This Accepted Manuscript has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

JNeuroscience

Research Articles: Behavioral/Cognitive

How does iReadMore therapy change the reading network of patients with central alexia?

Sheila J Kerry¹, Oscar M Aguilar^{2,3,4}, William Penny⁵, Jennifer T Crinion¹, Alex P Leff^{1,2,3} and Zoe V J Woodhead^{2,6}

¹Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, University College London, UK, WC1N 3AZ.
 ²Department of Brain Repair and Rehabilitation, Institute of Neurology, University College London, UK
 ³The Wellcome Centre for Human Neuroimaging, University College London, UK, WC1N 3BG
 ⁴Facultad de Psicología, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Colombia
 ⁵School of Psychology, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ
 ⁶Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, UK, OX1 3AQ

https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1426-18.2019

Received: 29 May 2018

Revised: 7 March 2019

Accepted: 16 March 2019

Published: 13 May 2019

Author contributions: S.K., O.M.A., and Z.V.J.W. performed research; S.K. analyzed data; S.K. wrote the first draft of the paper; O.M.A., W.D.P., J.C., A.P.L., and Z.V.J.W. edited the paper; W.D.P., J.C., A.P.L., and Z.V.J.W. designed research.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

We would like to thank Gareth Barnes for his guidance regarding the MEG study design and analysis for this project., This trial was supported by the Medical Research Council (MR/K022563/1). The trial was registered on www.clinicaltrials.gov, reference NCT02062619.

Corresponding author: Sheila Kerry, Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, 17 Queen Square, London WC1N 3AZ, sheila.kerry.11@ucl.ac.uk

Cite as: J. Neurosci 2019; 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1426-18.2019

Alerts: Sign up at www.jneurosci.org/alerts to receive customized email alerts when the fully formatted version of this article is published.

Accepted manuscripts are peer-reviewed but have not been through the copyediting, formatting, or proofreading process.

Copyright © 2019 the authors

- 1 Title (50 words max): How does iReadMore therapy change the reading network of
- 2 patients with central alexia?
- 3 Running title (50 characters): Reading network modulation in central alexia
- Sheila J Kerry^{*1}, Oscar M Aguilar^{2,3,4}, William Penny⁵, Jennifer T Crinion¹, Alex P
 Leff^{1,2,3} and Zoe V J Woodhead^{*2,6}
- 6 Author affiliations:
- 7 ¹ Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, University College London, UK, WC1N 3AZ.
- ² Department of Brain Repair and Rehabilitation, Institute of Neurology, University
 9 College London, UK
- ³ The Wellcome Centre for Human Neuroimaging, University College London, UK,
 WC1N 3BG
- ⁴Facultad de Psicología, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Colombia, 110311.
- 13 ⁵School of Psychology, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ
- ⁶ Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, UK, OX1 3AQ
- 15 Corresponding author:
- 16 Sheila Kerry, Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, 17 Queen Square, London WC1N
- 17 3AZ, sheila.kerry.11@ucl.ac.uk
- 18 Number of pages: 39
- 19 Number of figures: 5
- 20 Number of tables: 2
- 21 Abstract word count: 234
- 22 Introduction word count: 674
- 23 Discussion word count: 1200

25 Conflict of Interest:

26 The authors declare no competing financial interests

28 Acknowledgements:

- 29 We would like to thank Gareth Barnes for his guidance regarding the MEG study
- 30 design and analysis for this project.
- 31 This trial was supported by the Medical Research Council (MR/K022563/1). The trial
- 32 was registered on <u>www.clinicaltrials.gov</u>, reference NCT02062619.

33

34 Abstract

35 Central alexia (CA) is an acquired reading disorder co-occurring with a generalised 36 language deficit (aphasia). The roles of perilesional and ipsilesional tissue in 37 recovery from post-stroke aphasia are unclear. We investigated the impact of 38 reading training (using iReadMore, a therapy app) on the connections within and 39 between the right and left hemisphere of the reading network of patients with CA. In 40 patients with pure alexia, iReadMore increased feedback from left inferior frontal 41 region (IFG) to the left occipital (OCC) region. We aimed to identify if iReadMore 42 therapy was effective through a similar mechanism in CA patients.

Participants with chronic post-stroke CA (n=23) completed 35 hours of iReadMore training over four weeks. Reading accuracy for trained and untrained words was assessed before and after therapy. The neural response to reading trained and untrained words in the left and right OCC, ventral occipitotemporal (vOT) and IFG was examined using event-related magnetoencephalography.

The training-related modulation in effective connectivity between regions wasmodelled at the group level with Dynamic Causal Modelling.

50 iReadMore training improved participants' reading accuracy by an average of 8.4% 51 (range: -2.77 to 31.66) while accuracy for untrained words was stable. Training 52 increased regional sensitivity in bilateral frontal and occipital regions, and 53 strengthened feedforward connections within the left hemisphere. Our data suggests 54 that iReadMore training in these patients modulates lower-order visual 55 representations, as opposed to higher-order, more abstract ones, in order to improve 56 word reading accuracy.

57 Significance Statement

58 This is the first study to conduct a network-level analyses of therapy effects in 59 participants with post-stroke central alexia. When patients trained with iReadMore (a 60 multimodal, behavioural, mass practice, computer-based therapy), reading accuracy 61 improved by an average 8.4% on trained items. A network analysis of the 62 magnetoencephalography data associated with this improvement revealed an 63 increase in regional sensitivity in bilateral frontal and occipital regions and 64 strengthening of feedforward connections within the left hemisphere. This indicates that in CA patients iReadMore engages lower-order, intact resources within the left 65 66 hemisphere (posterior to their lesion locations) to improve word reading. This 67 provides a foundation for future research to investigate reading network modulation 68 in different CA subtypes, or for sentence level therapy.

69 Introduction

70 Central alexia (CA; also known as Alexia with agraphia (Dejerine, 1891)) is a reading 71 disorder that occurs within the context of a generalised language disorder (aphasia). 72 Patients with CA find reading slow and effortful and make frequent errors (Leff and 73 Starrfelt, 2013). There is no agreed treatment for CA and to date there have been no 74 group-level investigations of how neural plasticity may support reading recovery in 75 patients with CA. In Woodhead et al., (2018) we demonstrated that a computerised 76 word reading therapy app improved word reading in 21 patients with CA. The aim of 77 this cross-modal training was to co-activate orthographic, phonological and semantic 78 representations of the word in order to rebuild the neuronal connections between 79 them. The present study aimed to improve our understanding of the therapeutic 80 mechanisms in CA, with a view to developing stratified therapy pathways in future.

81

82 After left hemisphere stroke, the role of spared ipsilesional regions and right hemisphere homologues in supporting aphasia recovery are unclear (Adair et al., 83 84 2000; Tsapkini et al., 2011; Crinion and Leff, 2015; Hartwigsen and Saur, 2017). 85 There is evidence for functional reorganisation in spared left hemisphere regions 86 (Jobard et al., 2003; Fridriksson, 2010; Abel et al., 2014, 2015; van Hees et al., 87 2014; Bonilha et al., 2016; Pillay et al., 2017); while other studies have identified 88 right hemisphere homologues fulfilling this function (Meinzer et al., 2006; Richter et 89 al., 2008; Lee et al., 2017) both accounts may be correct and aphasia recovery may 90 rely on a combination of mechanisms (Saur et al., 2006; Kurland et al., 2008; 91 Turkeltaub et al., 2011; Crinion and Leff, 2015; Mohr et al., 2016). We modelled a 92 bilateral reading network in patients with CA to ascertain the effects of therapy within 93 and between the hemispheres.

94 While post-stroke aphasia is the result of focal damage, it is increasingly viewed as a 95 network disorder (Hartwigsen and Saur, 2017). Neuroimaging studies of skilled 96 readers show that word reading activates a predominantly left-lateralised network of 97 occipitotemporal, temporal and inferior frontal areas (Heim et al., 2005; Graves et al., 98 2010; Price, 2012; Carreiras et al., 2014; Hoffman et al., 2015; Perrone-Bertolotti et 99 al., 2017; Xu et al., 2017; Zhou and Shu, 2017). The local combination detector 100 (LCD) model of visual word recognition suggests that because neurons are tuned to 101 progressively larger fragments of a word as their location moves anteriorly, word 102 reading is achieved primarily through feed-forward processing along the visual 103 ventral stream (Dehaene et al., 2005). However, an alternative account suggests 104 that efficient word recognition relies on interactive feedforward (bottom-up) and 105 feedback (top-down) processing within this network (Cornelissen et al., 2009; Wheat

et al., 2010; Price and Devlin, 2011; Woodhead et al., 2014). Dynamic causal
modelling (DMC) identifies the causal influence of one region upon another, allowing
us to explore the interaction between top-down and bottom-up processes.

109 Within the domain of reading rehabilitation, in participants with pure alexia (typically 110 caused by left posterior cerebral artery (PCA) stroke), reading training was 111 associated with stronger connectivity within the left hemisphere, and increased top-112 down connectivity from frontal to occipital regions (Woodhead et al., 2013). This was 113 interpreted as evidence that predictions from phonological and/or semantic 114 representations in left frontal cortex facilitated visual word recognition after training. However, in CA (typically caused by left middle cerebral artery (MCA) stroke), these 115 116 'central' language representations are damaged or disconnected.

117 As there is little in the existing literature to guide predictions of network 118 reorganisation following therapy in CA, we based our hypothesis on what is known 119 about the reading network in healthy controls and pure alexia. The training employed 120 iReadMore, an adaptive word reading training app which improved word reading 121 ability for trained items in pure alexia (Woodhead et al., 2013) and CA (Woodhead et 122 al., 2018). Using DCM of magnetoencephalography (MEG) data we investigated how 123 effective connectivity within the reading network changed as a result of therapy. Our 124 speculative hypothesis was that training would strengthen feedback connections 125 within the left hemisphere, and the left IFG's self-connection. It is anticipated that 126 these analyses will yield predictions for future investigations of how neural network 127 plasticity supports language recovery.

128

129 Method

130 <u>Study design</u>

A within-subject, repeated measures design was used. The data presented here were acquired during a larger crossover study that assessed the effects of iReadMore therapy and transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) on single word reading (Woodhead et al., 2018). Participants completed an MEG scan before (T3) and after (T4) a four-week reading therapy block (see Figure 1). Additionally, two baseline language assessments were conducted four weeks prior to training (T1 and T2) and at two time points after training T5 and T6.

During the therapy block participants were asked to amass ~35 hours of iReadMore training, through 40-minute face-to-face sessions attended three times per week (Monday, Wednesday and Friday; 11 sessions in total) supplemented with independent use at home.

The effect of tDCS was not analysed in this paper as, a) it was not designed to be tested using a between subjects design, as would be required in the current analysis and b) the effect size of tDCS was small compared to the main effect of iReadMore.

145 Testing and face-to-face therapy sessions were conducted at the Institute of146 Cognitive Neuroscience, University College London.

147 Participants

Twenty-three participants with CA (15 males, mean age 52 years, range 26-78 years, see Table 1 for demographic information), diagnosed by a neurologist or speech and language therapist, were recruited from either the PLORAS stroke patients database held at the The Wellcome Centre for Human Neuroimaging 152 (Seghier et al., 2016), or speech and language therapy services at the National153 Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery, University College London Hospitals.

154 The following inclusion criteria were used: i) left-hemisphere middle cerebral artery 155 stroke with at least partial sparing of left IFG; ii) greater than 12 months post-stroke; 156 iii) dominant English language use in activities of daily living; and iv) CA, 157 operationalized as impaired word reading (CAT word reading T-score <61) and 158 impaired spoken language (CAT naming <63 or picture description <61). Screening 159 and diagnoses were conducted historically in a clinical setting (data available on 160 request from authors), but additional baseline tests (as described in Woodhead et 161 al., 2018) were performed at the start of the trial, including CAT Naming, non-word 162 reading and word reading (Table 1).

Exclusion criteria included: i) premorbid history of neurological or psychiatric illness; ii) history of developmental language disorder; iii) severe spoken output deficit and /or speech apraxia (CAT repetition <44); iv) seizures in the past 12 months; v) contraindications to MRI scanning; and vi) extensive damage to left IFG.

Participants were classified as having phonological (n=13), deep (n=9) or surface dyslexia (n=1) according to the pattern of word and non-word reading performance at baseline, using criteria described by Whitworth *et al.*, 2014 (for further details, see Woodhead *et al.*, 2018). The low proportion of patients with surface dyslexia is consistent with an opportunity sample of stroke patients described by Brookshire et al. (2014).

The participant information sheet was provided in written and auditory forms. All
participants gave informed written consent in accordance with the Declaration of
Helsinki. The Queen Square Research Ethics Committee approved this project.

176 Structural MRI

T1 weighted MRI scans were obtained in a 3.0T whole body MR system (Magnetom
TIM Trio, Siemens Healthcare, Erlangen, Germany) equipped with a standard 32
channel head coil radiofrequency (RF) receiver and RF body coil for transmission.

180 Data were pre-processed using Statistical Parametric Mapping 12 (SPM12; 181 http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/software/spm12/) mounted in Matlab 2014b (The 182 Math- Works Inc.; Natick, MA, USA). Magnetic transfer (MT) maps were obtained for 183 each participant using SPM12's Voxel Based Quantification (VBQ) toolbox (Weiskopf 184 et al., 2013; Callaghan et al., 2014). The MT maps were spatially normalized into 185 standard MNI space and segmented into tissue types (e.g. grey and white matter, cerebrospinal fluid, atypical or lesion). Lesions were identified using SPM12's 186 187 Automated Lesion Identification toolbox (Seghier et al., 2008). This compared CA 188 participant's segmented MT maps to the MT maps of 29 healthy controls. A binary 189 lesion image was created for each CA participant, upon which candidate dipole 190 location solutions could be compared. Across our group of participants, lesion 191 location was predominantly within the territory of the left middle cerebral artery, 192 centred on the supramarginal gyrus (Figure 2B).

193 iReadMore training

194 For a more detailed description of iReadMore training see Woodhead et al., 2018. 195 Briefly, iReadMore aims to retrain whole word reading by repeatedly exposing the 196 user to pairings of written and spoken words, and an associated picture. The aim of 197 this cross-modal training is to co-activate orthographic, phonological and semantic 198 representations of the word in order to rebuild the neuronal connections between 199 them. iReadMore was administered on a tablet computer. The software cycled 200 through 'training' and 'challenge' phases. During the training phase, participants 201 were presented with 10 face-down cards. On selection, the reverse of the card

<u>JNeurosci Accepted Manuscript</u>

202 revealed the written word, spoken word and a picture of the word (all congruent with203 each other).

204 The challenge phase consisted of up to 30 trials. In each trial a written and spoken 205 word were presented simultaneously. In half the trials the words were different 206 (incongruent). Participants made same/different judgements via a button press and 207 points were accrued for correct responses. If a criterion score was reached they 208 passed the level. The algorithm within the iReadMore software adjusted task 209 difficulty based on the user's performance. This modifies: i) the similarity between 210 the target spoken word and the written foils in the challenge phase (three levels); ii) 211 the exposure duration of the written words (from a maximum of 4000ms to a 212 minimum of 100ms); and, iii) the criterion score required to pass a level.

213 Training stimuli

High frequency words (SUBTLEX_{WF}>50) of three to six letters were drawn from the SUBTLEX database (Brysbaert and New, 2009). Two matched lists of 180 words were created. For each word on the A list there was a corresponding word on the B list matched for letter length, syllable length, written frequency and imageability.

218 Over two baseline sessions (T1 and T2), CA participants completed an assessment 219 of the entire word corpus whereby they read each word out aloud. Based on each 220 participant's baseline performance (word reading accuracy and speed), a 221 customised set of 150 matched words from the A and B word lists were selected 222 (please see Woodhead et al., 2018, Supplementary Materials, for further details). 223 One list was assigned to be trained and the other to be untrained. These word lists 224 were individualised for each patient. The aims of this word selection process were: to 225 have no significant difference in the patient's baseline reading ability (accuracy or 226 RT) between the selected A and B words; to have no significant difference in psycholinguistic variables (length, frequency, imageability, regularity or N-size) between the selected A and B words; and to have no significant difference in reading ability (accuracy or RT) between the selected word lists and the full list of words tested at baseline. The purpose of this latter aim was to avoid the possibility of regression to the mean, which would have been an issue if we had only selected words for therapy that the participants read poorly at baseline.

233 At the testing sessions immediately before and after therapy (T3 and T4), 234 participants were tested on a subset of 90 words from each word list (trained items 235 and untrained items; see Woodhead et al., 2018 for further details). Words were 236 presented in a random order over 3 blocks. E-prime software (Schneider et al., 2002) 237 was used to present words in the centre of a screen in black, lower case, size 36 238 Arial font on a grey background. Participants were instructed to read the words aloud 239 as quickly and accurately as they could into a voice-key microphone. Accuracy was 240 coded online as follows; 1- correct response, 0.5- self corrected errors or verbal false 241 starts, 0- incorrect response. Responses greater than 4 seconds post-stimulus onset 242 were coded as incorrect. Reaction times were excluded for: i) voice-key failures; ii) 243 incorrect and self-corrected responses; and, iii) RTs greater than 2 standard 244 deviations from the subject's mean. To identify voice-key failures, a visual cue was 245 displayed at the bottom left corner of the screen, which informed the experimenter 246 when the microphone had been triggered. Prior to inputting the accuracy of the 247 participant's response, the experimenter coded the validity of the voice key trigger; 248 1= accurate, 2 = inaccurate voice-key trigger (for example, if the participant said 249 "erm" or a response was not detected by the microphone).

250 <u>MEG scanning procedures</u>

Scans were acquired using a VSM MegTech Omega 275 MEG scanner with 274 axial gradiometers in software third gradient-mode at a sampling rate of 480Hz. Fiducial markers on the nasion and left and right pre-auricular points were used to determine head location in the scanner. Head movements were minimised by positioning the participant in a comfortable, well supported position and using padding around the participant's head. Recordings from fiducial markers indicated that the average head movement across a run was 9.14mm (SD=8.18mm).

258 MEG experimental paradigm and stimuli

259 Participants were seated upright in the scanner. Trained words (n=150), untrained 260 words (n=150), 'false font' symbol strings (n=150, described previously in Woodhead 261 et al., 2013) and common proper names (e.g. "Jenny", "Bob", n=40) were projected 262 onto the screen approximately 50 cm in front of the participant. Each stimulus was 263 presented for 1000ms followed by a crosshair for 2000ms with a total inter stimulus 264 interval of 3000ms. The stimuli were presented lower case Arial font of size 50 265 (see Figure 3). The stimuli types were evenly distributed in a pseudorandom order 266 across 4 runs and presented using Cogent software 267 (www.vislab.ucl.ac.uk/cogent.php). Participants were instructed to read the words 268 silently. To ensure that participants attended to every trial, they were asked to 269 respond via button press when they read a proper name. These catch trials were 270 removed from the analysis. The false font condition was included to allow 271 comparison with a dataset from healthy control participants, reported elsewhere 272 (Woodhead et al., 2014). The analysis of the false font trials is not reported in the 273 current paper.

274 MEG pre-processing

275 The MEG data in SPM12 were pre-processed (http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/software/spm12/) 276 using Matlab14a 277 (http://uk.mathworks.com/products/matlab/). Pre-processing steps included: high-278 pass filtering at 1Hz; removal of eye-movement artefact using the Berg method (Berg 279 and Scherg, 1994); epoching in the window -100ms to 500ms; low-pass filtering at 280 30Hz; and merging the four runs. Artefact detection using a simple threshold at 281 2500fT was applied, and channels with greater than 20% of trials removed were 282 rejected. This resulted in the removal of, on average, 40 trials (range 0-260 trials) for 283 each participant (out of a total of 600 trials) and a total of 10 instances where 284 channels were removed. Robust averaging across trials was conducted and a 30Hz 285 low-pass filter was applied. Data from the two time points were merged and a single 286 shell Boundary Element Method forward model was applied.

287 Source localisation

288 Dipolar source location was carried out with Variational Bayes Equivalent Current 289 Dipole Modelling (VB-ECD (Kiebel et al., 2008a)) which uses a non-linear 290 optimisation algorithm to simultaneously fit a number of dipoles with different prior 291 distributions on their locations and moments, at a single time point. For each 292 participant, the M170 peak was identified in a semi-automated fashion using the 293 average power of all trained and untrained word trials, in a time window 0-300 msec. 294 The sensor data at the subject-specifically identified M170 peak was used for the 295 VB-ECD dipole modelling. The M170 peak was reliably present in all subjects and is 296 known to represent orthographic processing (Tarkiainen, 1999; Marinkovic et al., 297 2003; Rossion et al., 2003; Pylkkänen and McElree, 2007; Vartiainen et al., 2009; 298 Zweig and Pylkkänen, 2009).

The Bayesian algorithm requires the specification of a prior mean and variance for the location and moment of each dipole. The location priors were the same as reported in Woodhead et al. 2014, which demonstrated that a 6-source model consisting of the left and right occipital regions (OCC; MNI coordinates: ± 15 -95 2), ventral occipital temporal regions (vOT; ± 44 -58 -15) and inferior frontal gyrus (IFG; ± 48 28 0) best fit the M170 peak for word reading in healthy controls.

Source solutions were free to move to any location. Therefore, the following restrictions were placed on the VB-ECD outputs: source locations must be 1) within the anatomically defined regions of interest, 2) greater than 2cm from adjacent sources 3) outside of the lesion. The solution with the greatest negative free-energy (i.e. that best fitted the data) that met the above criteria was selected to be used in the DCM estimations.

311 Dynamic Causal Modelling

We used DCM to investigate the effective connectivity between neuronal sources within the reading network and how connections strengths were modulated in response to iReadMore therapy. For a detail description of the methodology of DCM the reader is directed elsewhere (David et al., 2005; Kiebel et al., 2006, 2007, 2008b; Garrido et al., 2007; Reato et al., 2013).

Essentially, DCM employs a biologically informed neural mass model that uses the characteristic response rates and patterns of connectivity (Felleman and Van Essen, 1991) of three neuronal subpopulations (pyramidal cells, spiny stellate cells and inhibitory interneurons) within the layers of the cortical column (Jansen and Rit, 1995) to model the connections between different sources. For example, forward connections innervate spiny stellate cells in the granular layer which results in an excitatory effect, backward connections synapse pyramidal cells and inhibitory interneurons in the supra- and infra granular layers and hence can be excitatory or
inhibitory, lateral connections can innervate all three layers of the cortical column
and thus can also have an inhibitory or excitatory influence on the target region.

Self-connections are also modelled within the DCM. These quantify the maximal amplitude of the post-synaptic response in each cell population in that region (Kiebel et al., 2007). These maximal responses are modulated by gain parameters. Gain parameters greater than one increase the maximal response that can be elicited from a neuronal region. As such, the gain parameters are a measure of a region's sensitivity to an input.

333 iReadMore training improved participants' word reading accuracy for trained items 334 only. The aim of the DCM analysis was to identify connection strengths that were 335 significantly modulated by iReadMore training for these trained words, over and 336 above any test-retest effects observed for untrained items. The data used for the 337 DCM analysis were the evoked responses to trained and untrained words presented 338 before and after therapy (Tr Before; Un Before; Tr After; Un After). We were 339 interested in how therapy affected the early stages of word processing, so activity in 340 the 0-300 ms time window was modelled. The sensory inputs to the model were 341 specified as entering the left and right OCC. The A matrix modelled the connection 342 strengths for the Tr Before trials. Two B matrices modelled how connection 343 strengths were modulated by therapy. The first (Matrix B1) estimated the modulation 344 for trained words over time (Tr Before vs Tr After). To ensure the modulation 345 observed in Matrix B1 did not represent a simple effect of time, rather than training 346 per-se, Matrix B2 modelled modulation for untrained items after therapy versus to-347 be-trained items before therapy (Tr Before vs Un After). It is worth noting that an 348 alternative analysis could be to compare Un Before vs Un After for the B2 matrix,

349 as this would have meant that both B1 and B2 would have compared the same items 350 before versus after training. However, this mis-match of items in B2 is unlikely to 351 have made a significant impact on the results because before training, all items were 352 novel and each patient's to-be-trained and never-trained word lists were matched for 353 baseline performance and psycholinguistic properties.

354 Similar to other studies (Woodhead et al., 2013, 2014), and in order to reduce the 355 model space to a manageable computational level, we placed the following 356 constraints on how network connections varied between models: i) lateral 357 connections were only allowed within the same level of the cortical hierarchy (i.e. left 358 OCC to right OCC) and not between levels (e.g. left OCC to right vOT); ii) lateral 359 connections were reciprocal (e.g. a connection from the left vOT to right vOT was 360 mirrored by a connection from the right vOT to the left vOT); iii) forward and 361 backward connections were symmetrical between hemispheres. This resulted in nine 362 independently varying connections leading to 512 models (2^9) per subject, all of 363 which were fitted to their individual MEG data.

364 Bayesian model averaging

Random effects Bayesian Model Averaging (BMA) (Penny et al., 2010) was used to identify the average change in each connection strength across all models and all participants. BMA considers the entire model space and computes weighted averages according to the posterior probability for each model.

369 Experimental Design and Statistical Analysis

370 Word reading test analysis

371 Change in word reading accuracy and RT were calculated over the baseline period 372 and training block for each word list. Change was simply calculated as the difference from one time-point to the next. Repeated-measures ANOVAs were
calculated with within-subject factors of Block (pre-training (T3-Baseline) vs training
(T4-T3)) and Word-List (Untrained vs Trained).

376 MEG Analysis: Group-level effects of iReadMore therapy on the reading

377 <u>network</u>

The DCM analysis identified the training-related modulation in effective connectivity between regions at the group level. We defined whether connections showed training-related modulation according to two criteria: i) there was significant modulation in Matrix B1 (Tr_Before vs Tr_After); and ii) the therapy-specific modulation in Matrix B1 was significantly different to the non-specific change over time in Matrix B2 (Tr_Before vs Un_After).

For the first criteria, a non-parametric proportion test was used for each connection to test whether modulation in Matrix B1 (Tr_Before vs Tr_After) was significant. A Gaussian distribution based on the posterior mean and standard deviation was generated for each connection from which 10000 samples were obtained. A connection was deemed to be significantly stronger after therapy if >90% of samples were *greater than* 1; and significantly weaker if >90% of samples were *less than* 1 (Richardson et al., 2011; Seghier, 2013; Woodhead et al., 2013).

To identify therapy specific training effects, rather than a simple effect of time, a second analysis was performed to compare the B1 and B2 matrices. The B1 matrix provides the modulation of connections for training over time (Tr_Before vs Tr_After) whereas the B2 matrix encapsulates the main effect of time in the absence of any training (Tr_Before vs Un_After). If the experiment only induced a simple effect of time, the modulation of the two B matrices would be very similar, and not significantly different from each other. If, on the other hand, there was an additional effect of

398 therapy over time, we would expect the modulation in the two B matrices to be 399 different. Using a fixed-effect within-subject Bayesian Model Comparison (BMC), we 400 compared the two models; i) Matrix B1 \neq Matrix B2; and ii) Matrix B1 = Matrix B2. 401 Log Bayes Factors > 3 indicate that connections in B1 were significantly different to 402 those in B2 (i.e. the effect of therapy could not be simply explained as an effect of 403 time). If both criteria are satisfied then the connection is significantly modulated by 404 reading therapy (criterion 1) and is not simply explained as an effect of time (criterion 405 2).

406

407 **Results**

408 Training effects on reading ability

409 Participants completed on average 33.35 hours (sd=2.65 hours; range: 25.33 to
410 37.21 hours) of iReadMore therapy over the training period.

411 A repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant Block by Word-List interaction 412 for word reading accuracy (F(1,22)=11.869, P= 0.00231; see Figure 4). Paired t-tests 413 showed the change in accuracy for trained words was significantly greater during the 414 training block compared to the pre-training block (t(22)=-3.11, P=0.010), and change 415 over the training block was significantly greater for trained words compared to 416 untrained words (t(22)=5.89, P=0.001). Change in accuracy for untrained items was 417 not significantly different between Blocks (t(22)=1.479, P=0.153). This indicates that 418 therapy significantly improved word reading accuracy for trained words only. Word 419 reading accuracy improved by on average 8.4% (SD=7.36; range: -2.77 to 31.66) for 420 trained words compared to -0.11% (SD=5.39; range: -13.33 to 8.36) for untrained 421 words. A repeated-measures ANOVA of word reading reaction time data revealed no

422 significant Block by Word List interaction (F(1,21)=0.461, P=0.505) and no main
423 effect of Block (F(1,21)=2.983, P=0.099) or Word-List F(1,21)=0.066, P=0.800).

424 MEG scanner task results

425 Participants successfully completed the within-scanner name detection task.
426 Average accuracy for name trials was 89.71% (SD=16.01) and the average
427 percentage of false alarms (where the button was pressed for a trial other than a
428 name) were 3.91% (SD=6.06).

429 Cardiac artefacts

430 In response to a reviewer's comment, we tested whether cardiac artefacts could be 431 confounding our results by carrying out a post-hoc ICA analysis on the raw MEG 432 data. A heartbeat artefact component was identifiable in n=18 out of 23 participants. 433 This component was epoched according to trial onset times for the four main 434 conditions. The 'cardiac ERP' data was averaged into 10ms time bins over the 0-435 300ms time window (giving 30 time bins). A 2x2 repeated measures ANOVA at each 436 time point with factors Time (before vs after training) and Wordlist (trained vs 437 untrained words) revealed no significant main effect of either Time or Wordlist in any 438 of these 30 time bins.

439 Cardiac artefacts may have also added unsystematic noise to the data. This noise 440 was however not related to the trial type or time from trial onset. All DCM analyses 441 were based on averaged data (typically 150 trials) which would have significantly 442 attenuated this confound. Additionally, we used a robust averaging procedure, which 443 uses an iterative process to place weights on within trial samples of data based on 444 the degree of artefact present within the trial (Leski, 2002; Litvak et al., 2011). When 445 the data is averaged across trials, these weightings serve to down-weight outliers.

We conclude that any cardiac artefacts were unlikely to have influenced our DCM results, due to their random occurrence with respect to both stimulus onset and stimulus type allied with the use of robust averaging to minimise any effect that they may have had on the data.

450 Source Localisation

The average latency of the M170 peak was 189.71ms (range: 156.67 – 215.00) and the average peak amplitude was 37.15fT (range: 14.46-63.8fT). To show that the M170 peak is related to orthographic processing a correlation was performed between baseline word reading accuracy and M170 latency and amplitude. This revealed a significant negative correlation r=-0.550, P=0.007 indicating that those patients with greater word reading accuracy had earlier M170 peaks. See Figure 2A for each participants' dipole location plotted on a glass brain.

458 MEG Analysis: Group-level effects of iReadMore therapy on the reading

459 network

Table 2 displays the posterior mean and exceedance probability for connections that
showed significant therapy effects; i.e. that were significantly modulated in Matrix B1
(Tr_Before vs Tr_After) but this modulation was significantly different to that in Matrix
B2 (Un_Before vs Tr_After). Eight connections were significantly stronger after
therapy than before, and five were significantly weaker (see Figure 5).

465 <u>Stronger connections for trained words after therapy</u>

466 Of the eight connections significantly strengthened by iReadMore training two were 467 feedforward connections in the left hemisphere, two were lateral (between 468 hemisphere) connections from right to left and four were self-connections. More 469 specifically they were: the feedforward connections from left OCC to left IFG and left 470 vOT; the lateral connections between the OCCs and IFGs in the right to left direction; 471 the self-connections in left and right OCCs and IFGs (bottom and top of the reading 472 hierarchy respectively). Self-connections indicate the sensitivity of a region to an 473 input; indicating that these regions became more sensitive to trained words with 474 therapy.

475 <u>Weaker connections for trained words after therapy</u>

476 Of the five connections significantly weakened by iReadMore training, three were 477 feedback connections, two lateral and one was a self-connection. More specifically 478 they were: the feedback connections from both IFGs to both vOTs and from left vOT 479 to left OCC; the lateral connection between the OCCs in the left to right direction; the 480 self-connection on the right vOT.

481 **Discussion**

482 Our analysis explored training-induced connectivity modulation within the reading 483 network of stroke patients with CA at the group level. We observed changes 484 distributed across the reading network. We identified increased regional sensitivity to 485 trained words (changes in regions' self-connections) bilaterally at the top (frontal 486 regions) and bottom (occipital regions) of the reading network. As expected, this 487 included the left IFG. The between-region connections modified by therapy were 488 predominately in the left hemisphere or, when interhemispheric, were from right to 489 left. Contrary to our predictions, stronger connections were observed in a 490 feedforward direction from left OCC to vOT and from left vOT to IFG. Together, 491 these findings indicate that iReadMore training predominantly alters left hemisphere 492 connectivity and increases the influence of bottom-up processes.

493

494 The therapy induced inter-regional modulation of connectivity was predominantly in a 495 feedforward direction. Stronger connections were observed between the left OCC 496 and left IFG and left OCC and left vOT. These connections were also stronger for 497 words compared to false fonts in the first 300ms of reading in a group of healthy 498 control participants (Woodhead et al., 2014). According to the Local Combination 499 Detector (LCD) model (Dehaene et al., 2005; Dehaene and Cohen, 2011) neurons 500 are tuned to progressively larger fragments of the word as their location moves along 501 the ventral pathway. It is possible that mass exposure to the orthographic stimuli 502 enhanced the processing of word forms within the ventral reading route. These 503 results, when viewed with the reduced strength of feedback connections from the left 504 IFG to left vOT and from left vOT to left OCC, suggests that iReadMore training in 505 these patients modulates lower-order visual representations, as opposed to higher-506 order, more abstract ones, in order to improve word reading accuracy.

507

508 This finding is in contrast to patients with Pure Alexia (PA), where iReadMore 509 training effects were driven by increased feedback from the left IFG to left OCC 510 (Woodhead et al., 2013). It was suggested that improved predictions from the 511 phonological and semantic representations within the IFG constrained the visual 512 processing of trained words. This discrepancy may reflect differences in the lesion 513 location in the two groups; with damage to the PCA territory in PA patients and the 514 MCA territory in CA patients (see Figure 2B). In response to therapy, each group 515 may have maximised their available intact resources. Therapy effects in PA patients 516 are likely to rely on improving feedback support from the intact phonological and 517 semantic representation of words within their left IFG as damage affects input to the 518 reading network. Increased IFG involvement has been identified for task demanding

subordinate levels of semantic knowledge (Nagel et al., 2008; Whitney et al., 2011) and tasks relating to phonology (Devlin et al., 2003; Drakesmith et al., 2015). By contrast, CA patients have damage to the central phonological and/or semantic representations (or connections to them; Crisp and Lambon Ralph, 2006; Robson et al., 2011; Hoffman et al., 2015). Therefore, therapy may increase reliance on orthographic processing to drive rebuilding or reconnecting of the phonological and/or semantic representations in a feedforward manner.

526

527 Increases in self-connection strengths were observed in the left and right OCCs and 528 IFGs. In DCM, self-connections act as a gain control (Kiebel et al., 2007). The left 529 IFG has been implicated the early stages of visual word recognition (Cornelissen et 530 al., 2009; Wheat et al., 2010; Woodhead et al., 2014) and was modulated by 531 iReadMore therapy in patients with PA (Woodhead et al., 2013); however, we did not 532 expect the self-connection of the right IFG in our CA patients to also became 533 stronger. Support from the right IFG in language tasks has been reported in aphasia 534 rehabilitation research (Crinion and Price, 2005; Naeser et al., 2011; Turkeltaub et 535 al., 2012; Mohr et al., 2016; Nardo et al., 2017). However, it has been argued that 536 this strategy may be ineffective in comparison to using perilesional left hemisphere 537 regions (Heiss and Thiel, 2006). The stronger self-connections in both IFGs may 538 reflect the differences in patients' progress with training. In a participant with 539 phonological dyslexia, increased right IFG activity was observed immediately 540 following training. However, when training continued on words read correctly 541 immediately post-therapy, increased activation was observed in left hemisphere 542 perilesional regions (Kurland et al., 2008). It has been suggested that the right IFG 543 has a role in assisting with error monitoring and attention control (Hampshire et al.,

544 2010). The increased connection strength from right IFG to left IFG may suggest 545 that the right IFG has a different role in word reading, potentially related to error 546 monitoring, which will have also been modulated by iReadMore.

547 Within the right hemisphere, the connection from right IFG to right vOT became 548 weaker with training, as did the right vOT self-connection. This further suggests a 549 reduced role of the right hemisphere in reading after iReadMore training.

550

551 iReadMore was designed to retrain word reading across all subtypes of CA through 552 repeated activation of the semantic, phonological and orthographic representations 553 of trained words (Woodhead et al., 2018). Retraining in this omnibus manner 554 potentially strengthened the mappings between differing cortical representations of 555 words. It should be noted that almost all participants were classified as having either 556 phonological or deep dyslexia (indicating a deficit in the phonological domain or 557 sublexical reading route), which may limit our interpretations to this patient group. 558 However, in practice we observe that few patients have 'pure' deficits of one type or 559 another (Leff & Starrfelt, 2013), and it is an open question to what extent reading 560 rehabilitation targets one reading route over the other. In line with previous research 561 (Abel et al., 2015; Rueckl et al., 2015), our study suggests that therapeutic effects 562 play out among both surviving left and right hemisphere regions, albeit with a 563 leftward bias.

564

565 The following connections became stronger with training: a) the right OCC self-566 connection; and, b) the connection from right to left OCC. This may reflect selective 567 tuning of visual cortex to the orthographic information in trained words induced by 568 multiple, repetitive exposure with trial-by-trial feedback. According to the split fovea

569 theory, visual information from the front of a word is received by the right OCC as the 570 optimal viewing position is usually just to the left of centre of any given word (Nazir et 571 al., 1992). Acceptable dipole locations were not restricted to V1 so extra-striate 572 regions will almost certainly have contributed to the observed effects. As hemifield 573 integration occurs above the level of V1, the changes in the right OCC self-574 connection and interhemispheric connection to left OCC suggests increased 575 sensitivity to the front part (left of fixation) of trained words (Perea and Lupker, 2003). 576 This is consistent with the LCD reading model (Dehaene et al., 2001; Cohen et al., 577 2002; Perea and Lupker, 2003).

578

579 In summary, in a group of patients with CA (mainly with either phonological or deep 580 dyslexia), improved word reading after iReadMore training was associated with 581 distributed changes across the residual reading network. We identified a mixture of: 582 a) within hemisphere connections (mainly left-lateralized and feedforward), that were 583 strengthened by therapy; b) bihemispheric connections (particularly self-connections 584 at both the top and bottom of the reading hierarchy); c) between hemisphere connections (right to left pattern). The iReadMore therapy app will be available to the 585 586 public in 2018 (http://www.ucl.ac.uk/aphasialab/apps/ireadmore.html).

587 **References**

Abel S, Weiller C, Huber W, Willmes K (2014) Neural underpinnings for modeloriented therapy of aphasic word production. Neuropsychologia 57:154–165
Available at:
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0028393214000955 [Accessed
May 22, 2017].

Abel S, Weiller C, Huber W, Willmes K, Specht K (2015) Therapy-induced brain
reorganization patterns in aphasia. Brain 138:1097–1112 Available at:
http://brain.oxfordjournals.org/content/138/4/1097.abstract [Accessed May 19,
2015].

Adair JC, Nadeau SE, Conway TW, Gonzalez-Rothi LJ, Heilman P, Green IA,
Heilman KM (2000) Alterations in the functional anatomy of reading induced by
rehabilitation of an alexic patient. Neuropsychiatry Neuropsychol Behav Neurol
13:303–311 Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11186167
[Accessed July 29, 2017].

Berg P, Scherg M (1994) A multiple source approach to the correction of eye
artifacts. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 90:229–241 Available at:
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0013469494900949 [Accessed
March 4, 2016].

Bonilha L, Gleichgerrcht E, Nesland T, Rorden C, Fridriksson J (2016) Success of
Anomia Treatment in Aphasia Is Associated With Preserved Architecture of
Global and Left Temporal Lobe Structural Networks. Neurorehabil Neural Repair
30:266–279 Available at:
http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1545968315593808 [Accessed May
22, 2017].

Brookshire CE, Wilson JP, Nadeau SE, Gonzalez Rothi LJ, Kendall DL. Frequency,
nature, and predictors of alexia in a convenience sample of individuals with
chronic aphasia. Aphasiology 2014; 28: 1464-80.

Brysbaert M, New B (2009) Moving beyond Kučera and Francis: A critical evaluation
of current word frequency norms and the introduction of a new and improved
word frequency measure for American English. Behav Res Methods 41:977–

618 990.

Callaghan MF, Freund P, Draganski B, Anderson E, Cappelletti M, Chowdhury R,
Diedrichsen J, Fitzgerald THB, Smittenaar P, Helms G, Lutti A, Weiskopf N
(2014) Widespread age-related differences in the human brain microstructure
revealed by quantitative magnetic resonance imaging. Neurobiol Aging
35:1862–1872 Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24656835
[Accessed February 25, 2018].

Carreiras M, Armstrong BC, Perea M, Frost R (2014) The what, when, where, and
how of visual word recognition. Trends Cogn Sci 18:90–98 Available at:
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364661313002696 [Accessed
July 16, 2014].

629 Cohen L, Lehéricy S, Chochon F, Lemer C, Rivaud S, Dehaene S (2002) 630 Language- specific tuning of visual cortex? Functional properties of the Visual 631 Word Form Area. Brain 125:1054-1069 Available at: 632 https://academic.oup.com/brain/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/brain/awf094 633 [Accessed May 22, 2017].

Cornelissen PL, Kringelbach ML, Ellis AW, Whitney C, Holliday IE, Hansen PC
(2009) Activation of the left inferior frontal gyrus in the first 200 ms of reading:
evidence from magnetoencephalography (MEG). PLoS One 4:e5359 Available
at: http://www.plosone.org/article/info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0005359#pone0005359-g004 [Accessed October 10, 2014].

639 Crinion JT, Leff AP (2015) Using functional imaging to understand therapeutic effects
640 in poststroke aphasia. Curr Opin Neurol 28:330–337 Available at:
641 http://content.wkhealth.com/linkback/openurl?sid=WKPTLP:landingpage&an=00
642 019052-201508000-00005 [Accessed May 18, 2018].

<u>JNeurosci Accepted Manuscript</u>

643 Crinion JT, Price CJ (2005) Right anterior superior temporal activation predicts 644 auditory sentence comprehension following aphasic stroke. Brain 128:2858-Available 645 2871 at: 646 http://academic.oup.com/brain/article/128/12/2858/420523/Right-anterior-647 superior-temporal-activation [Accessed December 7, 2017]. 648 Crisp J, Lambon Ralph MA (2006) Unlocking the nature of the phonological-deep dyslexia continuum: the keys to reading aloud are in phonology and semantics. 649 650 J Cogn Neurosci 18:348-362 Available at: 651 http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/10.1162/jocn.2006.18.3.348 [Accessed June 652 5, 2017]. David O, Harrison L, Friston KJ (2005) Modelling event-related responses in the 653 654 brain. Neuroimage 25:756-770 Available at: 655 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811904007888 [Accessed March 3, 2016]. 656 Dehaene S, Cohen L (2011) The unique role of the visual word form area in reading. 657 658 Trends Sci 15:254-262 Available Cogn at: 659 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364661311000738 [Accessed July 17, 2014]. 660 661 Dehaene S, Cohen L, Sigman M, Vinckier F (2005) The neural code for written 662 words: proposal. Trends Cogn Sci 9:335-341 Available а at: 663 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364661305001439 [Accessed 664 July 14, 2014]. Dehaene S, Naccache L, Cohen L, Bihan D Le, Mangin JF, Poline JB, Rivière D 665

666 (2001) Cerebral mechanisms of word masking and unconscious repetition 667 priming. Nat Neurosci 4:752–758 Available at:

668 http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11426233 [Accessed May 22, 2017].

669 Dejerine J (1891) Sur un cas de cecite verbale avec agraphie, suivi dautopsie. C R
670 Soc du Biol 43:197–201.

Devlin JT, Matthews PM, Rushworth MFS (2003) Semantic Processing in the Left
Inferior Prefrontal Cortex: A Combined Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging
and Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Study. J Cogn Neurosci 15:71–84
Available at: http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/10.1162/089892903321107837
[Accessed February 13, 2018].

Drakesmith M, El-Deredy W, Welbourne S (2015) Differential Phonological and
Semantic Modulation of Neurophysiological Responses to Visual Word
Recognition. Neuropsychobiology 72:46–56 Available at:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26337735 [Accessed January 7, 2016].

Felleman DJ, Van Essen DC (1991) Distributed Hierarchical Processing in the
Primate Cerebral Cortex. Cereb Cortex 1:1–47 Available at:
http://cercor.oxfordjournals.org/content/1/1/1.1.short [Accessed December 15,
2014].

Fridriksson J (2010) Preservation and modulation of specific left hemisphere regions
is vital for treated recovery from anomia in stroke. J Neurosci 30:11558–11564
Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20810877 [Accessed May 22,
2017].

Garrido MI, Kilner JM, Kiebel SJ, Stephan KE, Friston KJ (2007) Dynamic causal
modelling of evoked potentials: a reproducibility study. Neuroimage 36:571–580
Available at:
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811907002273 [Accessed

692 September 24, 2014].

Graves WW, Desai R, Humphries C, Seidenberg MS, Binder JR (2010) Neural
Systems for Reading Aloud: A Multiparametric Approach. Cereb Cortex
20:1799–1815 Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19920057
[Accessed February 25, 2018].

Hampshire A, Chamberlain SR, Monti MM, Duncan J, Owen AM (2010) The role of
the right inferior frontal gyrus: inhibition and attentional control. Neuroimage
50:1313–1319 Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20056157
[Accessed May 1, 2018].

Hartwigsen G, Saur D (2017) Neuroimaging of stroke recovery from aphasia Insights into plasticity of the human language network. Neuroimage Available at:
 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811917310005

704 [Accessed December 4, 2017].

Heim S, Alter K, Ischebeck AK, Amunts K, Eickhoff SB, Mohlberg H, Zilles K, von
Cramon DY, Friederici AD (2005) The role of the left Brodmann's areas 44 and
45 in reading words and pseudowords. Cogn Brain Res 25:982–993 Available
at: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S092664100500296X
[Accessed February 12, 2018].

Heiss W-D, Thiel A (2006) A proposed regional hierarchy in recovery of post-stroke
aphasia. Brain Lang 98:118–123 Available at:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0093934X06000484
[Accessed February 2, 2015].
Hoffman P, Lambon Ralph MA, Woollams AM (2015) Triangulation of the

neurocomputational architecture underpinning reading aloud. Proc Natl Acad Sci
U S A 112:E3719-28 Available at:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26124121 [Accessed January 7, 2016].

718 Jansen BH, Rit VG (1995) Electroencephalogram and visual evoked potential 719 generation in a mathematical model of coupled cortical columns. Biol Cybern 720 73:357-366 Available at: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF00199471 721 [Accessed March 2, 2016]. 722 Jobard G, Crivello F, Tzourio-Mazoyer N (2003) Evaluation of the dual route theory 723 of reading: a metanalysis of 35 neuroimaging studies. Neuroimage 20:693-712 724 Available http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14568445 [Accessed at: 725 September 18, 2015]. 726 Kiebel SJ, Daunizeau J, Phillips C, Friston KJ (2008a) Variational Bayesian inversion 727 of the equivalent current dipole model in EEG/MEG. Neuroimage 39:728-741 728 Available at: 729 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S105381190700794X 730 [Accessed January 25, 2016]. 731 Kiebel SJ, David O, Friston KJ (2006) Dynamic causal modelling of evoked 732 responses in EEG/MEG with lead field parameterization. Neuroimage 30:1273-733 1284 Available at: 734 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811905025759 [Accessed November 26, 2014]. 735 736 Kiebel SJ, Garrido MI, Friston KJ (2007) Dynamic causal modelling of evoked 737 responses: the role of intrinsic connections. Neuroimage 36:332-345 Available 738 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811907001358 at: 739 [Accessed March 8, 2016]. 740 Kiebel SJ, Garrido MI, Moran RJ, Friston KJ (2008b) Dynamic causal modelling for 741 EEG MEG. and Cogn Neurodyn 2:121-136 Available at: 742 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11571-008-9038-0 [Accessed January 4,

743 2016].

Kurland J, Cortes CR, Wilke M, Sperling A, Lott SN, Tagamets MA, VanMeter J,
Friedman RB (2008) Neural mechanisms underlying learning following semantic
mediation treatment in a case of phonologic alexia. Brain Imaging Behav 2:147–
162 Available at: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11682-008-9027-2 [Accessed
January 31, 2018].

749Lee YS, Zreik JT, Hamilton RH (2017) Patterns of neural activity predict picture-750naming performance of a patient with chronic aphasia. Neuropsychologia75194:52–60Availableat:

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0028393216304110
[Accessed March 1, 2018].

Leff AP, Starrfelt R (2013) Alexia: Diagnosis, Treatment and Theory. Springer
Science & Business Media.

Leski, J. M. (2002). Robust weighted averaging [of biomedical signals]. IEEE
Transactions on Biomedical Engineering, *49*(8), 796-804.

Litvak V, Mattout J, Kiebel S, Phillips C, Henson R, Kilner J, Barnes G, Oostenveld
R, Daunizeau J, Flandin G, Penny W (2011) EEG and MEG data analysis in
SPM8. Computational intelligence and neuroscience.

Marinkovic K, Dhond RP, Dale AM, Glessner M, Carr V, Halgren E (2003) 761 762 Spatiotemporal Dynamics of Modality-Specific and Supramodal Word 763 Processing. Neuron 38:487-497 Available at: 764 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0896627303001971 [Accessed 765 December 10, 2014].

Meinzer M, Flaisch T, Obleser J, Assadollahi R, Djundja D, Barthel G, Rockstroh B
(2006) Brain regions essential for improved lexical access in an aged aphasic

| 768 | patient: a case report. BMC Neurol 6:28 Available at: | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 769 | http://bmcneurol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2377-6-28 [Accessed | | | | | | | |
| 770 | February 28, 2018]. | | | | | | | |
| 771 | Mohr B, MacGregor LJ, Difrancesco S, Harrington K, Pulvermüller F, Shtyrov Y | | | | | | | |
| 772 | (2016) Hemispheric contributions to language reorganisation: An MEG study of | | | | | | | |
| 773 | neuroplasticity in chronic post stroke aphasia. Neuropsychologia Available at: | | | | | | | |
| 774 | http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0028393216301142 [Accessed | | | | | | | |
| 775 | April 22, 2016]. | | | | | | | |
| 776 | Naeser MA, Martin PI, Theoret H, Kobayashi M, Fregni F, Nicholas M, Tormos JM, | | | | | | | |
| 777 | Steven MS, Baker EH, Pascual-Leone A (2011) TMS suppression of right pars | | | | | | | |
| 778 | triangularis, but not pars opercularis, improves naming in aphasia. Brain Lang | | | | | | | |
| 779 | 119:206–213 Available at: | | | | | | | |
| 780 | https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0093934X11001283 | | | | | | | |
| 781 | [Accessed February 28, 2018]. | | | | | | | |
| 782 | Nagel IE, Schumacher EH, Goebel R, D'Esposito M (2008) Functional MRI | | | | | | | |
| 783 | investigation of verbal selection mechanisms in lateral prefrontal cortex. | | | | | | | |
| 784 | Neuroimage 43:801–807 Available at: | | | | | | | |
| 785 | https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811908008513 | | | | | | | |
| 786 | [Accessed February 12, 2018]. | | | | | | | |
| 787 | 7 Nardo D, Holland R, Leff AP, Price CJ, Crinion JT (2017) Less is more: Neural | | | | | | | |
| 788 | mechanisms underlying anomia treatment in chronic aphasic patients. Brain | | | | | | | |
| 789 | 140:3039–3054 Available at: | | | | | | | |
| 790 | https://academic.oup.com/brain/article/140/11/3039/4259065 [Accessed May 1, | | | | | | | |
| 791 | 2018]. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

792 Nazir TA, Heller D, Sussmann C (1992) Letter visibility and word recognition: The

793 optimal viewing position in printed words. Percept Psychophys 52:315-328 794 Available at: http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.3758/BF03209148 [Accessed 795 December 8, 2017]. 796 Penny WD, Stephan KE, Daunizeau J, Rosa MJ, Friston KJ, Schofield TM, Leff AP 797 (2010) Comparing families of dynamic causal models. PLoS Comput Biol 798 6:e1000709 Available at: 799 http://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000709 800 [Accessed December 12, 2015]. 801 Perea M, Lupker SJ (2003) Does jugde activate COURT? Transposed-letter 802 similarity effects in masked associative priming. Mem Cognit 31:829-841 803 Available at: http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.3758/BF03196438 [Accessed 804 August 9, 2017]. Perrone-Bertolotti M, Kauffmann L, Pichat C, Vidal JR, Baciu M (2017) Effective 805 806 Connectivity between Ventral Occipito-Temporal and Ventral Inferior Frontal 807 Cortex during Lexico-Semantic Processing. A Dynamic Causal Modeling Study. 808 Front Hum Neurosci 11:325 Available at:

http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnhum.2017.00325/full [Accessed
January 25, 2018].

Pillay SB, Gross WL, Graves WW, Humphries C, Book DS, Binder JR (2017) The
Neural Basis of Successful Word Reading in Aphasia. J Cogn Neurosci:1–12
Available at: https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/jocn_a_01214
[Accessed March 12, 2018].

Price CJ (2012) A review and synthesis of the first 20years of PET and fMRI studies
of heard speech, spoken language and reading. Neuroimage 62:816–847
Available
at:

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811912004703 [Accessed
July 10, 2014].

Price CJ, Devlin JT (2011) The Interactive Account of ventral occipitotemporal
contributions to reading. Trends Cogn Sci 15:246–253 Available at:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S136466131100057X

823 [Accessed May 18, 2018].

Pylkkänen L, McElree B (2007) An MEG study of silent meaning. J Cogn Neurosci
19:1905–1921 Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17958491
[Accessed July 26, 2016].

Reato D, Rahman A, Bikson M, Parra LC (2013) Effects of weak transcranial 827 828 alternating current stimulation on brain activity-a review of known mechanisms 829 from animal studies. Front Hum Neurosci 7:687 Available at: http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00687/abstract 830

831 [Accessed May 8, 2015].

Richardson FM, Seghier ML, Leff AP, Thomas MSC, Price CJ (2011) Multiple routes
from occipital to temporal cortices during reading. J Neurosci 31:8239–8247
Available
at:

http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3785141&tool=pmcen
trez&rendertype=abstract [Accessed November 28, 2014].

Richter M, Miltner WHR, Straube T (2008) Association between therapy outcome
and right-hemispheric activation in chronic aphasia. Brain 131:1391–1401
Available at:
http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.562.8383&rep=rep1&t
ype=pdf [Accessed February 27, 2018].

842 Robson H, Keidel JL, Ralph MAL, Sage K (2011) Revealing and quantifying the

impaired phonological analysis underpinning impaired comprehension in
Wernicke's aphasia. Neuropsychologia 50:276–288 Available at: http://ac.elscdn.com/S0028393211005331/1-s2.0-S0028393211005331-

846 main.pdf? tid=c50edd62-1ec1-11e7-8607-

847 00000aacb362&acdnat=1491920504_d4f639c4a00d088661237442e6e36a9a
848 [Accessed April 11, 2017].

Rossion B, Joyce CA, Cottrell GW, Tarr MJ (2003) Early lateralization and
orientation tuning for face, word, and object processing in the visual cortex.
Neuroimage 20:1609–1624 Available at:
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811903004609 [Accessed
November 16, 2014].

854 Rueckl JG, Paz-Alonso PM, Molfese PJ, Kuo W-J, Bick A, Frost SJ, Hancock R, Wu 855 DH, Mencl WE, Duñabeitia JA, Lee J-R, Oliver M, Zevin JD, Hoeft F, Carreiras 856 M, Tzeng OJL, Pugh KR, Frost R (2015) Universal brain signature of proficient 857 reading: Evidence from four contrasting languages. Proc Natl Acad Sci 858 112:15510-15515 Available at: 859 http://www.pnas.org/content/112/50/15510.full.pdf [Accessed October 12, 2017]. 860 Saur D, Lange R, Baumgaertner A, Schraknepper V, Willmes K, Rijntjes M, Weiller C 861 (2006) Dynamics of language reorganization after stroke. Brain 129:1371–1384 862 Available at: https://academic.oup.com/brain/article-863 lookup/doi/10.1093/brain/awl090 [Accessed May 23, 2017].

Schneider W, Eschman a, Zuccolotto a (2002) E-Prime reference guide. Psychol
Softw Tools 3:1 Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20738343.

Seghier ML (2013) The angular gyrus: multiple functions and multiple subdivisions.
Neuroscientist 19:43–61 Available at:

http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=4107834&tool=pmcen
trez&rendertype=abstract [Accessed July 10, 2014].

870 Seghier ML, Patel E, Prejawa S, Ramsden S, Selmer A, Lim L, Browne R, Rae J, 871 Haigh Z, Ezekiel D, Hope TMH, Leff AP, Price CJ (2016) The PLORAS 872 Database: A data repository for Predicting Language Outcome and Recovery 873 After Stroke. Neuroimage 124:1208-1212 Available at: 874 http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=4658335&tool=pmcen 875 trez&rendertype=abstract [Accessed May 23, 2016].

Seghier ML, Ramlackhansingh A, Crinion JT, Leff AP, Price CJ (2008) Lesion
identification using unified segmentation-normalisation models and fuzzy
clustering. Neuroimage 41:1253–1266 Available at:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18482850 [Accessed October 17, 2016].

Tarkiainen A (1999) Dynamics of letter string perception in the human
occipitotemporal cortex. Brain 122:2119–2132 Available at:
http://brain.oxfordjournals.org/content/122/11/2119.short [Accessed November
17, 2015].

Tsapkini K, Vindiola M, Rapp B (2011) Patterns of brain reorganization subsequent
to left fusiform damage: FMRI evidence from visual processing of words and
pseudowords, faces and objects. Neuroimage 55:1357–1372 Available at:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811910016071

888 [Accessed February 1, 2018].

Turkeltaub PE, Coslett HB, Thomas AL, Faseyitan O, Benson J, Norise C, Hamilton
RH (2012) The right hemisphere is not unitary in its role in aphasia recovery.
Cortex 48:1179–1186 Available at: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0010945211001973 [Accessed March

893 10, 2018].

Turkeltaub PE, Messing S, Norise C, Hamilton RH (2011) Are networks for residual
language function and recovery consistent across aphasic patients? Neurology
76:1726–1734 Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21576689
[Accessed May 23, 2017].

van Hees S, McMahon K, Angwin A, de Zubicaray G, Copland DA (2014) Neural
activity associated with semantic versus phonological anomia treatments in
aphasia. Brain Lang 129:47–57 Available at:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0093934X14000054?via%3Di
hub [Accessed May 22, 2017].

Vartiainen J, Aggujaro S, Lehtonen M, Hultén A, Laine M, Salmelin R (2009) Neural
dynamics of reading morphologically complex words. Neuroimage 47:2064–
2072 Available at:
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811909006247 [Accessed

907 December 12, 2014].

Weiskopf N, Suckling J, Williams G, Correia MM, Inkster B, Tait R, Ooi C, Bullmore
ET, Lutti A (2013) Quantitative multi-parameter mapping of R1, PD*, MT, and
R2* at 3T: a multi-center validation. Front Neurosci 7:95 Available at:
http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnins.2013.00095/abstract [Accessed
February 25, 2018].

Wheat KL, Cornelissen PL, Frost SJ, Hansen PC (2010) During Visual Word
Recognition, Phonology Is Accessed within 100 ms and May Be Mediated by a
Speech Production Code: Evidence from Magnetoencephalography. J Neurosci
30:5229–5233 Available at:
http://www.jneurosci.org/cgi/doi/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4448-09.2010 [Accessed

918 September 26, 2014].

Whitney C, Kirk M, O'Sullivan J, Lambon Ralph MA, Jefferies E (2011) The neural
organization of semantic control: TMS evidence for a distributed network in left
inferior frontal and posterior middle temporal gyrus. Cereb Cortex 21:1066–1075
Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20851853 [Accessed
February 12, 2018].

Whitworth A, Webster J, Howard D. A cognitive neuropsychological approach to
assessment and intervention in aphasia: a clinician's guide. 2nd edn. Hove:
Psychology Press; 2014.

Woodhead ZVJ, Barnes GR, Penny WD, Moran RJ, Teki S, Price CJ, Leff AP (2014) 927 928 Reading front to back: MEG evidence for early feedback effects during word 929 recognition. Cereb cortex 24:817-825 Available at: 930 http://cercor.oxfordjournals.org/content/24/3/817.short#ref-36 [Accessed 931 October 10, 2014].

Woodhead ZVJ, Kerry SJ, Aguilar OM, Ong Y-H, Hogan JS, Pappa K, Leff AP,
Crinion JT (2018) Randomized trial of iReadMore word reading training and
brain stimulation in central alexia. Brain 141:2127–2141 Available at:
https://academic.oup.com/brain/article/141/7/2127/5035882.

936 Woodhead ZVJ, Penny WD, Barnes GR, Crewes H, Wise RJS, Price CJ, Leff AP 937 (2013) Reading therapy strengthens top-down connectivity in patients with pure 938 alexia. Brain 136:2579-2591 Available at: 939 http://www.researchgate.net/publication/251878762 Reading therapy strength 940 ens top-down connectivity in patients with pure alexia [Accessed September 941 15, 2014].

942 Xu M, Baldauf D, Chang CQ, Desimone R, Tan LH (2017) Distinct Distributed

<u>JNeurosci Accepted Manuscript</u>

943patterns of neural activity are associated with two languages in the bilingual944brain.SciAdv3:e1603309Availableat:945http://advances.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/sciadv.1603309[Accessed946February 21, 2018].

247 Zhou W, Shu H (2017) A meta-analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging
studies of eye movements and visual word reading. Brain Behav 7:e00683
Available at: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/brb3.683 [Accessed February 21,
2018].

Zweig E, Pylkkänen L (2009) A visual M170 effect of morphological complexity. Lang
Cogn Process 24:412–439 Available at:
http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01690960802180420 [Accessed
February 2, 2016].

Table 1. Demographic and clinical information on each patient. Reading change (%)
for trained items was calculated by subtracting pre-training (T3) WRT accuracy (as a
raw per cent) from post-training accuracy (T4) for trained words only. CA= central
alexia; P= phonological alexia; S= surface alexia; D= deep alexia.

959

Table 2. Results of the DCM analysis (group-level effects of iReadMore therapy on the reading network). Posterior means and exceedance probabilities from Matrix B1 (Tr_Before vs Tr_After) for the 13 connections that were shown to be significantly modulated by iReadMore therapy. L/ROCC= left/right occipital; L/RvOT=left/right ventral occipitotemporal cortex; L/RIFG= left/right Inferior Frontal Gyrus.

965

Figure 1. Study design. The Baseline assessment took place over two testing
sessions 1-2 weeks apart (T1 and T2). An MEG scan and behavioural assessment
was conducted before (T3) and after (T4) a four week block of iReadMore training.

969 Figure 2. A) Optimal source locations identified using Variational Bayesian 970 equivalent current dipole modelling for each subject, plotted on a glass brain in MNI 971 space. Average dipole location across the group are given for the six sources; 972 occipital (blue), ventral occipital temporal (grey) and inferior frontal gyrus (red). B) 973 Lesion overlay map for the group (n=23) where hotter colours indicate greater 974 number of patients with lesions affecting that area.

975

976 Figure 3. Stimulus presentation procedure for the MEG scans. Participants were 977 scanned before and after training. At each session, there were 150 trials for each 978 condition of interest (Trained and Untrained words), 150 trials for false fonts (omitted 979 from this analysis) and 40 catch trials (names).

980

Figure 4. Change over time in (A) mean word reading accuracy (n=23) and (B)
reaction times (n=22) for trained words (blue) and untrained words (red). Error bars
indicate 95% confidence intervals.

984

Figure 5. Results of the DCM analysis: Modulated connection strengths for words trained with iReadMore after training. These are connections that met the following criteria; i) there was significant modulation in Matrix B1 (Tr_Before vs Tr_After); and ii) the therapy-specific modulation in Matrix B1 was significantly different to the nonspecific change over time in Matrix B2 (Tr_Before vs Un_After). Connections in red

- 990 became significantly stronger after training, whereas connections in blue because
- 991 significantly weaker after training.



Pre-training assessment

Post-training assessment

Β.

A. Left Hemisphere







OCC:-21 -89 vOT:-42 -59 -16 IFG:-41 29 -3

Right Hemisphere







OCC: 23 -93 -4 vOT: 43 -58 -16 IFG: 43 28 -4









JNeurosci Accepted Manuscript

Group-level effects of iReadMore therapy on the reading network



Stronger after training

| ID | Age (years) | Gender | Time post- stroke (months) | Lesion Volume (cm³) | CA subtype | CAT naming, (%) | Pseudo- word Reading (%) | Baseline Word Reading (%) | Reading change (%) for trained items |
|-----|----------------|--------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| P01 | 44 | Male | 94 | 240.9 | D | 69 | 0 | 58.4 | 31.7 |
| P02 | 50 | Male | 82 | 304.5 | D | 53 | 0 | 40.3 | 17.2 |
| P03 | 64 | Male | 25 | 102.7 | Р | 81 | 70 | 96.7 | -2.8 |
| P04 | 52 | Male | 66 | 122.7 | Р | 66 | 0 | 71.1 | 18.9 |
| P05 | 56 | Female | 93 | 149.8 | S | 5 | 75 | 63.8 | 8.3 |
| P06 | 55 | Female | 75 | 151.2 | Р | 93 | 30 | 91.9 | 3.9 |
| P07 | 33 | Female | 59 | 181 | Р | 95 | 2.5 | 90.1 | 2.8 |
| P08 | 67 | Male | 107 | 11.7 | D | 72 | 2.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| P09 | 43 | Female | 55 | 399.2 | D | 81 | 0 | 58.2 | 11.7 |
| P10 | 61 | Male | 19 | 195.6 | D | 40 | 0 | 3.4 | 5.0 |
| P11 | 52 | Male | 12 | 31.2 | Р | 88 | 75 | 96.3 | 3.9 |
| P12 | 50 | Female | 14 | 59.4 | Р | 83 | 25 | 90.6 | 2.2 |
| P13 | 54 | Male | 24 | 149.3 | Р | 86 | 65 | 91.5 | 4.4 |
| P14 | 56 | Male | 23 | 45.1 | Р | 72 | 0 | 80.3 | 3.3 |
| P15 | 54 | Male | 39 | 189.7 | Р | 14 | 2.5 | 47.3 | 6.1 |
| P16 | 73 | Male | 158 | 205.2 | D | 71 | 0 | 20.0 | 5.8 |
| P17 | 60 | Male | 16 | 102.6 | D | 33 | 10 | 28.1 | 10.0 |
| P18 | 78 | Male | 22 | 128.5 | Ρ | 43 | 7.5 | 75.4 | 2.2 |
| P19 | 50 | Female | 72 | 141.3 | Р | 28 | 5 | 35.9 | 5.0 |
| P20 | 72 | Male | 101 | 243.3 | D | 9 | 0 | 13.4 | 5.8 |
| P21 | 58 | Female | 41 | 297.7 | Ρ | 81 | 0 | 59.5 | 16.1 |
| P22 | 42 | Male | 13 | 43.7 | Ρ | 72 | 27.5 | 74.9 | 12.2 |
| P23 | 26 | Female | 81 | 161.9 | D | 79 | 0 | 75.5 | 6.7 |
| | | | | | | | | | |

| Connection | Posterior | Exceedance | |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------|--|
| | mean | Probability | |
| Stronger with training | | | |
| LOCC to LOCC | 1.02 | 1.00 | |
| LOCC to LvOT | 1.17 | 1.00 | |
| LOCC to LIFG | 1.16 | 1.00 | |
| ROCC to LOCC | 1.07 | 0.97 | |
| ROCC to ROCC | 1.07 | 1.00 | |
| LIFG to LIFG | 1.10 | 1.00 | |
| RIFG to LIFG | 1.08 | 0.96 | |
| RIFG to RIFG | 1.03 | 0.99 | |
| Weaker with training | | | |
| LOCC to ROCC | 0.86 | 0.00 | |
| LvOT to LOCC | 0.92 | 0.01 | |
| RvOT to RvOT | 0.97 | 0.01 | |
| LIFG to LvOT | 0.80 | 0.00 | |
| RIFG to RvOT | 0.91 | 0.00 | |
| | | | |