]. However, a growing body of work suggests that CNNs may process visual information in fundamentally different ways [8], [9], [10]. One of the most influential claims in this direction is that CNNs trained on ImageNet are inherently biased towards texture, in contrast to humans who predominantly rely on shape cues [11]. This claim, first formalized by Geirhos et al. [8] through their cue-conflict experiment, has since shaped much of the discourse on how to evaluate and interpret the use of features in deep neural networks.

In the cue-conflict experiment, images are synthesized by combining the shape of one object class with the texture of another, using neural style transfer techniques [12]. Models and humans are then presented with these hybrid images, and their predictions are analyzed to infer which visual cues they rely on. The observed divergence, with CNNs favoring texture and humans favoring shape, has become a dominant narrative for understanding human-machine perceptual differences and has inspired a wide range of follow-up studies [13], [14], [15], [16], [17].

Although influential, the cue-conflict experiment is based on assumptions that may limit the generalizability and clarity of its findings, particularly under contemporary evaluation perspectives. Conceptually, it reduces feature reliance to a binary choice between shape and texture, overlooking other potentially informative cues such as color, and tends to link salience with reliance implic-




Figure 1: Comparison of cue-conflict setup [8] (left) and our suppression-based framework (right). While Geirhos et al. infer reliance through preference on hybrid images, our framework directly quantifies reliance by measuring accuracy under systematic suppression of texture, shape, or color.

itly. Methodologically, the generated stimuli entangle unintentionally multiple features, introduce texture cues across the image in a spatially unbalanced manner, and rely on shape-based response interfaces that may bias human judgments. As discussed further in Section 3, these conceptual and methodological limitations complicate conclusions about the feature use of models and humans.

In this work, we argue for a conceptual shift: from analyzing feature bias through forced-choice conflicts to assessing feature reliance through targeted suppression. This conceptual distinction reframes how feature preferences and reliance should be evaluated. A model may prefer a certain cue in conflict, not because it is more predictive, but because it is more salient. Conversely, a model may rely heavily on a feature in natural settings, even if it does not dominate in cue-conflict scenarios. To address the aforementioned limitations, we propose a new domain-agnostic evaluation framework that quantifies performance degradation under systematic suppression of individual feature types (e.g., shape, texture, and color), enabling empirical measurement of reliance. The proposed framework does not rely on adversarial inputs or neural style transfer, but instead uses direct feature-suppressing transformations. By isolating individual feature contributions, our framework offers a more reliable basis for interpreting model decisions and comparing representational strategies, both between humans and neural networks, and across model architectures and domains.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- (1) We present a re-examination of Geirhos et al.’s cue-conflict experiment, highlighting aspects in their evaluation protocol that may limit its generalizability.
- (2) We introduce a domain-agnostic framework for evaluating feature reliance through targeted feature suppression, enabling cleaner measurement of model dependence on individual visual cues without requiring conflicting cue setups.
- (3) Using the proposed framework, we systematically compare human and model feature reliance under controlled conditions. Our results challenge the texture bias hypothesis [8] by showing that CNNs are not inherently texture-biased; instead, they only exhibit a pronounced sensitivity to local shape, which can be mitigated through modern training strategies. Notably, models trained with vision-language supervision most closely match human behavior.
- (4) We apply the same framework to assess domain-specific differences in feature reliance, showing that models trained on CV, remote sensing (RS), and medical imaging (MI) datasets prioritize distinct visual cues depending on domain characteristics.

## 2 Related Work

Understanding which features deep neural networks rely on for image classification has been a long-standing research question. While early interpretations of CNNs assumed a hierarchical buildup from

low-level edges to complex shape representations [5], [6], [7] more recent studies have challenged this view, suggesting that CNNs often rely disproportionately on local texture rather than global shape [9], [10], [8], [18]. Geirhos et al. [8] formalized this observation as the texture bias hypothesis, using a cue-conflict protocol to reveal divergent feature preferences between humans and CNNs.

Subsequent work investigated factors shaping feature reliance beyond architecture. Hermann et al. [13] showed that texture bias in CNNs arises primarily from training objectives and augmentations, with techniques like blurring and cropping increasing shape bias more than architectural changes. Although shape features are present in deeper layers [15], [14], they are not consistently used during classification. Transformer-based models and vision-language models have shifted this discussion. Vision transformers (ViTs) exhibit lower texture bias due to their global attention mechanism [19], [20], and vision-language models show improved alignment with human-like shape use [21].

Various methods have attempted to enforce shape bias or suppress texture cues for improved robustness, including anisotropic filtering [22], edge encoding [23], style disentanglement [24], [25], and shape-focused augmentations [26], [27]. However, stylization alone may improve robustness independent of shape bias [28], and neither shape nor texture bias reliably predicts generalization [16]. These findings have motivated integrative approaches that combine diverse feature biases. Joint supervision [29], ensembles [30], and adaptive recombination [31] aim to harness complementary features. Ge et al. [32] and Jain et al. [17] show that disentangling and combining shape, texture, and color improve robustness and interpretability. Nonetheless, Lucieri et al. [33] caution that in domains like MI, cue entanglement is essential and biasing towards shape may be counterproductive.

Efforts to increase shape bias are often motivated by the broader goal of human-model alignment. Geirhos et al. [34], [35] show that even robust models exhibit error patterns that diverge from humans, revealing a persistent consistency gap. Muttenthaler et al. [36] further argue that alignment with human conceptual structure depends more on training signals than model scale, indicating that robustness and shape bias alone are insufficient proxies for human-like perception.

### 3 Rethinking Texture Bias: A Critical Look at Cue-Conflict Evaluation

The hypothesis that CNNs trained on ImageNet are biased towards texture was popularized by Geirhos et al. [8], who introduced a cue-conflict evaluation protocol. In this setup, images were generated by neural style transfer [12], combining the shape content (cue) of one class with the texture content (cue) of another. Predictions from both humans and CNNs on these images were then used to infer whether classification decisions were driven more by shape or texture features. Over time, the cue-conflict evaluation protocol has become a de facto standard for assessing feature bias in deep neural networks. While impactful, this protocol introduced several assumptions and limitations that have received limited attention. Conceptually, the protocol frames feature reliance as a binary shape-or-texture choice, which may overlook other cues such as color and conflate salience with dependence. In addition, the stylized stimuli constrain the evaluation of feature bias to naturalistic images with a similar set of classes and cannot be generalized across datasets (e.g., flower classification) or domains (e.g., RS, MI). Beyond these conceptual limitations, the cue-conflict protocol exhibits three methodological concerns in its design and implementation:

- (i) **Lack of Feature Isolation.** The texture cues within the cue-conflict images also preserved information beyond texture, including color and local shape structures (e.g., contours and parts of silhouettes). As a result, the synthesized texture cue was not a pure representation of texture but a composite of multiple features, making it difficult to attribute classification behavior to texture alone. An example can be seen in Figure 2a.
- (ii) **Overloaded Texture Class Signals.** The protocol consistently inserted texture cues not only into the object region but also into the image background. Since CNNs aggregate local statistics across spatial positions, this broad spatial distribution increased the signal strength of the texture class relative to the shape class. This spatial imbalance systematically biases CNNs towards texture-based decisions, not because of an intrinsic preference but due to the dominant spatial availability of the texture signal. An example can be seen in Figure 2b.
- (iii) **Human Interface Bias Towards Shape.** Participants in the human experiments selected the image class by clicking on buttons labeled with icons representing each category. These icons represented global shape characteristics (i.e., silhouettes), potentially guiding participants

towards matching shape features in the cue-conflict image with the icon. This response format potentially introduces bias towards shape decisions, especially when participants were unsure which feature to prioritize. The used icons are visualized in Figure 2c.




Figure 2: Example images taken from the cue-conflict dataset [8]. **(a)** Boat shape cue merged with chair texture cue. **(b)** Airplane shape cue merged with clock texture cue. **(c)** Icons of the human interface to select classes.

These design choices may inadvertently influence CNNs towards texture-driven decisions and humans towards shape-based judgments and complicate drawing definitive conclusions about the actual feature reliance of models.

#### 4 A Domain-Agnostic Framework for Feature Reliance

Accurately assessing how deep neural networks rely on different visual features remains a central challenge in understanding their behavior. While the cue-conflict evaluation protocol [8] introduced a reliance test based on feature bias, it imposes conceptual and methodological constraints that limit its generalizability. Rather than forcing models to choose between shape and texture, we propose to assess their reliance on individual feature types by systematically suppressing them and measuring the resulting impact on classification performance. This shift enables a more flexible, generalizable, and semantically grounded analysis of feature use in neural networks.

To evaluate the reliance of deep neural networks on individual visual features, we employ a set of image transformations that selectively suppress shape, texture, or color information while minimally affecting the remaining features. Each transformation is chosen for its ability to target a specific feature class. We define three feature types:

- **Shape** refers to information carried by spatial arrangement and structural contours, including both global (object outline) and local (part-level) shape.
- **Texture** is defined by repetitive patterns, high-frequency local variations, and fine-grained surface details.
- **Color** denotes chromatic information independent of spatial layout or texture.

For each feature type, we include two complementary transformations that differ in their suppression mechanisms and preservation profiles, offering distinct but comparable perspectives on the targeted feature. The transformations are summarized in Table 1 and briefly described in the following. Patch Shuffle [37], [28] and Patch Rotation disrupt shape by modifying non-overlapping image patches: Shuffle randomizes spatial positions, while Rotation preserves locality of patches but breaks edge continuity. Both affect global or local shape, depending on grid size. Bilateral Filtering [38] and Gaussian Blur reduce texture by smoothing high-frequency details, with the former preserving edges more effectively. Grayscale removes chromatic cues entirely, while Channel Shuffle disrupts color correlations without altering intensity. In the following, we validate the suppression effects of these transformations using quantitative metrics.

Table 1: Feature-suppressing transformations used in this work. Each feature is suppressed using two transformations with differing strengths.

Feature Type	Transformation 1	Transformation 2
Shape	Patch Shuffle	Patch Rotation
Texture	Bilateral Filter	Gaussian Blur
Color	Grayscale	Channel Shuffle

Table 2: Quantitative validation of suppression transformations across 800 images of ImageNet. Each transformation is used with a fixed parameter setting (see Param ID legend below). Values report normalized metric scores. Arrows indicate desired direction:  $\uparrow$  higher is better,  $\downarrow$  lower is better.

Transformation	Param ID	Texture $\downarrow$	Shape $\uparrow$	LV $\downarrow$	HFE $\downarrow$	ESSIM $\uparrow$	GC $\uparrow$
<i>Texture-Suppressing</i>							
Bilateral Filter	A	0.521	0.796	0.548	0.493	0.737	0.855
Box Blur	B	0.193	0.363	0.237	0.148	0.436	0.289
Gaussian Blur	C	0.349	0.662	0.392	0.306	0.744	0.579
Median Filter	D	0.357	0.506	0.399	0.316	0.584	0.429
NLMeans Denoising	E	0.706	0.797	0.723	0.690	0.730	0.864
Transformation	Param ID	Texture $\uparrow$	Shape $\downarrow$	LV $\uparrow$	HFE $\uparrow$	ESSIM $\downarrow$	GC $\downarrow$
<i>Shape-Suppressing</i>							
Patch Shuffle	F	1.000	0.176	1.000	1.000	0.205	0.147
Patch Rotation	F	1.000	0.293	1.000	1.000	0.339	0.247

**Legend:** A:  $d=11, \sigma_c=170, \sigma_s=75$ ; B:  $k=11$ ; C:  $k=11, \sigma=2.0$ ; D:  $k=11$ ; E:  $h=20, tws=11, sws=11$ ; F: grid=6.

#### 4.1 Quantitative Validation of Suppression Transformations

While the individual transformations used in this work are not novel, their selection for targeted feature suppression requires empirical justification. To validate that each transformation suppresses the intended visual feature (e.g., texture, shape) while preserving others, we quantify their effects using four metrics: Local Variance (LV) [39] and High-Frequency Energy (HFE) [40] to assess texture suppression, and Edge-SSIM (ESSIM) [41] and Gradient Correlation (GC) to measure shape preservation. All metrics are normalized to the range  $[0, 1]$  by dividing by the scores of the unsuppressed image. Higher values of ESSIM and GC indicate better preservation of edge and structural information, while lower values of LV and HFE reflect stronger suppression of texture features. Further, we compute a harmonic mean across the two texture metrics (Texture) and the two shape metrics (Shape) for each transformation.

We test the effectiveness of the feature suppression transformations across 800 sampled images from the ImageNet validation set. For each transformation, we evaluate a representative configuration chosen to balance suppression of the target feature and preservation of others. These settings, such as kernel size or smoothing strength, are indexed by Param IDs in Table 2, with details listed below the table. A full ablation of parameter settings is provided in the supplemental material. In addition to our selected texture suppression transformations, we also compare common alternatives such as Non-Local Means Denoising [42], Box blur, and Median filtering [43] to ensure a fair comparison across standard smoothing techniques. Among texture-suppressing methods, bilateral filtering yields the most balanced trade-off between reducing texture (LV: 0.54, HFE: 0.49) and preserving shape (ESSIM: 0.74, GC: 0.85). Gaussian Blur suppresses texture more uniformly but leads to a greater loss of shape information. Box blur and median filtering remove texture strongly, but at a substantial cost to shape preservation. For shape suppression, we evaluate Patch Shuffle and Patch Rotation with a grid size of 6. These transformations preserve texture but substantially disrupt structural integrity, making them suitable for assessing shape reliance. To complement the quantitative evaluation, qualitative visual examples of the suppression effects are provided in the supplemental material.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Experiment I: Human vs. CNNs Feature Reliance

**Experimental Setup.** To compare human and model reliance on different visual features, we designed a controlled experiment inspired by Geirhos et al.[34], [8]. We constructed an ImageNet16-like dataset by selecting 50 representative images for each of 16 entry-level categories derived from the WordNet hierarchy [44] (see [34] for details). Images were selected based on the most confidently predicted samples in the ImageNet validation set [45] by a ResNet50 [2] pretrained on ImageNet1k, ensuring balanced subclass coverage. For categories with insufficient confident predictions (airplane, knife, oven), additional samples were manually added. All images were resized to  $224 \times 224$  pixels.

Humans were presented with image stimuli in randomized order under one of five conditions: original, global shape suppression, local shape suppression, texture suppression, or color suppression. Each feature was suppressed via a single transformation with fixed hyperparameters: Patch Shuffle with grid size 3 (global shape), grid size 6 (local shape), bilateral filtering with  $d=12$ ,  $\sigma_{\text{color}}=170$  and  $\sigma_{\text{space}}=75$  (texture), and grayscale conversion (color). See Section 4.1 for justification. Each participant saw only one randomly chosen version of each image to avoid learning effects. The five suppression conditions of one image were split across groups of five participants to ensure balanced coverage. Twenty participants completed the study. Following Geirhos et al.[8], each trial included a 300 ms fixation square, 200 ms image presentation, and 200 ms pink noise mask ( $1/f$  spectral shape) to minimize feedback processing. Participants selected one of 16 categories via a  $4 \times 4$  grid of alphabetically sorted class names. An additional “not clear” button was available for unrecognizable stimuli. Attention checks were administered every 100 trials, and failed trials were excluded. Additional details and interface screenshots can be found in the supplemental material.

Model evaluation mirrored the human protocol, evaluating their performance under the same five suppression conditions using the identical image set shown to humans. For each image, the class prediction was computed by summing softmax outputs over all ImageNet subclasses mapping to the same entry-level category. Only predictions above the threshold of 0.5 were considered correct. This procedure was chosen heuristically, complementary results using argmax to define class predictions are reported in the supplemental material and show nearly identical reliance profiles.

We evaluated several architectures: ResNet50-standard, trained from scratch with basic augmentations, and ResNet50-sota, trained with a modern recipe [46]. Additional CNNs include MobileNetV3 [47], EfficientNet [3], EfficientNetV2 [48], ConvMixer [49], ConvNeXt [4], and ConvNeXtV2 [50]. Transformer-based models include ViT [51], DeiT [52], SwinTransformer [53], and CLIP-ViT [54]. All models except ResNet50-standard were obtained as pretrained checkpoints from the `timm` library [55]. The detailed training procedures can be found in the supplemental material.

**Results.** Figure 3 presents a comparative overview of the performance of humans and CNNs under feature suppression, plotted as the relative accuracy (i.e., accuracy under suppression divided by baseline accuracy on original images). Separate subplots show results for each suppressed feature type. We highlight three representative CNNs: ResNet50-standard, ResNet50-sota, and ConvNeXtV2 alongside human performance. The results show that CNNs are not strongly reliant on texture: under texture suppression, ResNet50-standard retains 80% of its original performance, close to performance under global shape suppression (83%). The highest vulnerability is observed under local shape suppression, where accuracy drops to just 28%. Humans exhibit a similar reliance profile with local shape suppression being most disruptive, but show higher robustness to it (76% retained accuracy). Interestingly, modern training strategies substantially mitigate this effect: the ResNet50-sota reaches 62% under local shape suppression, and ConvNeXtV2 improves further to 65%. These results suggest that the heavy reliance on local shape observed in earlier CNNs is not architectural in nature but can be alleviated through better training regimes. A likely contributing factor is the inclusion of stronger regularization, improved data augmentations, and more extensive training schedules in the modern setup, which may encourage broader feature utilization beyond local patterns. Statistical significance tests confirming these differences are reported in the supplemental material.

Broadening the analysis to a wider range of architectures (Table 3), we observe that several models trained with state-of-the-art recipes exhibit a more balanced reliance profile. However, this trend is not universal: ConvMixer, EfficientNet, and MobileNet variants retain a strong dependence on local shape, indicating that improved training alone does not guarantee human-like feature use and that architectural inductive biases or capacity limitations may still play a role. Among transformer-




Figure 3: Relative accuracy under feature suppression for human observers and three CNNs ResNet50-standard, ResNet50-sota, ConvNeXtV2 on the curated ImageNet16 dataset. Each subplot shows performance under suppression of a specific feature: **(a)** global shape via Patch Shuffle (grid=3); **(b)** local shape via Patch Shuffle (grid=6); **(c)** texture via bilateral filtering; and **(d)** color via grayscale.

Table 3: Relative accuracy (accuracy under suppression divided by accuracy on original images) for each feature suppression type across models and human observers.

Architecture	Global Shape	Local Shape	Texture	Color	Original	#Params
Humans	0.965	0.763	0.979	0.999	0.969	–
ResNet50-standard [2]	0.832	0.276	0.795	0.924	0.954	25.6M
ResNet50-sota [46]	0.943	0.618	0.867	0.948	0.931	25.6M
ConvNeXt [4]	0.938	0.606	0.910	0.961	0.934	28.6M
ConvNeXtV2 [50]	0.949	0.647	0.925	0.969	0.940	28.6M
EfficientNet [3]	0.870	0.240	0.892	0.987	0.856	30.0M
EfficientNetV2 [48]	0.926	0.423	0.897	0.957	0.932	24.0M
MobileNetV3 [47]	0.795	0.217	0.761	0.859	0.881	5.4M
ConvMixer [49]	0.920	0.437	0.815	0.891	0.874	21.1M
ViT [51]	0.930	0.636	0.921	0.977	0.929	86.6M
DeiT [52]	0.938	0.730	0.926	0.969	0.932	86.6M
Swin [53]	0.924	0.713	0.906	0.941	0.945	87.8M
CLIP ViT [54]	0.959	0.758	0.949	0.984	0.936	86.6M

based models, the ViT demonstrates a feature reliance profile similar to ResNet50-sota across all suppression conditions, challenging the notion that transformers are inherently more shape-oriented than CNNs. Notably, the CLIP model most closely matches human performance across all feature suppression conditions, suggesting that vision-language supervision encourages more human-aligned representations. This may reflect the effect of contrastive vision-language training, which prioritize alignment with high-level semantic concepts over low-level visual cues.

These findings challenge the texture bias hypothesis popularized by Geirhos et al. [8] as a fixed inductive bias of CNNs. Instead, the observed behavior in the cue-conflict experiment may have reflected a dominant reliance on local shape features, rather than an inherent texture bias.

## 5.2 Experiment II: Domain-specific Feature Reliance

While Section 5.1 focused on comparing feature reliance between humans and CNNs on a fixed benchmark, this section explores how reliance on shape, texture, and color varies across domains. The same suppression-based framework introduced earlier is applied to three representative visual domains: CV, MI, and RS. In each case, we fix the architecture to a ResNet50 and apply the standard training protocol, including only the data augmentation techniques random resized crop and horizontal flip. For CV datasets, we initialize models with ImageNet-pretrained weights (standard training protocol) and then finetuned on the respective datasets. For MI and RS, we train from scratch to allow a disentangled comparison across domains. Additional results for MI and RS with pretrained models to simulate operational scenarios can be found in the supplemental material. Details about the hyperparameter, as well as an overview of the corresponding validation accuracies, are provided in the supplemental material. To reduce redundancy, we report results using one representative suppression




Figure 4: Feature suppression results across three domains. **Top row (a–c)**: ResNet50 pretrained on ImageNet and finetuned on CV datasets. **Middle row (d–f)**: ResNet50 trained from scratch on MedMNIST-v2 (medical imaging). **Bottom row (g–i)**: ResNet50 trained from scratch on high-resolution RS datasets. Columns correspond to: **(a, d, g)** shape suppression (Patch Shuffle), **(b, e, h)** texture suppression (Bilateral Filter), and **(c, f, i)** color suppression (Grayscale).

technique per feature type in the main paper. Results using alternative suppression methods per feature type are included in the supplemental material and exhibit qualitatively similar patterns across domains.

To visualize domain-specific suppression sensitivity, we present a unified grid of per-domain results in Figure 4, showing the effect of suppressing shape, texture, and color for datasets from each domain. To ensure comparability across datasets with different numbers of classes and baseline accuracies, we standardize performance by rescaling: chance-level accuracy is mapped to 0, and baseline accuracy (i.e., accuracy on original images) is mapped to 1. Relative accuracy under suppression is then expressed on this normalized scale, facilitating direct comparison of feature reliance across domains and datasets. Finally, to synthesize the findings, we aggregate suppression curves in a domain-level comparison (Figure 5) by averaging results across datasets within each domain.

**Computer Vision (CV).** Figure 4a–c shows suppression results for five standard CV benchmarks (ImageNet [45], Caltech101 [56], Flowers102 [57], Oxford-IIIT-Pet [58], STL10 [59]). Across datasets, we observe that shape suppression induces the strongest performance degradation, especially as the patch shuffle grid size increases. This confirms a pronounced reliance on local shape information in pretrained CNNs. In contrast, texture suppression via bilateral filtering has minimal effect, and color suppression through grayscale conversion yields only minor degradation, indicating that CNNs fine-tuned on these datasets are largely robust to the removal of texture and color cues. These results are consistent with our human comparison study and suggest that local shape continues to dominate feature reliance in natural image classification tasks. For completeness, the supplemental material




Figure 5: Domain-averaged feature suppression curves for CV, MI, and RS. **(a)** Shape suppression via Patch Shuffle. **(b)** Texture suppression via bilateral filtering. **(c)** Color suppression via grayscale.

includes results for models trained from scratch as well as a class-wise analysis for ImageNet, which confirms that the global reliance patterns are consistent across categories.

**Medical Imaging (MI).** Figure 4d–f summarizes results on five datasets from the MedMNIST-v2 collection [60]: PathMNIST, RetinaMNIST, BloodMNIST, DermaMNIST, and ChestMNIST. All images were resized to  $224 \times 224$  pixels for consistency with the experimental setup. Across these datasets, suppression effects are more heterogeneous than in CV. While shape suppression degrades performance, the impact is generally less pronounced, and texture suppression yields moderate performance drops in datasets such as PathMNIST and BloodMNIST, but relatively little effect in RetinaMNIST and DermaMNIST. By contrast, color suppression induces a substantial decline in classification accuracy for most datasets, reflecting the strong diagnostic role of chromatic cues, except in ChestMNIST, which contains only grayscale images. Taken together, these results suggest that feature reliance in medical imaging varies substantially across datasets, with a common trend towards greater dependence on color information.

**Remote Sensing (RS).** Figure 4g–i reports suppression curves for five very-high-resolution RGB datasets: UCMerced [61], RSD46-WHU [62], DeepGlobe [63], PatternNet [64], and AID [65]. As in MI, shape suppression impacts performance, but the degradation is less pronounced than in the CV domain, indicating lower reliance on local shape. In contrast to CV and MI, texture suppression leads to substantial performance degradation across all datasets, suggesting that fine-grained surface patterns are critical for RS classification. Surprisingly, color suppression also results in notable performance drops, despite the use of RGB imagery only. This likely reflects strong correlations between chromatic cues and semantic land cover categories. Overall, RS models exhibit a pronounced reliance on texture and color, and comparatively less dependence on local shape, reflecting the distinct statistical structure and spatial semantics of RS imagery.

**Cross-Domain Comparison.** To synthesize these observations, Figure 5 presents the domain-averaged suppression curves for each feature, including 1-sigma error bars. Three clear trends emerge. First, CV models are most reliant on local shape, especially when trained from scratch, while ImageNet pretraining induces slightly greater robustness. Second, MI models exhibit stronger dependence on color, consistent with the nature of some medical tasks (e.g., in dermatology, histopathology), which often require interpreting chromatic cues. Third, RS models exhibit the highest texture reliance among the three tested domains. This may reflect the nature of many RS classes that are defined by texture-like patterns (e.g., fields, residential areas), rather than by distinct global contours. These patterns confirm that feature reliance is shaped not only by architecture and training regime, but also by the visual and semantic properties of the task or domain.

Complementary experiments for CV datasets with suppressing two features at the same time are provided in the supplemental material and are consistent with the patterns observed for single-feature suppression: performance is highest when only shape is preserved, reduced when only texture remains, and nearly lost when only color is available. In summary, the findings highlight that domain characteristics, alongside architecture and training regime, play a crucial role in shaping feature reliance. While prior work emphasized architecture-induced biases, our results suggest that data properties equally govern the perceptual strategies that models adopt.

## 6 Conclusion

This paper revisited the widely cited claim that CNNs trained on ImageNet are inherently biased towards texture. We identify critical conceptual and methodological limitations in the cue-conflict paradigm popularized by Geirhos et al. [8] that support this hypothesis. Further, we propose a new framework for evaluating feature reliance based on targeted suppression rather than forced-choice preference. Using this framework, we find no evidence for an inherent texture bias in CNNs, but instead observed a pronounced reliance on local shape features. Nonetheless, we show that this reliance can be substantially mitigated through modern training strategies. Across domains, we find that feature reliance varies substantially: CV models prioritize shape, MI models rely more evenly on color, and RS models exhibit strong texture sensitivity. These findings challenge the notion of fixed architectural biases and instead position feature reliance as a flexible property shaped by optimization objectives and domain-specific semantics, offering new directions for designing models that better align with human perceptual strategies. At the same time, the relative contributions of architectural components and training strategies to these reliance patterns remain to be systematically evaluated.

**Limitations.** Our framework relies on operational definitions of shape, texture, and color based on specific transformations, but features are continuous and interdependent, limiting perfect isolation. In practice, suppression only reduces rather than eliminates features: texture suppression can leave residual low-level features perceptible as texture, while shape suppression does not fully remove all shape cues. This reflects the inherent trade-off of reducing one feature while preserving others, making absolute removal unattainable. The applied suppression techniques may also introduce artifacts that affect model behavior independently of the targeted features (e.g., block-like structures from Patch Shuffle, smoothing from filtering). Further, the results obtained with pretrained models may reflect effects of similarities between suppression transformations and augmentation techniques (e.g., Cutout and Patch Shuffle). Finally, our human experiments employed a controlled forced-choice design with brief exposures and a limited set of categories to ensure comparability. While necessary for experimental control, these constraints may not fully reflect the richness and adaptability of human visual perception in real-world settings.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Johanna Vielhaben and Genc Hoxha for suggesting the addition of quantitative experiments to validate the feature suppression techniques, Liliann Lehrke for valuable guidance on the design of the psychological study, and Christopher Olk for helpful discussions in selecting the title.

## References

- [1] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. ImageNet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 25, 2012.
- [2] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [3] Mingxing Tan and Quoc Le. Efficientnet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6105–6114, 2019.
- [4] Zhuang Liu, Hanzi Mao, Chao-Yuan Wu, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Trevor Darrell, and Saining Xie. A convnet for the 2020s. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11976–11986, 2022.
- [5] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553):436–444, 2015.
- [6] Jonas Kubilius, Stefania Bracci, and Hans P Op de Beeck. Deep neural networks as a computational model for human shape sensitivity. *PLoS computational biology*, 12(4):e1004896, 2016. Publisher: Public Library of Science San Francisco, CA USA.

- [7] Samuel Ritter, David GT Barrett, Adam Santoro, and Matt M Botvinick. Cognitive psychology for deep neural networks: A shape bias case study. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2940–2949, 2017.
- [8] 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. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [9] 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. Publisher: Public Library of Science San Francisco, CA USA.
- [10] Wieland Brendel and Matthias Bethge. Approximating CNNs with Bag-of-local-Features models works surprisingly well on ImageNet. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [11] Barbara Landau, Linda B Smith, and Susan S Jones. The importance of shape in early lexical learning. *Cognitive Development*, 3(3):299–321, 1988.
- [12] Leon A Gatys, Alexander S Ecker, and Matthias Bethge. Image style transfer using convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2414–2423, 2016.
- [13] Katherine Hermann, Ting Chen, and Simon Kornblith. The Origins and Prevalence of Texture Bias in Convolutional Neural Networks. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 19000–19015, 2020.
- [14] Katherine Hermann and Andrew Lampinen. What shapes feature representations? Exploring datasets, architectures, and training. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 9995–10006, 2020.
- [15] Md Amirul Islam, Matthew Kowal, Patrick Esser, Sen Jia, Björn Ommer, Konstantinos G. Derpanis, and Neil Bruce. Shape or Texture: Understanding Discriminative Features in CNNs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [16] Paul Gavrikov and Janis Keuper. Can Biases in ImageNet Models Explain Generalization? In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22184–22194, 2024.
- [17] Saachi Jain, Dimitris Tsipras, and Aleksander Madry. Combining diverse feature priors. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9802–9832, 2022.
- [18] Ajay Subramanian, Elena Sizikova, Najib Majaj, and Denis Pelli. Spatial-frequency channels, shape bias, and adversarial robustness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 4137–4149, 2023.
- [19] Muhammad Muzammal Naseer, Kanchana Ranasinghe, Salman H Khan, Munawar Hayat, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Intriguing properties of vision transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:23296–23308, 2021.
- [20] Shikhar Tuli, Ishita Dasgupta, Erin Grant, and Thomas L Griffiths. Are convolutional neural networks or transformers more like human vision? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.07197*, 2021.
- [21] Paul Gavrikov, Jovita Lukasik, Steffen Jung, Robert Geirhos, Muhammad Jehanzeb Mirza, Margret Keuper, and Janis Keuper. Can We Talk Models Into Seeing the World Differently? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [22] Shlok Mishra, Anshul Shah, Ankan Bansal, Janit Anjaria, Jonghyun Choi, Abhinav Shrivastava, Abhishek Sharma, and David Jacobs. Learning visual representations for transfer learning by suppressing texture. In *British Machine Vision Conference*, 2022.

- [23] Narges Honarvar Nazari and Adriana Kovashka. The role of shape for domain generalization on sparsely-textured images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5120–5130, 2022.
- [24] Hyeonseob Nam, HyunJae Lee, Jongchan Park, Wonjun Yoon, and Donggeun Yoo. Reducing Domain Gap by Reducing Style Bias. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8690–8699, 2021.
- [25] Dhruva Kashyap, Sumukh K. Aithal, Rakshith C, and Natarajan Subramanyam. Towards Domain Adversarial Methods to Mitigate Texture Bias. In *International Conference on Learning Representations Workshop*, 2022.
- [26] Sangjun Lee, Inwoo Hwang, Gi-Cheon Kang, and Byoung-Tak Zhang. Improving Robustness to Texture Bias via Shape-Focused Augmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 4323–4331, 2022.
- [27] Aditay Tripathi, Rishubh Singh, Anirban Chakraborty, and Pradeep Shenoy. Edges to shapes to concepts: Adversarial augmentation for robust vision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 24470–24479, 2023.
- [28] Chaithanya Kumar Mummadi, Ranjitha Subramaniam, Robin Huttmacher, Julien Vitay, Volker Fischer, and Jan Hendrik Metzen. Does enhanced shape bias improve neural network robustness to common corruptions? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [29] Yingwei Li, Qihang Yu, Mingxing Tan, Jieru Mei, Peng Tang, Wei Shen, Alan Yuille, and cihang xie. Shape-Texture Debiased Neural Network Training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [30] Kenneth T Co, Luis Muñoz-González, Leslie Kanthan, Ben Glocker, and Emil C Lupu. Universal adversarial robustness of texture and shape-biased models. In *IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pages 799–803, 2021.
- [31] Xinkuan Qiu, Meina Kan, Yongbin Zhou, Yanchao Bi, and Shiguang Shan. Shape-biased CNNs are Not Always Superior in Out-of-Distribution Robustness. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 2326–2335, 2024.
- [32] Yunhao Ge, Yao Xiao, Zhi Xu, Xingrui Wang, and Laurent Itti. Contributions of shape, texture, and color in visual recognition. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 369–386, 2022.
- [33] Adriano Lucieri, Fabian Schmeisser, Christoph Peter Balada, Shoaib Ahmed Siddiqui, Andreas Dengel, and Sheraz Ahmed. Revisiting the shape-bias of deep learning for dermoscopic skin lesion classification. In *Annual Conference on Medical Image Understanding and Analysis*, pages 46–61, 2022.
- [34] Robert Geirhos, Carlos RM Temme, Jonas Rauber, Heiko H Schütt, Matthias Bethge, and Felix A Wichmann. Generalisation in humans and deep neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [35] Robert Geirhos, Kantharaju Narayanappa, Benjamin Mitzkus, Tizian Thieringer, Matthias Bethge, Felix A Wichmann, and Wieland Brendel. Partial success in closing the gap between human and machine vision. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:23885–23899, 2021.
- [36] Lukas Muttenthaler, Jonas Dippel, Lorenz Linhardt, Robert A. Vandermeulen, and Simon Kornblith. Human alignment of neural network representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [37] Tiange Luo, Tianle Cai, Mengxiao Zhang, Siyu Chen, Di He, and Liwei Wang. Defective Convolutional Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.08432*, 2019. \_eprint: 1911.08432.
- [38] Carlo Tomasi and Roberto Manduchi. Bilateral filtering for gray and color images. In *International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 839–846. IEEE, 1998.

- [39] Robert M Haralick, Karthikeyan Shanmugam, and Its' Hak Dinstein. Textural features for image classification. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, (6):610–621, 1973.
- [40] Rafael C Gonzales and Paul Wintz. *Digital image processing*. Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., 1987.
- [41] Zhou Wang, Alan C Bovik, Hamid R Sheikh, and Eero P Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 13(4): 600–612, 2004. Publisher: IEEE.
- [42] Antoni Buades, Bartomeu Coll, and J-M Morel. A non-local algorithm for image denoising. In *IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, volume 2, pages 60–65, 2005.
- [43] Thomas Huang, GJTYG Yang, and Greory Tang. A fast two-dimensional median filtering algorithm. *IEEE transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, 27(1):13–18, 1979.
- [44] George A Miller. WordNet: a lexical database for English. *Communications of the ACM*, 38 (11):39–41, 1995.
- [45] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 248–255, 2009.
- [46] Ross Wightman, Hugo Touvron, and Herve Jegou. ResNet strikes back: An improved training procedure in timm. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems Workshop*, 2021.
- [47] Andrew Howard, Mark Sandler, Grace Chu, Liang-Chieh Chen, Bo Chen, Mingxing Tan, Weijun Wang, Yukun Zhu, Ruoming Pang, Vijay Vasudevan, and others. Searching for mobilenetv3. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1314–1324, 2019.
- [48] Mingxing Tan and Quoc Le. Efficientnetv2: Smaller models and faster training. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10096–10106, 2021.
- [49] Asher Trockman and J. Zico Kolter. Patches Are All You Need? *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856.
- [50] Sanghyun Woo, Shoubhik Debnath, Ronghang Hu, Xinlei Chen, Zhuang Liu, In So Kweon, and Saining Xie. Convnext v2: Co-designing and scaling convnets with masked autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 16133–16142, 2023.
- [51] 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 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [52] Hugo Touvron, Matthieu Cord, Matthijs Douze, Francisco Massa, Alexandre Sablayrolles, and Hervé Jégou. Training data-efficient image transformers & distillation through attention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10347–10357, 2021.
- [53] 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 *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 10012–10022, 2021.
- [54] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, and others. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8748–8763, 2021.
- [55] Ross Wightman. PyTorch Image Models, 2019. URL <https://github.com/rwightman/pytorch-image-models>. Publication Title: GitHub repository.

- [56] Li Fei-Fei, R. Fergus, and P. Perona. Learning Generative Visual Models from Few Training Examples: An Incremental Bayesian Approach Tested on 101 Object Categories. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshop*, pages 178–178, 2004.
- [57] Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. Automated flower classification over a large number of classes. In *Indian Conference on Computer Vision, Graphics & Image Processing*, pages 722–729. IEEE, 2008.
- [58] Omkar M Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and CV Jawahar. Cats and dogs. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3498–3505, 2012.
- [59] Adam Coates, Andrew Ng, and Honglak Lee. An analysis of single-layer networks in unsupervised feature learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 215–223. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.
- [60] Jiancheng Yang, Rui Shi, Donglai Wei, Zequan Liu, Lin Zhao, Bilian Ke, Hanspeter Pfister, and Bingbing Ni. MedMNIST v2-A large-scale lightweight benchmark for 2D and 3D biomedical image classification. *Scientific Data*, 10(1):41, 2023. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group UK London.
- [61] Yi Yang and Shawn Newsam. Bag-of-visual-words and spatial extensions for land-use classification. In *Proceedings of the 18th SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems*, pages 270–279, 2010.
- [62] Yang Long, Yiping Gong, Zhifeng Xiao, and Qing Liu. Accurate object localization in remote sensing images based on convolutional neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 55(5):2486–2498, 2017.
- [63] Ilke Demir, Krzysztof Koperski, David Lindenbaum, Guan Pang, Jing Huang, Saikat Basu, Forest Hughes, Devis Tuia, and Ramesh Raskar. Deepglobe 2018: A challenge to parse the earth through satellite images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 172–181, 2018.
- [64] Weixun Zhou, Shawn Newsam, Congmin Li, and Zhenfeng Shao. PatternNet: A benchmark dataset for performance evaluation of remote sensing image retrieval. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 145:197–209, 2018.
- [65] Gui-Song Xia, Jingwen Hu, Fan Hu, Baoguang Shi, Xiang Bai, Yanfei Zhong, Liangpei Zhang, and Xiaoqiang Lu. AID: A benchmark data set for performance evaluation of aerial scene classification. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 55(7):3965–3981, 2017.
- [66] Pauli Virtanen, Ralf Gommers, Travis E. Oliphant, Matt Haberland, Tyler Reddy, David Cournapeau, Evgeni Burovski, Pearu Peterson, Warren Weckesser, Jonathan Bright, Stéfan J. van der Walt, Matthew Brett, Joshua Wilson, K. Jarrod Millman, Nikolay Mayorov, Andrew R. J. Nelson, Eric Jones, Robert Kern, Eric Larson, C J Carey, İlhan Polat, Yu Feng, Eric W. Moore, Jake VanderPlas, Denis Laxalde, Josef Perktold, Robert Cimrman, Ian Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, Charles R. Harris, Anne M. Archibald, Antônio H. Ribeiro, Fabian Pedregosa, Paul van Mulbregt, and SciPy 1.0 Contributors. SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python. *Nature Methods*, 17:261–272, 2020.

## A Notation of Feature Suppression Metrics

To quantify the effect of feature suppression, we define a transformation  $T_\tau : \mathbb{R}^{H \times W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{H \times W}$  that maps an original grayscale image  $\mathbf{x}$  to its feature-suppressed version  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = T_\tau(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $\tau \in \{\text{texture, shape}\}$ . We then compare  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  using a set of similarity metrics  $\phi(\cdot)$  that target either texture or shape characteristics.

**(1) Local Variance (LV).** This metric quantifies local contrast variability and serves as a proxy for fine-grained texture information. We compute the mean variance over non-overlapping windows  $\mathbf{w}_{i,j}$  of size  $k \times k$ :

$$\phi_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j} \text{Var}(\mathbf{w}_{i,j}), \quad (1)$$

$$\text{LV}(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \min \left( 1, \frac{\phi_{\text{var}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{\phi_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{x})} \right). \quad (2)$$

**(2) High-Frequency Energy Ratio (HFE).** This metric captures the spectral energy in high frequencies and is used to measure texture preservation. Using the 2D Fourier transform  $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ , we compute:

$$\phi_{\text{hf}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H}} |\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})_{u,v}|^2}{\sum_{(u,v)} |\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})_{u,v}|^2}, \quad (3)$$

$$\text{HFE}(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \min \left( 1, \frac{\phi_{\text{hf}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{\phi_{\text{hf}}(\mathbf{x})} \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}$  is the set of frequency components with distance greater than radius  $r$  from the center.

**(3) Edge Structural Similarity (ESSIM).** This metric evaluates the similarity of edge structures, capturing shape information. Sobel gradients are computed with kernel size  $k$ :

$$\phi_{\text{sobel}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{(\partial_x \mathbf{x})^2 + (\partial_y \mathbf{x})^2}, \quad (5)$$

$$\text{ESSIM}(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \text{SSIM}(\phi_{\text{sobel}}(\mathbf{x}), \phi_{\text{sobel}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})). \quad (6)$$

**(4) Gradient Correlation (GC).** This metric compares first-order gradients along both axes and targets shape preservation. It is defined as:

$$g_x(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial x}, \quad g_y(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial y}, \quad (7)$$

$$\text{GC}(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{1}{2} [\text{corr}(g_x(\mathbf{x}), g_x(\hat{\mathbf{x}})) + \text{corr}(g_y(\mathbf{x}), g_y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}))]. \quad (8)$$

**Averaged Texture and Shape Metrics.** We aggregate individual metrics into a Texture score and a Shape score using the *arithmetic mean*:

$$\text{Texture} = \frac{1}{2} (\text{LV} + \text{HFE}), \quad (9)$$

$$\text{Shape} = \frac{1}{2} (\text{EdgeSSIM} + \text{GC}). \quad (10)$$

All metrics are bounded in  $[0, 1]$ , where higher values indicate greater similarity to the original image and hence lower suppression of the respective feature. We set all hyperparameters to  $w = r = k = 11$ .

## B Notation for Relative Accuracy

To ensure comparability across datasets with different numbers of classes and baseline accuracies, we standardize performance using a linear rescaling:

$$\text{RelativeAccuracy} = \frac{A_{\text{sup}} - A_{\text{chance}}}{A_{\text{orig}} - A_{\text{chance}}}, \quad (11)$$

where  $A_{\text{sup}}$  denotes the accuracy under feature suppression,  $A_{\text{orig}}$  the accuracy on the original (unsuppressed) images, and  $A_{\text{chance}} = \frac{1}{C}$  the chance-level accuracy for  $C$  classes in the dataset. This mapping assigns 0 to chance-level accuracy and 1 to original accuracy, allowing direct comparison of suppression sensitivity across datasets and domains. For multi-label classification tasks, we estimate  $A_{\text{chance}}$  by simulating random predictions and computing the expected mean average precision.

## C Visual Examples for Suppression Transformations

Visual examples of the applied feature suppression transformations are provided in Figure 6 and Figure 7, illustrating images from the entry-level categories dog and bird in the ImageNet validation set. Additional examples for the RS domain are shown in Figure 16 and Figure 17, corresponding to the classes farmland and beach from the AID dataset. For the MI domain, Figure 18 and Figure 19 present examples from the classes melanocytic nevi in DermaMNIST and neutrophil in BloodMNIST.

## D Ablation Study for Suppression Effects of Transformations

To validate the robustness of our metric-based evaluation, we ablate the kernel size for all texture suppression transformations across the same 800 ImageNet images from the validation set. In this extended analysis, we include Bilateral filtering, Gaussian blur, Non-Local Means Denoising (denoted as NLMeans), Box blur, and Median filtering. For transformations with two parameters (e.g.,  $\sigma$  and  $k$  for Gaussian blur), we vary both parameters along a diagonal correspondence e.g.,  $(\sigma, k) = (0.66, 5), (1.0, 7), \dots, (2.33, 15)$  for Gaussian blur, and  $(\sigma_e, k) = (50, 5), (80, 7), \dots, (200, 15)$  for Bilateral filtering. For Non-Local Means Denoising, we use a slightly offset mapping:  $(h, k) = (5, 5), (5, 7), (10, 9), \dots, (25, 15)$  where  $k$  is used as template window size.

Figure 8 presents the effects of these transformations on normalized high-frequency energy (HFE) and gradient correlation (GC). Bilateral filtering achieves the most favorable trade-off, consistently reducing HFE while preserving edge structure to a high degree across kernel sizes. Gaussian blur suppresses texture even more strongly than Bilateral filtering, but still maintains a reasonable level of edge preservation, making it a competitive alternative when stronger smoothing is required. In contrast, Median and Box blur aggressively reduce texture but at the expense of substantial degradation in edge information. Non-Local Means Denoising preserves structural information well but is comparatively less effective at suppressing texture.

## E Experimental Details for Experiment Human vs. CNNs

### E.1 Participants Instruction

#### Participant Instructions

Thank you for participating in our visual perception study. This study investigates how humans recognize objects when certain visual features are suppressed. Please read the following instructions carefully before beginning.

#### General Information

You will be shown a series of images, each belonging to one of 16 everyday object categories (e.g., cat, car, airplane). In each trial, your task is to classify the object as accurately as possible.

#### Trial Procedure

Each trial will proceed as follows:



Figure 6: Visual illustration of feature suppression transformations applied to a sample image from the ImageNet validation set belonging to the entry-level category dog. **(a, d, g)** Show the original image. **(b)** Global shape suppression via Patch Shuffle with grid size 3. **(c)** Local shape suppression via Patch Rotation with grid size 8. **(e)** Texture suppression using Bilateral Filtering with  $d = 12$ ,  $\sigma_{\text{color}} = 170$ , and  $\sigma_{\text{space}} = 75$ . **(f)** Texture suppression using Gaussian Blur with kernel size  $k = 11$  and standard deviation  $\sigma = 2.0$ . **(h)** Color suppression via grayscale conversion. **(i)** Color suppression via random channel shuffle.

- (1) A small black fixation square will appear in the center of the screen for 300 milliseconds. Please focus your gaze on it.
- (2) An image will be shown for 200 milliseconds. The image may appear altered (e.g., blurred, gray, or shuffled).
- (3) Immediately after the image, a noise mask will appear briefly to reduce visual aftereffects.

### Response Task

After each image, you will see a  $4 \times 4$  grid of category labels. Click on the label that best matches the object you saw. If you are unsure or could not recognize the object, you may select the “not clear” option. Each image will be shown only once. Please respond based on your first impression.




Figure 7: Visual illustration of feature suppression transformations applied to a sample image from the ImageNet validation set belonging to the entry-level category bird. **(a, d, g)** Show the original image. **(b)** Global shape suppression via Patch Shuffle with grid size 3. **(c)** Local shape suppression via Patch Rotation with grid size 8. **(e)** Texture suppression using Bilateral Filtering with  $d = 12$ ,  $\sigma_{\text{color}} = 170$ , and  $\sigma_{\text{space}} = 75$ . **(f)** Texture suppression using Gaussian Blur with kernel size  $k = 11$  and standard deviation  $\sigma = 2.0$ . **(h)** Color suppression via grayscale conversion. **(i)** Color suppression via random channel shuffle.

### Estimated Duration

The study will take approximately 35–45 minutes. Please complete it in one sitting and avoid distractions.

### Participation and Data Protection

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may stop the study at any time without providing a reason and without any negative consequences. Before beginning the experiment, you will be asked to provide written informed consent. By doing so, you confirm that you understand the nature and purpose of the study and agree to participate. All data collected will be stored in an anonymized form and handled in accordance with institutional data protection policies. No personal identifying information will be published or shared.




Figure 8: Ablation of kernel parameter for quantitative evaluation of feature suppression transformations. **(a)** Normalized high-frequency energy quantifies texture removal. **(b)** Gradient correlation reflects edge preservation.

By continuing, you confirm that you have read and understood the instructions.

## E.2 Attention Test

Every 100 trials, an unannounced attention test was administered (in total 7). The participant was informed via a small text box about the attention test, in which the participant was informed that they would see an object of class A in the next image and that they had to click on a different class B to successfully pass it. Only if the attention test was correctly passed, we considered the results as valid.

## E.3 Screenshots

In Figure 9, screenshots of the tool for conducting the human study are shown.

## F Statistical Significance Test for Experiment Humans vs. CNNs

Two-sided paired t-tests performed for the experiment in Section 5 reveal statistically significant differences between human and ResNet50-standard performance across all suppression conditions ( $p < 0.001$ ). Effect sizes are large in all cases (Cohen’s  $d$  ranging from 8.69 to 39.83), confirming strong and systematic divergences in feature reliance (see Table 4). The t-tests are performed using the scipy library [66].

Table 5 reports mean accuracies with 95% confidence intervals for humans and the ResNet50-standard under each suppression condition, along with the corresponding human–model accuracy differences. To assess inter-subject and inter-model consistency, we further estimate the noise ceiling: the item-wise human noise ceiling is  $0.542 \pm 0.055$ , and the model noise ceiling is  $0.646 \pm 0.015$ .

Table 4: Paired two-sided  $t$ -test comparing human vs. ResNet50 accuracy under each suppression condition ( $n = 4$  per group). Cohen’s  $d$  quantifies the standardized effect size.

Suppression Type	$t$ -statistic	$p$ -value	Cohen’s $d$	Power
Global Shape	24.76	0.0001	12.38	1.000
Local Shape	48.16	<0.0001	24.08	1.000
Texture	79.65	<0.0001	39.83	1.000
Color	17.38	0.0004	8.69	1.000




Figure 9: Screenshots from the human study.

Table 5: Human and ResNet50-standard accuracies under different feature suppression conditions. Values denote mean accuracies with 95% confidence intervals (CI), and the rightmost column reports the human–model accuracy difference.

Suppression Type	Human Accuracy (CI)	ResNet Accuracy (CI)	Difference (CI)
Global Shape	0.965 ( $\pm 0.0067$ )	0.832 ( $\pm 0.0102$ )	0.133 ( $\pm 0.0121$ )
Local Shape	0.763 ( $\pm 0.0092$ )	0.276 ( $\pm 0.0141$ )	0.487 ( $\pm 0.0168$ )
Texture	0.979 ( $\pm 0.0064$ )	0.795 ( $\pm 0.0073$ )	0.184 ( $\pm 0.0097$ )
Color	0.999 ( $\pm 0.0052$ )	0.924 ( $\pm 0.0035$ )	0.075 ( $\pm 0.0063$ )

## G Comparison of Softmax Thresholding and Argmax Decision Rules

In Table 6 we compare our heuristic decision rule used in the main experiments, which aggregates subclass probabilities via summed softmax and applies a 0.5 threshold, with a plain argmax rule. Argmax increases absolute accuracy slightly, yet the relative degradation patterns across suppression types and models remain stable, indicating that the main conclusions about feature reliance are robust to the choice of decision rule.

## H Absolute Performance of Models trained on CV, MI and RS

Table 7 summarizes the maximum validation performance of ResNet50 across all datasets and domains. Results are reported as macro and micro accuracy, separately for models trained from scratch and, where applicable, fine-tuned from ImageNet pretrained weights. For DeepGlobe we report performance in mean average precision.

Table 6: Comparison of softmax thresholding and argmax decision rules. Values report accuracy under each suppression condition and on original images for three representative models.

Model variant	Global Shape	Local Shape	Texture	Color	Original
ResNet50-standard (Sum + Softmax > 0.5)	0.832	0.276	0.795	0.924	0.954
ResNet50-standard (Argmax)	0.880	0.361	0.840	0.944	0.962
ResNet50-sota (Sum + Softmax > 0.5)	0.943	0.618	0.867	0.948	0.931
ResNet50-sota (Argmax)	0.949	0.665	0.904	0.965	0.940
ConvNeXtV2 (Sum + Softmax > 0.5)	0.949	0.647	0.925	0.969	0.940
ConvNeXtV2 (Argmax)	0.979	0.748	0.956	0.984	0.944

Table 7: Maximum validation performance (macro and micro accuracy) of ResNet50 across domains, datasets, and training settings. For DeepGlobe performance metric is mean average precision.

Domain	Dataset	Training Type	Accuracy Macro	Accuracy Micro
Computer Vision	Caltech101	Pretrained	0.9523	0.9700
Computer Vision	STL10	Pretrained	0.9800	0.9800
Computer Vision	OxfordIIITPet	Pretrained	0.9404	0.9402
Computer Vision	Flowers102	Pretrained	0.9225	0.9225
Computer Vision	ImageNet	From Scratch	0.7423	0.7423
Computer Vision	Caltech101	From Scratch	0.7012	0.7972
Computer Vision	STL10	From Scratch	0.7800	0.7800
Computer Vision	OxfordIIITPet	From Scratch	0.6207	0.6214
Computer Vision	Flowers102	From Scratch	0.5186	0.5186
Medical Imaging	BloodMNIST	From Scratch	0.9868	0.9848
Medical Imaging	DermaMNIST	From Scratch	0.5444	0.7906
Medical Imaging	PathMNIST	From Scratch	0.9983	0.9984
Medical Imaging	ChestMNIST	From Scratch	0.7048	0.7048
Medical Imaging	RetinaMNIST	From Scratch	0.4446	0.5750
Remote Sensing	AID	From Scratch	0.8812	0.8847
Remote Sensing	PatternNet	From Scratch	0.9921	0.9921
Remote Sensing	RSD46WHU	From Scratch	0.8123	0.8177
Remote Sensing	UCMerced	From Scratch	0.9335	0.9335
Remote Sensing	DeepGlobe	From Scratch	0.8857	0.9295

## I Additional Experiments

### I.1 Class-wise analysis for ImageNet in Experiment II

To examine whether the feature reliance patterns observed in Experiment II generalize across categories or are driven by a small subset of classes, we conduct a class-wise analysis on ImageNet-1K. We evaluate performance under local shape suppression (Patch Shuffle, grid size 6), texture suppression (bilateral filter, kernel size 12), and color suppression (grayscale). For each of the 1000 ImageNet classes, we computed relative accuracy under suppression and visualized the distributions using kernel density estimates (KDEs). The class-level distributions in Figure 10 confirm the global trend: scores under texture suppression are clearly shifted toward higher values (mean = 0.62) compared to local shape suppression (mean = 0.24), with only modest overlap between the distributions (approximately 25–30%).

To assess consistency across classes, we computed the proportion of categories following the global ranking:

- 88.0% of classes show greater reliance on local shape than on texture




Figure 10: Kernel density estimates of class-wise relative accuracy under local shape, texture, and color suppression for ImageNet-1K.




Figure 11: Feature suppression results on CV datasets for a ResNet50 trained from scratch. (a) Shape suppression via Patch Shuffle. (b) Texture suppression via bilateral filtering. (c) Color suppression via grayscale.

- 94.2% show greater reliance on local shape than on color
- 77.6% show greater reliance on texture than on color

These results demonstrate that the observed reliance patterns hold broadly across the dataset rather than being driven by isolated outlier categories. To complement the quantitative analysis, we identified representative outlier classes. Representative outlier classes with unusually low reliance on local shape include *corn*, *Appenzeller (cheese)*, *bookstall*, *spider’s web*, *zebra*, *guacamole*, and *stone wall*. Classes with unusually high texture reliance include *Chesapeake Bay retriever*, *Crotalus cerastes*, *stingray*, *bath towel*, *Alligator mississippiensis*, and *bolete*. Outliers with stronger color reliance include *sunglass*, *tank suit*, *ladle*, *coffeepot*, *chain*, and *tam-tam*.

## I.2 CV Feature Reliance for Models trained from Scratch

Figure 11 shows suppression results for CV datasets using models trained from scratch. Compared to their fine-tuned counterparts, these models exhibit greater sensitivity to color and texture suppression, indicating higher reliance on these features. Interestingly, relative accuracy under light shape suppression (e.g., Patch Shuffle with small grid size) is lower than for fine-tuned models, while performance under strong shape suppression improves in several cases, indicating that these models increasingly use texture or color cues when shape information is heavily degraded. This effect is most pronounced for Flowers102, where the model retains comparatively high accuracy despite aggressive shape perturbation.

## I.3 MI and RS Feature Reliance for ImageNet-pretrained models

Figure 12 reports suppression results for MI and RS datasets using ImageNet-pretrained ResNet50 backbones fine-tuned on the respective training sets. The experimental setup and suppression protocols mirror those of Section 5.2 in the main paper. Across both domains, the overall reliance profiles remain broadly consistent with the models trained from scratch. However, pretraining introduces systematic shifts. In RS, models exhibit slightly stronger shape reliance and reduced sensitivity to texture and color suppression, in some cases up to 7% greater degradation under shape suppression and up to 20% less degradation under texture or color suppression. This aligns with shape




Figure 12: Feature suppression results across MI and RS domains when pre-trained on ImageNet. **Top row (a–c):** ResNet50 pre-trained on ImageNet and finetuned on MedMNIST-v2 (medical imaging). **Middle row (d–f):** ResNet50 pre-trained on ImageNet and finetuned on high-resolution RS datasets. Columns correspond to: **(a, d)** shape suppression (Patch Shuffle), **(b, e)** texture suppression (Bilateral Filter), and **(c, f)** color suppression (Grayscale).

trends observed in CV, where ImageNet pretraining enhances robustness to non-shape perturbations. In MI, the effects are more heterogeneous. For BloodMNIST, pretraining increases sensitivity to shape suppression, particularly under strong perturbations (e.g., Patch Shuffle with grid size 8), while for PathMNIST it amplifies the impact of texture suppression.

#### I.4 Alternative Transformations for Domain-specific Feature Reliance

Figure 13 presents the results using alternative transformations targeting the same feature types: Patch Rotation for shape suppression, Gaussian Blur for texture suppression, and Channel Shuffle for color suppression. Overall, the results strongly correlate with those reported in the main paper using the primary suppression transformations. The only notable deviations occur for DermaMNIST and BloodMNIST, which show increased robustness to shape suppression via Patch Rotation, and for DermaMNIST, which exhibits a stronger decline under color suppression via Channel Shuffle. Across all other datasets and domains, the relative suppression effects remain consistent.

#### I.5 Joint Suppression of Multiple Feature Types

The potential interdependence between features raises the question of whether the observed reliance patterns persist when multiple features are suppressed simultaneously. To probe this, we conduct an additional experiment on the CV datasets when pretrained on ImageNet using joint suppression. We evaluate three combinations: texture and color suppression (preserving only shape), shape and color suppression (preserving only texture), and shape and texture suppression (preserving only color). For each case, we measure relative accuracy across increasing suppression strengths, analogous to the procedure in Section 5.2.

The results reinforce and extend the single-feature findings. Relative accuracy is highest when only shape is preserved, lower when only texture remains, and almost lost when only color is available (see Figure 14). These outcomes suggest that the relative importance of features remains stable even under combined suppression.




Figure 13: Feature suppression results across three domains. **Top row (a–c)**: ResNet50 pretrained on ImageNet and finetuned on CV datasets. **Middle row (d–f)**: ResNet50 trained from scratch on MedMNIST-v2 (medical imaging). **Bottom row (g–i)**: ResNet50 trained from scratch on high-resolution RS datasets. Columns correspond to: **(a, d, g)** shape suppression (Patch Rotation), **(b, e, h)** texture suppression (Gaussian Blur), and **(c, f, i)** color suppression (Channel Shuffle).




Figure 14: Joint feature suppression results for a ResNet50 pretrained on ImageNet and finetuned on CV datasets. **(a)** Texture suppression via bilateral filtering and color suppression via grayscale (only shape preserving). **(b)** Shape suppression via Patch Shuffle and color suppression via grayscale (only texture preserving). **(c)** Shape suppression via Patch Shuffle and texture suppression via bilateral filtering (only color preserving).

## J Control Experiment for Block-Edge Artifacts in Patch Shuffle

Patch Shuffle simultaneously disrupts local spatial continuity and introduces artificial block-edge structures. To examine whether the observed performance degradation could be attributed primarily to block artifacts, we design a control condition that isolates the grid structure from the shuffling

operation. For grid sizes of 2, 4, and 8, we generate an overlay variant of Patch Shuffle as follows. We first apply Patch Shuffle to an image, then extract the 2-pixel-wide block boundaries (1 pixel on either side). These boundaries are superimposed onto the original unshuffled image, preserving the global and local content while mimicking the block structure characteristic of Patch Shuffle. This procedure introduces visible grid lines without altering patch arrangement. An example of the procedure is presented in Figure 15.

It is important to note that even the overlay condition introduces minor shape discontinuities, since the superimposed boundaries can slightly interrupt edge continuity. Consequently, the overlay condition still reflects two effects: (i) the presence of block edges and (ii) minor local shape disruption. Nevertheless, the stronger performance degradation observed under full Patch Shuffle compared to the overlay variant indicates (see Table 8) that block artifacts alone do not explain the results. Instead, the principal effect arises from the combined disruption of local spatial structure.




Figure 15: Example of superimposition of grid-structure for control experiment for block-edge artifacts. **(a)** Original image. **(b)** Extracted grid structure from the shuffled image. **(c)** Image with grid structure as overlay.

Table 8: Control experiment comparing Patch Shuffle with the grid-overlay variant, which mimics block structures without altering patch arrangement. Results are reported for different models and grid sizes.

Model	Grid Size	Overlay	Patch Shuffle
ResNet50-standard	2	0.950	0.921
	4	0.809	0.548
	8	0.540	0.069
ResNet50-sota	2	0.983	0.980
	4	0.870	0.837
	8	0.554	0.344
ConvNeXtV2	2	0.991	0.983
	4	0.957	0.859
	8	0.911	0.347

## K Implementation Details

### K.1 Timm Pretraining Hyperparameter

The following tables provide training hyperparameters for all evaluated CNNs, transformer-based models, and hybrid architectures used in Experiment I. All models, except ResNet50-standard, were obtained as pretrained checkpoints from the `timm` library and evaluated without further fine-tuning. CNNs are listed in Table 9, transformer and hybrid models in Table 10, and additional pretraining hyperparameters, if applicable, in Table 11.

We compiled the hyperparameter settings from a combination of official papers, GitHub repositories, HuggingFace model cards, and the `timm` source code. While we aim for high accuracy, no centralized

Table 9: Training hyperparameters for evaluated CNNs obtained from the timm library.

Category	ResNet50 -sota	ConvNeXt Tiny	ConvNeXt- V2-Tiny	EfficientNet -B5	EfficientNet- V2-RW-T	MobileNet V3-Large
Pretraining	–	–	IN-22k (FC-MAE)	JFT-300M (Noisy Student)	–	–
Input Resolution	224×224	224×224	224×224	456×456	224×224	224×224
Epochs	600	300	300	350	600	600
Batch Size	2048	4096	1024	2048	2048	2048
Optimizer	LAMB	AdamW	AdamW	RMSProp	RMSProp	RMSProp
Decay / $\beta_2$	–	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.9	0.9
Momentum / $\beta_1$	–	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
Base LR	5e-3	4e-3	8e-4	0.256	0.18	0.18
LR Schedule	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	RMSProp decay	Step exp decay	Step exp decay
Decay Rate	–	–	–	–	0.988	0.988
Warmup Epochs	5	20	40	5	5	5
Warmup Schedule	Linear	Linear	Linear	–	–	–
Label Smoothing	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
RandAugment	(7, 0.5)	(9, 0.5)	(9, 0.5)	–	(8, 2, 1.0)	(8, 2, 1.0)
AutoAugment	–	–	–	yes	–	–
Mixup $\alpha$	0.2	0.8	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.2
CutMix $\alpha$	1.0	1.0	1.0	–	–	–
Rand. Erasing $p$	0.25	0.25	–	–	0.35	0.35
Dropout	–	–	–	0.2	0.2	0.2
Stoch. Depth	0.05	0.1	–	–	0.1	0.1
Drop Path	–	–	0.2	0.2	–	–
Layer-wise LR Decay	–	0.65	0.9	–	–	–
Weight Init	–	Trunc. Normal	–	Trunc. Normal	–	–
Layer Scale Init	–	1e-6	–	–	–	–
Head Init Scale	–	–	0.001	–	–	–
EMA	–	0.9999	0.9999	–	0.9999	0.9999
Loss Function	BCE	CE	CE	CE	CE	CE
Mixed Precision	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Top-1 Accuracy	80.4%	82.1%	~83–84%	83.6%	79.4%	75.2%

specification of all training details exists within `timm`. Accordingly, some entries (e.g., MixUp and CutMix) are marked as `yes` to indicate usage without a reported  $\alpha$  value.

## K.2 Training Hyperparameter ResNet50 from Scratch

Table 12 summarizes the training hyperparameters for all ResNet50 models (denoted as ResNet50-sota in Section 5) trained from scratch that we used in our experiments. All models were trained or fine-tuned with minimal regularization to ensure comparability across datasets and domains. Data augmentation was limited to Random Resized Crop (RRC) and Horizontal Flip (HF). RRC was applied with a scale range of (0.3, 1.0), default aspect ratio, and probability 1.0. Through RRC all images were resized to  $224 \times 224$ . Horizontal flipping was applied with a probability of 0.5. For all computer vision datasets, ImageNet normalization statistics were used. For remote sensing and medical imaging datasets, dataset-specific statistics were computed from the training set. All models were trained using the cross-entropy loss, except for ChestMNIST (binary classification) and DeepGlobe (multi-label classification), which used binary cross-entropy. When using cosine annealing with warm restarts as learning rate scheduler, we set  $T_0 = 10$  epochs,  $\eta_{\min} = 1 \times 10^{-6}$ , and  $T_{\text{mult}} = 2$ , except for fine-tuning where  $T_{\text{mult}} = 1$ . For each dataset, the checkpoint with the highest validation accuracy was selected for subsequent suppression-based evaluation.

## K.3 Computation Resources

All experiments were conducted on an internal server equipped with 2× AMD EPYC 9554 64-core processors (256 threads), 6× NVIDIA H100 PCIe GPUs (each with 81 GB memory, CUDA 12.2), and 1.5 TiB of system RAM. The system runs Ubuntu 22.04 with Linux kernel 5.15 and NVIDIA driver version 535.183.01.

Training times for ResNet50 models varied by dataset. Training on ImageNet took approximately 10 days on a single GPU. For smaller CV datasets, training from scratch took 30 minutes for Flowers102, 120 minutes for STL-10 and Caltech101, and 90 minutes for Oxford-IIITPet. Fine-tuning on the same datasets required 10 minutes for Flowers102, 40 minutes for STL-10 and Caltech101, and 30 minutes

Table 10: Training hyperparameters for evaluated transformers and hybrid architectures obtained from the timm library. MixUp and CutMix are marked as *yes* where applied but unspecified.

Category	ConvMixer-768/32	ViT-B/16	DeiT-B	Swin-BP4-W7	CLIP ViT-B/16
Pretraining	-	ImageNet-21k	-	-	400M image-text pairs
Input Resolution	224×224	224×224	224×224	224×224	224×224
Epochs	150	300	300	300	32
Batch Size	64	4096	1024	1024	32768
Optimizer	AdamW	AdamW	AdamW	AdamW	AdamW
Decay / $\beta_2$	1e-3 ( $\epsilon$ )	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999
Momentum / $\beta_1$	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
Base Learning Rate	0.01	0.003	0.0005 × bs/512	0.001	5e-4
LR Schedule	OneCycle	Cosine decay	Cosine decay	Cosine decay	Cosine decay
Decay Rate	-	-	-	-	-
Warmup Epochs	0	5	5	20	- (2000 steps)
Warmup Schedule	-	-	-	Linear	-
Label Smoothing	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	-
RandAugment	(9, 0.5)	(9, 0.5)	(9, 0.5)	(9, 0.5)	(9, 0.5)
AutoAugment	-	-	-	-	-
Mixup	0.5	0.8	0.8	yes	yes
CutMix	0.5	1.0	1.0	yes	yes
Random Erasing $p$	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	yes
Dropout	-	0.1	0.1	-	-
Stochastic Depth	-	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
Drop Path	-	-	-	-	-
Layer-wise LR Decay	-	-	-	-	-
Weight Initialization	-	-	-	-	-
Layer Scale Init	-	-	-	-	-
Head Init Scale	-	-	-	-	-
EMA	-	-	-	-	-
Loss Function	CE	CE	CE	CE	InfoNCE (Contrastive)
Mixed Precision	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Top-1 Accuracy	~82.0%	~83.0%	~83.0%	~83.0% (est.)	~78.0% (0-shot)

Table 11: Pretraining hyperparameter for models later fine-tuned on ImageNet-1K.

Model	Dataset	Epochs	Pretraining Setup
ConvNeXtV2-Tiny	ImageNet-22k	800–1600	AdamW, LR 1.5e-4, weight decay 0.05, $\beta_1=0.9$ , $\beta_2=0.95$ , Cosine decay, RandomResizedCrop, warmup 40 epochs.
EfficientNet-B5	JFT-300M	800	Noisy Student self-training with teacher on IN-1k, student on JFT-300M with RandAugment, Mixup, Dropout.

for Oxford-IIITPet. In the MI domain, training durations were 30 minutes for BloodMNIST, 3 hours for ChestMNIST and PathMNIST, 20 minutes for DermaMNIST, and 5 minutes for RetinaMNIST. Training on RS datasets took 90 minutes for AID, DeepGlobe, PatternNet, and RSD46-WHU, and 15 minutes for UCMerced.

Evaluation time per model and dataset ranged between 1 and 10 minutes, depending on the suppression condition and dataset size.

## L Ethics Statement and Risk Assessment

This study involved a low-risk visual classification task conducted with adult participants. All participants were volunteers, fully informed about the purpose and procedures of the study, and provided written informed consent prior to participation. No vulnerable populations (e.g., children, patients, or individuals with impaired consent capacity) were involved. Participants were not exposed to any physical or emotional risks, high stress levels, or invasive procedures such as fMRI or TMS.

The study design, including all procedures for participant interaction and data handling, was reviewed through the standard ethics assessment protocol of our institution. The responsible ethics committee certified that the study complies with all relevant legal and institutional guidelines. Specifically, the ethics committee confirmed that:

Table 12: Training hyperparameters for ResNet50 models across all domains and settings. RRC: RandomResizedCrop, HF: HorizontalFlip. All models were trained or fine-tuned using supervised learning with cross-entropy loss, except for ChestMNIST (binary classification) and DeepGlobe (multi-label classification), which used binary cross-entropy.

Dataset	Pretraining	Epochs	Batch Size	Image Size	Optimizer	LR	Weight Decay	LR Schedule	Train Augment
<i>Computer Vision (From Scratch)</i>									
ImageNet	–	100	256	224x224	SGD	0.1	0.0001	CosAnnealWR	RRC + HF
Flowers102	–	300	64	224x224	AdamW	0.001	0.01	StepLR (4)	RRC + HF
STL10	–	300	64	224x224	AdamW	0.001	0.01	StepLR (4)	RRC + HF
Caltech101	–	300	64	224x224	AdamW	0.001	0.01	StepLR (4)	RRC + HF
OxfordIIITPet	–	300	64	224x224	AdamW	0.001	0.01	StepLR (4)	RRC + HF
<i>Computer Vision (Pretrained)</i>									
Flowers102	IN-1k	100	64	224x224	AdamW	1e-5	0.001	CosAnnealWR	RRC + HF
STL10	IN-1k	100	64	224x224	AdamW	1e-5	0.001	CosAnnealWR	RRC + HF
OxfordIIITPet	IN-1k	100	64	224x224	AdamW	1e-5	0.001	CosAnnealWR	RRC + HF
Caltech101	IN-1k	100	64	224x224	AdamW	1e-5	0.001	CosAnnealWR	RRC + HF
<i>Medical Imaging</i>									
BloodMNIST	–	50	64	224x224	AdamW	0.001	1e-5	StepLR (3)	RRC + HF
ChestMNIST	–	50	64	224x224	AdamW	0.001	1e-5	StepLR (3)	RRC + HF
DermaMNIST	–	50	64	224x224	AdamW	0.001	1e-5	StepLR (3)	RRC + HF
PathMNIST	–	50	64	224x224	AdamW	0.001	1e-5	StepLR (3)	RRC + HF
RetinaMNIST	–	50	64	224x224	AdamW	0.001	1e-5	StepLR (3)	RRC + HF
<i>Remote Sensing</i>									
AID	–	80	64	600x600	AdamW	0.0005	0.01	CosAnnealWR	RRC + HF
DeepGlobe	–	80	64	256x256	AdamW	0.0005	0.01	CosAnnealWR	RRC + HF
PatternNet	–	80	64	256x256	AdamW	0.0005	0.01	CosAnnealWR	RRC + HF
RSD46-WHU	–	80	64	256x256	AdamW	0.0005	0.01	CosAnnealWR	RRC + HF
UCMerced	–	80	64	256x256	AdamW	0.0005	0.01	CosAnnealWR	RRC + HF

- the study involves no foreseeable risk of harm;
- participants are not drawn from vulnerable populations;
- data privacy is protected in accordance with applicable regulations;
- informed consent was obtained from all participants;
- the study team bears responsibility for the truthful completion of the ethics review questionnaire and the ethical integrity of the study.

As such, the study received approval from the institutional ethics committee, and no ethical concerns were identified.




Figure 16: Visual illustration of feature suppression transformations applied to a sample image from the AID training set belonging to the class farmland. **(a, d, g)** Show the original image. **(b)** Global shape suppression via Patch Shuffle with grid size 3. **(c)** Local shape suppression via Patch Rotation with grid size 8. **(e)** Texture suppression using Bilateral Filtering with  $d = 12$ ,  $\sigma_{\text{color}} = 170$ , and  $\sigma_{\text{space}} = 75$ . **(f)** Texture suppression using Gaussian Blur with kernel size  $k = 11$  and standard deviation  $\sigma = 2.0$ . **(h)** Color suppression via grayscale conversion. **(i)** Color suppression via random channel shuffle.




Figure 17: Visual illustration of feature suppression transformations applied to a sample image from the AID training set belonging to the class beach. **(a, d, g)** Show the original image. **(b)** Global shape suppression via Patch Shuffle with grid size 3. **(c)** Local shape suppression via Patch Rotation with grid size 8. **(e)** Texture suppression using Bilateral Filtering with  $d = 12$ ,  $\sigma_{\text{color}} = 170$ , and  $\sigma_{\text{space}} = 75$ . **(f)** Texture suppression using Gaussian Blur with kernel size  $k = 11$  and standard deviation  $\sigma = 2.0$ . **(h)** Color suppression via grayscale conversion. **(i)** Color suppression via random channel shuffle.




Figure 18: Visual illustration of feature suppression transformations applied to a sample image from the DermaMNIST training set belonging to class melanocytic nevi. **(a, d, g)** Show the original image. **(b)** Global shape suppression via Patch Shuffle with grid size 3. **(c)** Local shape suppression via Patch Rotation with grid size 8. **(e)** Texture suppression using Bilateral Filtering with  $d = 12$ ,  $\sigma_{\text{color}} = 170$ , and  $\sigma_{\text{space}} = 75$ . **(f)** Texture suppression using Gaussian Blur with kernel size  $k = 11$  and standard deviation  $\sigma = 2.0$ . **(h)** Color suppression via grayscale conversion. **(i)** Color suppression via random channel shuffle.




Figure 19: Visual illustration of feature suppression transformations applied to a sample image from the BloodMNIST train set belonging to the class neutrophil. **(a, d, g)** Show the original image. **(b)** Global shape suppression via Patch Shuffle with grid size 3. **(c)** Local shape suppression via Patch Rotation with grid size 8. **(e)** Texture suppression using Bilateral Filtering with  $d = 12$ ,  $\sigma_{\text{color}} = 170$ , and  $\sigma_{\text{space}} = 75$ . **(f)** Texture suppression using Gaussian Blur with kernel size  $k = 11$  and standard deviation  $\sigma = 2.0$ . **(h)** Color suppression via grayscale conversion. **(i)** Color suppression via random channel shuffle.