

Published online 13 January 2009 | 457, 245 (2009) | doi:10.1038/457245a

News

Brain imaging studies under fire

Social neuroscientists criticized for exaggerating links between brain activity and emotions.

Alison Abbott

A study attacking some of the most prominent research in the burgeoning field of social neuroscience is flawed and unfair, according to top scientists who have been accused of overselling their results.

Social neuroscience is the study of the neurobiological mechanisms underlying social behaviour. The field frequently uses functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) to reveal which brain areas are activated while a subject is exposed to specific social interactions — for example, situations that may evoke jealousy or the perception of unfairness.

But a no-holds-barred paper¹, accepted for publication in *Perspectives on Psychological Science* and already circulating widely on the Internet, claims that many studies in the field are worthless because brain imaging data have been poorly analysed.

The paper was written by Edward Vul, a PhD student supervised by neuroscientist Nancy Kanwisher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, along with psychologists at the University of California, San Diego, including Harold Pashler.

The paper has touched a nerve: brain imaging studies were derided by some as "the new phrenology" when they became common 15 years ago, and interpretations of their highly complex data were denounced as naive. But those directly attacked say they are familiar with, and avoid, the pitfalls.

Vul and his co-authors say they wrote the paper because they were concerned by what they considered to be the "implausibly high correlations" reported between brain activation and particular forms of behaviour, and the lack of methodological details provided. So they selected 54 papers in social neuroscience and sent a brief questionnaire to the authors requesting details of their analyses.

They concluded that in a 'red list' of 31 cases — often in high-profile journals, including *Nature* and *Science* — the authors made fundamental errors in data handling and statistics.

They particularly criticize a 'non-independence error', in which bias is introduced by selecting data using a first statistical test and then applying a second non-independent statistical test to those data. This error, they say, arises from selecting small volumes of the brain, called voxels, on the basis of their high correlation with a psychological response, and then going on to report the magnitude of that correlation. "At present, all studies performed using these methods have large question marks over them," they write.

In a rebuttal², four authors of different red-list papers explain that there was no non-independence error because calculating the size of the correlation is not a statistical test.

Appropriate corrections ensure that the correlations between the selected voxels and psychological responses are likely to be real, and not noise, they add. And the strictness of the correction means that those correlations are necessarily less frequent and of higher magnitude — a situation far from implausible.

Vul and his colleagues also claim that the magnitude of correlation is limited by the average reliability of fMRI data generally. Not so, the accused respond: although the reliability of fMRI is very variable, the upper ceiling on data quality is extremely high.

The swift rebuttal was prompted by scientists' alarm at the speed with which the accusations have spread through the community. The provocative title — 'Voodoo correlations in social neuroscience' — and iconoclastic tone have attracted coverage on many blogs, including that of *Newsweek*. Those attacked say they have not had the chance to argue their case in the normal academic channels.

"I first heard about this when I got a call from a journalist," comments neuroscientist Tania Singer of the University of Zurich, Switzerland, whose papers on empathy are listed as examples of bad analytical practice. "I was shocked — this is not the way that scientific discourse should take place." Singer says she asked for a discussion with the authors when she received the questionnaire, to clarify the type of information needed, but got no reply.



Brain imaging is used to assess neural mechanisms in social behaviour.

SocialBrainLab, Univ. Med. Center Groningen

"We didn't disclose all our potential criticisms before asking these people to tell us things that should have already been in their method sections," says an unrepentant Vul. "Would they have described their methods differently if we had?"

They would indeed, says biopsychologist Turhan Canli of Stony Brook University, New York, who has four papers on the red list. He argues that the questionnaire, which was billed as taking no more than a few minutes to complete, was not able to capture the rationale for using particular analyses.

The article is scheduled for publication in September, alongside one or more replies. But the accused scientists are concerned that the impression now being established through media reports will be hard to shake after the nine-month delay. "We are not worried about our close colleagues, who will understand the arguments. We are worried that the whole enterprise of social neuroscience falls into disrepute," says neuroscientist Chris Frith of University College London, whose *Nature* paper³ on response to perceived fairness was called into question.

"On the other hand, we all agree that there is a kernel of truth in what Vul and his colleagues write about some of the literature being shaky," adds Christian Keysers of the University of Groningen in the Netherlands, whose 2007 paper in *NeuroImage* on empathy was highlighted⁴. "We can never be reminded often enough of the importance of good statistical practice."

ADVERTISEMENT



References

1. Vul, E. *et al.* www.pashler.com/Articles/Vul_et_al_2008inpress.pdf
2. Jabbi, M. *et al.* www.bcn-nic.nl/replyVul.pdf
3. Singer, T. *et al.* *Nature* **439**, 466–469 (2006). | [Article](#) | [PubMed](#) | [ISI](#) | [ChemPort](#) |
4. Jabbi, M. *et al.* *NeuroImage* **34**, 1744–1753 (2007). | [Article](#) | [PubMed](#) |

Comments

Reader comments are usually moderated after posting. If you find something offensive or inappropriate, you can speed this process by clicking 'Report this comment' (or, if that doesn't work for you, email redesign@nature.com). For more controversial topics, we reserve the right to moderate before comments are published.

"I was shocked ? this is not the way that scientific discourse should take place." It is just my personal belief that this is indeed the way scientific discourse needs to take place every so often. I respect Vul for making such direct criticisms of imaging methods. From experience working in an fMRI lab - there are students and faculty who are very knowledgeable and have a really strong grasp of their methodology, from both the data acquisition end [experimental design (hybrid, ER, etc.), pulse sequencing, explain their use of certain image imaging parameters (slice thickness, etc.)] to the data analysis [can explain what each data manipulation is doing to the data (things like 3dDeconvolve, unwarping, fieldmaps, motion correction, etc.)]. And there are others who just go down the list of plug-ins like a recipe, and if it gets an area of the brain to light-up, great, they will explain it in retrospect. The amount of published research from imaging experiments has drastically increased over the last 10 years, and if Vul can put it into the conscience of an experimenter that they better be sure they can explain themselves, then we will all benefit, particularly those who don't work in the field of brain imaging, and are at the mercy of the reviewers to assure them that those images weren't made in Photoshop.

Posted by: **Phoenix Monakhos** | 14 Jan, 2009

How are mirror neurons incorporated/prevented into conscious behavior in a social context. How do the emotions affect mirror neurons? To what degree is the effect emotion driven? Under what circumstances? Peter Templar

Posted by: **Laurie Simon** | 14 Jan, 2009

The criticised authors complain about the immediate publicity of the criticisms. This may indeed not be the way that scientific discourse should normally take place. However, given the sensationalism with which some of the questioned findings were publicised, it seems appropriate that the criticisms address the same audience. Journals that accept manuscripts according to the chance that they make headlines in the popular press may want to reconsider this strategy.

Posted by: **Fritz Funke** | 15 Jan, 2009

For those interested, you can find our response to this reply here: <http://edvul.com/voodoorebuttal.php> Cheers, Ed.

Posted by: **Ed Vul** | 15 Jan, 2009

RE: Self-criticism and Critics in Science -- As a retired (and published) scientist and now an independent reader-writer in the progress and philosophy of

neuroscience, I think it is encumbered upon all competent scientists to be self-critical in their own work; and that all their published work (despite the normal peer-review mechanism) shall be subject to the open scrutiny (and test of reproducibility of their published work) by other competent scientists as well as interested readers-critics alike. I thought Vul et al had acted properly and professionally, and that their own published work shall now be subject to the scrutiny of other competent neuroscientists as well. As an ongoing competitive human endeavor, all published scientific work (including those of social science, psychology, etc) shall withstand or fall by the test of their own weight and self-criticism as well as the criticisms of others, including those of non-scientists and philosophers alike. Best wishes, Mong 1/15/9usct1:45p; author "Decoding Scientism" and "Consciousness & the Subconscious" (works in progress since July 2007), "Gods, Genes, Conscience" (2006: http://www.iuniverse.com/bookstore/book_detail.asp?isbn=0595379907) and "Gods, Genes, Conscience: Global Dialogues Now" (blogging avidly since 2006: <http://www2.blogger.com/profile/18303146609950569778>).

Posted by: **Mong H Tan, PhD** | 15 Jan, 2009

For those interested, here is our invited reply [http://www.scn.ucla.edu/pdf/LiebermanBerkmanWager\(invitedreply\).pdf](http://www.scn.ucla.edu/pdf/LiebermanBerkmanWager(invitedreply).pdf)

Posted by: **Matthew Lieberman** | 27 Jan, 2009

Add your own comment

You can be as critical or controversial as you like, but please don't get personal or offensive, and do keep it brief. Remember this is for feedback and discussion - not for publishing papers, press releases or advertisements, for example. If you ramble on in an annoying way too often, we may remove your posting privileges.

You need to be registered with Nature to leave a comment. Please [log in](#) or [register](#) as a new user. You will be re-directed back to this page.

[Log in / register](#)

Nature ISSN 0028-0836 EISSN 1476-4687

[About NPG](#)

[Contact NPG](#)

[RSS web feeds](#)

[Help](#)

[Privacy policy](#)

[Legal notice](#)

[Accessibility statement](#)

[Nature News](#)

[Naturejobs](#)

[Nature Asia](#)

[Nature Education](#)

[About Nature News](#)

[Nature News Sitemap](#)

Search:

go

© 2009 Nature Publishing Group, a division of Macmillan Publishers Limited. All Rights Reserved.
partner of AGORA, HINARI, OARE, INASP, CrossRef and COUNTER