Dysfunctional visual word form processing in progressive alexia
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Progressive alexia is an acquired reading deficit caused by degeneration of brain regions that are essential for written word processing. Functional imaging studies have shown that early processing of the visual word form depends on a hierarchical posterior-to-anterior processing stream in occipito-temporal cortex, whereby successive areas code increasingly larger and more complex perceptual attributes of the letter string. A region located in the left lateral occipito-temporal sulcus and adjacent fusiform gyrus shows maximal selectivity for words and has been dubbed the ‘visual word form area’. We studied two patients with progressive alexia in order to determine whether their reading deficits were associated with structural and/or functional abnormalities in this visual word form system. Voxel-based morphometry showed left-lateralized occipito-temporal atrophy in both patients, very mild in one, but moderate to severe in the other. The two patients, along with 10 control subjects, were scanned with functional magnetic resonance imaging as they viewed rapidly presented words, false font strings, or a fixation crosshair. This paradigm was optimized to reliably map brain regions involved in orthographic processing in individual subjects. All 10 control subjects showed a posterior-to-anterior gradient of selectivity for words, and all 10 showed a functionally defined visual word form area in the left hemisphere that was activated for words relative to false font strings. In contrast, neither of the two patients with progressive alexia showed any evidence for a selectivity gradient or for word-specific activation of the visual word form area. The patient with mild atrophy showed normal responses to both words and false font strings in the posterior part of the visual word form system, but a failure to develop selectivity for words in the more anterior part of the system. In contrast, the patient with moderate to severe atrophy showed minimal activation of any part of the visual word form system for either words or false font strings. Our results suggest that progressive alexia is associated with a dysfunctional visual word form system, with or without substantial cortical atrophy. Furthermore, these findings demonstrate that functional MRI has the potential to reveal the neural bases of cognitive deficits in neurodegenerative patients at very early stages, in some cases before the development of extensive atrophy.
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Introduction

Reading involves a complex mapping from a pattern of light on the retina to an abstract visual word form that is invariant for features such as size, location, case and font (Warrington and Shallice, 1980). Functional imaging studies suggest that this mapping depends on a hierarchical posterior-to-anterior gradient of processing in the ventral visual stream, with successive regions coding increasingly larger and more complex perceptual attributes of the letter string (Cohen et al., 2003; Granger and Whitney, 2004; Dehaene et al., 2005; Vinckier et al., 2007). Collectively, the cortical network of visual areas that support reading has been referred to as the visual word form system (Vinckier et al., 2007).

The earlier stages of processing are bilateral; primary visual cortex represents simple features such as oriented bars, and extrastriate visual areas extract local contours and then letter shapes. The culmination of this stream of processing is an abstract visual word form in a left-lateralized region located in the lateral occipito-temporal sulcus and/or adjacent fusiform gyrus (Binder and Mohr, 1992; Cohen et al., 2000, 2002; Molko et al., 2002; Clarke, 2003; Cohen et al., 2003; Dehaene et al., 2005; Vinckier et al., 2007; Epelbaum et al., 2008; Dehaene and Cohen, 2011). This region has been termed the ‘visual word form area’ (VWFA) (Cohen et al., 2000). Although its functional specificity continues to be debated (Price and Devlin, 2003, 2011; Dehaene and Cohen, 2011; Vogel et al., 2012), researchers concur that the VWFA plays an important role in reading.

Acquired reading deficits are traditionally divided into peripheral and central alexias. Peripheral alexias involve deficits in mapping visual inputs to visual word forms, whereas central alexias involve damage to orthographic representations or the mapping from orthography to phonological and/or semantic representations. When the visual word form system is damaged, words can no longer be recognized quickly and automatically. Reading is often possible if orthography and/or semantic representations remain intact. Nevertheless, reading is often possible to some extent, but it is characterized by a slow and effortful serial strategy referred to as letter-by-letter reading (Dejerine, 1892; Damasio and Damasio, 1983; Binder and Mohr, 1992; Beversdorf et al., 1997; Cohen et al., 2003; Leff et al., 2006; Mani et al., 2008; Pflugshaupt et al., 2009). Although letter-by-letter reading is generally considered the most archetypal form of peripheral alexia, it should be noted that many patients with letter-by-letter reading also exhibit central orthographic processing deficits that may affect both reading and spelling (Behrmann et al., 1998; Rapcsak and Beeson, 2004; Tsapkini and Rapp, 2010).

Acquired alexia due to neurodegenerative disease is termed ‘progressive alexia’. Its onset is insidious and deficits become progressively worse over time (Mendez et al., 2007). Acquired peripheral alexias are most commonly associated with the clinical neurodegenerative syndrome of posterior cortical atrophy (PCA) (Benson et al., 1988), which usually reflects Alzheimer’s pathology (Hof et al., 1997; Tang-Wai et al., 2004) though other aetiologies have been reported (Victoroff et al., 1994). PCA is characterized by progressive deficits of visual and visuospatial functioning. Peripheral alexias are a prominent early symptom in most, if not all cases with PCA, often constituting the first clinical manifestation of the disease (Benson et al., 1988; McMonagle et al., 2006). Patients with PCA have been reported to present with a variety of types of peripheral alexia including not only letter-by-letter reading, but also neglect alexia, attentional alexia, and alexia secondary to simultanagnosia (Cogan, 1985; De Renzi, 1986; Benson et al., 1988; Freedman et al., 1991; Freedman and Costa, 1992; Graff-Radford et al., 1993; Ardila et al., 1997; Beversdorf and Heilman, 1998; Mendez and Cherrier, 1998; Mendez et al., 2002; Tang-Wai et al., 2004; McMonagle et al., 2006; Crutch and Warrington, 2007; Mendez et al., 2007; Crutch and Warrington, 2009; Giovagnoli et al., 2009; Catricala et al., 2011; Fragassi et al., 2011). Alexia is typically out of proportion to any other language deficits that may occur, such as anomia or transcortical sensory aphasia (McMonagle et al., 2006).

Although progressive peripheral alexia most frequently occurs in patients with PCA, it is also occasionally seen in cases of primary progressive aphasia. For instance, several patients with semantic dementia have been reported with letter-by-letter reading (Hodges et al., 1992; Patterson and Hodges, 1992; Noble et al., 2000). However, peripheral alexias are not common in primary progressive aphasia; more commonly seen are central alexias involving deficits in linking visual word forms to semantic or phonological representations (Hodges et al., 1992; Patterson and Hodges, 1992; Mendez, 2002; Jefferies et al., 2004; Brambati et al., 2009; Wilson et al., 2009; Henry et al., 2012; Snowden et al., 2012).

Relatively little is known about the neural substrates of progressive peripheral alexias with letter-by-letter reading. Most patients with clinically defined PCA have atrophy and/or hypometabolism of bilateral occipito-parietal and/or occipito-temporal cortex (Benson et al., 1988; Graff-Radford et al., 1993; Mendez et al., 2002; Tang-Wei et al., 2004; Whitwell et al., 2007); however, imaging abnormalities are not apparent in all individuals (McMonagle et al., 2006). Several cases have been reported in which alexia was the most prominent symptom and in which atrophy and/or hypometabolism were more pronounced in left than right posterior brain regions (Freedman et al., 1991; Beversdorf and Heilman, 1998; Giovagnoli et al., 2009; Fragassi et al., 2011). There have also been suggestions that alexia in PCA may be related to ventral rather than dorsal pathology (Beversdorf and Heilman, 1998; Mendez and Cherrier, 1998). However, no structural or functional imaging studies have been carried out to identify which regions are specifically responsible for progressive alexia in PCA. Similarly, in primary progressive aphasia, although several studies have investigated the neural basis of central alexias (Brambati et al., 2009; Wilson et al., 2009; Henry et al., 2012), it is not known which regions are implicated in the occasional patients with primary progressive aphasia whose alexia includes a peripheral component.

In this study, we investigated the structural and functional status of the visual word form system, including the VWFA, in two patients with progressive alexia and a profile of letter-by-letter reading. One patient was diagnosed with PCA and the other with logopenic variant primary progressive aphasia. We used a functional MRI paradigm that was optimized to detect the posterior-to-anterior gradient of selectivity for word forms, culminating in word-specific activity in the VWFA, in every individual
healthy control participant. We hypothesized that the visual word form system would be functionally abnormal in the two patients with progressive alexia, and by comparing the patients to healthy control subjects, we sought to characterize the nature of any functional abnormalities.

Previous functional imaging studies of patients with letter-by-letter reading due to stroke or surgical resection have revealed abnormal or absent neural activation when the VWFA is damaged or disconnected from its visual inputs (Cohen et al., 2000, 2003, 2004; Henry et al., 2005; Gaillard et al., 2006; Epelbaum et al., 2008; Ino et al., 2008; Tsapkini et al., 2011). All of these cases had frank structural damage to the visual word form system. In contrast, although our two patients had different degrees of atrophy in the visual word form system, no regions were completely destroyed, raising the question of whether functional abnormalities can be identified in such cases.

Materials and methods

Participants

Two individuals with progressive alexia participated in the study. Both were male, and aged 71 and 74, respectively, when they were scanned. Before scanning both patients completed a comprehensive battery of language, neuropsychological and reading evaluations, described below.

Control data for the functional imaging study were acquired from 10 healthy control participants who were primarily recruited from newspaper advertisements or flyers. These included five males and five females, with a mean age of 67 years (range: 50–77). In particular, there were four control males who were similar in age (72, 74, 75 and 77 years) to the two patients.

As control subjects for voxel-based morphometry, we used 9 of these 10 control subjects (the youngest, aged 50, was not used), plus an additional 13 age-matched control subjects who had been scanned on the same scanner for a different study, for a total of 22 control subjects. These included nine males and 13 females, with a mean age of 71 years (range: 63–77).

All participants gave written informed consent, and were compensated for taking part in the study. The study was approved by the University of Arizona Institutional Review Board.

Patient J: Case history and evaluations

Patient J was a left-handed male who was first seen in November 2010, at which time he was 70 years old. He had a masters degree in Fine Arts, had worked as an artist and art teacher, and continued to work part-time facilitating art classes. He described a 4 to 5-year history of progressive reading difficulties.

Because Patient J was left-handed, we used a standard clinical language mapping paradigm (picture naming) to determine whether his language areas were left-lateralized. This study revealed clear left lateralization for language processing (Supplementary Fig. 1). Because lateralization for reading tends to match lateralization for spoken language (Van der Haegen et al., 2012), it is reasonable to assume that in Patient J, reading would probably also have been premorbidly left-lateralized.

Patient J’s spoken language was largely intact (Table 1). In conversation, his output was fluent but characterized by mild anomia. In formal testing, this was reflected in a score of 46 out of 60 on the Boston Naming Test. His comprehension of conversational speech was very good but there was a mild deficit on formal testing of single word comprehension; he made three semantic errors on spoken word-picture matching (PALPA 47); in each case, he chose semantically-related foils, e.g. he chose ‘tiara’ in response to ‘crown’.

He did not show any significant cognitive, executive or memory deficits (Table 1). He performed poorly only on the Trail Making Test, which was presumably due to the fact that this test requires reading of letters and digits. He exhibited only mild visuospatial deficits; he performed well on copy and delayed copy of a modified Rey-Osterrieth figure (Fig. 1B and C) and well on face matching. However, he missed 3 of 10 items on the number location subtest from the Visual Object and Space Perception battery (VOSP) (Warrington and James, 1991), in which participants are asked to identify which of 16 digits in a square correspond to the location of a dot in an adjacent square.

Patient J was severely alexic (Table 2). Although he was highly educated, he was no longer reading at all in daily life. He was compensating through the use of books on tape and a computerized reading program. He had deficits at the single letter level, with errors on case matching, letter naming, and matching spoken-to-written letters (Table 2). He read single words extremely slowly with a letter-by-letter strategy, subvocally mouthing the individual letter names before eventually producing a response. His reading time increased as a function of word length (Fig. 2), a typical pattern in letter-by-letter readers. Because his single letter naming was error-prone, his letter-by-letter strategy was often not successful; overall, he read 70% of words and 50% of pseudowords correctly. Most frequent error types were visually similar words (46%, e.g. ‘stale’ for ‘slate’, ‘bride’ for ‘bribe’, ‘circuit’ for ‘circus’), probably reflecting his deficits at the single letter level. Other frequent error types were lack of any response (33%) and unrelated words (17%, e.g. ‘step’ for ‘chef’, ‘huge’ for ‘laugh’). Paragraph reading was extremely slow. Patient J took 202 s to read the first two lines of a second grade level passage (18 words, 11.2 s per word), and he read only 11 of the 18 words correctly.

Patient J’s written spelling was also impaired; he spelled 80% of regular real words, 60% of irregular real words, and 85% of pseudowords correctly. Direct copy of single words was good (96% letters correct), whereas case conversion was poor (58% correct), suggesting an allographic impairment, i.e. an impairment in mapping graphemes to letter shapes.

We evaluated Patient J again in June 2011, 7 months later. His anomia had progressed only slightly; he scored 42 out of 60 on the Boston Naming Test. In contrast, his reading was now dramatically worse. He read only 28% of words and 5% of pseudowords correctly. His most common error type was not to respond (73%, e.g. ‘I don’t know’), followed by visually similar words (22%, e.g. ‘dump’ for ‘bump’, ‘comfort’ for ‘compact’). However, testing in the oral modality revealed strikingly spared orthographic knowledge. He was able to recognize 98% of words that were spelled out loud for him, and 90% of pseudowords.

Patient J’s written spelling had further deteriorated; he now spelled only 55% of regular real words, 33% of irregular real words, and 65% of pseudowords correctly. However, he performed much better in oral testing, correctly spelling out loud 95% of regular words, 70% of irregular words, and 100% of pseudowords. The superior performance in oral spelling suggests a significant allographic impairment, whereas the pattern of surface agraphia in both modalities suggested mild damage to central orthographic representations.

In summary, Patient J presented with severe progressive alexia that was predominantly peripheral in nature, as evidenced by his very slow
and error-prone letter-by-letter reading. In addition, he showed a significant allographic impairment and mild damage to central orthographic representations. Patient J met criteria for the clinical syndrome of PCA (Tang-Wei et al., 2004). We scanned him in June 2011, shortly after this second evaluation.

**Table 1 Language and neuropsychological measures in the two progressive alexic patients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nov 2010</th>
<th>June 2011</th>
<th>Patient B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diagnosis</strong></td>
<td>Progressive alexia and mild anomia</td>
<td>Progressive alexia and logopenic PPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MMSE (/30)</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Handedness</strong></td>
<td>left-handed</td>
<td>right-handed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAB classification</td>
<td>Anomic</td>
<td>Anomic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content (/10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency (/10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension (/10)</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition (/10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naming (/10)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston naming test (/60)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonemic verbal fluency (generate words starting with d)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic verbal fluency (generate animal names)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyramids and Palm Trees (pictures)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyramids and Palm Trees (written)</td>
<td>discontinued</td>
<td>too impaired</td>
<td>discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken word-picture match (PALPA 47, 5AFC, /40)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Phonological Battery (/100)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cognitive/Executive/Memory**

| Raven’s Progressive Coloured Matrices (/36) | 31 | 31 | 21 |
| Trail Making Test A* | 81 s | — | 45 s |
| Trail Making Test B* | >300 s | — | discontinued |
| Digits forward | 8+ | 7 | 5 |
| Digits backwards | 5 | 3 | — |

**Visuospatial tests**

- Modified Rey-Osterrieth copy (/17) — 13 | 13 |
- Modified Rey-Osterrieth delayed copy (/17) — 13 | 6 |
- Modified Rey-Osterrieth recognition (yes/no) — yes | yes |
- Number location (VOSP) (/10) — 7 | 8 |
- Face matching (CATS) (/12) — 11 | 11 |

**Notes:**

- MMSE = Mini-Mental State Examination (Folstein et al., 1975); WAB = Western Aphasia Battery (Kertesz, 1982); PALPA = Psycholinguistic Assessments of Language Processing in Aphasia (Kay et al., 1992); VOSP = number location subtest from the Visual Object and Space Perception battery (Warrington and James, 1991); CATS = face matching subtest from the Comprehensive Affect Testing System (Froming et al., 2006).
- Boston Naming Test (Kaplan et al., 1983); Pyramids and Palm Trees (Howard and Patterson, 1992); Arizona Phonological Battery (Rapcsak et al., 2009); Raven’s Progressive Colored Matrices (Raven et al., 1990); modified Rey-Osterrieth figure copy and recall (Possin et al., 2011).
- — = not tested.
- 5AFC = 5-alternative forced choice.
- * Performance on the Trail Making Test was presumably compromised by reading deficits. Normal performance on Trails A in this age range is 40 ± 14 s (education > 12 years, as for Patient J) or 42 ± 15 s (education ≤ 12 years, as for Patient B). Normal performance on Trails B is 86 ± 24 s (education > 12 years) or 110 ± 35 s (education ≤ 12 years) (Tombaugh, 2004).
- ** Visuospatial tests were performed several months later than the other tests.

Patient B: Case history and evaluation

Patient B was a right-handed male who was first seen in June 2010, at which time he was 73-years-old. He had an eighth grade education, had worked as a construction foreman, and was the owner of a company involved in the mining industry. He described an ~18-month history of difficulty expressing himself, which he first noticed as a difficulty in telling jokes, and progressive reading difficulties over the same period.

His spoken language was characterized by prominent anomia, circumlocutions, and retracings, and mild comprehension difficulties were evident in conversation. Language testing resulted in a clinical diagnosis of logopenic progressive aphasia (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011), supported by anomia in spontaneous speech and confrontation naming, impaired repetition, and preserved single word comprehension, motor speech, and grammatical function (Table 1).
Table 2 Orthographic, reading, writing and spelling measures in the two progressive alexic patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patient J</th>
<th>Patient B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single letter tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirror reversal (PALPA 18, 2AFC, /36)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case matching (PALPA 19/20, 2AFC, /52)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter naming (PALPA 22, /26)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken letter-written letter match (PALPA 23, 4AFC, /26)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical decision, illicit foils (PALPA 24, 2AFC, /60)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical decision, plausible foils (PALPA 25, 2AFC, /60)</td>
<td>discontinued</td>
<td>too impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthographic choice (2AFC, /40)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>too impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral reading of regular words (ABRS) (/40)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral reading of irregular words (ABRS) (/40)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral reading of pseudowords (ABRS) (/20)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral ‘reading’ of regular words spelled out loud (/40)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral ‘reading’ of irregular words spelled out loud (/40)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral ‘reading’ of pseudowords spelled out loud (/20)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written word-picture match (PALPA 48, 5AFC, /40)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy of single words (% letters correct)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case conversion (/52)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written spelling of regular words (ABRS) (/40)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written spelling of irregular words (ABRS) (/40)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written spelling of pseudowords (ABRS) (/20)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral spelling of regular words (ABRS) (/40)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral spelling of irregular words (ABRS) (/40)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral spelling of pseudowords (ABRS) (/20)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PALPA = Psycholinguistic Assessments of Language Processing in Aphasia (Kay et al., 1992); ABRS = Arizona Battery for Reading and Spelling (Henry et al., 2007; Rapcsak et al., 2009; Beeson et al., 2010).

Control subjects make only occasional sporadic errors and are at ceiling for all measures (Beeson et al., 2010).

— = not tested.

nAFC = n-alternative forced choice.
Mr. B showed moderate cognitive deficits, as evidenced by poor performance on Raven’s progressive coloured matrices (Table 1). He performed poorly on the Trail Making Test but, as noted above, this test requires reading of letters and digits. He exhibited only mild visuospatial deficits; he performed well on copy and moderately well on delayed copy of a modified Rey-Osterrieth figure (Fig. 1D and E). He missed 2 of the 10 items on the number location subtest from the Visual Object and Space Perception battery, but he did well on face matching.

Patient B reportedly had never been much of a reader, but he had read the Bible and trade magazines. He described reading less and less as he had found it becoming increasingly difficult. Patient B’s reading was severely impaired (Table 2), with deficits at the single letter level evident in errors of discrimination of mirror-reversed letters, case matching, and case conversion. He employed a laborious letter-by-letter reading strategy that was often unsuccessful due to his difficulties in the identification of individual letters. The following examples are typical of his attempts to read single words:

1. [Target: reach] B R E A T H, berneath, bearth, I dunno, that’s not it
2. [Target: showe] S H O P E, sharp, no
3. [Target: choir] cough, C O U M D, cough, that don’t sound right, cough, C O U, no that’s not C O, C H O I R, cough, no, it’s C O U something, C H O I R.

Overall, single words were read correctly just 20% of the time, and no pseudowords were read correctly. The most common error types were unrelated words (30%, e.g. ‘touch’ for ‘double’) and visually similar words (22%, e.g. ‘change’ for ‘charge’). Too few of his responses were correct to permit the calculation of reaction time.

Patient B was generally unable to pronounce words that were spelled out loud for him, but this was not formally tested (note that the phonological short-term memory deficits of logopenic primary progressive aphasia would make this challenging even if orthographic representations were intact). Written spelling was also very poor for both words and pseudowords.

In sum, patient B showed severe progressive alexia with a significant peripheral component, as evidenced by his slow and error-prone letter-by-letter reading. His spelling impairment for both words and pseudowords indicated damage to lexical-semantic and sublexical spelling mechanisms. In addition, Patient B demonstrated prominent spoken language deficits, meeting diagnostic criteria for logopenic primary progressive aphasia (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011). We scanned Patient B ~1 year after we first saw him, in June 2011.

**Functional magnetic resonance imaging experimental design**

The aim of our functional imaging study was to determine whether the visual word form system was functionally normal in the two patients with progressive alexia, therefore it was important to optimize our paradigm such that the functional organization of the visual word form system could be robustly mapped in each individual healthy control participant. Otherwise a seemingly abnormal pattern in the patients might just reflect interindividual variability, and would be difficult to interpret. Pilot studies suggested that four design features were important to reliably map the visual word form system: (i) a block design to maximize signal to noise; (ii) a control condition closely matched for low-level visual features; (iii) a rapid presentation rate; and (iv) an attentionally demanding non-linguistic task. It is likely that these last two features minimize semantic processing and other higher level processing of the stimuli, and thus are more effective in revealing lower level processes, which are more consistent across subjects than higher level processes. Rapid presentation rates and attentionally demanding tasks have been used in previous studies aimed at mapping response selectivity in occipito-temporal cortex (Vinckier et al., 2007).

We used false font strings rather than non-word orthographic strings as the control condition, because activation levels for non-word strings depend heavily on the orthographic plausibility of the non-word strings. Implausible non-words behave like false fonts, whereas plausible non-words produce similar levels of activity to real words (Vinckier et al., 2007).

Participants were scanned with functional MRI as they viewed blocks of rapidly presented words, false font strings, or a fixation crosshair, while performing an attentionally demanding non-linguistic task. Each block was 20s long, and in each run there were six repetitions of each of the three conditions, presented in pseudorandom order, for a total run length of 6 min, plus 8 s to acquire four additional volumes that were discarded. Participants completed two runs each, except for one control participant, who completed only one run.

The stimulus words were nouns and adjectives selected from the Medical Research Council database (Coltheart, 1981). They were all six letters long and medium frequency, with Kucera-Francis frequencies ranging from 10 to 110. Proper names and some emotive words were excluded. Words were shown in Times New Roman font, all capitals, centred on a fixation cross. Words were presented in white on a grey background for 100 ms, then a white fixation cross was displayed for 200 ms, then the next word was presented. There were 67 words in each 20-s block.

The false font stimuli were created using letters from alphabetic orthographies other than English. These stimuli were presented with the same timing and visual parameters as the words.

The task was to detect occasional words or false font strings presented in red instead of white, and then press a button on a response pad as quickly as possible. These catch trials were presented pseudorandomly in four of the six word blocks, and four of the six false font blocks.

Participants were familiarized with the stimuli and practiced the task, before being placed in the scanner.

**Neuroimaging protocol**

Participants were scanned as they lay supine in a General Electric 3 T HD Signa Excite scanner at the University of Arizona Medical Centre. They viewed the stimuli through magnetic resonance-compatible goggles (Resonance Technology, Inc.), and wore padded headphones and earplugs to attenuate scanner noise.

For anatomical reference and registration, a T1-weighted 3D spoiled gradient recalled inversion recovery sequence was acquired with the following parameters: 160 sagittal slices; slice thickness = 1 mm; field of view = 256 × 256 mm; matrix = 256 × 256 mm; repetition time = 7.5 ms; echo time = 3.0 ms; inversion time = 500 ms; flip angle = 15°.

For the functional imaging paradigm, 184 blood oxygen level-dependent T2*-weighted volumes were acquired using a single-shot spiral pulse sequence (Glover and Law, 2001) with the following parameters: 30 anterior commissure/posterior commissure-aligned axial slices in sequential order; slice thickness = 4 mm with no gap; field of view = 240 × 240 mm; matrix = 64 × 64; repetition time = 2000 ms; echo time = 30 ms; flip angle = 90°.

Visual stimuli were presented with PsychToolbox 3.0.8 (Brainard, 1997; Pelli, 1997) running under MATLAB 7.11 (Mathworks) on a Windows PC.
Voxel-based morphometry

The T1-weighted structural images were bias-corrected, segmented into grey matter, white matter and CSF, and normalized to MNI space using the unified segmentation algorithm in SPM (version SPM5; http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm; Ashburner and Friston, 2005). Grey matter and white matter probability maps were scaled by Jacobians, smoothed with a Gaussian kernel of 10 mm full-width half-maximum, then summed together to obtain a map of brain par enchyma (Wilson et al., 2010). Each of the two patients was compared to the 22 control subjects, with age, sex and total intracranial volume included as covariates. Statistical maps were thresholded at voxelwise \( P < 0.005 \), with a minimum cluster size of 1500 mm\(^3\).

Functional magnetic resonance imaging data analysis

The functional imaging data were preprocessed with AFNI (version 2011-06-22; http://afni.nimh.nih.gov/afni; Cox, 1996). The data were corrected for slice timing differences, realigned to account for head movement, smoothed with a Gaussian kernel of 4 mm full-width half-maximum, high pass filtered (cut-off = 0.006 Hz) and detrended (Legendre polynomials of order up to and including two). A general linear model was fit at each voxel using the ‘fminlm’ procedure from FMRISTAT (version 2006-06-02; http://www.math.mcgill.ca/keith/fmristat; Worsley et al., 2002), modelling temporal autocorrelation as an autoregressive process of degree one.

The design matrix contained one explanatory variable for word blocks and one for false font blocks, each convolved with a canonical haemodynamic reference function modelled as a difference of two gamma functions. Six head motion parameters, slow drift parameters, and the global whole-brain signal were included as covariates of no interest. Each subject’s two runs were combined with a fixed effects model using the ‘multisub’ procedure from FMRISTAT.

Functional images were initially coregistered to structural images using SPM5, then manually realigned for greater accuracy. Anatomical images were transformed to MNI space with SPM5, and this transformation was then applied to the statistical images.

To identify the VWFA in each individual subject, we contrasted words to false font strings at voxelwise \( P < 0.05, \) masked by the contrast of words versus fixation at \( P < 0.001 \). We also plotted the mean signal for words and false font strings in occipito-temporal cortex in each hemisphere as a function of \( y \) coordinate (i.e. posterior-to-anterior), by averaging across a region of interest defined by the control group activation for words versus rest thresholded as described above (voxelwise \( P < 0.005 \) and corrected for multiple comparisons at \( P < 0.05 \)).

Results

Voxel-based morphometry

Voxel-based morphometry showed that Patient J had very mild atrophy of the left posterior inferior temporal gyrus, and widening of the left sylvian fissure (Fig. 3A, Table 3). Patient B had much more extensive atrophy of the left inferior and middle temporal gyri, the left fusiform gyrus, the white matter underlying these regions, and a smaller region of the right posterior inferior temporal gyrus (Fig. 3B, Table 3).

Behavioural data collected during functional magnetic resonance imaging

Control subjects responded to 90.5% ± 15.8% (SD) of the catch trials (occasional words or false font strings coloured red instead of white). Patient J responded to 87.5% of the catch trials, and Patient B responded to 100% of the catch trials. Most participants also made occasional false positive responses.

Functional magnetic resonance imaging

All 10 control subjects showed a VWFA that responded more to words than false font strings according to our criteria (Fig. 4A–C, Table 4). For the more basic contrasts of words versus fixation and false font strings versus fixation, all control subjects showed bilateral occipito-temporal activation (Fig. 4A–C).

Unlike the control subjects, neither of the two patients with progressive alexia showed a VWFA according to our criteria (Fig. 4D and E, Table 4). For the more basic contrasts relative to fixation, the two patients differed from one another. Patient J showed typical robust bilateral occipito-temporal activation for both of these contrasts (Fig. 4D). Patient B showed much weaker activation for these contrasts, with more activity in the right than the left hemisphere (Fig. 4E).

We next checked whether loosening our criteria for the VWFA (i.e. words versus false font strings \( P < 0.05 \), words versus fixation \( P < 0.001 \), within 15 mm of published coordinates) would reveal any evidence for a VWFA in either patient. For Patient J, there were two single voxels meeting the voxel-wise criteria in left occipito-temporal cortex; however, the closest to the VWFA was 27 mm away at \((-52, -82, -14)\). In right occipito-temporal cortex there was a cluster of 39 voxels with centre of mass \((41, -57, 2)\), which is 17 mm from the right hemisphere homologue of the VWFA. We then examined the contrast of words versus false fonts without the mask of words versus rest, and observed a cluster of 44 voxels with centre of mass \((-60, -56, -11)\), which is
18 mm from the VWFA. However, activation at that location was slightly negative for all words relative to rest, suggesting that the cluster arose due to a deactivation for false font strings. A failure to activate for words relative to rest is inconsistent with the response properties of the VWFA. For Patient B, there were no voxels meeting the voxel-wise criteria in left occipito-temporal cortex. In right occipito-temporal cortex there were a few scattered voxels meeting the voxel-wise criteria, but none were close to the right homologue of the VWFA; the closest was located at (–40, –72, –2), which is 20 mm from the right hemisphere homologue of the VWFA. We then examined the contrast of words versus false fonts without the mask of words versus rest, and observed a small cluster of nine voxels with centre of mass (–50, –43, –10), which is 17 mm from the VWFA. But activation at that location was slightly negative for all words relative to rest, inconsistent with the response properties of the VWFA.

In summary, neither patient showed any activation resembling a typical VWFA, even when the criteria were relaxed.

We next performed a whole-brain random effects analysis contrasting words to false font strings in the 10 control subjects. The VWFA was the only region activated (centre of mass: –43, –50, –18; extent = 6312 mm$^3$; corrected $P < 0.001$) (Fig. 5A). We then directly compared the two patients to the 10 control subjects. The patients showed significantly less activation than control subjects in the VWFA (centre of mass: –39, –45, –19; extent = 1000 mm$^3$; corrected $P = 0.034$) (Fig. 5B). This was the largest cluster observed, and no other clusters reached significance.

To reveal the anticipated posterior–anterior gradient of selectivity for words, we plotted the signal to false font strings as a proportion of the signal to words, in regions that were active for words versus fixation (Fig. 6). We found evidence for this gradient in each of the 10 control subjects (Fig. 6A–J). There was some individual variability, for instance, Control Subject 4 (who was left-handed) showed a typical gradient in the left hemisphere, but an even stronger gradient in the right hemisphere; Control Subject 5 showed rather weak activity for both conditions relative to rest; and Control Subject 9 showed an additional word-selective region more posteriorly. However, despite this variability, left hemisphere posterior–anterior gradients were evident in all control subjects.

In contrast, neither of the two patients with progressive alexia exhibited a posterior–anterior gradient of selectivity for words (Fig. 6K and L). Both patients had small regions in the right hemisphere that were selective for words at $P < 0.05$, but in both cases these were considerably dorsal to the right hemisphere homologue of the VWFA (Fig. 6K and L).

We also plotted the mean signal for words and false font strings in occipito-temporal cortex in each hemisphere as a function of...
y coordinate (i.e. posterior-to-anterior) (Fig. 6). This analysis highlighted a notable difference between the two patients. Patient J showed normal responses to both words and false font strings in posterior occipito-temporal cortex, but unlike control subjects, he showed no emergence of selectivity for words more anteriorly.

In fact, he showed somewhat less activity for words than false font strings in the vicinity of the VWFA. In contrast, Patient B showed minimal activation for either words or false font strings in any part of occipito-temporal cortex. In this respect, Patient B differed from Patient J and the control subjects, all of whom showed robust responses for both words and false font strings relative to rest.

Table 4 Localization of VWFA with functional MRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>MNI coordinates of VWFA</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Max t</th>
<th>Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control 1</td>
<td>−37 −45 −23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 2</td>
<td>−44 −54 −16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 3</td>
<td>−45 −56 −9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 4</td>
<td>−35 −45 −20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 5</td>
<td>−45 −56 −15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 6</td>
<td>−41 −60 −12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 7</td>
<td>−51 −51 −14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>3416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 8</td>
<td>−42 −52 −13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>3184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 9</td>
<td>−43 −52 −12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 10</td>
<td>−43 −52 −14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient J</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance is the distance from the VWFA coordinates of (−42, −57, −15) reported by Cohen et al. (2002).

*Clusters for these subjects were contiguous with other clusters outside the VWFA, so cluster extent could not be determined. The t threshold was raised until the clusters separated to determine the centre of mass of the VWFA cluster.
The goal of this study was to investigate the structural and functional status of the visual word form system, including the VWFA, in two patients with progressive alexia. Structural imaging showed left-lateralized occipito-temporal atrophy in both patients, mild in one (Patient J) but moderate to severe in the other (Patient B). Functional imaging in control subjects revealed a posterior-to-anterior gradient of selectivity for words, and all 10 showed a functionally defined VWFA that was activated for words relative...
to false font strings. In contrast, neither of the two patients showed any evidence for a selectivity gradient or for word-specific activation of the VWFA. These findings support our hypothesis that the visual word form system would be functionally abnormal in progressive alexia.

Patient J showed normal bilateral occipito-temporal responses for words relative to rest and false fonts relative to rest, whereas Patient B showed reduced activation even in these basic contrasts. This may be related to the degree of occipito-temporal atrophy, which was much greater in Patient B. Because Patient B showed abnormal activity even in basic contrasts in regions posterior to the VWFA, it seems clear that early processing stages in the visual word form system were implicated in his reading deficit, consistent with the fact that his deficits extended even to the single letter level. Patient J, in contrast, did not lack activation of regions posterior to the VWFA. Rather, he lacked any emergence of selectivity for words. Whereas the dysfunction of his visual word form system was more subtle than that of Patient B, regions posterior to the VWFA may likewise be implicated as Patient J also had deficits at the single letter level. Although our data suggest that functional abnormalities arise posterior to the VWFA in both patients, it should be emphasized that neither patient had severe visual perceptual deficits, and object recognition was intact. Both patients’ deficits were quite specific for reading.

A crucial methodological aspect of our study was the optimization of a paradigm that would reliably activate the VWFA in every individual normal control subject. Otherwise, failure to detect the VWFA in the patients with progressive alexia might simply reflect a lack of statistical power. We used a block design with false font VWFA in the patients with progressive alexia might simply reflect individual normal control subject. Otherwise, failure to detect the stimulation of a paradigm that would reliably activate the VWFA in every patient in the two patients, it should be emphasized that neither patient had severe visual perceptual deficits, and object recognition was intact. Both patients’ deficits were quite specific for reading.

Our two patients with progressive alexia met criteria for different clinical syndromes. Patient J likely represents an early case of PCA, whereas Patient B met diagnostic criteria for logopenic primary progressive aphasia. Here we consider our findings for each patient in the context of their broader clinical syndrome.

Patient J met clinical criteria for PCA, in that his presenting difficulty was the insidious onset of a primary visual dysfunction (Tang-Wai et al., 2004). It is not uncommon that the first visual dysfunction in PCA is progressive peripheral alexia (Benson et al., 1988; McMonagle et al., 2006; Mendez et al., 2007). Patient J did not have any other significant visual or visuospatial deficits, although he made some errors on the number location subtest from the Visual Object and Space Perception battery, which may be a harbinger of the emergence of a more generalized visual impairment.

Some authors have proposed that distinct variants of PCA differentially involve dorsal and ventral visual streams (Caselli, 1995; Mackenzie Ross et al., 1996; Beversdorf and Heilman, 1998; Mendez and Cherrier, 1998; Migliaccio et al., 2012) or that there is a continuum between dorsal and ventral forms (Lehmann et al., 2011), whereas others have argued that the dorsal stream is generally more affected than the ventral stream (McMonagle et al., 2006). Mendez and Cherrier (1998) reported two cases of PCA in which alexia with letter-by-letter reading was the first symptom, but both patients eventually developed a more general ventral simultanagnosia and eventually dorsal simultanagnosia. In contrast, Mendez (2001) reported another patient with PCA with deficits primarily affecting visual localization and visuospatial integration, in whom reading was largely preserved. PET showed bilateral occipito-parietal hypometabolism. In another patient with occipito-parietal degeneration, Vinckier et al. (2006) showed that reading was preserved, except in situations that make particular demands on visuospatial processing, such as
rotated words, or words with spaces between the letters. Taken together, these cases suggest that peripheral alexia with letter-by-letter reading in PCA is related to dysfunction of ventral rather than dorsal visual regions (Mendez and Cherrier, 1998; Mendez, 2001).

Our findings with Patient J are consistent with this view. The functional abnormalities we observed were ventral, as was the mild structural atrophy, consistent with progressive alexia being the only prominent symptom in this case. We concur with previous researchers that there are multiple variants of PCA depending on the particular regions affected (Caselli, 1995; Mackenzie Ross et al., 1996; Lehmann et al., 2011; Migliaccio et al., 2012), and that cases in which alexia is the first and most prominent symptom reflect a ventral variant (Beversdorf and Heilman, 1998; Mendez and Cherrier, 1998).

Patient B met clinical criteria for logopenic primary progressive aphasia. He showed progressive alexia with a prominent peripheral component, as evidenced by letter-by-letter reading, as well as a central spelling deficit, and significant aphasia. Although logopenic primary progressive aphasia is associated with reading deficits (Brambati et al., 2009; Henry et al., 2012), such deficits are typically central in nature; to our knowledge, no previous cases have been reported with significant peripheral deficits as well. Patient B’s unique pattern of impairment can be explained in terms of his atrophy, which encompassed both posterior perisylvian cortex, accounting for spoken language deficits and possibly contributing to his spelling impairment, as well as occipito-temporal regions, accounting for peripheral alexia. Patient B’s atrophy was also strongly left-lateralized, which is consistent with his relatively spared visuospatial functions. It has been suggested that PCA and logopenic primary progressive aphasia have much in common as atypical Alzheimer’s variants, and may differ primarily in relative lateralization of posterior atrophy (Migliaccio et al., 2009).

In conclusion, we have shown that the visual word form system was functionally abnormal in two cases of progressive alexia, despite the fact that the VWFA was neither completely destroyed nor were there any frank lesions that would disconnect it from its afferents. This functional abnormality was accompanied by substantial atrophy in only one of the two cases, indicating that defective activation of the visual word form system resulting in profound alexia may precede significant atrophy.
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