

Supramarginal gyrus involvement in visual word recognition

Cornelia Stoeckel¹, Patricia M. Gough^{2,3}, Kate E. Watkins^{1,2}, Joseph T. Devlin⁴

¹FMRIB Centre, Department of Clinical Neurology, University of Oxford

²Department of Experiment Psychology, University of Oxford

³Department of Neuroscience, University of Parma

⁴Cognitive, Perceptual and Brain Sciences and Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, UCL

Running title: Reading and the SMG

Correspondence: Joseph T. Devlin

Cognitive, Perceptual, and Brain Science, UCL

Gower Street

London, WC1E 6BT

Email: joe.devlin@ucl.ac.uk

Phone: +44 (0)207 679 5414

Fax: +44 (0)207 7436 4276

To appear in the Special Issue: The contribution of TMS to structure-function mapping in the human brain. Action, Perception and Higher Functions. Guest eds: E.Rusconi & S.Bestmann

Abstract

1
2 Introduction. In the classic neurological model of language, the human inferior parietal lobule
3
4 (IPL) plays an important role in visual word recognition. The region is both functionally and
5
6 structurally heterogeneous, however, suggesting that subregions of IPL may differentially
7
8 contribute to reading. The two main sub-divisions are the supramarginal (SMG) and angular
9
10 gyri, which have been hypothesized to contribute preferentially to phonological and semantic
11
12 aspects of word processing, respectively. Methods. Here we used single-pulse TMS to
13
14 investigate the functional specificity and timing of SMG involvement in reading. Participants
15
16 performed two reading tasks that focused attention on either the phonological or semantic
17
18 relation between two simultaneously presented words. A third task focused attention on the
19
20 visual relation between pairs of consonant letter strings to control for basic input and output
21
22 characteristics of the paradigm using non-linguistic stimuli. TMS to SMG was delivered on
23
24 every trial at 120, 180, 240 or 300 msec post-stimulus onset. Results. Stimulation at 180
25
26 msec produced a reliable facilitation of reaction times for both the phonological and semantic
27
28 tasks, but not for the control visual task. Conclusion. These findings demonstrate that SMG
29
30 contributes to reading regardless of the specific task demands, and suggests this may be due to
31
32 automatically computing the sound of a word even when the task does not explicitly require it.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Keywords: reading, phonology, semantics, chronometric TMS, inferior parietal
44
45 lobe, neurological model of reading
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

1. Introduction

In the classic neurological model of language, visual word recognition involves a distributed set of left hemisphere brain regions. The written word first activates visual cortices that send information to the inferior parietal lobule (IPL) where visual word forms are recognized (Dejerine, 1891, 1892). These are then linked to auditory word forms in Wernicke’s area and then to articulatory motor patterns located in Broca’s area. Damage to either IPL or the visual pathway linking occipital cortex to IPL can result in preferential impairments for reading by destroying or disconnecting one’s memory for visual word forms (Dejerine, 1891, 1892; Damasio and Damasio, 1983; Warrington and Shallice, 1980; Philipose, Gottesman et al., 2007). Functional neuroimaging studies confirm the importance of IPL for reading, but question its specific contribution (Pugh, Mencl et al., 2001; Price and Mechelli, 2005). Several authors, for instance, attribute IPL activation to the process of converting spelling-to-sound rather than to stored visual word forms and suggest that dysfunction in this region is the cause of poor reading skills in developmental dyslexics (Shaywitz, Shaywitz et al., 2002; Bookheimer, Zeffiro et al., 1995; Pugh, Mencl et al., 2000; Horwitz, Rumsey et al., 1998). Currently there is no clear consensus regarding the functional role of IPL in reading.

Anatomically, IPL is a heterogeneous region comprised of several distinct cytoarchitectonic fields (von Bonin and Bailey, 1947) with the two largest, Brodmann areas 40 and 39, roughly corresponding to the supramarginal (SMG) and angular (ANG) gyri, respectively (Rushworth, Behrens et al., 2005). Functionally, these two regions are also heterogeneous and contribute to a wide range of tasks, not just reading (e.g. Schacter, Addis et al., 2007; Gobel, Walsh et al., 2001). Within the visual word recognition literature, studies have shown increased SMG activation when participants focus on the sound of a word which contrasts with increased ANG activation when participants focus on its meaning (Demonet,

1 Price et al., 1994; Mummery, Patterson et al., 1998; Devlin, Matthews et al., 2003; Price,
2 Moore et al., 1997). This double dissociation corresponds with the distinct patterns of
3
4 connectivity for each region. SMG is connected to auditory association regions of posterior
5
6 supratemporal plane and to a region of posterior inferior frontal gyrus (Catani, Jones et al.,
7
8 2005), both of which are involved in phonological processing (Gough, Nobre et al., 2005;
9
10 Poldrack, Wagner et al., 1999; Hickok and Poeppel, 2000). In contrast, ANG sits at the
11
12 posterior end of the inferior longitudinal fasciculus which links it with temporal lobe regions
13
14 implicated in semantic memory (Catani, Howard et al., 2002; Spitsyna, Warren et al., 2006;
15
16 Hodges, Graham et al., 1995). In other words, it may be possible to establish a more fine
17
18 grained understanding of IPL contributions to reading by separately considering its two major
19
20 sub-divisions.
21
22
23
24
25

26 Here, we investigated the specific contributions of supramarginal involvement in
27
28 visual word recognition using chronometric TMS (Walsh and Pascual-Leone, 2003). We
29
30 hypothesized that stimulating SMG would disrupt phonological more than semantic
31
32 processing based on previous imaging studies. In addition, we hypothesized this disruption
33
34 would be strongest approximately 200-300 msec after the onset of the word based on previous
35
36 ERP and MEG findings (Khateb, Annoni et al., 1999; Pammer, Hansen et al., 2004).
37
38 Participants performed three different tasks emphasizing phonological, semantic, or visual
39
40 aspects of the stimuli while single pulses of TMS were delivered to SMG at 120, 180, 240, or
41
42 300 msec post-stimulus onset.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **2. Methods**

52 *2.1 Subjects*

53 22 healthy, right-handed volunteers (13 female, aged 19-34) participated in the study.
54
55 All subjects were native English speakers who were free of any neurological deficits and
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 screened for TMS exclusion criteria. Prior to the experiment, subjects gave their informed
2 written consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Subjects were paid for
3 participation and free to leave the experiment any time. The study was approved by the NHS
4
5 Oxfordshire Research Ethics Committee.
6
7
8
9

10 11 *2.2 TMS parameters*

12
13 TMS was carried out with a MagStim Rapid² stimulator (Magstim, Whitland, UK)
14 using a 70-mm figure-of-eight coil. The stimulation intensity was set to 55% of the maximum
15 stimulator output for all subjects. During the localiser task, trains of three pulses were
16 delivered at 100, 200 and 300 msec following stimulus onset in a third of all trials. During the
17 main task, a single pulse was delivered at 120, 180, 240, or 300 msec post-stimulus onset in
18 every trial. Stimulation parameters were well within international safety guidelines
19 (Wassermann, 1998).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 33 *2.3 Neuronavigation*

34
35 In order to accurately target SMG in our participants, we employed a two-stage
36 localisation procedure. The first used the BrainSight frameless stereotaxy system (Rogue
37 Research, Montreal, Canada) to anatomically identify potential stimulation targets within each
38 participant's left SMG. For each subject, a high-resolution MRI scan was either already
39 available or collected on a Siemens (Erlangen, Germany) 1.5 T Sonata scanner (FLASH
40 sequence, TR = 10 msec, TE = 4.75msec, flip angle = 19°, resolution = 1×1×1 mm). Prior to
41 the TMS session, a single target site was marked on the individual's structural scan by placing
42 a marker at the end of the posterior ascending ramus of the Sylvian fissure. A set of eight
43 additional markers were placed around this site, generating a 3 × 3 grid of testing locations
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 within SMG (Figure 1a). These sites were then tested in a second stage to determine whether
2 stimulation of any of them disrupted phonological processing.
3

4
5 The aim of the first part of the TMS experiment was to find a stimulation site where
6 short bursts of rTMS interfered with phonological processing. A rhyme judgement task was
7 used to focus attention on the sounds of the words. A trial began with a centrally presented
8 fixation cross which remained on the screen for 1000 msec before two words appeared, above
9 and below the cross, for a further 500 msec. Participants had to decide whether or not the
10 words rhymed (e.g. chair – pear) and indicate their responses by pressing a button with either
11 their index or middle finger. There was a 2500 msec inter-trial interval before the next trial
12 began and each run consisted of 30 trials presented in a random order, for a total duration of 2
13 mins per run. One third of the trials had concurrent rTMS (10Hz for 300 msec) starting 100
14 msec after the onset of the word pair. Reaction times (RTs) were recorded from the onset of
15 the stimulus and only correct responses were analysed. When the median RT for TMS trials
16 was numerically greater than for non-TMS trials on two separate runs at the same location,
17 then that site was used for testing in the main experiment. In short, a TMS-based functional
18 localiser was employed to identify the main testing site (cf. Ashbridge, Walsh et al., 1997;
19 Devlin, Matthews et al., 2003; Gough, Nobre et al., 2005).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Testing began with a practice run where no TMS was delivered. When participants
42 were comfortable with the task, then TMS was introduced by placing the coil on the scalp
43 such that the line of maximum magnetic flux intersected one of the anatomically marked
44 SMG sites. All participants tolerated TMS with no discomfort, although in a few cases there
45 was peripheral stimulation of the temporalis muscle. After each run, RTs were analysed and
46 if TMS led to faster RTs (i.e. facilitation), the next site was tested. When there was inhibition,
47 the site was re-tested to ensure the effect was repeatable. Inhibition effects of more than 100
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 msec were considered physiologically unlikely and were re-tested. If after 10 runs we were
2 unable to identify a suitable testing site, the experiment ended.
3
4
5
6

7 *2.4 Procedure*

8
9 The main experiment involved three different tasks: i) deciding whether two words
10 sounded the same (e.g. cite – sight); ii) deciding whether two words meant the same thing
11 (e.g. idea – notion); and iii) deciding whether two consonant letters strings were visually
12 identical (e.g. shqwy – shqwy). In all cases, there were equal numbers of matching and non-
13 matching trials (i.e. “yes” and “no” responses). The first two tasks were designed to focus
14 attention on either the sound of the word or its meaning while the third was used as a non-
15 linguistic control task, which shared visual and response characteristics of the main tasks
16 without any linguistic component. The tasks were blocked to minimize switching costs and
17 the order was counter-balanced across participants. A block began with a short instruction
18 screen (2s) followed by 13 trials using the same presentation characteristics as the localiser
19 task (1000 msec fixation, 500 msec stimulus duration) but a shorter ITI (1500 msec). The
20 first trial in each block was excluded from analyses to help minimize contamination from task
21 switching. In total there were 8 blocks (i.e. 96 trials) per task. On each trial a single pulse of
22 TMS was delivered at 120, 180, 240 or 300 msec after the onset of the stimulus and these
23 were balanced so that there were 24 trials per task per TMS condition. Participants first
24 practiced the main experiment with TMS to familiarise themselves with the experience of
25 single pulse stimulation and the fact that it occurred on all trials. None of the stimuli used in
26 the practice were repeated in the main experiment.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 *2.5 Stimuli*

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The words used in the TMS localiser task ranged in length from 3-8 letters. TMS and
2 non-TMS trials were matched within and across runs for British English written word
3
4 frequency (Baayen and Pipenbrook, 1995), for rated familiarity, and imageability (Coltheart,
5 1981), and for number of letters and syllables (all $p>0.1$). Note that the rimes of word pairs
6
7 always had different spellings (e.g. razor – laser) so that rhyme judgements could not be
8
9 performed solely on the orthography of the words. The words in the main experiment were 3-
10
11 10 letters long and were matched for familiarity and written word frequency. Due to the
12
13 limited numbers of homophones in English, we were unable to match the sets for the
14
15 remaining factors, with items in the phonological task being less imageable (500 versus 547),
16
17 having fewer letters (4.9 versus 5.3) and fewer syllables (1.3 versus 1.6, all $p<0.05$).
18
19 Importantly, there were no significant differences between the four TMS conditions (120, 180,
20
21 240, 300) nor Task \times TMS interactions. Nonetheless, a behavioural pre-test was conducted
22
23 with a different set of 22 native English speakers (15 female; age ranged: 17-47 years) to
24
25 determine whether any putative TMS effects could be due to insufficient matching on
26
27 psycholinguistic factors in the absence of TMS. That is, the items were classified as being in
28
29 one of the four TMS conditions (120, 180, 240 or 300 msec) even though no stimulation
30
31 occurred in this experiment. This allowed us to determine whether our stimuli matching was
32
33 sufficient by looking for significant differences in RTs across conditions even without TMS.
34
35 Any such difference would indicate insufficient matching. An item analysis confirmed a
36
37 highly significant effect of Task ($F(3,184) = 35.1, p<0.001$) with faster responses for the
38
39 phonological than semantic task. Crucially, however, there was no significant main effect of
40
41 TMS ($F(3,184)=0.02, p=0.996$) nor a significant Task \times TMS interaction ($F(3,184) = 0.15, p=$
42
43 0.895). In short, although the two tasks have different RTs, the conditions within tasks were
44
45 well balanced. No words from the practice or localiser task appeared in the main experiment
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 and no words were repeated within the experiment. Finally, the consonant strings were
2 matched in length to the lexical stimuli.
3
4
5

6 7 *2.6 Analyses*

8
9 There were no significant effects of TMS on accuracy in either experiment so all the
10 analyses focus on RTs. To minimize the effect of outliers, the median RT of correct
11 responses per condition per subject was used when calculating group results. Paired t-tests
12 were used to compare RTs on the TMS and no-TMS trials in the localiser task. For the main
13 experiment, a repeated measures 3×4 ANOVA used Task (phonological, semantic, visual)
14 and TMS (120, 180, 240, and 300 msec) as the independent factors. In addition, a second
15 analysis compared each TMS condition to the task mean to normalize for overall task
16 performance. This has the advantage of providing a statistically unbiased measure which can
17 reveal relative facilitation and inhibition effects (Drager, Breitenstein et al., 2004).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **3. Results**

35 *3.1 Localisers*

36 One participant was slower by approximately 400 msec across tasks than the others
37 and was therefore removed from all analyses leaving 21 participants. In 7 of these we failed
38 to find a consistent TMS-induced slow down at any of the SMG sites within 10 TMS localiser
39 runs. In the remaining 14 participants, TMS clearly interfered with rhyme judgements. In
40 these participants, TMS produced a significant inhibition effect of 51msec ($t(13)=5.9$,
41 $p<0.001$). When normalized to reflect between-subject variability in overall RT, this equated
42 to a 7.9% slow-down in individuals. In contrast, stimulation of the other SMG sites produced
43 a (non-significant) facilitation effect of 16msec which, when normalized, was equivalent to a
44 2.7% speed-up in RTs. The sites where stimulation led to a slow-down for rhyme judgements
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 are shown in Figure 1B. The mean coordinate in standard space defined by the MNI152
2 template brain was $X = -52$, $Y = -45$, $Z = +39$ and is shown with a filled circle. The sites for
3 the individuals are shown as open circles and these sites were used as the test sites for the
4 main experiment.
5
6
7
8

9
10 *Insert Figure 1 here*

11 12 13 14 *3.2 Main experiment*

15
16 Participants responded correctly to 93% of the homophone judgements (phonological
17 task), 90% of the synonym judgements (semantic task), and 92% of visual judgements
18 (control task). A 3×4 repeated measures ANOVA with Task and TMS as independent
19 factors revealed no significant main effects nor interactions (all $F < 1.8$, all $p > .12$),
20 demonstrating that accuracy was unaffected by either Task or TMS.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Reaction times for all three tasks are shown in Figure 2. In the left column, RTs
30 measured from the onset of the visual stimulus are shown for each of the four TMS
31 conditions. An ANOVA confirmed a significant effect of Task ($F(2,26) = 55.6$, $p < 0.001$)
32 indicating that semantic decisions (956 msec) were performed more slowly than phonological
33 decisions (876 msec) which were slower than purely visual decisions (738 msec). The main
34 effect of TMS was non-significant ($F(2,26) = 2.2$, $p = 0.10$) with mean RTs per TMS time
35 window of 858, 844, 859, and 865 msec, respectively. The Task \times TMS interaction term was
36 not significant ($F(2,26) = 0.9$, $p = 0.51$).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 *Insert Figure 2 here*

51 Our second analysis investigated TMS effects within task by comparing each
52 condition to its overall task mean (cf. Drager, Breitenstein et al., 2004). For phonological
53 decisions, the only inhibitory effects occurred at 240 and 300 msec and were non-significant
54 (both $t(13) < 1.6$, $p > 0.137$) but there was a 16msec facilitation effect at 180 msec post-stimulus
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 onset ($t(13)=2.16$, $p=0.050$). Similarly, for semantic decisions there was a significant 25
2 msec facilitation effect at 180 msec ($t(13)=2.41$, $p=0.031$) but no other reliable differences.
3
4 When normalized for overall RTs per task, both the phonological and semantic TMS effects
5 represented a 2% decrease in RTs relative to the overall mean. Finally, there were no
6
7 significant effects of TMS during the visual control task.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Discussion**

15
16
17 Despite identifying the testing site in each individual as one where rTMS *interfered*
18 with rhyme judgements, single-pulse TMS of the same area *facilitated* homophone
19 judgements, but only when applied at 180 msec post-stimulus onset. This temporal specificity
20
21 was also present for synonym judgements but not for the visual control task. These findings
22 were surprising for three reasons. First, we anticipated the effect would be specific to
23
24 phonological decisions. Second, both repetitive and single pulse TMS were expected to
25
26 *interfere* with processing. Third, we expected TMS to have its effect later than 180 msec,
27
28 based on previous ERP, MEG, and TMS findings (Devlin, Matthews et al., 2003; Khateb,
29
30 Annoni et al., 1999; Pammer, Hansen et al., 2004). Here we consider a number of potential
31
32 explanations for these surprising results.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Previous neuroimaging studies have reported increased activation in SMG when
42 directly comparing phonological to semantic decisions (Devlin, Matthews et al., 2003;
43
44 Demonet, Price et al., 1994; Mummery, Patterson et al., 1998) and an earlier TMS study
45
46 demonstrated that rTMS to SMG significantly disrupted verbal working memory (Romero,
47
48 Walsh et al., 2006). In contrast, semantic decisions are more typically associated with the
49
50 angular gyrus (Price, 2000; Devlin, Matthews et al., 2003; Demonet, Price et al., 1994;
51
52 Mummery, Patterson et al., 1998) so it was surprising that TMS at 180 msec facilitated
53
54 responses for both tasks. One possibility is that direct comparisons of activation levels in
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
phonological and semantic tasks hide the fact that the area is activated by both tasks but to
different extents. Preliminary evidence supporting this hypothesis comes from an imaging
study comparing activation levels in a sentence completion task (e.g. “I like to play on a warm
summer’s ____”) where participants either chose a response that made the sentence rhyme
(e.g. “day”) or just completed the sentence sensibly (e.g. “evening”; Gough, Nobre, and
Devlin, in preparation). Although rhyme completions led to significantly greater activation in
several cortical areas including SMG, both tasks significantly activated SMG above baseline
levels. This common activation may reflect the fact that all words require phonological
processing at some level which would explain why in the current study, TMS to SMG
affected semantic as well as phonological decisions. Clearly these results raise new questions,
however, and these can be explored with further TMS experiments. If our hypotheses are
correct, then a more robust chronometric stimulation technique such as paired pulses delivered
40 msec apart (Juan and Walsh, 2003) should disrupt processing in SMG and interfere with
both phonological and semantic decisions, presumably at a slightly later time window.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
The other surprising findings were that stimulation facilitated, rather than interfered
with, response times in the main experiment and that this effect occurred earlier than one
might expect. One possibility that can be ruled out is that this was due to the specific task
used in the main experiment, particularly as inhibition was observed at the same site in the
localiser task. Rhyme and homophone decisions were chosen because both focus attention on
the sound of the words and because a previous study found that rTMS to left pars opercularis
significantly impaired both types of decisions (Gough, Nobre et al., 2005). Therefore, there is
no reason to expect the difference in task to drive the divergent findings. A more likely
candidate is the difference in stimulation paradigms. Short bursts of repetitive TMS disrupt
processing in a region for the length of the stimulation train whereas a single pulse has its
effect for roughly 40-60 msec (Amassian, Cracco et al., 1989; Brasil-Neto, McShane et al.,

1992). As a result, rTMS typically has a larger effect than single pulses and is most commonly used to induce virtual lesions (Devlin and Watkins, 2007; Pascual-Leone, Bartres-Faz et al., 1999). In fact, several studies have shown facilitated responses following single-pulse stimulation (Grosbras and Paus, 2003; Pascual-Leone, Valls-Sole et al., 1992; Pulvermuller, Hauk et al., 2005; Topper, Mottaghy et al., 1998). For instance, Topper and colleagues (1998) found that single pulses of TMS delivered to Wernicke’s area decreased picture naming latencies while Pulvermuller et al. (2005) demonstrated that single pulses of stimulation delivered to either hand or leg areas of primary motor cortex facilitated lexical decisions to either hand- or leg-related action words, respectively. Interestingly, a common factor in these studies was that the pulse was delivered early in the time course of a trial – before activation in the region was expected. This is consistent with the current results where the only significant facilitation occurred at 180 msec post-stimulus onset – roughly 70-120 msec before SMG was expected to contribute to the tasks (Devlin, Matthews et al., 2003; Khateb, Annoni et al., 1999; Pammer, Hansen et al., 2004). In other words, the fact that single TMS pulse facilitated, rather than inhibited, responses and that this occurred relatively early in time is at least consistent with some previous studies. These facilitation effects are often explained as TMS “priming” the region to respond (Pulvermuller, Hauk et al., 2005), although the physiological basis of the effect remains unknown and further studies using state-dependent effects of TMS (Silvanto and Muggleton, 2008b, a) would be necessary to evaluate the validity of this hypothesis.

Acknowledgements

1 MCS was supported by the European Commission (Marie Curie Fellowship 25413) and the
2 British Academy (small research grant SG-43944). This work was supported by the
3
4
5 Wellcome Trust (JTD).
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 **References**

15
16
17 Amassian VE, Cracco RQ, Maccabee PJ, Cracco JB, Rudell A, and Eberle L. Suppression of
18
19 visual perception by magnetic coil stimulation of human occipital cortex.
20

21 *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol*, 74: 458-62, 1989.

22
23
24 Ashbridge E, Walsh V, and Cowey A. Temporal aspects of visual search studied by
25
26 transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Neuropsychologia*, 35: 1121-1131, 1997.
27

28
29 Baayen RH and Pipenbrook R. *The celex lexical database. Secondary Titl.* Philadelphia, PA:
30
31 Linguistic Data Consortium, University of Pennsylvania, 1995.
32

33
34 Bookheimer SY, Zeffiro TA, Blaxton T, Gaillard W, and Theodore W. Regional cerebral
35
36 blood flow during object naming and word reading. *Hum Brain Mapp*, 3: 93-106,
37
38 1995.
39

40
41 Brasil-Neto JP, McShane LM, Fuhr P, Hallet M, and Cohen LG. Topographic mapping of the
42
43 human motor cortex with magnetic stimulation: Factors affecting accuracy and
44
45 reproducibility. *Journal of Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*,
46
47 85: 9-16, 1992.
48
49

50
51 Catani M, Howard RJ, Pajevic S, and Jones DK. Virtual in vivo interactive dissection of white
52
53 matter fasciculi in the human brain. *Neuroimage*, 17: 77-94, 2002.
54

55
56 Catani M, Jones DK, and ffytche DH. Perisylvian language networks of the human brain. *Ann*
57
58 *Neurol*, 57: 8-16, 2005.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Coltheart M. The mrc psycholinguistics database. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 33A: 497-505, 1981.
- Damasio A and Damasio H. The anatomic basis of pure alexia. *Neurology*, 33: 1573-1583, 1983.
- Dejerine J. Sur un cas de cecite verbale avec agraphie, suivi d'autopsie. *Memoires Societe Biologique*, 3: 197-201, 1891.
- Dejerine J. Contribution a l'etude anatomoclinique et clinique des differentes varietes de cecite verbal. *CR Hebdomadaire des Sceances et Memories de la Societe de Biologie*, 4: 61-90, 1892.
- Demonet JF, Price C, Wise R, and Frackowiak RS. Differential activation of right and left posterior sylvian regions by semantic and phonological tasks: A positron-emission tomography study in normal human subjects. *Neurosci Lett*, 182: 25-8, 1994.
- Devlin JT, Matthews PM, and Rushworth MF. 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, 2003.
- Devlin JT and Watkins KE. Stimulating language: Insights from tms. *Brain*, 130: 610-22, 2007.
- Drager B, Breitenstein C, Helmke U, Kamping S, and Knecht S. Specific and nonspecific effects of transcranial magnetic stimulation on picture-word verification. *Eur J Neurosci*, 20: 1681-7, 2004.
- Gobel S, Walsh V, and Rushworth MF. The mental number line and the human angular gyrus. *Neuroimage*, 14: 1278-89, 2001.
- Gough PM, Nobre AC, and Devlin JT. Dissociating linguistic processes in the left inferior frontal cortex with transcranial magnetic stimulation. *J Neurosci*, 25: 8010-6, 2005.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Grosbras MH and Paus T. Transcranial magnetic stimulation of the human frontal eye field facilitates visual awareness. *Eur J Neurosci*, 18: 3121-6, 2003.

Hickok G and Poeppel D. Towards a functional neuroanatomy of speech perception. *Trends Cogn Sci*, 4: 131-138, 2000.

Hodges JR, Graham N, and Patteron K. Charting the progression in semantic dementia: Implications for the organization of semantic memory. *Memory*, 3: 463-495, 1995.

Horwitz B, Rumsey JM, and Donohue BC. Functional connectivity of the angular gyrus in normal reading and dyslexia. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 95: 8939-44, 1998.

Jenkinson M and Smith S. A global optimisation method for robust affine registration of brain images. *Med Image Anal*, 5: 143-56, 2001.

Juan CH and Walsh V. Feedback to v1: A reverse hierarchy in vision. *Exp Brain Res*, 150: 259-63, 2003.

Khateb A, Annoni J-M, Landis T, Pegna AJ, Custodi M-C, Fonteneau E, Morand SM, and Michel CF. Spatio-temporal analysis of electric brain activity during semantic and phonological word processing. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 32: 215-231, 1999.

Loftus GR and Masson MEJ. Using confidence-intervals in within-subject designs. *Psychon Bull Rev*, 1: 476-490, 1994.

Mummery CJ, Patterson K, Hodges JR, and Price CJ. Functional neuroanatomy of the semantic system: Divisible by what? *J Cogn Neurosci*, 10: 766-777, 1998.

Pammer K, Hansen PC, Kringelbach ML, Holliday I, Barnes G, Hillebrand A, Singh KD, and Cornelissen PL. Visual word recognition: The first half second. *Neuroimage*, 22: 1819-25, 2004.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Pascual-Leone A, Bartres-Faz D, and Keenan JP. Transcranial magnetic stimulation: Studying the brain-behaviour relationship by induction of 'virtual lesions'. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society London B*, 354: 1229-1238, 1999.
- Pascual-Leone A, Valls-Sole J, Wassermann EM, Brasil-Neto J, Cohen LG, and Hallett M. Effects of focal transcranial magnetic stimulation on simple reaction time to acoustic, visual and somatosensory stimuli. *Brain*, 115 (Pt 4): 1045-59, 1992.
- Philipose LE, Gottesman RF, Newhart M, Kleinman JT, Herskovits EH, Pawlak MA, Marsh EB, Davis C, Heidler-Gary J, and Hillis AE. Neural regions essential for reading and spelling of words and pseudowords. *Ann Neurol*, 62: 481-92, 2007.
- Poldrack RA, Wagner AD, Prull MW, Desmond JE, Glover GH, and Gabrieli JD. Functional specialization for semantic and phonological processing in the left inferior prefrontal cortex. *Neuroimage*, 10: 15-35, 1999.
- Price CJ. The anatomy of language: Contributions from functional neuroimaging. *Journal of Anatomy*, 197: 335-359, 2000.
- Price CJ and Mechelli A. Reading and reading disturbance. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*, 15: 231-8, 2005.
- Price CJ, Moore CJ, Humphreys GW, and Wise RJ. Segregating semantic from phonological processes during reading. *J Cogn Neurosci*, 9: 727-733, 1997.
- Pugh KR, Mencl WE, Jenner AR, Katz L, Frost SJ, Lee JR, Shaywitz SE, and Shaywitz BA. Neurobiological studies of reading and reading disability. *J Commun Disord*, 34: 479-92, 2001.
- Pugh KR, Mencl WE, Shaywitz BA, Shaywitz SE, Fulbright RK, Constable RT, Skudlarski P, Marchione KE, Jenner AR, Fletcher JM, Liberman AM, Shankweiler DP, Katz L, Lacadie C, and Gore JC. The angular gyrus in developmental dyslexia: Task-specific

1 differences in functional connectivity within posterior cortex. *Psychol Sci*, 11: 51-6,
2 2000.

3
4 Pulvermuller F, Hauk O, Nikulin VV, and Ilmoniemi RJ. Functional links between motor and
5 language systems. *Eur J Neurosci*, 21: 793-7, 2005.

6
7
8
9 Romero L, Walsh V, and Papagno C. The neural correlates of phonological short-term
10 memory: A repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation study. *J Cogn Neurosci*, 18:
11 1147-55, 2006.

12
13
14
15
16
17 Rushworth MF, Behrens TE, and Johansen-Berg H. Connection patterns distinguish 3 regions
18 of human parietal cortex. *Cereb Cortex*, 2005.

19
20
21
22 Schacter DL, Addis DR, and Buckner RL. Remembering the past to imagine the future: The
23 prospective brain. *Nat Rev Neurosci*, 8: 657-61, 2007.

24
25
26
27 Shaywitz BA, Shaywitz SE, Pugh KR, Mencl WE, Fulbright RK, Skudlarski P, Constable RT,
28 Marchione KE, Fletcher JM, Lyon GR, and Gore JC. Disruption of posterior brain
29 systems for reading in children with developmental dyslexia. *Biol Psychiatry*, 52: 101-
30 10, 2002.

31
32
33
34
35
36 Silvano J and Muggleton NG. New light through old windows: Moving beyond the "Virtual
37 lesion" Approach to transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Neuroimage*, 39: 549-52,
38 2008a.

39
40
41
42
43 Silvano J and Muggleton NG. Testing the validity of the tms state-dependency approach:
44 Targeting functionally distinct motion-selective neural populations in visual areas
45 v1/v2 and v5/mt+. *Neuroimage*, 40: 1841-8, 2008b.

46
47
48
49
50
51 Spitsyna G, Warren JE, Scott SK, Turkheimer FE, and Wise RJ. Converging language streams
52 in the human temporal lobe. *J Neurosci*, 26: 7328-36, 2006.

1 Topper R, Mottaghy FM, Brugmann M, Noth J, and Huber W. Facilitation of picture naming
2 by focal transcranial magnetic stimulation of wernicke's area. *Experimental Brain*
3
4
5 *Research*, 121: 371-378, 1998.
6

7 von Bonin G and Bailey P. *The neocortex of macaca mulatta*. Urbana, IL: University of
8
9 Illinois Press, 1947.
10

11 Walsh V and Pascual-Leone A. *Transcranial magnetic stimulation: A neurochronometrics of*
12
13 *mind*. London: MIT Press, 2003.
14
15

16 Warrington EK and Shallice T. Word form dyslexia. *Brain*, 103: 99-112, 1980.
17
18

19 Wassermann EM. Risk and safety of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation: Report and
20
21 suggested guidelines from the international workshop on the safety of repetitive
22
23 transcranial magnetic stimulation, june 5-7, 1996. *Electroencephalogr Clin*
24
25 *Neurophysiol*, 108: 1-16, 1998.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure legends

1
2
3
4
5 **Figure 1.** Stimulation sites. A) In each subject, the termination of the posterior ascending
6
7 ramus of the Sylvian fissure was identified and marked using a frameless stereotaxy system.
8
9 Then a 3×3 grid of markers was overlaid to label nine possible SMG testing sites. B) In the
10
11 main experiment, the final testing site for all 14 participants is shown (open circles) as well as
12
13 the mean group location (filled circle). Both panels are shown on a para-sagittal plane
14
15 through a single participant's brain after normalizing to the standard MNI152 space with an
16
17 affine registration (Jenkinson and Smith, 2001).
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Figure 2.** Reaction times for all three tasks in the main experiment. A. The left column
25
26 displays the absolute RTs from the onset of the visual stimulus for each of the four stimulation
27
28 timings. The dashed line represents the mean RT across the four stimulation conditions. Note
29
30 the scale of the y-axes are not identical due to the main effect of Task with visual <
31
32 phonological < semantic decisions. B) The right column displays the timings relative to the
33
34 task mean and reveals significant facilitation effects at 180 msec post-stimulus onset for both
35
36 phonological and semantic judgements. The numbers above or below the bar plots are the
37
38 effect sizes (in msec) from the mean. Error bars reflect standard error of the mean adjusted to
39
40 correctly reflect the variance in the within-subject design (Loftus and Masson, 1994).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 2

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

